CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPEAN LITERARY THEORY AND THE WEST

Edited by Michał Mrugalski, Schamma Schahadat,
and Irina Wutsdorff

Central and Eastern European Literary Theory and the West

Central and Eastern European Literary Theory and the West

Edited by
Michał Mrugalski, Schamma Schahadat,
and Irina Wutsdorff

in collaboration with Danuta Ulicka

DE GRUYTER

Table of Contents

IV Some Key Terms

I Introduction: Entangled Literary Theory

Michał Mrugalski, Schamma Schahadat, Irina Wutsdorff

Introduction

The starting point of this book on modern literary theory in the cultures of Central and Eastern Europe as an entangled history is the fact that in the twentieth century there was intensive intellectual movement in the Central and Eastern European region as well as between Eastern and Central Europe and Western academia. This was due not only to an active exchange of ideas, but also to personal and institutional, official and unofficial contact.

Yet this exchange was only possible in a rather restricted manner over long periods of time: political events led to a number of waves of exile and to the seclusion of larger parts of Central and Eastern Europe. A few theories nevertheless made it into the Western discourse on literary theory via exiled scholars, some of them (e. g. Bakhtin's dialogicity) becoming known only indirectly and being transferred to new cultural contexts, while others (e. g. the theories of Ol'ga Freidenberg or Stefania Skwarczyńska) had limited reception outside of the Russian or Polish context.

The articles on literary schools and circles, on methods and on keywords, on transformations, translations and migrations take an in-depth, research-based look at the cultural and historical conditionality of literary theory in Central and Eastern Europe as well as its *histoire croisée*. The period under investigation extends from the beginnings of modern literary theory in the early twentieth century to developments in the present day. From a historical perspective, the volume examines the stories of intellectual entanglement and the transfer of theories and ideas between players and institutions in Central and Eastern Europe and beyond (specifically: Russian, Polish and Czech theories in exchange with each other and with the German-speaking world). Submerged and overlooked bodies of knowledge which in the first half of the twentieth century were part of the European intellectual field but tended to be suppressed as the so-called Eastern Bloc was excluded thus become visible in the Western field of theory. Political but also linguistic barriers have contributed to the fact that large parts of Central and East European thought and knowledge have never or only very rarely been taken into consideration in Western Europe and in the Anglo-American sphere.

A famous example of a successful and yet inhibited transfer of ideas is the story of literary structuralism – the origins of which can be traced back to the transcultural Prague of the interwar period – which split into numerous trends following World War II: the internationally renowned Paris structuralism captured the attention of academia, whereas Warsaw structuralism and the further developments of Prague structuralism were much less known in the West. This

was unwarranted, since both contained, among other outstanding features, elements of those theories that were later (re-)imported to Central and Eastern Europe from France and the USA under the label of poststructuralism.

In this book we follow two theses: first, the intent to discover a neutral, universal, i. e. culturally independent literariness and associated specific artistic methods in literary texts that Russian scholars of literature and linguistics formulated in the 1910s and 1920s was a reaction to the traditionally high regard for literature as a place of national-cultural identification with a community, as was the case in Russian, Polish, Czech and German culture. It was only in this context that the emergence of a new school in literary studies – Russian formalism – could become a major cultural event to which even Trotskii (2005 [1924], 138–153) felt obliged to respond. Russian formalism presented itself as the cradle of literary theory, just as the Russian futurists also depicted themselves as the beginning of literature, throwing Pushkin, Dostoevskii and Tolstoi from the steamboat of the present. Second, the concepts of literary theory that came from and moved into different disciplines can be seen as a reaction to the fact that literatures in the literature-centric countries of origin were always thought of in relationship to other cultural areas. Thus the following articles analyse two movements of exchange, transfer, migration and entanglement: one between cultural areas and the other between disciplines, or, more precisely: between literary theory and other disciplines in the humanities and cultural studies.

1 The research context

In 2004, Galin Tihanov formulated two theses that received a great deal of attention: first of all, he argued that modern theory of literature originated in Central and Eastern Europe; secondly, he maintained that this theory was presently, i. e. in 2004, undergoing a crisis which became visible as a result of the turn from the theory of literature towards the anthropology of literature in the late 1980s (Wolfgang Iser) and as a result of Iurii Lotman's cultural semiotics (semiotics as a 'global theory of culture', Tihanov 2004, 61). The age of literary theory, as Tihanov saw it, was over. Fifteen years later, he writes:

> I submit that literary theory is the product of one specific phase in the evolution of one particular regime of relevance. [...] Literary theory is only a particular shade of that phenomenon; disciplined, rational thinking about literature does not come to an end with the demise of literary theory as a unique and time-limited episode in that disciplined, rational reflection. (Tihanov 2019, 2)

Literary theory was relevant when literature was considered to be an "autonomous discourse that tends to differ [...] from other discourses" (Tihanov 2019, 2), and literary theory is a "historically circumscribed mode of thinking about literature" (Tihanov 2019, 5). Tihanov observes a move from literary theory to philosophy in the 1980s (Tihanov 2004, 62); one could also argue that in the 1990s rhetoric and politics moved into the foreground, laying the foundation for a new regime of relevance. Contemporary regimes of relevance turn to something outside of literature and language that was the basis of literary theory, as can be seen, for instance, in the ethical or material turn (new materialism) today.

Both of Tihanov's theses are of importance to our book insofar as we analyse from various angles how modern theory of literature – formed in the early twentieth century – evolved, how individual concepts were reviewed, transformed and incorporated into new cultural contexts, how different literary theories (structuralism, hermeneutics, psychoanalytical literary theory, postcolonial studies, etc.) emerged and over the course of time partly fell back on the terminological and conceptual reservoir of early literary theory. How did literary theories dissociate themselves from Central and Eastern European discussions and continue to develop in Germany, France and the USA? In the course of the twentieth century, how was the dialogue of theories emanating from Central and Eastern Europe (first formalism and structuralism, later [cultural] semiotics) conducted in exchange with Western theories and how were local traditions suppressed in favour of American and French theories? What do theories transformed by Western discussions and re-imported into Central and Eastern Europe look like? (On the movements of a (re-)transfer of theory, see Hüchtker and Kliems 2011.) Since these movements between the cultures include a transdisciplinary dimension, it is also important to ask whether literary theory, with its movements into other disciplines and its expansion into different literary theories in the plural (e. g. psychoanalytical theory of literature, literary anthropology) has actually reached its end, as proclaimed by Tihanov, or whether, from the very beginning, it was always also a theory of culture.

With this background in mind, the focus of our book is thus on the analysis of two transfers: first, the transfer between cultural spaces primarily involved in the development of literary theories (Central and Eastern Europe, the German-speaking areas, France and the Anglo-American cultural sphere), and, second, the movement between the disciplines, since there was an active exchange between literary theories and other subjects in the humanities (e. g. psychoanalysis, historical sciences and ethnology, to name but a few).

Different versions of the history of literary theories are in circulation: either a genealogy is constructed based on few references to the conditions under which these theories came into being (e. g. as a movement from phenomenology to

psychoanalysis via structuralism and poststructuralism; Eagleton 2008; Waugh [2006] in turn describes this development as one from a 'theory of literature' to a 'theory revolution', i. e. from concentrating on literature to concentrating on theory as such), or it is narrated as an institutional history of literary criticism closely connected to the public sphere (on developments in Western Europe, see Hohendahl 1982), or rather as a repression of the public sphere, i. e. the political (as in Russia, cf. Dobrenko and Tihanov 2011). Or, in a completely different way, as mentioned above, it is narrated as a story of decline, as the history of a theory of literature which abandoned its specificity by further diverging into different theories and ultimately opening up towards cultural theory (Tihanov 2004).

2 Literary theory in Central and Eastern Europe

Why Literary Theory?

Reflections on literary history by early German Romanticism and Idealism (Schelling, Hegel), of fundamental importance for the intellectual history of Central and Eastern Europe, can be interpreted as initial impulses towards a type of literary theory. Kant's writing on the *Critique of Judgement* in the eighteenth century, the German Romanticists and the Russian formalists are linked by a "particular regime of relevance that defines literature and its significance with reference to its autonomy" (Tihanov 2019, 3). While in the age of Enlightenment the East and West Slavic cultures were oriented primarily towards France, they then subsequently reviewed German Romanticism as well as Classicism and Idealism and began a dialogue which in turn had repercussions on German culture (e. g. August Cieszkowski as a leading philosopher of the *Vormärz*, or Fedor Dostoevskii as a seminal figure for the conservative revolution in Germany).

The works of the Russian formalists from the 1910s onwards, however, are regarded as the beginning of a modern, institutionalised literary theory which – in the tradition of the Romantics – considered literature to be an autonomous subject. What was new was that they linked this to language rather than to a gifted mind (Tihanov 2019, 3). Their theories were recognised and discussed across Europe. In connection with de Saussure's structuralism, they had a considerable influence on the advancement of literary theories. This is where this book sets out to show the movements of cultural transfer and the *histoire croisée* of a literary theory with many branches.

Even though modern literary theory (in the early formalist writings) demanded a status of autonomy at the very outset, it can nonetheless be observed that it

soon exhibited a cultural-theoretical dimension: Russian formalism's movement from immanent methods (according to Hansen-Löve, a 'paradigmatic model of reduction', F I) to extra-literary series (F III according to Hansen-Löve, cf. Hansen-Löve 1996) marks this jump from literature to culture; Renate Lachmann (1970) observes that these borders were already breached in the early Shklovskii when she asks whether his thesis of the 'resurrection of the word' in 1914 (Shklovskii 1972) indicated that there was a 'regaining of life', a new 'awareness of life' or a new 'view of things', or whether it was a process of perception immanent to art. The same is true for Prague structuralism, which was multi-disciplinary from the start; it included, for instance, important ethnological texts (cf. Bogatyrev 2011), and Mukařovský's aesthetic concept (1970 [1936]) took into consideration the social collective. His late structural aesthetics of the 1940s is ultimately based on an anthropological functional model. Essentially, the developments of literary theory towards a literary anthropology or a cultural semiotics can thus also be considered to be a logical advancement of these early approaches. In the Russian context, the 'anthropological turn' in theory has been discussed in *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* (NLO, *New Literary Observer*) (initiated by Prokhorova 2009; Breininger 2013). A culturally rooted literary theory ('kulturowa teoria literatury') has also crystallized in Poland (e. g. Nycz and Markowski 2006; Walas and Nycz 2013). In the Western European debate, in which literary theory gives way to cultural theoretical approaches, there has been a convergence between literary and cultural studies in the form of 'literary studies as cultural studies' (cf. Schößler 2006), established in the 1990s in the course of the *cultural turn* (described primarily by Bachmann-Medick 1996, 2006), falling back on concepts originating in the 1920s (cf. Voßkamp 2003, 75).

Why Central and Eastern Europe?

The emergence of modern literary theory in Central and Eastern Europe was, as Galin Tihanov states, connected to intellectual, political and cultural developments around World War I (Tihanov 2004, 65–67) which led to an explosion of 'modern' thought, the fall of the European empires and the climax of the migration of people and their ideas. Central and Eastern Europe form, to use a term coined by Aleida Assmann, a special *Erinnerungsgemeinschaft*, a "community of remembering" (Assmann 2006). For such a community, memory functions as both a connecting and a dividing power (Assmann 2006, 15). This concept can be applied to the region with which we are concerned, a region which was connected by the experience of belonging to an imperial power (Austro-Hungary, Russia) that collapsed around World War I as well as by the experience of being divided by

its heterogeneity regarding cultures, languages, social status and religion. Csáky (2010, 62) compares the region he calls "Central Europe" to Fernand Braudel's *Méditerranée*. If we look at a region, a community of remembering whose experiences are at once both different and similar, where a certain cosmopolitanism existed among the intelligentsia in the metropolises, we can trace intellectual trajectories from a diachronic perspective, beginning – in our case – around 1906 in Berlin with the *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* (*Journal of Aesthetics and the General Science of Art*), in 1912 in St. Petersburg with the Institute of Art History (Institut istorii iskusstv) and in 1914 and 1915 in St. Petersburg and Moscow with the first theoretical manifestos of the Russian formalists.

Literary theory, even though its early proponents aimed for an objective, theoretical, general approach, does not exist outside of its cultural and historical context, and both the theories and the actors are affected by it. It is important to keep this contextualization in mind and, even if this is something of a truism, science is not always neutral. Rosi Braidotti, who approaches the topic from a feminist perspective, urges us to remember that the ruptures in history (revolutions, wars, exile) decided which theories made it into the canon, which survived and thrived while others were forgotten. The canon is marked, Braidotti argues, by the "socially constructed amnesia of our times" (Braidotti 2002, 161; also quoted in Hüchtker and Kliems 2011, 10).

Many of the agents of literary theory were migrants and took their theories with them; extreme historical circumstances led, for instance, to the exile of Roman Jakobson, to Mikhail Bakhtin's wanderings from Nevel and Vitebsk to Leningrad, Saransk and then Moscow, to Iurii Lotman's appointment as a professor in Tartu rather than in Leningrad and to Manfred Kridl's exile in New York. Due to the political circumstances, the once-formalist Jakobson found himself in Prague, where he met kindred spirits such as Jan Mukařovský and became part of the Prague Linguistic Circle before moving on to the United States. "Exile remains a key aspect in the formation of literary theory", Tihanov writes (2019, 2). (Incidentally, we cite Tihanov so often because his book is the latest publication on literary theory in Russia.) Still, literary theory tried to free itself from the social context and propagated the autonomy of science, not only in its formalist beginnings, but also, and especially, in later, Soviet times:

> Tartu intellectuals were searching for the means of separating themselves from the [social] context, of finding and demarcating a free, detached spiritual space – because the whole 'inhabited' space of culture was contaminated – in order to build on it their own separate world. (Boris Gasparov; quoted in Waldstein 2005, 39)

Some of the most famous actors in this context are Roman Jakobson and René Wellek and, in the German-speaking world, Erich Auerbach (cf. Konuk 2010 on Auerbach). However, there are also less popular cases: the Polonist Manfred Kridl from Vilna dedicated his work to Russian formalism in Poland in the early 1930s, i.e. at about the same time as the theory was debated in Prague (cf. Karcz 2002, 105–106); in 1944 Kridl was the first in the USA to write about Russian formalism (Kridl 1944), followed in 1955 by Victor Erlich, who worked in Polish studies in Warsaw before the Second World War (Erlich 1955). In other cases, the scholars remained in their home countries and merely their ideas migrated, as was the case with the repeated re-contextualization of the theories of Mikhail Bakhtin or Iurii Lotman. In a new reading (or rather: misreading), Julia Kristeva – a Bulgarian socialised in France – introduced the Russian theoretician Mikhail Bakhtin to Western Europe as the founder of intertextuality, as a result of which Bakhtin's ideas were advanced on the one hand in the emerging field of intertextuality (cf. for instance Lachmann 1990; Mai 1991; Lesic-Thomas 2005) and, on the other hand, in the context of postcolonial studies (cf. for instance Young 1995; cf. Grübel 2011 on the migration of Bakhtin's concept of dialogicity; on the reception of Bakhtin cf. Emerson 2010). Yet Bakhtin's embeddedness in the German tradition of hermeneutics has been receiving more attention of late (cf. Soboleva 2010). A point less embraced by Western reception is the dependence of Bakhtin's dialogicity on Russian (and not only Russian) philosophy of religion often pointed out by Russian Bakhtinologists (cf. for instance Ivanov 1999; Hirschkop 2002; Tamarchenko 2011). The acknowledgement of Iurii Lotman's works in the West was similarly diverse: initially, Lotman enjoyed success in Western European semiology and narratology (cf. Schmid 2014); he then became a theoretician of the border concept before featuring as a narratologist again in more recent German theory (Koschorke 2018 [2012]). Roman Ingarden, who in Germany was received within the context of the group Poetics and Hermeneutics (Poetik und Hermeneutik), has recently been receiving attention in France as a missing link between Paris structuralism and present-day cognitive science (via Wellek and Warren's *Theory of Literature* from 1949) (see Potocki and Schaeffer 2013).

One has to reflect on why some thinkers from the alleged intellectual periphery of Central and Eastern Europe became prominent while others (such as Ol'ga Freidenberg and Stefania Skwarczyńska) are ignored or forgotten. In this way, this book intends to uncover the discursive mechanisms of exclusion and inclusion of a scientific development of a canon which dominates the field of literary studies.

It is our aim to (re-)write the history of literary theory, whereby we do not seek to produce a grand narrative about a literary theory which in part stems from small cultures and has been integrated, indeed somewhat transformed, into the master discourse of the Anglo-American and French theories. Instead, many

small narratives of seemingly local concepts will be integrated into a wider transcultural context.

At this point one could object that, while we talk about "Central and Eastern Europe", we only concentrate on Russian, Czech and Polish literary theory – we do not mention Ukrainian formalism, for example, or Romanian theory. The reason for that is that we, the scholars who came together to write this book, know very little about either. Ukrainian formalism has only recently come into focus, an interest spurred by Russia's aggressive war against Ukraine in February 2022, as we were finalizing work on this manuscript. Readers interested in Ukrainian formalism might find Galina Babak and Aleksandr Dmitriev's first Russian-language study on Ukrainian formalism useful (Babak/Dmitriev 2021) as well as the online conference on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of Ukrainian formalism that took place in April 2022 at the Viadrina University in Frankfurt (Oder)[1]. Perhaps some readers will be inspired to write a book that includes the Central and Eastern European theoretical schools and scholars that, for lack of relevant expertise, we had to leave out of this handbook.

3 Beginnings and Endings

2013 and 2014 were important years for literary theory: all over the world, Slavists celebrated the centenary of Russian formalism, in Geneva, in Moscow, in Paris and even in Erfurt, for example (Jaccard and Morar 2015; Levchenko and Pilshchikov 2017; Depretto, Pier, and Roussin 2018). Following the pathos of the Russian futurists, Depretto, Pier and Roussin declare: "Russian Formalism has deeply changed the way we describe and understand literature" (Depretto et al. 2018, 7). To this day, the Russian formalists are understood to be the beginning of modern literary theory. The dates that mark this beginning vary: is it 23 December 1913, when Viktor Shklovskii read his paper "Mesto futurizma v istorii iazyka" ("The Place of Futurism in the History of Language") in the Brodiachaia sobaka (Stray Dog) cabaret? "The article became an event", writes Jean-Philippe Jaccard (Jaccard 2011); some of Shklovskii's listeners were enthusiastic, others attacked him, but nonetheless, "on 23 Dec the historical meeting between futurism and formalism took place" (Jaccard 2011). Or is 1914 the beginning of modern literary theory, the year when the written version of Shklovskii's paper was published,

---

1 https://www.kuwi.europa-uni.de/de/lehrstuhl/kg/entangled-ukraine/Kommende-Veranstaltungen/Ukrainian-Formalism-Conference-Program-2022.pdf.

"Voskreshenie slova" ("The Resurrection of the word"), since it is considered to be "the first historical document of Formalist theory" (Kauffman 1992, 9)? Or, yet another possibility: 1915, when the linguistic circle was founded in Moscow under the leadership of Roman Jakobson, or 1916, when the St Petersburg Society for Poetic Language (Obshchestvo poėticheskogo iazyka, OPOIaZ) held its first meetings, represented by Viktor Shklovskii, Iurii Tynianov and others (Depretto et al. 2018, 7)? In other words, the founding myth of Russian formalism spans a development from oral performance (1913) via the written word (1914) to institutionalization (1915–1916); the beginnings of modern literary theory thus depend on the perspective of the critic.

Beginnings, Edward Said states, aim to produce "a deliberate other production of meaning" (Said 1975, 257), they seek to create a new world, a new law, but at the same time they are part of a genealogy – even though the Russian futurists, in their manifesto of 1913, "Poshchechina obshchestvennomu vkusu" ("A Slap in the Face of Public Taste"), claimed to be new and unexpected, and even though the Russian formalists, their theoretical counterparts, are seen as having "deeply changed the way we describe and understand literature" (cf. Depretto et al. 2018, 7), they still have their predecessors who turned the aesthetic object or the literary text into an object of description. One of these precursors is Broder Christiansen, who in 1909, in his book *Philosophie der Kunst* (*Philosophy of Art*), defined the aesthetic object as an object consisting of various characteristics that differentiate it from other objects – Christiansen uses the terms "differential quality", "differential sensations" and "dominant", elements we also find in formalist and structuralist theories (see, e. g., Steinfeld 2016, 29–38; Hansen-Löve 1978, 215–216; Lachmann 1970, 236–237; Robinson 2008, 132; Čivikov 1987). Both Christiansen and the Russian formalists wanted to reach their object, art or literature, with the help of abstract attributes (Steinfeld 2016, 37); the formalists borrowed and transformed Christiansen's terminology: Shklovskii took up his "differential quality" while Ėikhenbaum used his "dominant" trait (Steinfeld 2016, 34).

The beginnings of a modern literary theory in the writings of the Russian formalists in the 1910s built on a European culture of science which emerged in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries: Aleksandr Potebnia, against whom Shklovskii turns in his "Iskusstvo kak priem" (1917, "Art as Device"), already understood literature as a linguistic object, as did the later formalists, and coined the word 'poeticity' (*poetichnost'*) as early as 1862 in his book *Mysl i jazyk* (*Thought and Language*) (see Viktor Shklovskii's article "Potebnia", Shklovskii 2018, 245–249). And although the formalists paired with the futurists and were therefore anti-symbolists, some of the Symbolists or their predecessors nevertheless approached literature from a similar perspective, as did later formalists, such as the literary histo-

rian Aleksandr Veselovskii (1883–1906) or the poet Andrei Belyi (1880–1934), the theoretician of the Russian Symbolists. Veselovskii, an important source of inspiration for the Symbolists, searched for regularities in the development of literary history and referred to the orientalist and linguist Theodor Benfey. Benfey followed the migration of fairytale motifs and developed what the Russian tradition calls the "theory of borrowing" (*teoriia zaimstvovaniia*): people migrating create migrating images and motifs (Aumüller 2009, 10). Veselovskii's poetics of the plot (or *sujet* or Russian *siuzhet*) is part of a lecture series he held in St Petersburg in 1898, and, like the later formalists, he worked on a methodological approach to literature, moving very close to theories in anthropology around the same time, such as Edward Burnett Tylor's *Primitive Cultures* (Aumüller 2009, 10; Zhirmunskii 1940, 15, 25). And even Veselovskii was not the starting point of historical poetics; Sergei Tashkenov calls him the "discourse founder" (Tashkenov 2013) who, however, could look back to the 1840s, when literary history first appeared as a field that was different from the aesthetic and idealistic literary theory in Russia (Tashkenov 2013, 44). Another very important forerunner was the Symbolist poet Andrei Belyi, who wrote essays on the "forms of art" and on the "magic of language". In his essay "Magiia slov" ("The Magic of Words") from 1909, Belyi is searching for the basis of the word, especially the poetic word, which for him is the "living word" (*zhivoe slovo*), and he finds it in its connection to mythology, metaphor and symbols (Belyi 1994, 230–233). Belyi, like the later formalists, is searching for the poetic word, the literariness of literature, but unlike the formalists he locates this poetic essence in his Symbolist worldview.

In addition to the local traditions, the following played an important role: the *explication du texte*, which had developed in France since the late nineteenth century; German aesthetics (Broder Christiansen, Theodor Lipps); German psychology (Wilhelm Wundt); *Allgemeine Kulturwissenschaft* ('general cultural studies', Alois Riegl); the science of art and musicology (Heinrich Wölfflin, Eduard Hanslick); linguistics, stylistics and morphology of literature (Karl Vossler, Leo Spitzer, Wilhelm Dibelius); phenomenology and Neo-Kantianism. Tihanov (2004, 65) considers the beginning of literary theory a paradigm change within the context of a process of disintegration of philosophical concepts. The result was a transfer of terminology, concepts and ideas between German philosophy, the writing of history, linguistics, the arts and literary studies and the Slavic cultures. Thus the classical philologists Tadeusz Zieliński and Stanisław Srebrny, who both had a Polish background and gave impulses to both the young Russian futurists and formalists as well as to Mikhail Bakhtin, completed their studies in Germany; the Polish linguist Baudouin de Courtenay, who was important for the development of phonology and francophone structuralism, lectured at both Russian and Polish universities.

The beginnings of a literary theory, like any other beginnings, are a performance rather than a fact. If we take into consideration the predecessors and the heirs of Russian formalism, formalism appears to be a turning point rather than a beginning, absorbing and transforming ideas which in turn are then used, migrate, are rewritten and turn into something other than what they were. Prague structuralism, structuralism in Poland, French structuralism, Bakhtin, intertextuality, and even postcolonial theory (Young 1995) or deconstruction (see Speck 1997) participate in this turning point called Russian formalism.

One note for those who did not grow up with Russian formalism: if you look at academic syllabuses for an introduction to literary studies, often they do not contain a seminar session on Russian formalism, and not so long ago a colleague of ours stated that there is no literary theory outside France. But, as Galin Tihanov correctly writes, "the supposed advances in literary theory in its second 'golden age', the 1960s and 1970s, were hardly more than elaborations and variations on themes, problems, and solutions played out in the interwar period in Central and Eastern Europe" (Tihanov 2004, 63–64). This is one of the aims of our book: to turn the perspective for those learning about and teaching literary theory in the direction of where modern literary theory entered the stage.

4 A note on the structure of the book

The handbook is subdivided into four sections.

In **section I**, we approach the basic aspects that allow us to delve deeper into the various directions literary theory took after it had been established as a scientific object by the Russian formalists. This means paying attention to the "Migration of Concepts", to "Translation of Theories" and to "Theories of Translation". Renate Lachmann (in "Migration of Concepts") suggests using the typology of intertextuality – i. e. a concept which has been wandering between several theoretical contexts itself – to distinguish between various types of relating to migrated concepts: transposition, participation and resistance. Irina Wutsdorff (in "Translation of Theories – Theories of Translation") shows not only how the concept of spots of indeterminacy was translated and transferred from Ingarden's phenomenological approach to the literary work of art to Wolfgang Iser's concept of reception aesthetics via Prague structuralism's model of literary history formulated by Felix Vodička, but that the notion of translation itself played a significant role in the understanding of concretisation crucial to all of these theories.

Migration implies a verb and an actor; it evokes a movement, wandering. Translation stresses the fact that something happens to these concepts when they

are carried from one cultural space to the other. The movement, the change of place, occurs in history (see the volume edited by McMahon and Moyn 2014) and experiences semantic shifts.

By following literary and cultural theories around the world, we use certain concepts such as migration or translation, but, of course, there are others: transfer and travels, for example. Cultural transfer, as a concept that proved to be very successful in the theoretical discourse, emerged in the 1980s in France, originally as "transfert culturel", in order to describe the cultural relationship – transfer – between France and Germany (see Keller 2006, 101). From the very outset, the idea of transfer implied goods and ideas as well as human beings, media and discourses – anything that moved from one culture to the other or between cultures (Keller 2006, 102). Selection and integration are part of this process, and cultural transfer research asked exactly what happens when a transfer takes place: does the new culture swallow the object of transfer completely or is a central core of the original context preserved (Keller 2006, 104)? Transfer, like translation, is imagined as a movement between a starting point and an endpoint while something happens in between.

Edward Said uses the term "traveling theory" in order to describe this route from the point of origin to the transformed result – imagining a direct line between "point of origin" and the "new time and place", its "locality"; Said sees the theories located in different "situations" regarding time and place (Said 1983, 226–227). As an example of such a travelling theory, Said presents Lucien Goldmann's reading of Georg Lukács' *Geschichte und Klassenbewußtsein* (1923, *History of Class Consciousness*). Goldmann transposes Lukács' theory from the early 1920s into the 1950s (Goldmann's *Le Dieu caché*, 1955). By changing the situation, Goldman transforms Lukács' writing about theory and class struggle into a tragic vision of the world (Said 1983, 235). For Said, it is especially important to stress that the transformations that occur on the way from one situation to another do not necessarily involve the "slavish copying" or "productive misreading" of a travelling theory; on the contrary, there are all kinds of intermediary forms (Said 238, 236). In Mieke Bal's approach to "travelling concepts", these are the basis of an interdisciplinary practice, of "interdisciplinary cultural analysis" (Bal 2002, 3) – she posits her concepts in what she calls "intersubjectivity", encompassing interdisciplinarity, the international and the intercultural (Bal 2002, 13). For Bal, the aim of cultural analysis is "intellectual excitement" (Bal 2002, 3): "Hazardous, exciting, and tiring, travel is needed if you are to achieve the gain of new experience" (Bal 2002, 4).

The migration and changes of theories could also be described as "circulation" or even – evoking Stephen Greenblatt's "social energies" (see, e. g. Greenblatt 1989) – "theoretical energies" which depart from the movement of the line (the point of origin and point of arrival) and, instead, evoke a multilateral network.

In this introductory chapter, in addition to the description of movement, migration and/or translation, we also focus on the "Migrants of Theory" (I.3) and the "Spaces of Theory" (I.4). We have already mentioned that ideas often travel with their inventors, and since the twentieth century was rich in events that uprooted not only history but also the people experiencing them, there was a lot of academic migration – or, more precise: academic exile – all around the world. In this chapter, Schamma Schahadat presents three case studies whose destinies are rather different: Roman Jakobson, whose migrating biography proved a success story, since not only he became world famous but also his theories in linguistics and literary studies. Starting out in the milieu of the Russian formalists, Jakobson took with him his original ideas on the structure of poetic language and on the universal laws of language in general and developed them further in close dialogue with colleagues in Prague, Scandinavia and the United States, publishing in various languages on multiple literatures and languages, thus disseminating Russian formalism and Prague structuralism as well as Czech and Russian literature all over the world. Manfred Kridl, case study number two, is less well-known, although he was a key figure for the development of formalist and structuralist thinking in Poland in the interwar period. He took his knowledge with him to the United States, where he fled in 1939, spreading Russian and Polish formalism over the Atlantic. Julia Kristeva, the third figure, is a different case altogether, since she did not have to flee from an oppressive government or a war, but came to Paris on the basis of an international exchange program and introduced Mikhail Bakhtin to the (post-)structuralist Paris scene. These three case studies are, however, really just examples of a vast number of migrating or exiled proponents of literary theory who left their countries of origin in the aftermath of the Russian Revolution, World War II or the Cold War. Many of them left a strong mark in the discipline, be it literary theory, comparative literature or Slavic studies. These exponents include, to mention but a few: Georg Lukács, Petr Bogatyrev, Leo Spitzer, Erich Auerbach, René Wellek, Victor Erlich and Krystyna Pomorska from the earlier generation and Lubomír Doležel, Tzvetan Todorov, Vilém Flusser, Boris Gasparov, Viacheslav Ivanov, Igor' Smirnov, Boris Groys, Mikhail Ryklin and Irina Paperno from the generation that emigrated in the latter half of the twentieth century, mainly to the United States, but also to Germany.

In Chapter I.4., Danuta Ulicka discusses the foundational narratives of modern literary theory (see above, "Beginnings?"), focusing on place rather than on time. Taking as a case in point the Polish situation, which is less known than Russian or Czech literary theory of the interwar period, Ulicka stresses that the places where modern literary theory originated were (often) 'unofficial zones': libraries, private homes, cabarets. The actors of theory who migrated not only took their ideas with them but also the forms of "circle-ness" (a term coined by Tomáš Glanc [2015,

18]) they had established in their home towns. Ulicka makes the important point that literary theory may have originated in a certain chronotope, but it developed beyond national boundaries – the chapter "Spaces of Theory" thus dovetails with the beginning of Section I, with migration and translation. The chronotope, Ulicka argues, had an effect on the methodology and style of the theories.

This becomes very clear in the case study of the migration of the term "Intertextuality" (I.5), with which Valentin Peschanskyi closes the section: Based on an – albeit fruitful – misreading, the concept split up into very different connotations it took on in different scientific and cultural contexts.

Section II forms the core of our book: "Formations of Literary Theory: Schools, Institutions, Concepts and Methods". Having discussed and introduced the movements, the translations, the migrants, the spaces and the variations of theory in Section I, the handbook now focuses on the fact that ideas and concepts which establish central theories and discourses emerge in dialogue, establishing schools and institutions. "Schools, circles and other scholarly communities have been a major force in twentieth-century intellectual movements" (Grishakova and Salupere 2016, ix), Marina Grishakova and Silvi Salupere state in their book on such institutions in Eastern and East Central Europe, France, Germany, Israel and the United States. As a kind of motto, they use Jonathan Culler's idea that "[l]iterary theory is not a disembodied set of ideas but a force of institutions. Theory exists in communities of readers and writers, as a discursive practice, inextricably tangled with educational and cultural institutions" (Culler 2000, 117). Some of the questions Grishakova and Salupere ask are: how do schools, circles and institutions influence the intellectual movement? How do they communicate within themselves, in their own and foreign cultural contexts? How do they come into existence and how and why do they perish? These are central questions for reading and understanding institutions of theory. We can take up some of the questions – however, we shift the focus to the movements and interactions in order to create a dynamic map of theories.

In section II.1. we thus pay attention to "Institutions of Interdisciplinary Research from the 1910s to the 1930s": in Berlin, Petrograd/Leningrad and Moscow, before coming to the school that "revolutionized twentieth century humanities" (Glanc 2015, 1): Russian formalism, which then spread all over the world (II.2.). We trace the movements of the major twentieth-century theories such as structuralism and semiotics (II.9), phenomenology (II.3) and hermeneutics (II.4), also encompassing theoretical fields such as psychoanalysis (II.5), sociological and Marxist literary theory (II.6) and the Frankfurt School (II.7) as well as groups and circles like the Bakhtin circle (II.8) or the influential group Poetics and Hermeneutics (II.4).

Section III is concerned with the transformations of literary theory in the late twentieth and the early twenty-first century: postcolonial studies, translation studies and cultural studies. A key term of postcolonial studies is "hybridity", a term that – in literary studies – originated in the works of Mikhail Bakhtin (Young 1995); paying attention to the different 'languages' or 'awarenesses" (*soznaniia*), as Bakhtin called it, is one of the central aims of postcolonial studies. Translation studies is a good example of migrating theories; if we look at its development from the 1960s to the present day, it has consistently used structuralist, formalist and poststructuralist concepts. Before the translational turn in the 1990s, East and East Central European theorists approached translation studies from a structuralist perspective; the very successful polysystem theory developed by Itamar Even-Zohar (1990) is based on Russian formalism, and the turn to the visible or invisible translator (Venuti 2008), i. e. to the impact of the actor in translation, takes up central issues of cultural studies. In following the transformations or at least the interdisciplinary migrations of literary theory into postcolonial studies, translation studies and cultural studies, we can use Galin Tihanov's idea of "regimes of relevance":

> The history of ideas about literature can be told as the history of attempts to conceptualize the changing regimes of its relevance. By "regime of relevance" (a concept of Foucauldian provenance), I mean the prevalent mode of literary consumption in a society at a particular time. Any given regime or mode is shaped by social and institutional factors that tend to function in competition and conflict with each other. It seems to me that the rise of literary theory as an autonomous discourse was dependent on the pronounced belief in (a very specific type of) relevance of literature to society. (Tihanov 2004, 77)

If the regime of relevance placed literary theory high in the hierarchy of intellectuality in the first half of the twentieth century, other disciplines moved into the foreground later on. The essays in Section III also show, however, that literary theory was never concerned with literature alone; rather, culture was part of the picture from the outset.

In **Section IV**, "Some Key Terms", we focus on certain terms and concepts that originated in Central or Eastern Europe and then moved around the world, changing, adapting and transforming. To work with terms, words and concepts is the core task of 'conceptual history' or, to use Koselleck's original term, 'Begriffsgeschichte'. *Begriffsgeschichte*, Jan Werner Müller writes, is "both a coming-to-terms with the past and a coming-to-terms with the present" (Müller 2014, 77).

* * *

We would like to end this introduction with an editorial note and by expressing our gratitude to all the people who have been busy working on this book for many years.

Editorial note

First, a note on the language: some of the texts were written in English by native speakers and did not need additional copy-editing; some were translated into English by different translators – they are credited at the end of the respective articles. Others were written in English by non-native speakers, and most of those texts were copy-edited by John Heath, without whom we would never have managed to publish this book in English. Thank you, John!

The translations of the quotations into English are reproduced from published translations; where no published translations were available, they were rendered by the authors of the articles (or their translators). We have not marked these as "my translation", since this should be clear from the lack of bibliographical references.

The authors wrote their articles in either British or American English; we decided to keep it that way and refrained from linguistic unification.

Second, a note an transliteration: we use the system of the Library of Congress (https://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/romanization/russian.pdf), with some exceptions: those theorists who spent most of their lives outside of Russia and published abundantly in, e. g., English, French or German, keep their international names, like, for example, Roman Jakobson (instead of Iakobson), Jurij Striedter (instead of Iurii Shtridter), Wassily Kandinsky (instead of Vasilii Kandinskii) or Julia Kristeva (instead of Iulia Kr''steva). So you may read "Iurii Lotman" alongside with "Jurij Striedter" in our book.

Acknowledgements

Bensch). And for years many student assistants – some of whom are now no longer students today – carefully undertook bibliographical research, proofreading, formatting and editing: Daniela Amodio, Jennifer Döring, Gaia Englert, Josef Nelson, Hartmut Nüßle, Aurelia Ohlendorf and Salome Winkhart-Möglich. We would like to make special, chronological mention of those who headed these efforts, without whose help the book would never have been finished: first Valentin Peschanskyi, later Elena Glökler, and, finally, Sophie Freidank and Julia Furmanczyk. And, although already mentioned: John Heath made it possible for many non-native speakers of English to publish in the language. Many thanks to all of you!

Finally, we would like to commemorate Robert Bird, who died much too young in 2020 and whose article on "Hermeneutics in Russia" we are allowed to publish by courtesy of his wife, Christina Kiaer.

References

Aumüller, Matthias. "Kommentar (Aleksandr Veselovskij: Poetik des Sujets)". *Russische Proto-Narratologie: Texte in kommentierten Übersetzungen*. Ed. Wolf Schmid. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2009. 10–11.

Babak, Galina, and Aleksandr Dmitriev. *Atlantida sovetskogo nadmodernizma: Formal'nyi metod v Ukraine (1920-e – nachalo 1930-kh)*. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2021.

Bachmann-Medick, Doris. *Kultur als Text: Die anthropologische Wende in der Literaturwissenschaft*. Frankfurt/M.: Fischer, 1996.

Bachmann-Medick, Doris. *Cultural Turns: Neuorientierung in den Kulturwissenschaften*. Reinbek/H.: Rowohlt, 2006. (English translation: *Cultural turns: New Orientations in the Study of Culture*. Trans. by Adam Blauhut. Berlin and Boston, MA: De Gruyter, 2016.)

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Moscow: Russkie slovari, 2000–2012.

Bal, Mieke. *Travelling Concepts in the Humanities: A Rough Guide*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002.

Belyi, Andrei. "Magiia slov." Andrei Belyi, *Kritika. Estetika. Teoriia simvolizma*. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1994. 226–244.

Bogatyrev, Petr. *Funktional-strukturale Ethnographie in Europa: Texte aus den 1920er und 1930er Jahren zu Brauchtum, Folklore, Theater und Film*. Ed. Klaas-Hinrich Ehlers. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2011.

Braidotti, Rosi. "Identity, Subjectivity, and Difference: A Critical Genealogy." *Thinking Differently: A Reader in European Women's Studies*. Eds. Rosi Braidotti and Gabriele Griffin. London: Zed Books, 2002. 158–180.

Breininger, Ol'ga. "Kartografirovanie mikro- i makroizmenenii v sovremennoi slavistike: Polemika vokrug 'antropologicheskogo povorota' v 'Novom literaturnom obozrenii'." *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* 122 (2013). http://magazines.russ.ru/nlo/2013/122/4b-pr.html (20 March 2014).

Čivikov, Germinal. *Das ästhetische Objekt: Subjekt und Zeichen in der Literaturwissenschaft anhand einer Kategorie des Prager Strukturalismus*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 1987.

Culler, Jonathan. *Literary Theory: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Csáky, Moritz. *Das Gedächtnis der Städte: Kulturelle Verflechtungen – Wien und die urbanen Milieus in Zentraleuropa*. Vienna, Cologne, and Weimar: Böhlau, 2010.

Depretto, Catherine, John Pier, and Philippe Roussin (eds.). *Le formalisme russe cent ans après*. Special Edition *Communication* 103 (2018).

Dobrenko, Evgenii, and Galin Tihanov (eds.). *A History of Russian Literary Theory and Criticism: The Soviet Age and Beyond*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2011 (see also the much more detailed version in Russian: Dobrenko, Evgenii, and Galin Tikhanov (eds.): *Istoriia russkoi literaturnoi kritiki: Sovetskaia i postsovetskaia ėpochi*. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2011).

Eagleton, Terry. *An Introduction to Literary Theory*. (Anniversary Edition). Malden, MA: John Wiley & Sons, 2008.

Emerson, Caryl. *The First Hundred Years of Mikhail Bakhtin*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997.

Erlich, Victor. *Russian Formalism*: *History — Doctrine.* The Hague: Mouton Publishers, 1955.

Even-Zohar, Itamar. *Polysystem Studies*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1990.

Glanc, Tomáš. "The Russian Formalists as a Community." *Theoretical Schools and Circles in the Twentieth-Century Humanities: Literary Theory, History, Philosophy*. Eds. Marina Grishakova and Silvi Salupere. New York, NY, and London: Routledge, 2015. 1–22.

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Shakesperean Negotiations: The Circulation of Social Energy in Renaissance England.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1988.

Grishakova, Marina, and Silvi Salupere (eds.). *Theoretical Schools and Circles in the Twentieth-Century Humanities: Literary Theory, History, Philosophy*. New York, NY, and London: Routledge, 2016.

Grübel, Rainer. "Dialogizität versus Intertextualität. Transformation eines Konzepts durch (Re-)Migration." *Überbringen — Überformen — Überblenden: Theorietransfer im 20. Jahrhundert*. Eds. Dietlind Hüchtker and Alfrun Kliems. Cologne, Weimar, and Vienna: Böhlau, 2011. 187–205.

Hansen-Löve, Aage A. *Der russische Formalismus: Methodologische Rekonstruktion seiner Entwicklung aus dem Prinzip der Verfremdung*. 2nd edition. Vienna: Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1996.

Hirschkop, Ken. *Mikhail Bakhtin: An Aesthetic for Democracy*. New York, NY, and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Hohendahl, Peter. *The Institution of Criticism*. Ithaca, MA: Cornell University Press, 1982.

Hüchtker, Dietlind, and Alfrun Kliems (eds.). *Überbringen – Überformen – Überblenden: Theorietransfer im 20. Jahrhundert*. Cologne, Weimar, and Vienna: Böhlau, 2011.

Iser, Wolfgang. *Das Fiktive und das Imaginäre: Perspektiven literarischer Anthropologie*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1993.

Ivanov, Viacheslav [Vjačeslav]. "The Dominant of Bakhtin's Philosophy: Dialogue and Carnival." *Bakhtin: Carnival and Other Subjects. Selected Papers from the fifth International Bakhtin Conference University of Manchester*. Ed. David Shepard. Amsterdam and Atlanta, GA: Rodopi, 1993. 3–12.

Jaccard, Jean-Philippe [Zhakkar, Zhan-Filipp]. *Literatura kak takovaia: Izbrannye raboty o russkoi slovesnosti*. St. Petersburg: NLO, 2011. https://lit.wikireading.ru/44350 (27 February 2020).

Jaccard, Jean-Philippe, and Annick Morar [Zhakkar, Zhan-Filipp, and Annik Morar]. *1913. "Slovo kak takovoe." K iubileinomu godu russkogo futurizma. Materialy mezhdun-*

arodnoi nauchnoi konferentsii (Zheneva, 10–12 aprelia 2013g.). St. Petersburg: Izd-vo evropeiskogo universiteta, 2015.

Karcz, Andrzej. *The Polish Formalist School and Russian Formalism*. Rochester, NY, and Cracow: University of Rochester Press, 2002.

Kauffman, Linda S. *Special Delivery: Epistolary Modes in Modern Fiction.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Keller, Thomas. "Kulturtransferforschung: Grenzgänge zwischen den Kulturen." *Kultur: Theorien der Gegenwart.* Eds. Stephan Moebius and Dirk Quadflieg. Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 2006. 101–114.

Konuk, Kader. *East West Mimesis: Auerbach in Turkey*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2010.

Koschorke, Albrecht. *Fact and Fiction: Elements of a General Theory of Narrative* [2012]. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2018.

Kridl, Manfred. "Russian Formalism." *The American Bookman: A Quarterly of Criticism and Theory of the Public Arts* 1 (1944): 19–30.

Lachmann, Renate. "Die Verfremdung und das Neue Sehen bei Viktor Šklovskij." *Poetica* 3 (1970): 226–249.

Lachmann, Renate. *Gedächtnis und Literatur: Intertextualität in der russischen Moderne*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1990.

Lesic-Thomas, Andrea. "Behind Bakhtin: Russian Formalism and Kristeva's Intertextuality." *Paragraph* 28.3 (2005): 1–20.

Levchchenko, Ian, and Igor' Pil'shchikov. *"Ėpokha 'ostraneniia'". Russkii formalizm i sovremennoe gumanitarnoe znanie.* Moscow: NLO, 2017.

Lotman, Iurii M. "Teatr i teatral'nost' v stroe kul'tury nachala XIX veka." Iurii Lotman, *Izbrannye stat'i*. Vol. 1. *Stat'i po semiotike i tipologii kul'tury.* Tallinn: Aleksandra, 1992a. 269–286.

Lotman, Iurii M. "Dekabrist v povsednevni zhizni (Bytovoe povedenie kak istorikopsikhologicheskaia kategoriia)." Iurii Lotman, *Izbrannye stat'i*. Vol. 1. *Stat'i po semiotike i tipologii kul'tury.* Tallinn: Aleksandra, 1992b. 269–336.

Lotman, Iurii M.: "Poėtika bytovogo povedeniia v russkoi kul'ture XVIII veka." Iurii Lotman, *Izbrannye stat'i*. Vol. 1. *Stat'i po semiotike i tipologii kul'tury.* Tallinn: Aleksandra, 1992c. 248–268.

Lotman, Iurii M.: "Literaturnaia biografiia v istoriko-kul'turnom kontekste (K tipologicheskomu sootnosheniiu teksta i lichnosti avtora)." Iurii Lotman, *Izbrannye stat'i*. Vol. 1. *Stat'i po semiotike i tipologii kul'tury.* Tallinn: Aleksandra, 1992d. 365–376.

McMahon, Darrin M., and Samuel Moyn (eds.). *Rethinking Modern European Intellectual History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Mai, Hans-Peter. "Bypassing Intertextuality: Hermeneutics, Textual Practice, Hypertext." *Intertextuality*. Ed. Heinrich F. Plett. Berlin and New York, NY: De Gruyter, 1991. 30–59.

Mukařovský, Jan. *Aesthetic Function, Norm and Value* [1936]. Trans. by Mark E. Suino. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Contributions, 1970.

Nycz, Ryszard, and Michał Paweł Markowski (eds.). *Kulturowa teoria literatury: Główne pojęcia i problemy.* Cracow: Universitas, 2006.

Nycz, Ryszard, and Teresa Walas (eds.). *Kulturowa teoria literatury* 2: *poetyki, problematyki, interpretacje*. Cracow: Universitas, 2013.

Potocki, Christophe, and Jean-Marie Schaeffer (eds.). *Roman Ingarden: ontologie, esthétique, fiction*. Paris: Editions des Archives Contemporaines, 2013.

Prokhorova, Irina. "Novaia antropologiia kul'tury. Vstuplenie na pravakh manifesta." *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* 100 (2009). http://magazines.russ.ru/nlo/2009/100/za1.html (20 March 2020).

Robinson, Douglas. *Estrangement and the Somatics of Literature: Tolstoy, Shklovsky, Brecht.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008.

Said, Edward W. *Beginnings: Intention and Method.* New York, NY: University Press Group, 1975.

Said, Edward W. "Traveling Theories." Edward W. Said, *The World, the Text and the Critic.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983. 226–248.

Schößler, Franziska. *Literaturwissenschaft als Kulturwissenschaft: Eine Einführung.* Tübingen: Francke, 2006.

Shklovskii, Viktor. "Voskreshenie slova / Die Auferweckung des Wortes." *Texte der russischen Formalisten.* Eds. Jurij Striedter, Wolf-Dieter Stempel, and Inge Paulmann. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1972. 2–17.

Shklovskii, Viktor. *Sobranie sochinenii.* Vol. 1. *Revoliutsiia.* Ed. Il'ia Kalinin. Moscow: NLO, 2018.

Soboleva, Maiia [Maja]. *Die Philosophie Michail Bachtins: Von der existentiellen Ontologie zur dialogischen Vernunft.* Hildesheim et al.: Olms, 2010.

Speck, Stefan. *Von Šklovskij zu de Man: Zur Aktualität formalistischer Literaturtheorie.* Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1997.

Steinfeld, Thomas. *Ich will, ich kann: Moderne und Selbstoptimierung.* Konstanz: Konstanz University Press, 2016.

Tamarchenko, Natan. *"Ėstetika slovesnogo tvorchestva" M. M. Bakhtina i russkaia filosofskofilologicheskaia traditsiia.* Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Kulaginoi, 2011.

Tashkenov, Sergei [Taškenov, Sergej] P. "Aleksandr Nikolaevič Veselovskij: Diskursbegründer der Historischen Poetik." *Die russische Schule der historischen Poetik.* Eds. Dirk Kemper, Valerija Tjupa, and Sergej Taškenov. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 2013. 43–58.

Tihanov, Galin. "Why Did Modern Literary Theory Originate in Central and Eastern Europe? (And Why Is It Now Dead?)." *Common Knowledge* 10.1 (2004): 61–81.

Tihanov, Galin. *The Birth and Death of Literary Theory: Regimes of Relevance in Russia and Beyond.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2019.

Trotskii, Lev [Trotsky, Leon]. *Literature and Revolution* [1924]. Trans. by Rose Strunksy. Chicago, IL: Haymarket Books, 2005.

Venuti, Lawrence. *The Translator's Invisibility*: *A History of Translation.* Revised ed. London: Routledge, 2008.

Voßkamp, Wilhelm. "Literaturwissenschaft als Kulturwissenschaft." *Konzepte der Kulturwissenschaften.* Eds. Ansgar Nünning and Vera Nünning. Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 2003. 73–85.

Waugh, Patricia. "Introduction: criticism, theory, and anti-theory." *Literary Theory and Criticism.* Ed. Patricia Waugh. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006. 1–33.

Waldstein, Maxim. *The Soviet Empire of Signs: A History of the Tartu School of Semiotics.* Saarbrücken: Verlag Dr. Müller, 2005.

Wellek, René. *A history of modern criticism.* Vol. 7. *German, Russian, and Eastern European Criticism 1900–1950.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1991.

Wellek, René, and Austin Warren. *Theory of Literature.* New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace, and Company, 1949.

Young, Robert. *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture, Race.* London: Routledge, 1995.

Zhirmunskii, Viktor. "Istoricheskaia poėtika A. N. Veselovskogo." *Aleksandr Veselovskii, Istoricheskaia poėtika.* Leningrad: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1940. 3–37.

Renate Lachmann
The Migration of Concepts

It might be said of some concepts in literary theory that they emerge only gradually by migrating between contexts and disciplines, especially those that have migrated from East to West and vice versa.

One of the most prominent migrations from East to West arose in the 1960s with the reception of formalist poetics; German, English and French attempts to translate the concept into their own respective idioms also displayed efforts to force them into a pre-existing scholarly context. This is already evident in the translation of the very general term *priem* as *procédé*, *stratégie*, procedure, strategy, but also as *Kunstgriff* (Shklovskii 1966c). The extensive bilingual edition of texts by the Russian formalists published by Jurij Striedter and Wolf-Dieter Stempel in Konstanz in the late 1960s and early 1970s (Striedter and Stempel 1969, 1972) allowed comparison of the original terminology with the translation and was thus superior in this respect to the translations of works by Shklovskii, Ėikhenbaum und Tynianov. At a time of literary-theoretical reorientation – or, more accurately, crisis – Striedter and Stempel's pioneering and heavily cited introductions prepared the ground for what would become a most productive field of theory. Particular attention was paid to the idea of estrangement, the conception of literary evolution in the sense of system change (*smena sistem*), the idea of automation and de-automation of forms, a theory of poeticity, and the narratologically important concept of depicting the subject matter (*siuzhetoslozhenie*).

1 The migration of *ostranenie* (estrangement)

Terms circulate on different levels or states of abstraction, often taking different migratory routes. The concept of *Verfremdung* (estrangement, *ostranenie*) was a special case of such migration, shifting back and forth between Germany and Russia throughout the 1930s, between Brecht and Shklovskii. Its contours were shaped by several theoretical interests, something approaching an original term – semantically anything but clear-cut – emerging in constellation with other concepts. As a term pertaining to *technē* in the sense encountered in Aristotle's poetics and rhetoric, estrangement, in combination with other terms, made formalist literary theory attractive and thus communicated a concept of art that privileged the parodistic, the self-referentiality of techniques, 'literariness', and later, in a different context, took on elements of a worldview.

The translation of *ostranenie* into other languages gave rise to well-known curiosities, such as English 'foregrounding' (opening up another semantic horizon) or 'estrangement' (as a literal rendering of *ostranenie*), and French *étrangement* or *aliénation*, which was also used to translate the German *Entfremdung*, evoking a Rousseauist-Marxist context. These terminological approximations and departures are some of the readings of *Verfremdung* combining a variety of connotations. (See also Erik Martin's chapter on alienation/defamiliarisation/ estrangement in this volume).

As early as 1953, Dmitrij Tschižewskij (1953) demonstrated in his analysis of Comenius' *Labyrint světa a ráj srdce* (1623, *The Labyrinth of the World and the Paradise of the Heart*) the functions of estrangement as a "negative allegory" and "unbefitting perspective". Estrangement became firmly established in the literary studies of the 1960s and 1970s. In 1961, R. Grimm published the conceptual-historical study *Verfremdung. Beiträge zu Wesen und Ursprung eines Begriffs* (*Estrangement. Papers on the Nature and Origin of a Concept*), pointing to the term's prehistory in German Romanticism (Novalis' dictum of the poetic as "the art of estrangement in pleasing fashion", Novalis 1928, 685), to the concepts of the Concettists, *acutezza*, *arguzia*, and to Giambattista Marino's *far stupir*. In *Das Groteske* (1957, *The Grotesque*), Wolfgang Kayser qualified Chirico's method of *render strano*, the principal techniques of the *pittura metafisica*, as estrangement (Kayser 1957, 182 f.). The term featured in *Immanente Ästhetik* (*Immanent Aesthetics*, Iser 1966). In *Brechts Verfremdung der Lyrik* (*Brecht's Estrangement of Poetry*), C. Heselhaus (1966) borrowed the term *alienatio* from Jakob Masen's dramatic poetics to describe Lessing's concept of wit and Vischer's idea of the comedic, while Jurij Striedter (1966), in his article "Transparenz und Verfremdung" ("Transparency and Estrangement"), outlined the semantics of estrangement in Esenins "Pesn' o khlebe" ("Song about Bread"). J. W. Wissmann (1966, 1968) portrayed estrangement as the main artistic technique of the twentieth century in "Collagen oder die Integration von Realität im Kunstwerk" (1966, "Collages, or the Integration of Reality in the Work of Art") and in "Pop-Art oder die Realität als Kunstwerk" (1968, "Pop Art or Reality as Artwork") in *Die nicht mehr schönen Künste* (1968, *The Arts, no longer Beautiful*). The term was established somewhat poetically and hermeneutically and became ubiquitous in analyses and interpretations of texts from a variety of different periods. The focus was not on the original elements of Shklovskii's theory, nor on the term's somewhat messy history. It was only later research on Shklovskii's position within Russian literary studies of the 1920s that paid attention to Shklovskii's 'forms made difficult' and his references to Aristotle's *glotta* (*Poetics* 22, 1458a) with its techniques enabling said forms to be made difficult, which he required to make the reader aware of them once his reading of Tolstoi's diary entry of 1 March 1897 had opened his eyes to the loss of consciousness that sets in when actions become automatic.

Another new focus of 1920s scholarship was his reception of Broder Christiansen's theory of the dominant concepts of differential quality and differential sensations in *Philosophie der Kunst* (1909, *Philosophy of Art*), which gave him the idea of departure from the norm as a quality. Early Shklovskii reception – at least in Germany – removed one element of his theory from its original context, thereby distancing the concept from its author, and indeed from its post-history. For after what became the dominant official strand of literary studies in the 1920s had condemned formalism and not least of all the concept of *ostranenie*, Shklovskii evidently felt compelled to revise (and indeed rescue) it. In the chapter "Obnovlenie poniatiia" ("Concept Renewal") in the second volume of his *Povesti o proze* (*Tales about Prose*) of 1966 (a collection of earlier texts), he qualifies the term as untrue and unoriginal ("neveren i neoriginalen", Shklovskii 1966b, 305). He regards himself dependent on Novalis's *Fragmente* (*Fragments*) and once again places himself in the classical tradition by citing the passage on the enlightening puzzle in Aristotle's rhetoric. By accusing himself of unoriginality, he is able to further develop his concept, liberate it from the accusation of being for its own sake, and emphasise the aspect of effect, in the sense of sharpening awareness, which he includes as "new vision" ("novoe videnie") in the chapter "O novom videnii" ("On New Vision") (Shklovskii 1966b, 198–202) and as "sharpening of focus" ("zaostrivanie vospriiatiia", Shklovskii 1966a, 97) in the semantic field of the revised *ostranenie*. Shklovskii introduces a further term allowing another reference to Aristotle, *udivlenie*, to astound, evoking Aristotle's *thaumazein*. In the chapter "Ob udivlenii" ("On the Sense of Wonder", Shklovskii 1966a), he writes: "The sense of wonder is the source of life" (Shklovskii 1966a, 206). And: "The sense of wonder is one of the goals achieved by the construction of events, their sequence, and their contradictory relations" (Shklovskii 2017, 267; 1966a, 201). In this context, he no longer used *priem*, 'technique', 'artistic device', but *sposob*, 'manner'. In Volume 2 of *Stories*, he takes up this new concept again: the process of awareness begins with *udivlenie* and *stseplenie* (the Tolstoiean term, which influenced his concept of *siuzhetoslozhenie*) (Shklovskii 1966b, 303). He also makes a connection to Brecht in "Obnovlenie poniatia" ("Concept Renewal", Shklovskii 1966b, 298–299) by emphasising the technique of *otodvinutost'*, detachment creating a distance between the audience and the stage, which he says Brecht had introduced with his theatrical praxis and had termed *otchuzhdenie*.

The dissemination channels between Shklovskii and Brecht are by no means linear however, and are complicated by the terminology. John Willett (1959) assumes that Brecht became acquainted with the idea of *ostranenie* in 1935; his first use of the term appears a year later as *Verfremdung* and denoted a central technique of his theatrical praxis (which was also shaped by the Russian Avant-Garde). German renders *ostranenie*, reviled during the 1930s, the very period

Brecht spent in the Soviet Union, as *Verfremdung*, while Brecht's *Verfremdung* is translated in Russian as *otchuzhdenie*, which is also the classical translation of the philosophical concept of *Entfremdung*, alienation. That Brecht's reading of Marx also introduced the concept of *Entfremdung* as a critique of society and consciousness does not make these terminological complications any easier to deal with; with reference to Brecht, Bloch merges *Entfremdung* and *Verfremdung* (a pairing and wordplay that is not possible in other languages), i. e. a critique of society and a poetics of the theatre (see Bloch 1962). Shklovskii includes one of the connotations of *otchuzhdenie* in his revised concept when he recommends revealing counterfeits, the distance between viewer and object on the path to correct cognition, to new perception. He seems to stress these connotations of critique of consciousness with elements of social criticism in order to further legitimise his newly outlined concept while showing his original idea in a positive light, although he does not deny his dependence on Brecht. However, he expresses himself more openly in a letter to his Polish translator, Seweryn Pollak (Shklovskii 1964, 11), implying, conversely, that Brecht is indebted to his concept: "The term 'Verfremdung' (Polish *udziwnienie*), which I coined in 1918–1919, has, as I later discovered, parallels in some statements by the Romantics, especially in Novalis. In Brecht it sounds like 'Entfremdung', 'Wegrücken' (Polish *wyobcowanie*, *odsunięcie*)". The fact that he highlights *ostranenie* as his own lexical invention is, as a belated stance on the concept (and phenomenon), as remarkable as his emphasis of the purpose of the technique he had already described as a specific feature of Brecht's theatrical praxis, namely *otodvinutost'* (implying the back translation of *odsunięcie* into Russian). In revising his concept, Shklovskii cites the second part of Tolstoi's diary entry, which he had omitted in 1918–1919, concerning the interdependence of consciousness and freedom: "Without consciousness there is no freedom and without freedom there can be no consciousness"; "consciousness of freedom" (*svobodosoznanie*) was the consciousness that had to be attained (Tolstoi 1953, 142).

Incidentally, several amendments were made to Shklovskii's terminology. The discussion concerning the function of *priem* in determining form, which Roman Jakobson had declared the actor of rational literary studies and Shklovskii appropriated for his dictum of the work of art as the sum of its techniques, was further adapted in Viktor Zhirmunskii's critique of Shklovskii as *otnoshenie* (Zhirmunskii 1977, 35). In his early work *Lektsii po struktural'noi poétike* (1964, *Lectures on Structuralist Poetics*), Iurii Lotman criticises this purely intratextually-oriented conception of the artwork, considering *priem* a relational concept that can combine the intratextual with the extratextual (Lotman 1968, 155, 158, 161).

Without knowledge of Shklovskii's revision of the term in his reactivation of the diary entry forging the reference to Tolstoi's notion of 'freedom', *Verfremdung* morphed into a 'left-wing' ideology. With reference to Shklovskii and his

concept 'canonised' in the West, Herbert Marcuse writes in his "Versuch über die Befreiung" (1969, "An Essay on Liberation") that "The destruction of the familiar modes of perception, the radical break with routinised ways of seeing, feeling and understanding things" is the precondition of "liberation"; only "the revolution in perception" can lead to the "restructuring of society", and it is the "new sensibility" that guarantees this by penetrating "false automation" (Marcuse 1969, 64). Marcuse's phrasing is evidently influenced by Shklovskii's 'new vision' (*novoe videnie* via 'sense of wonder' [*udivlenie*] and 'sharpening of focus' [*zaostrivanie vospriiatiia*]): in the 'new seeing', the dominant poetological aspect is complemented by the elements of social criticism and a worldview, rendering the connection to the new sensibility plausible – *Verfremdung* thus indirectly takes on a temporary explosiveness in an entirely different context).

However, the actual *Verfremdung* only began with the monumental work of Aage Hansen-Löve (1978). For the West, Hansen-Löve provided an introduction to a theory's nascence, its logic, its manifold ramifications and its crisis; for Russia, he revived a theoretical field that had been consigned to history. In Russia it was literary and cultural theory that profited from and took up the discourse. *Der russische Formalismus* (1978, *Russian formalism*) became one of the most-read books in West European Slavonic studies and thus drew attention to this scene of formalism reception in Russia too. In Germany, the discourse remained limited to theory-oriented Slavonic studies, while general literary studies was satisfied with what it thought it already knew about the subject. (See also, among others, Lachmann 1970)

2 Bakhtinology

A term, a concept can, after remaining dormant, suddenly gain fresh attention, mobilise related concepts or be revitalised by them. "Nothing is absolutely dead: every meaning will have its homecoming festival. The problem of *great time*" (Bakhtin 1986a, 170), wrote Mikhail Bakhtin a year before his death. The reception of his work confirms this prophecy. The revival of the ideas accumulated in his writings had already begun in the 1960s however.

The West's almost avaricious appropriation of Bakhtin's concept of the carnivalesque or his dual, but not dualistic cultural theory in the late 1960s pointed to a standstill in the cultural paradigm. The concept of *le discours carnavalesque*, the carnivalesque discourse, Julia Kristeva somewhat unexpectedly introduced to the structuralist and post-structuralist discourse, together with the reception of the concept of dialogism (to which we will return later), led to modifications in the

field of theory. In *Le texte du roman* (Kristeva 1970), Bakhtin's book on Rabelais is cited, paraphrased and hijacked for a new discourse executing movements of the open and closed, the official and unofficial, the doctrinaire and the unbound. It was only later that Bakhtin's Rabelais study was translated into French. In the USA, in the course of the deconstruction debate, Bakhtin fell into the clutches of post-modern theorems of the decentring of the subject, of representation and logocentrism critique, while in the works of Michael Holquist, Katharina Clark, Caryl Emerson and Gary Saul Morson, Slavonic studies sought to gradually produce a comprehensive picture of Bakhtin without deferring to the demands of fashion. Especially these authors have in turn influenced Russian discourses, as emphatically demonstrated by their contributions to *Bakhtinskii Sbornik* (*Bakhtin Anthology*) and *Dialog. Karnaval. Khronotop* (*Dialogue. Carnival. Chronotope*), the publishing organs of Russian Bakhtinology.

The ductus of Bakhtin's work, which has been so influential for so many disciplines, with its merging of heterogeneous thought traditions but also the polyvalence of its terminology, with its peculiarly floating metaphoricity inviting interpretation, may be one of the reasons his work can be subjected to manifold readings. Structuralism, post-structuralism and Post-Modernism have availed themselves of his theories, each with their own emphasis. This is particularly true of specialists on the body and the carnivalesque. In the Soviet Union, Bakhtin was appropriated by neo-Slavophiles who stylised him as the prophet of a pan-Slavic idea of salvation, while cultural semiotics has adopted his theories for sober constructivist purposes.

A spectacular critique of his cultural theory, especially the concept of carnival culture and the grotesque, is offered by Boris Groys in his highly regarded and much reviled article "Grausamer Karneval. Michail Bachtins ästhetische Rechtfertigung des Stalinismus" (1989, "The Carnival of Cruelty: Bakhtin's Aesthetic Justification of Stalinism"). Written for a German readership, the provocative dimension of Groys' position – toppling a theorist celebrated as an anti-Stalinist thinker – obscured the stringency of his Bakhtinian argumentation. His argument is based on the assumption that there was an uninterrupted development leading from the futurist manifestos to the dictate of Socialist Realism, corresponding to the development from pre-revolutionary to post-revolutionary politics: totalitarianism and state terror are a manifestation of the carnivalesque and the grotesque. In presenting Bakhtin as a theorist of Stalinism and allowing the utopia of the carnival to be read as a cultural legitimation of Stalinist rule by violence, carnival as a totalitarian assault on the individual, Groys makes Bakhtin a crypto-Stalinist whose alternative to the system of a monologic-monolithic culture, an alternative seeking to eliminate all that is unofficial or centrifugal, must thus be unmasked. Groys does this by stripping Bakhtin's concept of ambivalence,

polyphony, the utopian moment, the idea of a delayed ultimate truth and ignoring the philosophical pathos inherent to the concept of the carnival: i. e. the pathos of a space free from fear and hegemony in which laughter frees the body from its individual boundaries and its subjection to censorship. Groys was not convinced by the attraction of the laughter principle promising the regeneration of the generic body, the idea of a cyclic return of excess expressed as a transitory counter-culture via the specific forms of the carnival rites. Nor was he enamoured with the 'carnivalesque way of writing' operating with a licence for the excessive, the exorbitant, the shocking and the speculative. While the latter points largely influenced Bakhtin reception in France as well as Germany and Canada (*Bakhtin News Letter*) and have become hard currency in all works concerned with corporality and the grotesque, Groys (presumably irritated by this) isolated the aspect of violence and terror virulent within the carnival and the grotesque and made it the main index to the entire idea. In his article "Ekstasis des Terrors" (1992, "Ecstasy of Terror"), Mikhail Ryklin turns once again to the laughter principle he identifies in two varieties in Bakhtin's Rabelais study: "distanced (ambivalent) laughter and endless (cosmic) laughter", whose effect he sees in a certain "terror" (threatened from outside and not caused by such laughter) and the phenomenon of "collective corporality" (Ryklin 1992, 35). Ryklin presents an almost unprecedented reading of the Rabelais study as trauma therapy. Groys's demolition job was not well received by Russian Bakhtinologists, who, devoted to the exegesis of the master's writings and philosophical development, had begun the scholarly publication of his works. Nevertheless, Groys's piece (1997) was published in *Bakhtin Anthology*, an important organ of Russian Bakhtinology, together with papers presenting an opposing orientation.

3 Dialogism and intertextuality

Bakhtin reception departed along a different tangent in 1979 with Rainer Grübel's study stressing the axiological aspect of his thought (Grübel 1979). Grübel's analysis formed the introduction to his collection of Bakhtin's essays entitled *Die Ästhetik des Wortes* (*The Aesthetics of the Word*), an interpretation rooted in the philosophy of language and the theory of aesthetics. Grübel countered the trivialising appropriation of the concept by discussing the mainly German philosophical prehistory of the idea of dialogism and its embeddedness in the Russian conceptual milieu and by portraying the dialogic relations (which cannot be reduced to either linguistic, psychological or logical references) as factors emerging in the text due to "convergence" and "divergence of meaning" (Grübel 1979, 49).

In the late 1960s however, the reception of Bakhtin's theory of dialogism had brought forth results consolidated in a new context, intertextuality. Julia Kristeva, from a theoretically 'refined' Bulgarian field of literary studies with outstanding knowledge of Russia's formalist and cultural semiotic scene, read Bakhtin relatively early and upon emigrating recognised the relevance his ideas held for the French theory scene that had been opened up by the post-structuralists. In an interview in the Vitebsk quarterly *Dialogue. Carnival. Chronotope*, she talks about Bulgarian readings of Dostoevskii and Bakhtin's study of Rabelais in the early 1960s, which, like interpretations elsewhere, considered these texts to be revolutionary. She also discusses her attempts to introduce Bakhtin to France, where he was completely unknown, and combine him with pre-existing theories (Kristeva 1995, 5–17).

In Germany it was Horst-Jürgen Gerigk who caused a stir at the Heidelberg Slavonic studies conference of 1964 not only with news of the (re-)appearance of Bakhtin's book on Dostoevskii but also with his interpretation of its theory of dialogism. In the discussion that followed, Dmitrij Tschiževskij recommended that German Slavonic studies strike new paths via Bakhtin reception. It took some time for non-Slavonic German literary studies to recognise the role of the dialogic and its Russian roots in the French import of intertextuality.

In France, Bakhtin's dialogism entered a theoretical network whose fabric, woven by Jean Starobinski, was further embellished following Kristeva's work by Michael Riffaterre, Laurent Jenny, Gérard Genette and others in a collision of descriptive and theoretical approaches. Terms from the fields of rhetoric, linguistic poetics, philosophy, semiotics, structuralism and post-structuralism and mythopoetics – terms with varying potential for generalisation – were related to each other. In the 'country of origin', the concept was further developed, albeit with different terminology, via back referencing and indirect allusions: we can identify French and Russian lineages that seem to display some crossover in the reinterpretation of Saussure's anagram studies.

Shortly after the newly edited and expanded version of Bakhtin's Dostoevskii study appeared in 1963, Kristeva used the dialogism determining the word and the text and the anagram studies analysed by Starobinski to develop her concept of intertextuality and the paragram, considering the individual text in a referential context with other texts and their interdependence as dialogically reflected, an argumentation also drawing on Jacques Derrida's critique of logocentricism and Jacque Lacan's conception of language. That is, Bakhtin's dialogism is combined with the then current (interdisciplinary) discourse, certain interpretations of Bakhtin's ideas giving the impression he anticipated concepts such as *lecture/ écriture*, *ambivalence*, and *le double*. In this vein, she writes: "Bakhtin [...] does not see dialogue only as language assumed by a subject; he sees it, rather, as a

writing where one reads the *other* (with no allusion to Freud). Bakhtinian dialogism identifies writing as both subjectivity and communication, or better, as intertextuality. Confronted with this dialogism, the notion of a 'person-subject of writing' becomes blurred, yielding to the idea of the 'ambivalence of writing'" (Kristeva 1986 [1966], 39). We shall return to this later.

Jean Starobinski's *Les mot sous les mots* (1971, *Words upon Words*), based on Ferdinand de Saussure's study of anagrams, elaborated two impulses using the concepts of double codification and interference between the latent and the manifest, implying the very connection between words and texts leading to the concept of intertextuality. In discussing Saussure's concept of the *mot-thème*, as a requirement of the *texte développé poétique* to which Saussure himself repeatedly referred using different terms (*anagramme*, *anaphome*, *hypogramme*, *paragramme*, *paratexte*), Starobinski elaborates the decisive notion that "He had evidently been thinking of a text within the text, of a pre-text" (Starobinski 1979, 11). Starobinski develops the answer to the question as to what came before the text, namely "not the creative *subject*", nor the linguistic code, but "but the inductive word" (Starobinski 1979, 121), "antecedent discourse" (Starobinski 1979, 4), from the concept of the anagram, which he explicates thus: "the words of a work are rooted in other, antecedent words, and [...] *they are not directly chosen* by the formative consciousness" (Starobinski 1979, 121). Starobinski attempts to generalise Saussure's central theory when he says, "all discourse is an *ensemble* which lends itself to the extraction of a *sub-ensemble*. This latter can be interpreted (a) as the latent content or infrastructure of the whole, or (b) as its antecedent" (Starobinski 1979, 122).

The subsequent question as to whether it might not also be the case that every text (*discours*) constitutes a whole only, as it were, provisionally – that it merely proffers to be a closed entity – is raised by the idea of an open textual chain in which each link can initially be considered the last (enveloping its predecessor) yet is swallowed up by the addition of a new one and so on. That is, there are only provisional totalities, whose precarious status – enclosed and enclosing – correspond to a place in between, a threshold between past and future textual totality. Such ideas are developed in other contexts too. Roman Timenchik (1981, 73) speaks of a pause, a gap between texts (*mezhtekstovoi probel*), that is bridged when the new text is connected to the old one; at the same time, this gap is the moment, the drawing (or holding) of breath in between when the foreign, other text has faded (*otzvuchal*) and the new one has yet to begin. The pause, the gap, the drawing of breath – belong to the prehistory of the new text.

The "inter" in Kristeva's *intertextualité* also points to this in-between. There are a number of parallels between Starobinki's and Kristeva's readings of the anagram, with respect to doubling and the idea of another word hidden within

the manifest word. For Starobinski, the anagram displays a hidden text whose hiddenness is marked by readable signals however. The hidden text can be a concrete, other text (as originally in Saussure), or the continuation of the text per se that is inherent to and precedes every text and into which every text feeds. In Kristeva's work on the paragram (1998 [1967], 1986 [1966]), the origins of which are apparent in the title, *le double* becomes the central concept. *Le double* contains the idea of the ambivalence of *lecture*/*écriture* and Bakhtin's dual-voicedness (*dvugolosoe slovo*). The 'paradigmatic' represents, as it were, the code of dual codification; it is the grammar of the dual sign. However, *le double* always entails the masked, unofficial semantic component too, the hidden.

The *science paragrammatique* which Kristeva proposes developing could fulfil the demands of Bakhtin's metalinguistics (Bakhtin 1981, 259–300; 1999, 181–185, 202, 265), which seek to make the dual orientation of the word the object of inquiry. That is, the dual sign, the double, the *paragramme* would, with its dual reference structure, replace the simple *signe*. Kristeva's paragramatics, as a new discipline of dialogistic poeticity, combines both aspects of Bakhtin's dialogism, duality and ambivalence: "poetic language is a *dialogue* between two discourses. A foreign text enters the network of writing" (Kristeva 1998, 29). Via the two concepts of *intertextualité* and the *paragramme*, Kristeva seeks to draw attention to each orientation of the compact dialogism complex: dialogue between the texts as *intertextualité* and dialogue in the word as a *paragramme*. Bakhtin's dialogism – interpreted intertextually and paragramatically – is thereby revived for a dimension of poetic language to which neither the novel nor poetry can lay exclusive claim.

With reference to *Marksizm i filosofiia iazyka* (*Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*), a work rooted in the philosophy of language published in 1929 under the pseudonym Valentin Voloshinov, Roman Jakobson, without considering its authorship, advanced and revived earlier formalist positions, in putting forward his idea of "speech within speech, utterance within utterance" (Voloshinov 1973, 115) as a contribution to dialogism. In doing so, he included an essential aspect of anagrams. With recourse to Voloshinov (1973, 125–127), Jakobson proposes the following thesis: "Virtually any poetic message is a quasi-quoted discourse [...] 'speech within speech'" (Jakobson 1968 [1960], 371). "Quasi-quoted discourse" and "speech within speech" are attempts to determine the speech of others within the context of a model of dialogism. The speech of others, reflecting others' semantic positions, is implicit in actualised speech, responds to it and makes it ambivalent. Jakobson cites the idea of speech within speech in its entirety in connection with the problem of the shifter: "Reported speech is speech within speech, a message within a message and at the same time it is also speech about speech, a message about a message as Vološinov formulates it" (Jakobson 1971 [1957], 130).

In Jakobson, the concept of the dialogic, meaning in Bakhtin's theory the collision of two semantic authorities and the resulting semantic potency of the word (not, then, the primary dialogue with allocated roles and corresponding linguistic instrumentalisation), is replaced by concepts such as dual structure, ambiguity and anagrammatic value. Reception of Saussure's anagram studies is also evident in Jakobson's concept of the subliminal (Jakobson 1970). Each element of poetic language comprises a manifest and a hidden symbolic value. The anagrammatic value is the value of the word that demands a second reading, a key role being played by the idea of a linguistic rule that has become forgotten or unconscious, realising the poetic language without the writer producing it being aware of it. That is, in poetic language each linguistic strategy also records a latent rule (subliminal pattern), an idea taking up Saussure's concept of the substrate.

Russian Bakhtinology was influenced by the circumstance that Bakhtin and, more generally, the Bakhtin Circle did not pay constructive attention to the dialogism in the poetry of Acmeism and its implications for the text-to-text relationship, just as Acmeism for its part overlooked Bakhtin's dialogic poetics of prose. We must distinguish between the synchronic correspondence between theory and practice evident in Russian formalism and futurism (and – to an extent – Post-Modernism and post-structuralism) and a striking phase shift characterising the relationship between the Russian post-symbolism of Acmeism and the theoretical works on the movement.

It was not until forty years later that a connection was established in the course of a (historically determined) re-reading of the works of the Bakhtin Circle and the Acmeists, particularly the works of Akhmatova and Mandel'shtam. In Soviet semiotics, this re-reading led to the articulation of a new semantic model (see also Rusinko 1979), focusing on the relationship between the manifest text and the underlying latent text, the subtext. At the same time, with his interpretation of Mandel'shtam, the American Slavonic scholar Kiril Taranovskii (1976, 18) developed an influential toolkit which also considered the subtext. Vladimir Toporov (1981, 1–63) set about re-examining Saussure's fundamental theories, which Saussure himself him had rejected, subjecting them to further development despite their author's skepsis. This new focus on the idea of the anagram from an analytical perspective, the plethora of studies on Acmeism 'upgrading' its poetic paradigm to the status of a cultural paradigm (Levin et al. 1974), but also the increasing complexity of literary prose – especially in the works Andrei Belyi and Vladimir Nabokov – led to a new poetic and poetological episteme.

The concept of intertextuality with its complex reciprocal relationship with the new text episteme itself now proved anything but lucid or even definitive. Rather, its conceptual tangents with their respective terminological consequences became something of an irritation. But even if the plethora of sub-concepts that

entered circulation were able to develop their descriptive and analytical potential in divergent discourses, they appear to originate in the same question. This holds for the following triggered by Julia Kristeva and Jean Starobinski in the French context, especially in the debate that played out in the journal *Poétique* 27 (1976) or the American discussion documented in the *New York Literary Forum* (Parisier-Plottel and Charney 1978), and indeed for the analyses by Michel Riffaterre (1978, 1983), the terminological systematics of Gerard Genette (1982) or the theoretically- and analytically-oriented efforts presented in issues of *Semeiotike* (Lotman 1981) published by the Tartu–Moscow School. The 'subtext', the 'hypotext', the 'anatext', the 'paratext', the 'transtext', the 'text in the text' – in combination with the 'metatext' and the 'autotext' – denote aspects of the complex phenomenon of text-to-text contact and the process of establishing such contact inherent to all texts – implied by Starobinski's reading of Saussure, Timenchik's reading of the Acmeists and Bakhtin's idea of the mutual dialogic affixation of texts. (On Russian modernism and intertextuality see also Lachmann 1997.)

Iurii Lotman (1969) expands the concept of *podtekst* (in the sense of subtext and paratext) with the idea of transposition (*transpozitsiia*) by including other non-linguistic sign systems in the dialogue and intertextual exchange. In her later works, Kristeva replaced the notion of *intertextualité,* which itself, incidentally, considers other non-verbal systems, with *transposition*. Erika Greber too subscribes to a concept of intertextuality drawing on Boris Pasternak which includes non-verbal 'texts' (music) (Greber 1989).

However, this is not what interested an analyst like Riffaterre. His approach is rather centred on the development of a descriptive figure leading back to the textual space. By combining a reception-oriented with a text-generative aspect, preceding his concepts of the semantic paragram and syllepsis, both of which evolved from anagram theory under the influence of Freudian overdetermination, he develops an applicable figure. This figure relates to the specific finding of intertextual construction, doubling, i. e. the production of dual signs. "Normal meaning [*signification*] is both referential and discursive – that is, experienced through a linear reading – so significance can be distinguished from meaning only outside of linearity" (Riffaterre 1983, 75). This idea of the text's dual semantic structure (reminiscent of Jakobson's *doublesensedness*, although he is not cited) is elaborated in *La Production du texte* (1979, *Text Production*) and illustrated by emphasising the concept of syllepsis as "a word understood in two different ways at once, as meaning and as significance" (Riffaterre 1980, 638). Syllepsis, as a switchboard between the text and the *intertexte* (he does not acknowledge his adaptation of Kristeva's term), becomes the rhetorical representation of overdetermination and dual codification: the dual-coded element refers to the syntax constituting it, that is, to present signs of textual consistency and at the same time –

as a break with isotopy – to absent texts. Breaks and incompatibilities marked by the dual sign work like tropes, i. e. like deviations, yet not from a linguistic norm, but from the norm of the given textual continuum. Here the role played by the reader becomes relevant: he notices the deviation when the *paragramme intertextuel* (the dual sign – here too without acknowledging Kristeva) remains unclear to him upon first reading and he compensates for it by searching for meaning in a re-reading that takes him beyond the boundaries of the text. Riffaterre's studies of poetry are a good example of how he refined his analytical method developed from a composite concept of intertextuality; he adds rhetorical tropes and figures, discovering, so to speak, their ability to describe 'intertextual' structures.

Incidentally, it is significant that the intertextuality theorists ultimately continue to strive to preserve the concept of meaning. Laurent Jenny (1982, 40) employs the "focal text" to tame the intertextual strategies – drawing on M. Arrivé (1973) he speaks of "a text absorbing a multiplicity of texts while remaining oriented by a meaning" (Jenny 1982, 45). Riffaterre's analytical practice of searching for intertexts, with its identification of syllepses and dual structures, also points to a construction of meaning produced and limited by the authoritarian text. Especially Genette's attempts to create a typology seek to re-academicise the concept by providing a descriptive toolkit. The development of a metalanguage of intertextuality shows structuralism's rejection of post-structuralist thought's transcendence of structure (of the individual text).

The writings of Bakhtin and Voloshinov seek to promote this concept opposed to abstract objectivism and system linguistics, repeatedly criticising – vehemently and unmistakably – the monopoly on meaning claimed by a centripetally linguistic and hegemonic space as a threat to the life of the word (life itself). It is the eccentricity of meaning, the crossing of accentuations of values intoned in the utterance that allow the centrifugal symbolic actions that are able to evoke the accumulated and potential meaning. The discussion surrounding Bakhtin's (and Voloshinov's symbol-theoretical) theories extends to other aspects of the dialogic, asking how to distinguish between the type of dialogic event and its participants. This aspect, including the concept of symbolic community and symbolic situations is taken up, in turn, by the authors of the Bakhtin Circle (see Voloshinov 1926, 244–267; 1996, 60–87). The symbolic context the text evades is that which is yet to become text, the "inferred" ("podrazumevaemoe", Voloshinov 1926, 250), which possesses validity due to a common cultural experience. The social context as a symbolic context functions as an "enthymema" (Voloshinov 1926, 251) of symbolic and textual experience of which each updated text avails itself.

The text's entwinement in the symbolic context also marks the cultural and ideological site revealing the functions of the intersection of signs, the functions of the intertextual organisation of the text itself. The text is thus manifested in the

social context as an ideological act that intervenes in the symbolic context. (For Voloshinov, the ideological is only ever a symbolic act.) Kristeva too is concerned with a similar question: with concepts such as the literary text that "inserts" or "writes itself" into the text (Kristeva 1998 [1967], 29), she determines the specific semantic achievement of the text in the historical and societal space, of the text in its function as an ideologeme.

Kristeva may appear to be inverting the dialogic principle into an authorless, quasi-autopoetic concept and sacrificing the aspect of authorship to a newly emerging discourse whose 'energy' takes effect here. In this context, Rainer Grübel speaks of a "productive misunderstanding" and, more pointedly, of an "historical irony" (Grübel 2008, 342). The passages in Kristeva (including those cited above), argue: "Bakhtin [...] does not see dialogue only as language assumed by a subject; he sees it, rather, as a *writing* where one reads the *other* [...]. Confronted with this dialogism, the notion of a 'person-subject of writing' becomes blurred, yielding to that of 'ambivalence of writing'" (Kristeva 1986 [1966], 39). Ambivalence means the dual function of the text as a "writing" and as a "reading of the anterior literary corpus" and – even more radically – as the "absorption of and reply to another text". This idea appears in many variations: the literary text features as a "reminiscence", that is, "the evocation of another writing" and as "the transformation of this writing" (Kristeva 1998, 30).

The *lecture* in the *écriture* does not exclude the idea of the person writing as the reader of someone else who is writing or has written – so goes the first part of the theory. Since the text can only take on meaning in relation to other texts, this semantic process loses its static character and can be conceived as a process: "Bakhtin was one of the first to replace the static hewing out of texts with a model where literary structure does not simply *exist* but is generated in relation to *another* structure" (Kristeva 1986 [1966], 35–36).

The author is locked into the text for which he is responsible, i. e. he is locked into the answer to the other text (of the other writer), into its absorption and transformation. Kristeva implicitly takes up Bakhtin's dictum permitting the idea of authorlessness: "Two speech works, utterances, juxtaposed to one another, enter into a special kind of semantic relationships that we call dialogic" (Bakhtin 1986b, 118). By locating the text in a dialogic relationship with the other text and having the resultant semantic friction take place within the text itself, Bakhtin assumes a dual movement. The text emerges by transcending its boundaries while at the same time returning to its inner territory in which the dialogic experience with the other texts unfolds, as it were. Such a movement is admittedly not the object of textual description, but is executed in the very process of understanding:

> Each word (each sign) of the text exceeds its boundaries. Any understanding is a correlation of a given text with [...] other texts. Stages in the dialogic movement of *understanding*: the point of departure, the given text; movement backward, past contexts; movement forward, anticipation (and the beginning) of a future context. [...] The text lives only by coming into contact with another text (with context). Only at the point of this contact between texts does a light flash, illuminating both the posterior and anterior, joining a given text to a dialogue. (Bakhtin 1986a, 161–162)

In Bakhtin's concept of the genre memory too, which is of particular importance for his blueprint for an alternative literary history, a supersubjective process becomes conceivable, a process which the author enters as a creative subject and by which he is captured. In his history of the menippea, which he traces from Lukian to Dostoevskii, Bakhtin seeks to provide evidence of the existence of a 'genre memory' (see Lachmann 2006). Subjectlessness concerns, then, the quasi-energetic effect texts have on each other, the memory of forms and the events that take place within the word as a dialogue between two voices. Elsewhere however, Bakhtin introduces a personalisation to the cognitive process constituting the dialogue, a personalisation implying a concept of the subject (albeit one that is difficult to delimit). "But personalization is never subjectivization. The limit here is not *I* but *I* in interrelationship with other personalities, that is, *I* and *other*, *I* and *thou*" (Bakhtin 1986a, 167). The subject is of interest whenever it encounters another subject within the dialogue. "Contextual meaning is personalistic; it always includes a question, an address, and the anticipation of a response, it always includes two (as a dialogic minimum). This personalism is not psychological, but semantic" (Bakhtin 1986a, 169–170). However, the shift away from a psychological concept of the subject (rooted in examination of the central positions of the Freudian school) by replacing the psyche with meaning, the subject with the person, personality, or personification is indebted to the ideas of dialogue and understanding meaning as a symbolic process (Voloshinov 1927; Bakhtin 1993). The speaking, sign-using subject is never merely an individual; it is constituted as a person (a voice) in the other speaker's word. The word is thus seen as both a two-sided act and a product of this act: "Each and every word expresses the 'one' in relation to the 'other.' I give myself verbal shape from another's point of view [...]" (Voloshinov 1973, 86). Ulrich Schmid (2008, 19–20) identifies in the concept of the foreign as the other traces of a reception of Hermann Cohen's theorems, to which Bakhtin was exposed via Matvei Kagan. In *Ethik des reinen Willens* (1904, *The Ethics of Pure Will*), Cohen writes: "The other, the alter ego, is the origin of the ego" (Cohen 1904, 201). In the context of the French discussion influenced by Lacan's concept of the other, Tzvetan Todorov, in his paper "Bakhtine et l'altérité" (1979, "Bakhtin and Alterity") (Todorov 1979, 504), sought to explain Bakhtin's dialogism in the concept of subjectivity as alter-

ity and of the author as the 'other', reducing this to the paronomastic formula of *être/autre*.

The Western reception of dialogism becomes more nuanced with the treatise published under Voloshinov's names (to which he presumably contributed) which Jakobson had already cited. This new understanding was shaped by concepts of deconstruction. In his readings of Voloshinov, in the context of Derrida's *différence/différance* and *absence*, Samuel Weber pointed to the utterance as a subsequent and antecedent product of interaction:

> As a translation without an original, the utterance is more reproduction than identity, a differential factor of transference [...] it is reaction and repetition, but not as a dilution of a given identity, but as the movement of a difference that produces the utterance while the same time revoking and destroying it. (Weber 1975, 32)

But this "selectivity" is also "fictive" (Weber 1975, 29). In this interpretation, the idea of valuing or a value accent, suggesting a provisional unambiguousness and semantic decision or a "placement that forgets or wishes to forget its emergence and quality as a translation" (Weber 1975, 36), seems indispensable for the concept of dialogism. The value accent constitutes verbal interaction as social interaction, functions as an interpreter of the use of signs. The difference between certain positions in *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* and Bakhtin's writings is thus overlooked: while Voloshinov's Marxist interpretation of verbal interaction sees the use of signs as an ideological event and militantly seeks to redeem the value accents articulating meaning as 'interest' (the sign as the "arena of the class struggle" [Voloshinov 1973, 23]), Bakhtin is concerned with dismantling the selective consolidation of values. That is, division and differentiation, retention and clues must be thought of as coexisting in the word. The word connoting the contexts it has passed through traces the clues as to the meaning intonated within it. Each new meaning it penetrates finds these clues: the division occurs in accumulation, accumulation occurs via division. Bakhtin's world model of a growing complexity of signs oscillates between anticipated utopia and utopian completion. "In recollections we also take subsequent events (with in the past) into account, that is, we perceive and understand what is remembered in the context of the unfinalized past" (Bakhtin 1986a, 160). Denying the first and the final word allows dialogue to penetrate the "boundless past" and the "boundless future":

> There is neither a first nor a last word and there are no limits to the dialogic context (it extends into the boundless past and the boundless future). Even past meanings, that is, those born in the dialogue of past centuries, can never be stable (finalized, ended once and for all) [...]. At any moment in the development of the dialogue there are immense, boundless masses of forgotten contextual meanings, but at certain moments of the dialogue's subsequent development along the way they are recalled and invigorated in renewed form (in a

new context). Nothing is absolutely dead: every meaning will have its homecoming festival. The problem of *great time*. (Bakhtin 1986a, 170)

All these processes of decentrification, pluralisation and distortion of meaning imply the voice as an authority infusing the word with that combination of the familiar and the strange, the diaphonic word (*dvugolosoe slovo*). The internal word dialogue is the result of duophonicity and, in more extreme cases, polyphony.

A related discussion concerns the concept of the voice in opposition and proximity to Derrida's concept of the script. Bakhtin countered the hypostasis of the letter with the hypostasis of the voice, the 'represented voice', speech made script, which is descriptualised or, more precisely, degrammaticised by recognition of its traces. Assuming the voice is a voice of ambivalence, a dual voice, his idea leads to diaphonology, not grammatology. Derrida's script as a "differential structure of deferment" and an "afterwardsness" with which it is impossible to catch up (Derrida 1967, 83; see also Hörisch 1979, 14) lends Bakhtin's voice its logocritical contours. For Bakhtin, script is that disciplined force that smoothes over the pluralism of meaning and polyphony while also allowing script to capture voices; script must be descriptualised, rendered sound. Hence the voice functions in a process between grammaticisation and degrammaticisation. In the manifold intonations that distort a given meaning, the word of the voice falls silent in script, yet in order to grasp these intonations, the manifold abbreviated semantic intentions we need to read 'out loud'. That is, the mass of meaning silences the 'phonetic' voices and causes the script into which they sink to resound. While Voloshinov calls for reading aloud, Bakhtin sees this procedure more abstractly: it is a matter of perceiving the vocal traces that have 'suffered' a kind of provisional unambiguousness through their scriptural imprisonment. Script is not dialogic without additional effort to voice it. It is only in the novel that this is possible; it is only here that an open-ended process is set in motion: "Therefore the internal dialogism of double-voiced prose discourse can never be exhausted thematically (just as the metaphoric energy of language can never be exhausted thematically)" (Bakhtin 1981, 326).

4 Against reductionism: more recent Bakhtin reception

Vitalii Makhlin has closely followed Western Bakhtin reception: in his survey *Bakhtin i Zapad* (1993, *Bakhtin and the West*), a reception of reception discussing twenty-seven contributions (from 1988 to 1991), Michael Holquist's emerges as the

most insightful; he is considered the pioneer of useful Western reception and an interpreter who has in turn influenced the original scene (Makhlin 1993). Holquist is not just a disseminator, but also an intermediary. For Makhlin, the genesis of the concept, the intertwinement of elements of theory occurring in other discourses, the emergence of a new discourse are not of primary importance, nor is the idea of dialogism interesting for literary studies. In his interpretation, the Russian history of philosophy of religion is Bakhtin's initial source, and in a peculiar way, Bakhtin is a Russian philosopher.

Filtered back to the West, Bakhtin's cultural-philological terminology becomes the subject of a concept of archaeology, largely thanks to the work of Brian Poole (1998, 2001). Rainer Grübel too has not strayed from precise analysis of concepts and the reconstruction of terminologically relevant neologisms, most recently in collaboration with Ulrich Schmid and Edward Kowalski. In their introduction and commentary on Bakhtin's early work *Avtor i geroi v ėsteticheskoi deiatel'nosti* (1979 [posthumously], *Author and Hero in Aesthetic Activity*), they also highlight those aspects of his 'aesthetic anthropology' that already anticipate figures of thought in the later works; a theory of acting and the beginnings of a holistic aesthetic conception emerge. The interpretative efforts tend to prevent reductionist readings and give hope for a new Bakhtin reception. While Makhlin emphasises Bakhtin's *russkost'* ('Russianness'), Grübel et al. unfold the German context to which many of Bakhtin's figures of thought belong.

Their focus also extends to *vnenakhodimost'* (outsideness). In discussing this context, Ulrich Schmid takes up an idea of Caryl Emerson's (2005), which sees in "Shklovsky's ostranenie, Bakhtin's vnenakhodimost" an unexpected connection between representatives of divergent doctrines. Schmid remarks, "[i]t is certainly possible to relate Bakhtin's core category of 'Außerhalbbefindlichkeit' to the Formalist concept of estrangement (ostranenie)" (Schmid 2008, 15). For Schmid, Bakhtin assumes that every aesthetic activity presupposes a certain distancing, both production and reception. Bakhtin calls for 'loving distancing' (*ustranenie*), from the life of the hero. In both cases, the aesthetic activity is based on a surplus of perception that can only adapt to an external position; formalist estrangement is also based on an aesthetic distance: "Dostoevsky was undoubtedly familiar with Voltaire's menippea Micromégas, belonging to the same fantastic line in the development of the menippea, the line that estranges earthly reality" (Bakhtin 1999, 148). The abstract *vnenakhodimost'* formed from *vne* (out of) is a term rooted in Russian philosophy, i. e. *vnenakhodimost'* is no terminological coincidence. With reference to Pavel Florenskii's *vnepolozhnost'* ([state of] being located outside [of something]) and Sergei Bulgakov's *vnepolagaet* (relinquishes) Schmid opens up, in the sense of "being metaphysically located outside" (Schmid 2008, 29), a new perspective on Bakhtin's *vnenakho-*

dimost', which Todorov reproduces as *exotopie*, Emerson as 'outsideness', Grübel as *Außerhalbbefindlichkeit*.

Rainer Grübel does not so much trace the potential connection with a formalist figure of thought as attempt to delineate Bakhtin's concept of 'outside', which he considers 'partitive', from that of Plessner, which he labels 'absolute', thus offering a specific reading of Plessner's term (Grübel 2008, 338). The complex concept of 'eccentric positionality' with which Plessner proposes distinguishing between man and beast (and plants) could also be read differently however. 'Eccentric positionality' means the stance that allows humans, who are determined by their limits (i.e. their own bodies) to act in relation to their centre, within which they cannot exist however, since they are inside it and outside it. While animals rest in their centre, that is, are of a centric disposition, human observe their centre from an excentre, orienting themselves around it – and this relationship with their centre also describes their consciousness as self-consciousness. 'Eccentric positionality' enables people to name their egos (Plessner 1928, 288–293).

With Schmid's reference to Kant, Cohen, Scheler, Simmel and the Russian Sophiologist tradition, *vnenakhodimost'* takes on new contours, especially regarding the latter movement. It is a matter of "God's eccentricity with regard to His creation – as an unstable condition that must culminate in the recreation of the original unity of the universe" (Schmid 2008, 31). Precisely this idea opens up a further horizon, since on the one hand it evokes a Cabbalistic figure of thought concerned with *ein-sof* and *tikkun*, or implying God's 'condition' before the act of creation, and on the other hand points to a Gnostic doctrine that sees God beyond the poor creation of a demiurge.

What is going on in these studies of conceptual history? Formulations such as 'this idea of X's goes back to Y' or 'here X takes up the idea of Y' and the metaphor of influence circumscribe the process leading to the generation of concepts. Looking back on his description of the development of Bakhtin's theory, Schmid speaks of a "broad spectrum of theoretical offerings" on which Bakhtin could draw, of "synthetic intellect", and points to "overlaps, entanglements and superimpositions" of theoretical elements (Schmid 2008, 25).

It is a question of retracing the genesis of a concept influencing a theorist's thought, and qualifying his terminology. Terms and their transformation are often retraced. What is not always pursued is the lines of argumentation, the rhetoric of representation, the stylistics of the statement, the status of the theorem (hypothesis, claim etc.), the statement's mode (irony, criticism, self-criticism). Different levels of theory reception can usually be observed; the first step is to examine an author within the context of his own prehistory, to fit him into an existing frame of reference. The next step is then to probe the field that adopts him, which transforms him or is transformed by him. In the Western Bakhtin reception, we can observe the

integration of his own theorems into existing discourses, followed by processes of amalgamation, of transformation. At same time, an interest develops in the prehistory of his theories and the transformations he himself effected with theorems that grew into his conception. Here we can observe processes of abbreviation (*detractio*), elaboration (*adiectio*), and transformation (*transmutatio*). (On the Western reception of Bakhtin see Rainer Grübel's chapter on Bakhtin in this volume.)

Inquiry into the genesis of a theory and its relationship to prior theories gives rise to the idea of treating theoretical constructs like literary ones and using a typology of intertextuality to determine that which produces a given theory's relationship with other figures of thought or arguments: transposition, participation, resistance. Specific processes of such intertextual contact include quotation, allusion, contamination, critique, pastiche, plagiarism. An antecedent theoretical impulse can serve as a subtext (as an anagram); in some cases, one might speak metaphorically of a palimpsest of theory.

If one takes a dynamic view of the reception, one might ask whether it takes place in the contact and overlapping of discourses or whether only (the one) discourse is the site of an 'exchange of energy' between theoretical positions (Bakhtin's idea of texts reciprocally affecting each other), or whether a new discourse emerges as several prior discourses merge with one another. In the case of the migration of concepts between East and West, amalgamations, processes of integration into the respective discourses are just as common as distortions, but also conceptual 'enrichments' that have taken some concepts back to their original contexts. But the migration of concepts, by removing asymmetries, also creates a balance of knowledge. Asymmetries that have arisen due to ignorance of a theory are clearly easier to balance than those created by ideological constellations that have become obstacles. Further, one can observe intellectual milieus shaped by scholarly curiosity alongside scenes that present themselves as a private club and have a somewhat sceptical attitude towards foreign theorems, especially those of Eastern provenience. But it has also proven to be the case that 'objective' gaps in existing theories require a certain openness and can give rise to innovation via contact with foreign concepts.

But there are also extraordinary cases of migration, as demonstrated by the history of the boundless reception of Bakhtin's work and the echo thus created from West to East to West. As early as 6 April 1991, V. N. Turbin recognised the singularity of this process in *Literaturnaia gazeta* (*Literary Newspaper*): "The general impression: something rolls through the world like a wave ... Bakhtin transcended the framework of some single sphere of interpretation; he becomes a magnetic figure generating attempts to understand a new man in the world".

Translated by John Heath

References

Arrivé, Michel. "Pour une théorie des textes poly-isotopiques." *Langages* 31 (1973): 53–63.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Discourse in the Novel." *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Trans. by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Ed. Mikhail Bakhtin, Michael Holquist. Austin, TX, and London: University of Texas Press, 1981. 259–422.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Toward a Methodology for the Human Sciences." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Trans. by Vern W. McGee. Eds. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1986a. 159–172.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "The Problem of the Text in Linguistics, Philology, and the Human Sciences: An Experiment in Philosophical Analysis." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Trans. by Vern W. McGee. Eds. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1986b. 103–131.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Bakhtin pod maskoi. Maska pervaia: Freidizm*. Vol. 1. Ed. V. L. Makhlin. Moscow: Labirint, 1993.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Ed. and trans. by Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis, MN, and London: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.

Bloch, Ernst. *Verfremdungen*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1962.

Christiansen, Broder. *Philosophie der Kunst*. Hanau: Clauss & Feddersen, 1909.

Cohen, Hermann. *Ethik des reinen Willens*. Berlin: Cassirer, 1904.

Derrida, Jaques. *De la grammatologie*. Paris: Ed. de Minuit, 1967.

Emerson, Caryl. "Shklovsky's *ostranenie*, Bakhtin's *vnenakhodimost'*. (How Distance serves an Aesthetics Differently from an Aesthetics Based on Pain)." *Poetics Today* 26 (2005): 637–676.

Genette, Gerard. *Palimpsestes – La littérature au second degré*. Paris: Éd. du Seuil, 1982.

Greber, Erika. *Intertextualität und Interpretierbarkeit des Textes: Zur frühen Prosa Boris Pasternaks*. Munich: Fink, 1989.

Grimm, Reinhold. "Verfremdung: Beiträge zu Wesen und Ursprung eines Begriffs." *Revue de littérature comparée* 35 (1961): 207–236.

Groys, Boris. "Grausamer Karneval: Michail Bachtins ästhetische Rechtfertigung des Stalinismus." *FAZ* (21 June 1989).

Groys, Boris. "Totalitarizm Karnavala." *Bakhtinskii Sbornik* III. Ed. Vitalii Makhlin. Moscow: Labirint, 1997. 76–80.

Grübel, Rainer. "Zur Ästhetik des Wortes bei Michail M. Bachtin." Michail M. Bachtin, *Die Ästhetik des Wortes*. Ed. Rainer Grübel. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1979. 21–78.

Grübel, Rainer. "Bachtins Philosophie in der ästhetischen Handlung und ihre Aktualität." Michail Bachtin, *Autor und Held in der ästhetischen Tätigkeit*. Trans. by Hans-Günter Hilbert, Rainer Grübel, Alexander Haardt, and Ulrich Schmid. Eds. Rainer Grübel, Edward Kowalski, and Ulrich Schmid. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 2008. 317–352.

Hansen-Löve, Aage Ansgar. *Der russische Formalismus: Methodologische Rekonstruktion seiner Entwicklung aus dem Prinzip der Verfremdung*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1978.

Heselhaus, Clemens. "Brechts Verfremdung der Lyrik." *Immanente Ästhetik, ästhetische Reflexion: Lyrik als Paradigma der Moderne*. (Poetik und Hermeneutik Vol. II.) Ed. Wolfgang Iser. Munich: Fink, 1966. 307–326.

Hörisch, Jochen. "Das Sein der Zeichen und die Zeichen des Seins – Marginalien zu Derridas Ontosemiologie." Jacques Derrida, *Die Stimme und das Phänomen — Ein Essay über das*

Problem des Zeichens in der Philosophie Husserls. Trans. by Jochen Hörisch. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1979. 7–50.

Iser, Wolfgang (ed.). *Immanente Ästhetik, ästhetische Reflexion: Lyrik als Paradigma der Moderne*. Munich: Fink, 1966.

Jakobson, Roman. "Linguistics and Poetics." [1960] *Style in Language*. Ed. Thomas Albert Sebeok. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1968. 350–377.

Jakobson, Roman. "Subliminal Verbal Patterning." *Studies in General and Oriental Linguistics*. Eds. Roman Jakobson and Shigeo Kawamoto. Tokyo: TEC Co., 1970. 302–308.

Jakobson, Roman. "Shifters, Verbal Categories, and the Russian Verb." [1957] Roman Jakobson, *Selected Writings*. II. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1971. 130–147.

Jenny, Laurent. "The Strategy of Form." *French Literary Theory Today: A Reader*. Ed. Tzvetan Todorov. Cambridge and New York, NY: Cambridge University Press 1982. 34–63.

Kayser, Wolfgang. *Das Groteske*. Oldenburg: Stalling, 1957.

Kristeva, Julia. *Le texte du roman*. Paris and The Hague: Mouton, 1970.

Kristeva, Julia. "Word, Dialogue and Novel." [1966] Trans. by Alice Jardine, Thomas Gora, and Léon S. Roudiexz. Julia Kristeva, *The Kristeva Reader*. Ed. Toril Moi. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1986. 34–61.

Kristeva, Julia. "Beseda s Iuliei Kristevoi." *Dialog. Karnaval. Khronotop* 2 (1995): 5–17.

Kristeva, Julia. "Towards a Semiology of Paragrams." [1967] *The Tel Quel Reader*. Eds. Patrick French and Roland-François Lack. London and New York, NY: Routledge, 1998. 25–49.

Lachmann, Renate. "Die 'Verfremdung' und das 'Neue Sehen' bei Viktor Šklovskij." *Poetica* 3 (1970): 226–249.

Lachmann, Renate. *Memory and Literature: Intertextuality in Russian Modernism* [1990]. Trans. by Roy Sellars and Anthony Wall. Foreword by Wolfgang Iser. Minneapolis, MN, and London: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.

Lachmann, Renate. "Bachtins Konzept der Menippeischen Satire und das Phantastische." *Fremde Wirklichkeiten: Literarische Phantastik und antike Literatur*. Eds. Nicola Hömke and Manuel Baumbach. Heidelberg: Winter, 2006. 19–39.

Levin, Iurii I., Dmitrij M. Segal, Roman D. Timenchik, Vladimir N. Toporov, and Tat'iana V. Tsiv'ian. "Russkaia semanticheskaia poėtika kak potentsial'naia kul'turnaia paradigma." *Russian Literature* 3.2/3 (1974): 47–82.

Lotman, Iurii. *Lektsii po struktural'noi poėtike*. Providence, RI: Brown University Press, 1968.

Lotman, Iurii. "Stikhotvoreniia rannego Pasternaka i nekotorye voprosy strukturnogo izucheniia teksta." *Trudy po znakovym sistemam* 4 (1969): 206–238.

Lotman, Iurii. "Tekst v tekste." *Trudy po znakovym sistemam* 14 (1981): 3–18.

Makhlin, Vitalii. "Bakhtin i Zapad: Opyt obzornoi orientatsii." *Voprosy filosofii* 1 (1993): 5–27.

Marcuse, Herbert. *Versuch über die Befreiung*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1969.

Novalis, *Schriften*. Vol. 3. Eds. Paul Kluckhohn and Richard Samuel. Leipzig: Bibliographisches Institut, 1928.

Parisier-Plottel, Jeanine, and Hanna Charney (eds.). *Intertextuality – New Perspectives in Criticism*. New York, NY: New York Literary Forum 2, 1978.

Poole, Brian. "Bakhtin and Cassirer: The Philosophical Origins of Bakhtin's Carnival Messianism." *Bakhtin/"Bakhtin": Studies in the Archive and Beyond*. Ed. Peter Hitchcock. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998. 537–578.

Poole, Brian. "From Phenomenology to Dialogue: Max Scheler's Phenomenological Tradition and Mikhail Bakhtin's Development from *Towards a Philosophy of the Act* to his Study

of Dostoevsky." *Bakhtin and Cultural Theory*. Eds. Ken Hirschkop and David Shepherd. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001. 109–135.

Plessner, Helmuth. *Die Stufen des Organischen und der Mensch*. Berlin and Leipzig: De Gruyter, 1928.

Riffaterre, Michael. *Semiotics of Poetry*. Bloomington, IN, and London: Indiana University Press, 1978.

Riffaterre, Michael. "Syllepsis." *Critical Inquiry* 6.4 (1980): 625–638.

Riffaterre, Michael. *Text Production*. Trans. by Terese Lyons. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1983.

Rusinko, Elaine. "Intertextuality: The Soviet Approach to Subtext." *Dispositio* IV.11/12 (1979): 213–235.

Ryklin, Michail. "Ekstasis des Terrors." *Lettre international* 19 (Winter 1992): 35–40.

Schmid, Ulrich. "Der philosophische Kontext von Bakhtins Frühwerk." Michail Bachtin, *Autor und Held in der ästhetischen Tätigkeit*. Trans. by Hans-Günter Hilbert, Rainer Grübel, Alexander Haardt, and Ulrich Schmid. Eds. Rainer Grübel, Edward Kowalski, and Ulrich Schmid. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 2008. 7–32.

Shklovskii, Viktor [Szkłowski, Wiktor]. *O prozie: Rozważania i analizy*. 2 Vols. Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1964.

Shklovskii, Viktor. *Povesti o proze*. Vol. I: *Rasskazyvaiushchii, glavnym obrazom, o zapadnoi proze*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1966a.

Shklovskii, Viktor. *Povesti o proze*. Vol. II: *V kotorom rasskazyvaetsia o russkoi proze*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1966b.

Shklovskii [Šklovskij], Viktor. *Theorie der Prosa*. Trans. by G. Drohla. Frankfurt/M.: S. Fischer, 1966c.

Shklovskii [Shklovsky], Viktor. "On the Sense of Wonder." *Viktor Shklovsky: A Reader*. Ed. and trans. by Alexandra Berlina. New York, NY, London, Oxford, New Delhi, and Sydney: Bloomsbury, 2017. 266–268.

Starobinski, Jean. *Words upon Words: The Anagrams of Ferdinand de Saussure*. Trans. by Olivia Emmet. New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 1979. [French original: Starobinski, Jean (ed.). *Les mots sous les mots-les anagrammes de Ferdinand de Saussure*. Paris: Gallimard, 1971.]

Striedter, Jurij. "Transparenz und Verfremdung." *Immanente Ästhetik, ästhetische Reflexion: Lyrik als Paradigma der Moderne*. (Poetik und Hermeneutik Vol. II.) Ed. Wolfgang Iser. Munich: Fink, 1966. 263–296.

Striedter, Jurij, and Wolf-Dieter Stempel (eds.). *Texte der russischen Formalisten*. Vol. II: *Texte zur allgemeinen Literaturtheorie und zur Theorie der Prosa*. Ed. and with an introduction by Jurij Striedter. Ed. and indexed by Witold Kośny. Munich: Fink, 1969.

Striedter, Jurij, and Wolf-Dieter Stempel (eds.). *Texte der russischen Formalisten*. Vol. II: *Texte zur Theorie des Verses und der poetischen Sprache*. Ed. and with an introduction by Wolf-Dieter Stempel. Notes and ed. by Inge Paulmann. Munich: Fink, 1972.

Taranovsky, Kiril. *Essays on Mandel'stam*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1976.

Timenchik, Roman. "Tekst v tekste u akmeistov." *Trudy po znakovym sistemam* 14 (1981): 65–73.

Todorov, Tzvetan. "Bakhtine et l'alterité." *Poétique* 40 (1979): 502–523.

Tolstoi, Lev. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*. Vol. 53. *Dnevniki i zapisnye knizhki 1895–1899*. Ed. V.G. Chertkov. Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo "Khudozhestvennaia literatura", 1953.

Toporov, Vladimir. "Die Ursprünge der indoeuropäischen Poetik." *Poetica* 13 (1981): 1–63.

Tschiževskij, Dmitrij. "Das Labyrinth der Welt und das Paradies des Herzens des J. A. Comenius: Einige Stilanalysen." *Harvard Slavic Studies* 1 (1953): 120–145.

Turbin, Vladimir Nikolaevich. *Literaturnaia gazeta (*6 March 1991).

Voloshinov, Valentin. "Slovo v zhizni i slovo v poezii." *Zvezda* 6 (1926): 244–267. [Reprinted in *Bakhtin pod maskoi*. Vol. 5, no. 1. Ed. V. L. Makhlin. Moscow: Labirint, 1996. 60–87.]

Voloshinov, Valentin. *Freidizm – Kriticheskii ocherk*. Moscow and Leningrad: Goslitizdat, 1927.

Voloshinov, Valentin [Vološinov, V.N.]. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. Trans. by Vladislav Matejka and I.R. Titunik. New York, NY, and London: Seminar Press, 1973.

Weber, Samuel M. "Der Einschnitt – Zur Aktualität Voloshinovs." Valentin Vološinov, *Marxismus und Sprachphilosophie*. Ed. Samuel M. Weber. Frankfurt/M.: Ullstein, 1975. 9–45.

Willett, John. *The Theatre of Bert Brecht*. London: Methuen, 1959.

Wissmann, Jürgen. "Collagen oder die Integration von Realität im Kunstwerk." *Immanente Ästhetik, ästhetische Reflexion: Lyrik als Paradigma der Moderne.* (Poetik und Hermeneutik Vol. II.) Ed. Wolfgang Iser. Munich: Fink, 1966. 327–366.

Wissmann, Jürgen. "Pop-Art oder die Realität als Kunstwerk." *Die nicht mehr schönen Künste: Grenzphänomene des Ästhetischen.* (Poetik und Hermeneutik Vol. III.) Ed. Hans Robert Jauss. Munich: Fink, 1968. 507–530.

Zhirmunskii, Viktor. "Zadachi poètiki." Viktor Zhirmunskii, *Teoriia literatury: Poètika. Stilistika.* Eds. I. D. Levin and D. S. Likhachev. Leningrad: Izdat. "Nauka", 1977. 15–55.

Irina Wutsdorff

Translation of Theories –
Theories of Translation

The aim of this handbook is to trace those intensive intellectual movements in Central and East-Central Europe that provided the impetus for the development of literary theory (or theories). Particularly in the early twentieth century, ideas and individuals – and with them concepts and theories – migrated back and forth between the cultures of the German-speaking areas, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Russia, creating common theoretical field. Even if in the course of the century the opportunities for this exchange were limited due to the political conditions that prevailed for long periods, exiled scholars still transported theories to the Western literary-theoretical discourse, where some of them enjoyed divergent careers and were transformed within new cultural contexts. Both translators and the transformation translation necessarily entails thus play a decisive role for the entangled movements examined by this handbook.

An important consideration is what emphasis we should place on the relationship between concepts and actors when describing such migratory movements. Can such an entangled history of literary theory (or theories) be understood in the classical tradition of the history of ideas and concepts? Should then the focus be on each specific development of concepts and terms in their various contexts, meaning that the aspect of entanglement would consist in ascribing particular significance to reciprocal exchange of these contexts? Or would it be better to trace the entangled history in terms of specific, individual actors who served as mediators, and often as translators, of concepts?

In Slavic literary theory, the classic example of a wandering actor is Roman Jakobson, who took the concepts of Russian formalism with him to Prague, where he entered into intensive exchange with the members of the Prague Linguistic Circle before finally further disseminating and developing the concepts of Russian formalism and Prague structuralism in the USA. Mediating, wandering actors like him initiated, one might say, the migration of concepts.

In Slavic studies, the classic example of concepts taking on a life of their own due to their migration is probably the thought of Mikhail Bakhtin: in Western Europe, his theory of dialogicity became a theory of intertextuality, and the concept of hybridity emanating from his concept of carnival took on innumerable guises in post-colonial studies. Another actor comes to the fore in this shift from dialogicity to intertextuality: Julia Kristeva, who as a Bulgarian emigrée took Bakhtin with her to Paris, where she was able to render his ideas compatible with the local scene's then nascent discussions on poststructuralism. It is much harder

to establish the originator of the transfer of hybridity as a characteristic of the post-colonial. It would thus seem to be primarily the concepts that unfold new semantic potential, even if they are initially communicated by wandering actors (like Kristeva): for instance, in the concept of intertextuality, dialogicity, which in Bakhtin's concept is always bound up with its author, becomes a relationship between texts, and hybridity becomes a key term in post-colonial studies, a discipline Bakhtin himself never pursued.

Our example shows that neither concentrating on the mediating and translating actors, not all of whom cannot be identified either, nor focusing only on the travelling concepts is an appropriate strategy for tracing literary theory's entanglement, since the concepts themselves are transformed in the course of their transfer by various readings. Such shifts can be well explained using the concept of cultural translation, in which an important role is played by the attention paid to the reception context in the target language or culture. In our case, we would have to speak of reception contexts of various cultures of theory.

1 Translation(s) as a method, object and example

From a methodological perspective, our focus here is on cultural studies' understanding of translation as transfer not just from one natural language to another, but also between cultural contexts. However, in the following exemplary discussions, translation also becomes an object, since we shall be concerned with translated theory which itself (also) examines translations. Here the question concerning the role and the weight of the actors will continue to be of interest, since the example centres on such an actor who was a mediator in the best sense of the term: at the initiative – and probably also under the leadership – of Jurij Striedter, in the first half of the 1970s a German translation of the works of Felix Vodička was produced by the Research Group for Structural Methods in Linguistics and Literary Studies at the University of Konstanz. It includes a selection from his volume *Struktura vývoje* (1969, *The Structure of Development*) and an essay on Josef Jungmann's translation of Chateaubriand's *Atala* from Vodička's book *Počátky krásné prózy novočeské* (1948, *The Beginnings of Modern Czech Prose*). Striedter's two-part treatise, just short of 100 pages in length but merely listed as an "Introduction", shares important considerations on the development "From Russian Formalism to Czech Structuralism" (in Part I), followed by an examination of "Felix Vodička's Theory of Reception and Structuralist Literary History" (in Part II). Here, Striedter discusses how it was via a translation that Vodička first elaborated his understanding of concretisation: the translation of *Atala* allowed

him to demonstrate the extent to which one of the leading protagonists of the national revival, Josef Jungmann, adapted Chateaubriand's original text to the demands of the then renascent Czech literature (or to what he understood to be the demands of the time). Later, in a study concentrating, unlike Vodička, not so much on the history of Czech literature as on Czech cultural history, Vladimír Macura typologised the manifestations of the culture of the era of national revival as "translationism" (*překladovost*), showing how in their efforts to realise a comprehensive Czech culture as swiftly as possible, the actors of this renaissance often turned to translation, not with a view to faithfully reproducing the originals, but catering to the desiderata of the Czech target culture (Macura 1995, 61–78).

A further case of translation relevant to the history of theory and on which Striedter elaborates in his introduction is Vodička's shifting reference to Ingarden. Both Ingarden's concept of spots of indeterminacy (Ingarden 1986 [1931]) and Vodička's linking this model with Mukařovský's notion of the work of art in his concept of concretisation served as significant impulses for Konstanz reception aesthetics, especially Wolfgang Iser's gap model (Iser 1970; 1978 [1976]). It can be assumed that Striedter both disseminated and discussed these matters with them. Just how closely the discussions were related is demonstrated by the fact that the reception aesthetics reader edited by Rainer Warning in 1975 included two of Vodička's texts that had been translated for the German Vodička edition that appeared a year later: the section on "Die Rezeptionsgeschichte literarischer Werke ("The Reception History of Literary Works") from the extensive treatise "Literaturgeschichte: Ihre Probleme und Aufgaben" ("Literary History: Its Problems and Tasks"), originally from 1942, and "Die Konkretisation des literarischen Werkes: Zur Problematik der Rezeption von Nerudas Werk" ("The Concretization of the Literary Work: Problems of the Reception of Neruda's Works"), originally from 1941.

In the following, I seek to demonstrate that translation in this network of relationships was not merely a recurrent object and repeated practice but also – in the broader sense of transfer between different contexts – a common basis for questions of structuralist aesthetics of the work, reception aesthetics and cultural semiotics. To this end, I will first examine cultural studies' broader concept of translation, with particular focus on Lotman's cultural semiotic theories on the subject, before returning to indeterminacy and concretisation in Ingarden and Vodička and Striedter's thoughts on their relationship.

2 Translation as a category in cultural studies

In cultural studies, translation has recently become a programmatic category. The focus is no longer on the mere transfer of individual texts from one language to another, but about the processual nature and dynamics of cultural translation. As translators know from their daily work, texts simply cannot be 'transported' from one shore in the source language to another shore in the target language, as the oft-cited metaphor of a bridge suggests. Such frictionless and unbroken 'transport' from one language to another is hardly possible; it is prevented not only by the respective linguistic peculiarities, but also – indeed, especially – by the different contexts in which we find the *translandum* or the *translat* at the translation process's point of departure and destination. In this respect, every translation is accompanied by a transformation. This elasticity inherent to translation has made it interesting for a cultural studies that no longer assumes that cultures are fixed entities but especially examines those processes connected with cultural contacts.

Hence, Doris Bachmann-Medick thus already considered the translational turn, which has recently enjoyed something of a revival, one of the important "cultural turns" in her 2006 survey of *Neuorientierungen in den Kulturwissenschaften* (Bachmann-Medick 2006, 238–283; English translation: *Cultural Turns. New Orientations in the Study of Culture*, 2016, 175–209). In a more recent study, she observes: "translation also turns into a model for the study of culture as it transforms cultural concepts by making them translatable and translating them consciously into different fields" (Bachmann-Medick 2012, 26–27).

Thus it was especially the dynamics and processuality associated with translation that made this category attractive for cultural studies beyond its object in the narrow sense. The road from the practice of translation as 'translation proper' to translation as part of cultural studies it has inspired is traced by Dilek Dizdar (2009), as Bachmann-Medick explains:

> In these moves outward to wider horizons, clearly the role of language, and with it 'translation proper', cannot be ignored. However, in the disciplinary framework of translation studies, 'translation proper' itself suggests a concept of translation that undermines representationalism: a multilayered, complex concept that is constantly generating difference and hybridity and confounding tendencies towards homogenization through what translation studies scholar Dilek Dizdar refers to as its 'third-party position' (Dizdar 96). Dizdar shows how 'translation proper', as a language-oriented procedure, can offer valuable insights for the investigation of in-between positions and ethical implications as opposed to mere transcodings, thus making visible the translation process and the actions of translators themselves. (Bachmann-Medick 2012, 28–29)

Such an understanding of translation thus implies a departure from holistic concepts of text and culture. For if an examination of translational practice makes a mockery of the idea that a text can be transported unchanged and hence "undamaged", then this casts doubt not only on traditional categories such as authorship and "original, representation, equivalence", which are replaced by "new guiding categories such as cultural transfer, foreignness and alterity, cultural differences and power" (Bachmann-Medick 2004, 449). In particular, this shows the extent to which cultures cannot be imagined as hermetically sealed entities, developing rather via these very processes of translation. "Cultures are not only translated; rather, they are constituted in translation and as translation" (Bachmann-Medick 2004, 454). "Culture [...] is both transnational and translational" (Bhabha 2004 [1994], 247), as Homi Bhabha put it programmatically as well as succinctly. That also brings us to the discursive context within which the category of translation has recently received particular attention: the field of post-colonial theory, which is concerned with both the analysis of largely present-day cultural reciprocal relationships and their practice, not least with respect to their (power-)political and social aspects.

3 Translation in cultural semiotics: Lotman's semiosphere model

While we mostly refer in this context to reflections in English-language cultural studies, here, particularly given the focus of this handbook, we should also remember the important role translation plays in Iurii Lotman's theory of cultural semiotics. *Semiosphere* is the term Lotman (1990) uses to describe a model of culture as a semiotic space that is always penetrated by several languages. By languages, he means both natural languages and all other forms of codes (such as behavioural norms and conventions); the crucial aspect is the idea of reciprocity to which all these codes are subject. Processes of translation that always generate additional information are constantly taking place both within a semiosphere and at its boundaries, for it is the very inadequate aspects inherent to a greater or lesser extent to every translation, the other, foreign contexts encountered by the *translandum* in the target language, that allow new semantic potential to emerge:

> Because the semiotic space is transected by numerous boundaries, each message that moves across it must be many times translated and transformed, and the process of generating new information thereby snowballs. (Lotman 1990, 140)

While Lotman assumes that every semiotic system, especially in the centre, which is the most organised and structured, has a tendency for self-organisation and self-description, he leaves us in no doubt that he also recognises in this phenomenon the danger of ossification. He clearly prefers the semiosphere's periphery, those edges where less-organised semiotic practices are encountered, where confrontations with other semiotic systems and processes of translation into and out of them take place, in the course of which said intensification of semiotic processes (Lotman 1990, 142) emerges. Here, the translations function on the one hand as processes of appropriation and domestication of the foreign, the other, while on the other hand they always simultaneously disturb the structure of one's own code and one's own norms. This becomes clear in Lotman's discussion of the boundary, which forms the site of the most productive exchange:

> But the hottest spots for semioticizing processes are the boundaries of the semiosphere. The notion of boundary is an ambivalent one: it both separates and unites. It is always the boundary of something and so belongs to both frontier cultures, to both contiguous semiospheres. The boundary is bilingual and polylingual. The boundary is a mechanism for translating texts of an alien semiotics into 'our' language, it is the place where what is 'external' is transformed into what is 'internal', it is a filtering membrane which so transforms foreign texts that they become part of the semiosphere's internal semiotics while still retaining their own characteristics. (Lotman 1990, 136–137)

In semiotic terms, then, in Lotman too we encounter those points that are emphasised in the current discussions on cultural translation: cultures are not to be understood as holistic and essentialist; rather they are constituted by diverse codes that are in constant processes of reciprocal exchange and translation within which meaning is not simply transferred but is also always transformed. Here we can observe both centripetal movements that seek to incorporate that which is to be translated into the respective prevailing code and norm system and centrifugal movements that infiltrate the existing entrenched systems and enable the creation of new meanings.

The extent to which this model, related to all kinds of cultural communication, is inspired in its emphasis of centrifugal dynamics by the special case of communication via and in the presence of a (verbal) work of art might become clear if we now return to the attempts to describe how the artwork functions in its concretising reception, which itself always bears the characteristics of a translation insofar as its results vary according to the context of its reception.

4 Reception as an act of (concretising) translation

To this end, it is first necessary to consider the reception-aesthetic implications of Vodička's concept of concretisation, which is a transfer of theory in itself and in this respect a kind of translation of Ingarden's (1986 [1931]) layered model of the literary artwork. While Ingarden's model entails spots of indeterminacy that must be filled by the recipient, Vodička reads it against the background of his contemporary Prague discussions on the development of a structural aesthetics. In his introduction to Vodička's writings on literary history, Striedter summarises the different readings thus:

> Since the historicity of every concretization of aesthetic objects is fundamental for Prague Structuralism, the interest of the Structuralists progresses from the structure of the work of art to the conditions for its concretization, which are given outside of the work itself, are collectively handed down, and are historically variable. This concept of concretization differs importantly from that of Ingarden, who expressly allows that such factors do exist and contribute, but for his own part concentrates on the relationship between the work of art and the perceiving subject, aspiring in the final analysis to an ideal concretization, independent of time, realizing "*all* the aesthetic qualities in the work"—even if he posits this only in the sense of a theoretical postulate. (Striedter 1989, 125–126; citing Vodička 1976, 95; emphasis by J. S.)

What Striedter doesn't mention is that in the early 1940s, around the same time as Vodička's foundational text (cited here), Jan Mukařovský's thoughts on the realisation of the aesthetic object in the act of reception led him to stress the unintentional as a most essential characteristic of the artwork. A path-breaking analysis in this respect is his study "Záměrnost a nezáměrnost v umění" (1943, "Intentionality and Unintentionality in Art"). While in Ingarden, the act of filling spots of indeterminacy tends to be led by the intentionally layered structure of the work of art, for Mukařovský it is the very unintentionality that guarantees the work's lasting vitality and potency: as long as shifting aspects of an artefact are perceived as unintentional in different contexts, the artefact will always be realised as an aesthetic object in ever-new ways. What triggers these ever-new acts of reception is the work's quality that resists a harmonious reading, countering the impression of a harmonious interplay of the individual elements forming the whole. Here, Mukařovský uses the term "thing": the very quality that repeatedly makes the work a "matter of vital import" (Mukařovský 1978 [1943], 122) is that which the work of art does not permit us to encounter as a sign – as an ultimately decipherable sign – but presents to us as a thing to which we cannot immediately assign meaning. The aesthetic object, which is always initially created and constantly recreated in the act of reception – and indeed can only be created by such a process – is thus imagined as possessing maximal flexibility, without being arbi-

trary however, since it remains connected to the artefact that gives rise to its reception. The work of art is thus created in a complex reciprocal relationship and interplay between the artefact and the individual and collective reception context. In his introduction to his reader on *Rezeptionsästhetik* (1975, *Reception Aesthetics*), Rainer Warning notes just how difficult it is to grasp this relationship between individual and collective traits (Warning 1975, 9–41, esp. 13–19 on Vodička). Felix Vodička was certainly influenced by the Prague School's understanding of the work of art with its consideration of both production and reception, although as a literary historian he was primarily interested in a work's concretisation at the time of its creation. He was also fascinated by a work's value for the development of literature, that is, to what extent it provided the impulse for new developments. This literary-historical interest may explain why it was a literary translation and not an original work upon which he first elaborated his concept of concretisation (cf. Striedter 1989, 136–137). For he considers translation a form of concretisation:

> Particular problems arise when we observe the reception of a work of art in a foreign literary environment. A translation is already a concretization in a certain sense, provided by the translator. The readerly and critical response to a work of art in a foreign environment is often completely different to its reception in its native environment, since the [literary] norm is also a different one. (Vodička 1976 [1942], 71)

Specifically, following Ingarden's layered model, Vodička describes in great detail how Josef Jungmann went about his translation of Chateaubriand's *Atala*, where he departed from the original not only in terms of language but also in the axiological presentation of the topic, thus adapting the *translat* to the demands of his target context – the emerging Czech literature that was foundational to the national renaissance and whose further development Jungmann sought to influence with his translation.

The cultural-semiotic dimension to this analysis was later emphasised by Vladimír Macura, whose typological examination of the culture of revival era (1995) identified translation as one of its characteristic traits. In their attempt to accelerate the complete and comprehensive development of the Czech culture they sought to establish, the revivalists used translation wherever they saw a lack of original Czech cultural products (in all areas of written culture, not only *belles lettres*), with a clear orientation around the target context. These were not translations following the principle of remaining faithful to the original; rather, they even omitted or added passages in line with the demands of the contemporary Czech circumstances – or, as Vodička demonstrated in the case of Jungmann, they made stylistic or axiological changes. Macura, who as a historian of Czech literature and culture was at least as familiar with the works of Prague structuralism as Iurii Lotman, with whose cultural-semiotic method he engaged closely during

a period studying in Tartu, was able to apply it in inspiring fashion to the revival era following Vodička's foundational study.

In Lotman's idea that, from a semiotic perspective, it is mistranslations that generate additional information, we might recognise traces of or at least a parallel with the reception-aesthetic concept of concretisation as the different realisation of the aesthetic object according to its individual and collective context. While Mukařovský's and Vodička's – and indeed Iser's – approach is ultimately bound up with the aesthetics of the work, that is, remains concerned with the concept of the work as an initiator but also an authority restricting diverse concretisations, Lotman's approach is primarily descriptive in its focus on communication structures as presented in his model of the semiosphere. That he thereby constantly reveals a preference for centrifugal semantic processes that shatter ossified meanings may be a consequence of his examination of the specificity of literary texts, which he too used as his point of departure.

5 Actors and/or concepts?

I opened by connecting these observations on an entangled history of literary theory (or theories) with the question as to whether the focus should be on the mediating actors or the travelling concepts. This attempt to show an exemplary excerpt of such an entangled history focused on concepts that can be outlined by the keywords reception as concretisation as translation. Jurij Striedter is a prime example of *mediating actor* in the best sense of the term, since he was clearly an academic teacher with the ability to inspire his students, initially in Konstanz and later in Harvard (where Barack Obama also took in his lectures). In the German-speaking world, he first came to attention with the volume *Texte der russischen Formalisten* (1969, *Texts of Russian Formalists*), to which he wrote an in-depth introduction. He later used this introduction and his two-part "introductory treatise" prefacing the German translation of Felix Vodička's works in his 1989 study *Literary Structure, Evolution and Value. Russian Formalism and Czech Structuralism Reconsidered*, written while he was in America. When Striedter wrote his introduction to Vodička's works in 1976, he thought contemporary readers no longer needed to be made acquainted with Russian formalism and Czech structuralism, "[u]nlike in the introduction to the first volume on the Formalists of 1969, which sought to make the German reader more familiar with Formalism as a phenomenon in the history of scholarship by demonstrating its relevance to the recent discussion of theory" (Vodička 1976, VII). After the Prague School had become well known for its theoretical writings due to the pre-existing translations

of Jan Mukařovský's works on poetics (*Kapitel aus der Poetik* [1967, *Chapters from Poetics*]) and aesthetics (*Kapitel aus der Ästhetik* [1970, *Chapters from Aesthetics*]), presenting Vodička's works was intended to fill a gap, since they offered insights into their hitherto unknown "actual literary-critical implementation and [...] analytical and literary-historical practice" (Striedter 1976, VIII). Later, in 1989, Striedter revised his assumption that the Western theoretical discourse was familiar with the basic theoretical positions of Czech structural aesthetics primarily advanced by Jan Mukařovský. In his introduction – written when poststructural criticism of structuralist positions prevailed – Striedter observed that "the earlier and in many respects different Czech version" of structuralism "has remained unknown or was underestimated", particularly in the French discussions, which sought the dissolution of, above all, French structuralism. His book, especially the last part, written in 1989, is an attempt to remedy this situation: "Therefore the achievements of the Czech Structuralists have to be rediscovered and reevaluated beside this well-known mainstream and to be compared with other approaches to the same issues." (Striedter 1989, 9–10)

Above all, Striedter sought, then, to emphasise the potential connections Russian formalism and Czech structuralism could have offered the era's debates on theory and still offered more recent ones. By contrasting them with newer approaches, he advanced a re-reading of the 'old' texts both in the light of the problems they themselves had raised and in the light of the problems demonstrated by later theories in order to show the stimulus that was still offered by these often tentative blueprints for what was then still a relatively young literary theory. It is in this sense that his closing argument must be understood. Given that Bernd Stiegler, for instance, wrote in his introduction to *Theorien der Literatur- und Kulturwissenschaften* (2015, *Theories of Literary and Cultural Studies*) that "Structuralism is very interesting but – admittedly – also pretty much as dead as a doornail, since today there are hardly any scholars who would call themselves Structuralists" (Stiegler 2015, 11), only for the relevant chapter to cover solely French structuralism in the figures of Ferdinand de Saussure, Claude Lévi-Strauss and Roland Barthes, unfortunately Striedter's remarks remain no less relevant today:

> The idea that we are somehow beyond Structuralism is not a valid excuse for continuing to neglect the insights of the Czech Structuralists. [...] To reconsider what these once groundbreaking schools [Russian formalism and Czech structuralism] have tried or achieved in the study of literary structure, evolution, and value might – even even in an era beyond Formalism and beyond Structuralism – be a worthwhile task for anyone who wishes to understand the function and value of literature. (Striedter 1989, 261)

In this sense – and this is the second conclusion we can draw from Striedter– it would mainly be concepts and their transformations that would have to be the focus of a history of theory oriented towards entangled history. Ultimately, it is concepts and their transformations that are able to unfold inspiring potency and fascination – and certainly most effectively if they are communicated by charismatic figures.

Translated by John Heath
Translations of Czech quotations by Anna Conant

References

Bachmann-Medick, Doris. "Übersetzung als Medium interkultureller Kommunikation und Auseinandersetzung." *Cultural turns: Handbuch der Kulturwissenschaften*. Vol. 2: *Paradigmen und Disziplinen*. Eds. Friedrich Jäger and Jürgen Straub. Stuttgart and Weimar: Verlag J. B. Metzler, 2004. 449–465.

Bachmann-Medick, Doris. *Neuorientierungen in den Kulturwissenschaften*. Reinbek/H.: Rowohlt Taschenbuch Verlag, 2006. (English translation: *Cultural turns: New Orientations in the Study of Culture*. Trans. by Adam Blauhut. Berlin and Boston, MA: De Gruyter, 2016.)

Bachmann-Medick, Doris. "Translation – A Concept and Model for the Study of Culture." *Travelling Concepts for the Study of Culture*. Eds. Birgit Neumann and Ansgar Nünning. Berlin and Boston, MA: De Gruyter, 2012. 23–43.

Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture* [1994]. New York, NY: Routledge, 2004.

Dizdar, Dilek. "Translational Transitions: 'Translation Proper' and Translation Studies in the Humanities." *Translation Studies* 2.1 (2009): 182–196.

Ingarden, Roman. *The Literary Work of Art: An Investigation on the Borderlines of Ontology, Logic, and Theory of Literature* [1931]. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1986.

Iser, Wolfgang. *Die Appellstruktur der Texte, Unbestimmtheit als Wirkungsbedingung literarischer Prosa*. Konstanz: Universitätsverlag, 1970.

Iser Wolfgang. *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response* [1976]. London: Routledge, 1978.

Lotman, Iurii [Yuri] M. *Universe of the Mind: a Semiotic Theory of Culture*. Trans. by Ann Shukman. London and New York, NY: Tauris, 1990.

Macura, Valdimír. *Znamení zrodu: České národní obrození jako kulturní typ*. 2nd edition. Jinočany: H&H, 1995.

Mukařovský, Jan. "Intentionality and Unintentionality in Art." [1943] *Structure, Sign and Function: Selected Essays by Jan Mukařovský*. Ed. and trans. by John Burbank and Peter Steiner. New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 1978. 89–128.

Stiegler, Bernd. *Theorien der Literatur- und Kulturwissenschaften: Eine Einführung*. Paderborn: Fink, 2015.

Striedter, Jurij (ed.). *Texte zur allgemeinen Literaturtheorie und zur Theorie der Prosa: Texte der russischen Formalisten*. Vol. 1. Munich: Fink, 1969.

Striedter, Jurij. *Literary Structure, Evolution and Value: Russian Formalism and Czech Structuralism Reconsidered*. Cambridge, MA, and London: Harvard University Press, 1989.

Vodička, Felix. *Počátky krásné prózy novočeské*. Prague: Melantrich, 1948.

Vodička, Felix. *Struktura vývoje*. Prague: Odeon, 1969.

Vodička, Felix. *Die Struktur der literarischen Entwicklung*. Ed. by the Forschungsgruppe für strukturale Methoden in den Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaften an der Universität Konstanz. Munich: Fink, 1976.

Warning, Rainer. *Rezeptionsästhetik: Theorie und Praxis*. Munich: Fink, 1975.

Schamma Schahadat
Migrants of Theory

Vladimir Nabokov's eponymous character in the novel *Pnin* (1953) is probably one of the best-known and perhaps also most popular academic exiles in literature. Having left Russia with an interim stay in France, Pnin works as a lecturer in Russian at a provincial American college, trying to spark a passion for Russian in a handful of students who want to read "Anna Karamazov" in the original (Nabokov 1989, 10). Like the real-life Roman Jakobson, who "was fond of saying that he spoke Russian in twenty languages" (Jakobson quoted in Winner 1996, 17), Pnin had a hard time pronouncing English words:

> If his Russian was music, his English was murder. He had enormous difficulty ("dzeefee-cooltsee" in Pninian English) with depalatisation, never managing to remove the extra Russian moisture from *t*'s and *d*'s before the vowels he so quaintly softened. (Nabokov 1989, 66)

In Timofey Pnin, Nabokov personifies all the pitfalls of the émigré who is a "stranger to himself", as one could rephrase the title of Julia Kristeva's *Strangers to Ourselves* (1991). Pnin, the Russian in America, thinks he is perfectly integrated into the strange culture while his Russianness becomes obvious in every word he utters and every step he takes. The novel's famous opening, in which Pnin is unaware of sitting on the wrong train taking him to the wrong destination may be read as a key scene for exiles who are always somehow sitting on the wrong train, misreading the signs of the other, new culture from their exile position.

Bronisław Malinowki (1884–1942), who unlike Pnin is not a fictional character, but a real-life person, exemplifies the opposite prototype of the migrant academic. Early on in his career, Malinowski wanted to become a cultural convert, a British anthropologist, choosing Joseph Conrad (1857–1924) – the Polish sailor turned English writer – as his role model, even though there were quite a few differences between Conrad and Malinowski (e.g., Conrad left Poland when he was very young, while Malinowski already held a Ph.D.). James Clifford quotes Malinowski in his article on "Ethnographic Self-Fashioning": "Rivers is the Rider Haggard of Anthropology: I shall be the Conrad!" (Clifford 1988, 96). Malinowski read Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* (1899) as a pretext for his own life text (Clifford 1988, 99–100). Just like Conrad, he got rid of his native language, his personality and his nationality and made a career in a foreign culture. Not only was Malinowski the first (and at that time, in 1927, the only) professor of Social Anthropology at a major British university, but he was also "a founder of the functionalist school of social anthropology, and its undisputed leader in Britain until 1937", when

Radcliffe-Brown became a professor in Oxford (Kuklick 2010, 436). Malinowski's biography is a success story if the aim is cultural conversion.

The fictional Pnin and the real-life Malinowski embody two extremes of academic migrants: the first takes his culture with him and tries to transport it to his new home country (even though Pnin thinks he is adjusting to American culture, a misconception that makes him an heir of Don Quixote), and the second completely gets rid of his Polish upbringing and shifts his whole career into a thoroughly British institution which recognizes him as the leader in his field.

Both cases illustrate a specific type of what today is labelled 'academic mobility' (see Dervin 2011), namely academic migration or academic exile. And even though "[a]cademic migration should not be confused with academic mobility" (Dervin 2011, 3), these two phenomena are linked, since wandering academics take their cultural capital, as Bourdieu would call it, with them, moving from one place to the next. The focus of my chapter will be on academic migration that encompasses academic exile, which is usually an effect of historical and political circumstances. Three case studies will be presented, all of which involve a movement from Eastern or East-Central Europe to the West. I seek to show that if, on the one hand, theories can travel completely independently of their inventors (think of Kant, who never left Königsberg and who to this day is considered one of the most powerful discourse founders), on the other hand, concepts and ideas also accompany intellectual migrants, being extended, transformed or rewritten on their journey, inspired by the new cultural context. The case studies I will present include Roman Jakobson (1896–1982), whose wanderings from Russia to the United States via Prague and Scandinavia inspire the further development of his early ideas in a fruitful dialogue with academics from all over the world: "the succession of scientific environments, each with its own particular interests and local watchwords, allowed me to reformulate my own questions and to enlarge their scope", Jakobson himself stated (Jakobson and Pomorska 1983, 35). My second example is Manfred Kridl (1882–1957), who moved from L'viv via Warsaw, Brussels and Vilnius to the United States and played an important role in the dissemination of Russian formalism and Polish structuralism across the borders. A somewhat different case, representing a voluntary change of place, is Julia Kristeva (b. 1941), who moved from Bulgaria to France in the 1960s and not only became an important member of the French intellectual group Tel Quel, but also initiated Mikhail Bakhtin's reception as a theoretician of intertextuality and carnival in the Western discourse.

1 Academic mobility, academic exile

The twentieth century was a century of exile; many intellectuals were affected by its political and social upheavals (two world wars, the Russian Revolution, the Nazi regime and the Cold War, to name but a few). "Twentieth-century forms of exile", John Neubauer argues, differ from earlier forms of exile in that they are characterized by a "transcendental homelessness" (*transzendentale Obdachlosigkeit*), a term coined by Georg Lukács in his *Theorie des Romans* (1914–1915, *Theory of the Novel*, 1971). Even though 'transcendental homelessness' originally marked a condition of the modern, it can also be read as a metaphor for exile: "Homelessness has permeated the worldview of many modern European writers and intellectuals, who became alienated from their native culture, and frequently departed from it all but voluntarily" (Neubauer 2009, 6). Many of those intellectuals who were forced to leave their countries found a new home, one could argue, in what even in the early twentieth century was a globalized world of academia; this environment gave them an intellectual roof over their heads. Many of them were included in a network of intellectual dialogue; they tended to establish "schools and circles" wherever they were or become part of one (see Grishkova and Salupere 2015). Thus, the Prague Linguistic Circle of the 1920s was made up of both Prague scholars and exiles, just as the "University of Exiles" at the "New School for Social Research" founded by Alvin Johnson at New York University provided an intellectual home for German scholars who were in danger under the Nazi regime, including Hannah Arendt (see Plessner 1995, 73–83).

Neubauer mentions a second aspect that separates twentieth-century exile from its predecessors: while there had been expulsions of both masses and individuals since the Renaissance, in the twentieth century a prohibition of exile was introduced: "Twentieth-century European dictatorships preferred to keep their critics, dissidents, and undesirable elements at home rather than abroad, for at home they could be silenced" (Neubauer 2009, 7–8). Many of the theoreticians we discuss in our book on entangled literary theory were forced to stay in their countries; they were moved around like chess pieces (Bakhtin), were murdered (like many of the Jewish-Polish structuralists of the Warsaw Circle in the 1930s) or could only enter global intellectual circulation by way of severely belated translations (for instance, Lev Vygotskii's *Psikhologiia iskusstva* [*Psychology of Art*] or Vygotskii's work in general; see Minick 2003, 49). My three case studies were luckier, since Jakobson and Kridl left their (home) countries just in time: Jakobson emigrated to Prague in the aftermath of the Russian Revolution and during the Civil War in 1920, and he left Prague before the Germans invaded; Kridl also managed to escape the Nazis just in time, fleeing from Vilnius to the United States via Sweden.

Julia Kristeva's case is somewhat different, since she was not fleeing Bulgaria, but went on a study abroad programme and then settled permanently in Paris.

One shouldn't stretch the parallels too far, but one can recognize some characteristics of the Russian-American fictional Pnin and the real-life Polish anthropologist turned Briton in our case studies: Roman Jakobson, just like Nabokov's Pnin, is a wanderer in the world who moves from one spot to the next, carrying his Russian origins and ideas with him; all his life, Jakobson published on Russian topics. On the other hand, Kristeva accomplished a near-perfect cultural conversion, just like Malinowski; after moving to Paris, she became a highly acknowledged member of the academic establishment. Manfred Kridl is less prominent than either Jakobson or Kristeva, his strategies in the international intellectual field were less radical, and yet he transported his intellectual baggage to his new country and became a multiplier of East-Central European literary theory.

2 Roman Jakobson

"Jan Mukařovský should be counted among the most prominent twentieth-century theorists of literature", writes Lubomir Doležel (2015, 50), a scholar of the third generation of the Prague Linguistic Circle (Pražský lingvistický kroužek, PLK; also see see Tomáš Glanc' chapter on the Prague School in this volume). "Unfortunately, writing in a minor language and using a minor literature for his analyses and examples hampered the international reverberations of his works" (Doležel 2015, 50), he continues. Jan Murařovský (1891–1975), one of the leaders of the Prague Linguistic Circle in the 1920s and 1930s, worked alongside Roman Jakobson, and one could call him Jakobson's academic twin whose fate was determined by staying in his home country instead of by flight and global wandering: they both discussed and wrote about linguistics, about poetics and literary theory, about semiotics (see Doležel 2015, 43). But while Mukařovský's movements were confined to Prague, Pilsen and Brno, Jakobson's academic life took him all over the globe: he was born in Moscow in 1896; in 1915, after finishing his studies of literature, linguistics, folklore and psychology, he moved to St. Petersburg, and in 1920 he went on to Prague and Brno:

> He came in 1920, initially as part of a Russian mission of the Red Cross, but he soon began to continue his study of philology at Charles University and at the German University in Prague. At the same time, he worked for the Soviet trade mission and later for the Soviet diplomatic office in Prague, where he held the position of head of the press department in 1925. (Zavacká 2019, 853)

In the early 1930s, Jakobson became a professor of Slavic Philology at Masaryk University in Brno (Zavacká 2019, 854). In 1939 he had to leave Czechoslovakia due to the impending Nazi occupation and fled to Scandinavia (Denmark, Sweden and Norway); in 1941, he moved to the United States, where he taught at the university-in-exile École libre des hautes études in New York, at Columbia University, at Harvard and at MIT and had invitations to teach and conduct research from universities all over the world (Prange 1998, 429). While Jakobson initially saw his stay in the US as temporary and was ready to return to Brno, after the communist coup d'état in February 1948 this possibility no longer existed (Zavacká 2019, 855–856); in 1951 a "hate campaign against Jakobson was unleashed in the Czechoslovak press" (Zavacká 2019, 857), and it was only from the mid 1950s on that Jakobson was re-acknowledged as an eminent thinker in the Slavic countries (Zavacká 2019, 859).

Jakobson started his academic writings in the context of Russian Symbolism and especially the avant-garde, which he also promoted in his later years, since they served as examples for linguistic interests. In one of his dialogues with his wife Krystyna Pomorska, "The Path Toward Poetics", Jakobson gives an insight into his early years as a schoolboy. Inspired by brilliant teachers who introduced him to Russian ethnology and folklore, grammar and literature, the young Jakobson looked for new paths:

> Although Narskij [one of his teachers] had furnished us with a wealth of material about the study of Russian literature and folklore as it was understood at this time, it was becoming ever more evident to me that the question of the very essence of literary art [...] remained unanswered. And it seemed ever clearer that these questions were closely linked to the verbal foundation of literary works [...] I must admit that the artistic life of the period gave me the basic suggestion, and for this I am deeply grateful." (Jakobson and Pomorska 1983, 4–5)

His sources of inspiration were the Russian Symbolists, who reached their zenith in the 1900s, French Symbolist poetry and, from 1912 on, the Futurist poets as well as modern painting: "It is curious that my closest ties were probably with the painters whom I came to know in the course of my discussions as a schoolboy – Pavel Filonov [..] and particularly Kazimir Malevich" (Jakobson and Pomorska 1983, 9).

Later, Jakobson moved from Russian formalism (see Igor Pilshchikov's chapter on Russian formalism in this volume) to Prague structuralism (see Glanc, Wutsdorff and Ambros on Prague structuralism in this volume), searching – as structuralists do – for fundamental laws (see Jakobson and Pomorska 1983, 40–41) Another turning point was the founding of the Prague Linguistic Circle in 1926 by Vilém Mathesius, Roman Jakobson, Bohuslav Havránek, Bohuslav Trnka and Jan Rypka; its members included the aforementioned Jan Mukařovský, Piotr

Bogatyrev and Dmitrij Tschiževskij (Doležel 2015, 41). They were linguists and literary scholars specializing in English, Russian, Iranian, Turkish or Chinese literature and/or language. This famous group, working on a theory of structuralism, took up the threads of various literary theories of different origin; Jakobson called it a "symbiosis of Russian and Czech thought" while also adopting "the experience of Western and American science" (Jakobson 1971, 547–548; also quoted and translated in Doležel 2015, 41). Ferdinand de Saussure's writings as well as the Russian formalists' theories inspired the Circle (Doležel 2015, 41), and both Mukařovský and Jakobson further developed Karl Bühler's model of functions, adding the aesthetic (Mukařovský) or the poetic function (Jakobson).

Due to political circumstances, Jakobson moved on, but he took the intellectual baggage of Russian formalism and Prague structuralism with him to the United States. Other than Mukařovský, who published most of his works in the "minor language" Czech (to quote Doležel 2015, 50), Jakobson wrote not only in Russian, but also in Czech, German and, of course, English as well as in other languages; additionally, the examples he worked with were not only from 'minor' literatures (e. g. Czech or Polish), but also from French, Russian, English and other literatures (Jakobson 1983, 113); the analyses are collected in his *Poėziia grammatiki i grammatika poėzii* (*Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry*) of 1981. "The culmination of Jakobson's poetics, his postwar cycle of analyses of poetic masterworks [...], known as 'The Poetry of Grammar and the Grammar of Poetry', preserves the two-pronged approach of the Prague School", Doležel writes (2015, 50), meaning the technique of tying together linguistics and poetics that characterizes Jakobson's readings of these masterworks (see also Birus 2007, xv).

As already mentioned, Jakobson developed his theories in close dialogue with linguistic trends and traditions he encountered on his way. Thus, the idea of "grammar in poetry" was based on "the idea held by American linguists concerning the obligatory character of grammatical categories in any given language" (Jakobson 1983, 110). Moreover, many of his theoretical reflections and the analyses that resulted from them were inspired by his work with Slavic languages other than Russian. One example would be his work on translations of Pushkin into Czech and Polish, when he established that the "grammatical framework in verse systems" played a central role in the original which could not be reproduced in the translations (Jakobson 1983, 111). Another example is Jakobson's discovery of the Polish linguist Mikołaj Kruszewski (1851–1887), whose article on sound alternations from 1881 triggered the young Jakobson's interest in similarity and contiguity as early as 1914, when he was still a first-year graduate student: "it was quite by accident that I became familiar with Kruszewski's attempt to extend and apply to language the theory of association by similarity and contiguity that he had found drafted by English thinkers" (Jakobson 1983, 127). In his dialogues with

Krystyna Pomorska (1983), Jakobson diligently traces the intellectual encounters with other thinkers that influenced, inspired and triggered his own theories. To sum it up, Roman Jakobson is probably one of the most visible literary theorists of the twentieth century, which is all the more intriguing since he is also – or even foremost – a linguist.

But what effect did Jakobson have on literary theory in the twentieth century? He is considered to be an important key figure for American New Criticism and French Structuralism; he influenced Claude Lévi-Strauss as well as Jacques Lacan, Roland Barthes and Umberto Eco (see Prange 1998, 434). While Jakobson was looking for fundamental or universal laws in "the phonological structure of the world's languages" (Jakobson 1978, 116), Lévi-Strauss sought to establish universal laws of thinking (see Lévi-Strauss 1978, xvii–xxvi).

Eco valued Jakobson's influence on the "development of Semiotics", calling him "the major 'catalyst' in the contemporary 'semiotic reaction'" (Eco 1987, 111): "Let me assume that the reason Jakobson never wrote a book on semiotics is that his entire scientific existence was a living example of a Quest for Semiotics" (Eco 1987, 112). Birus considers one of Jakobson's most important contributions to modern linguistics in his "semantics of form" (Birus 2007, xxviii), a step Jakobson took when he moved away from the formalist concept of the *priem* (device) to the more integrative perspective of the interdependence between grammatical categories and semantics. And since his examples were often taken from Slavic literatures (e. g. an old Slavic text like Ilarion's *Slovo o zakone i blagodati* [1051, *The Word of the Law and of Mercy*], or a Czech Romantic poem like Karel Hynek Mácha's *Maj* [*May*] of 1836), the intellectual circulation encompassed not only theories, but also literary texts which thus entered the global literary field.

3 Manfred Kridl

Other than Roman Jakobson or Julia Kristeva, the exile Manfred Kridl did not have a big impression on the global circulation of ideas. Still, it is worthwhile including him in this chapter, since he had a considerable influence on a group of young Polish formalists and structuralists and took the ideas which they developed under his tutorage with him to the United States.

Before Kridl can be introduced, however, one has to paint the picture of Polish literary studies in the interwar period, the time when Kridl was active in Vilnius, where he taught, and in Warsaw, where the young Polonists acknowledged him as their leader (for more detailed analyses see Kola and Ulicka 2015; Schahadat 2016; Michał Mrugalski's chapter on Polish structuralism in this volume). In 1918,

after 123 years when it had only existed as a part of Russia, Austria and Prussia, Poland re-emerged as a nation-state. The universities in Vilnius (then part of Poland) and Warsaw, which had been closed down for decades, were reopened in 1915 (Warsaw) and 1919 (Vilnius) (see Kola and Ulicka 2015, 67). In these universities, the humanities tried to reorganize themselves and to enter the European discourse. In the context of national rebirth, Polish studies played a central role, and the young Polonists avidly read the Russian formalists and phenomenology, the latter via Roman Ingarden. These intellectual explorations took also place in official seminars at the universities, but mainly in semi-official circles, the "circles of Polonists" (see Kola 2010, 248).

A forerunner of the formalist movement in Poland was Kazimierz Wóycicki (see Michał Mrugalski's chapter on Polish formalism in this volume); Adam Kola and Danuta Ulicka see Wóycicki's study of the Polish prose and verse *Forma dźwiękowa prozy polskiej i wiersza polskiego* (1912, *The Soundform of Polish Prose and Polish Verse*) of 1912 as the beginning of modern Polish literary studies (Kola and Ulicka 2015, 65). At the same time, in 1914, Viktor Shklovskii published his booklet *Voskreshenie slova* (1914, *The Resurrection of the Word*) in St. Petersburg, which marked the beginning of Russian formalism. The reception of the Russian formalists in Poland did not begin until the mid-1920s (Bujnicki 1996, 115): in 1934 Viktor Shklovskii's *Vvedenie v metriku* (1925, *Introduction to metrics*, 1934) was translated into Polish, followed by Boris Tomashevskii's *Teoriia literatury: Poètika* (1925, *Theory of Literature: Poetics*, 1935) in 1935 (Bujnicki 1996, 116). However, even though the first articles in the strain of a new philology were published in the 1910s, its institutionalization in Poland did not set in until the 1930s, when literary studies started to take linguistics as its base (Kola and Ulicka 2015, 66) and the Circles of Polonists established themselves in Vilnius and Warsaw. They were in close contact with each other and discussed the impulses of Russian formalism and phenomenology. This modernisation of Polish literary studies lasted until the early 1960s, when Polish structuralism had established itself (Kola 2010, 238).

Manfred Kridl became a central figure for these two circles (Kola 2010, 238). He had earned his Ph.D. in Warsaw with a dissertation on Mickiewicz in 1921 after finishing Polish Studies at Lwów (now L'viv) University. In 1929, Kridl became a professor for Slavic Literatures in Brussels; in 1932 he was offered a professorship at Vilnius University. He had hitherto taken a traditional approach to literary studies; he was mainly a literary historian and worked on the Romantic poets Mickiewicz and Słowacki (Smaszcz 1992, 102–103). Upon taking up his position in Vilnius, he made a radical methodological turn: in his inauguration lecture "Przełom w metodyce badań literackich" (1932, "A Break-through in the Method of Literary Studies"), he presented his program rejecting an approach that trans-

gressed the literary work itself. After that lecture, the Vilnius Circle of Literary Studies, formed in the early 1920s, gathered around Kridl. 25 years later, Kridl recalled:

> By and by in Vilnius a talented group of listeners who were interested in theoretical problems was established […] In the beginning our work had a more intimate character, it was a kind of meeting where ideas were exchanged and graduate students' works discussed, but soon articles and reviews written 'in the new spirit' by the members of this group appeared in literary journals (Kridl 1957, 298).

Since the Warsaw Polonists did not have any central personality to guide their theoretical inquiries, they soon accepted Kridl's authority (see, e. g., Kola 2010, 251).

The Warsaw and the Vilnius groups worked in close cooperation; they also published together. Thus, in 1937 a commemorative publication for Kazimierz Wóycicki appeared in Warsaw: *Prace ofiarowane Kazimierzowi Wóycickiemu* (*Works in Honour of Kazimierz Wóycicki*), a kind of manifesto (Kola 2010, 242). Stefan Żółkiewski (1911–1991), one of the Warsaw participants, later wrote: "It was a book that voiced a programmatic manifesto for a new type of literary studies bordering on linguistics" (Żołkiewski 1989, 19). In his preface to the publication for Wóycicki Kridl emphasizes that the book was written by young Warsaw Polonists as well as scholars from other regions (Kridl 1937, 5), and this Warsaw–Vilnius coproduction can be seen as an example of an East-Central European network of literary theory: the book was edited in Manfred Kridl's series *Z zagadnień poetyki* (*Problems of Poetics*) in Vilnius, and the authors of the articles were from Warsaw, Vilnius and Prague; even Roman Jakobson, who was then teaching at the University of Brno, contributed an article in honour of Wójcicki, as did Nikolai Trubetskoi. Although Jan Mukařovský was missing, he had been invited to write something (Kola and Ulicka 2015, 71).

While the Warsaw and Vilnius circles of Polonists tried to enter the discourse of modern European literary theory, their position was radically different from that of the Russian formalists: they were recipients of the new theoretical currents, not their discoverers, and they investigated other texts than their Russian colleagues; the latter were inspired by the avant-garde, while the former – such as Franciszek Siedlecki – polemicized against it and used a combination of theories from Russian formalism and Prague structuralism (see Schahadat 2016, 248–250).

Manfred Kridl also combined various theories, as can be seen in his 1936 book *Wstęp do badań nad dziełem literackiem* (1936, *Introduction to the Studies of the Literary Work*), mainly formalism and phenomenology, but he also reached back to the aesthetic ideas of Benedetto Croce and Oskar Walzel (see Karcz 2000, 176–177), demonstrating his "eclecticism of views" (Karcz 2000, 177) and design-

ing something he called the 'integral method'. His aim was to broaden the formalist approach (poetic language and concentration on form) with content in order to examine the work "as a whole" (Kridl 1936, 293; see also Mrugalski's chapter on Polish formalism in this volume and Mrugalski 2017). Kridl explains his "integral method": "I represent the position of the 'wholeness and unity' of the work, i. e. I look at all its elements as integral parts of its wholeness [...] this leads to the claim [...] that those parts have to be looked at from the point of view of the role they play in the whole organism of the work" (Kridl 1936a, 150–151).

In 1939, when Vilnius became part of Soviet-occupied Lithuania in the aftermath of the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact, Kridl fled to Sweden, then to Belgium and finally to the United States, where he first taught at Smith College from 1940 and was offered the Adam Mickiewicz Professorship in Polish at Columbia University in New York in 1948. The American Slavist Robert A. Maguire, who studied with Kridl in the 1950s, later remembers a class he took with him:

> Much of the course was devoted to one great international twentieth-century of thought which, under different names, originated in the Slavic world: Russian Formalism, Czech Structuralism, and Polish Integralism. In the person of Manfred Kridl, we had before us a leading proponent of this last school [...] In seven 'theses', Kridl outlines a methodology, which amounts to an investigation, 'strictly and solely', of 'those specific literary properties which distinguish literary works from all others'; a focus on the works themselves, not on the life or 'psychology' of their authors. (Maguire 2001, 206–207)

Even though Manfred Kridl was not the founder of a literary theory that conquered the world, like Jakobson and perhaps Kristeva, he is a good example for proving that the centres of knowledge in Central and Eastern Europe did not stay where they originated – instead, due to the wandering of their actors, there began an intellectual circulation of ideas which crossed the European borders.

4 Julia Kristeva

"I was born in Bulgaria in 1941, and I arrived in France on Christmas Eve of 1965. I have since done all my intellectual work in French, that is, in a foreign language that evokes a culture that is not my own but has been a part of my life for a long time," Julia Kristeva stated in an interview with *France-Culture* in 1988 (Kristeva 1996, 3–4). For Kristeva it was, she continues, a liberation due to the new "political, familial, personal and especially intellectual situation" (Kristeva 1996, 3–4). She is an intellectual whose work is characterized as "rich multiplicity", since it is a combination of various disciplines, including linguistics, cultural theory, philosophy, feminism, political theory, psychoanalysis (Payne 2010, 383).

Kristeva's cultural conversion from Bulgarian to French is similar to Joseph Conrad's or Bronisław Malinowski's conversion from Polish to British, and foreignness is one of the topics she worked on, for instance in *Des Chinoises* (1974, *About Chinese Women*) or in *Étrangers à nous-mêmes* (1988, *Strangers to Ourselves*), two texts that are closely intertwined, since Kristeva's experience of strangeness in China in a group excursion consisting of members and friends of Tel Quel (Philippe Sollers, Marcelin Pleynet, Roland Barthes and François Wahl were travelling with her) played an important role for her concept of the own and the other (see Hacker 2011, 162–163). However, not only the French intellectuals in China, but also the Bulgarian student in Paris experienced strangeness, as Kristeva often notes, for example, in interviews:

> Foreigners must confront a ghost from the past that remains hidden in a secret part of ourselves. Although I consider myself to be well assimilated into French culture, I think that the French people themselves do not find me to be so. They communicate this to me indirectly, yet I am constantly reminded that I come from somewhere else. (Kristeva 1996, 4)

Julia Kristeva is an important link between Russian and French theories. When asked to describe the French intellectual discourse in the mid-1960s, the time when she moved from Sofia to Paris, one of the lines of thought that impressed her was "the discovery of Russian Formalism through Levi-Strauss" (Kristeva 1996, 13), who later wrote an extremely critical review on Vladimir Propp's formalist analysis of the fairy tale, *Morfologiia skazki* (1928, *Morphology of the Folktale*, 1958) (Lévi-Strauss 1976 [1960]; see also Olshanskii 2008). Lévi-Strauss starts his argument with a reference to the importance of Russian formalism for the emergence of structuralism:

> The message of the Russian Formalist school was not, however, to be lost. In Europe itself, the Linguistic Circle of Prague first took it up and spread it. Since about 1940, Roman Jakobson's personal influence and teachings have been carrying it to the United States [...] although his doctrine cannot in any way be called 'formalist,' Roman Jakobson has not lost sight of the historical role of the Russian school and its intrinsic importance. (Lévi-Strauss 1976 [1960], 116)

Besides Lévi-Strauss' reference to Russian formalism, Kristeva mentions two other discourses that dominated 1960s intellectual Paris: "the revival of Marxism" and "the renewal of psychoanalysis through Lacan" (Kristeva 1996, 13).

Kristeva's first contribution to these debates was a text about Mikhail Bakhtin; in 1966 she presented her first paper on him in a seminar led by Roland Barthes, and Bakhtin "soon became an important figure" (Kristeva 1996, 149). One could call this presentation the scene of origin for the theory of intertextuality, since it formed the basis for Kristeva's famous article "Bakhtine, le mot, le dialogue et le

roman" ("Word, Dialogue, and the Novel"), which was published in April 1967 in *Critique* (Kristeva 1996, 271), the journal that had been founded by Georges Bataille in 1946 as a literary, philosophical and artistic platform (see Richman 1990, 143). This article was the starting point for the theory of intertextuality as put forward by Harold Bloom (1975), Renate Lachmann (1997) and others (see Schahadat 1995; Berndt and Tonger-Erk 2013; also see Valentin Peschanskyi's chapter on intertextuality in this volume). However, Kristeva's essay was not just a summary of Bakhtin's ideas; it was also a rereading (or misreading) of them in the context of the (post)structuralist Parisian intellectual flair of the 1960s, or, as David Duff puts it, a "reformulation of Bakhtin's 'sociological poetics' [...] in terms of French structuralist poetics" (Duff 2002, 55). From a later perspective, Kristeva herself saw Bakhtin's "notions of dialogism and carnival [as an] import point in moving beyond structuralism" (Kristeva 1996, 189). In the paper given in Barthes' seminar, Kristeva's interpretation of Bakhtin on the one hand, as she phrases it, "remains faithful to his ideas, and demonstrates, on the other, [her] attempts to elaborate and enlarge upon them" (Kristeva 1996, 189). Intertextuality was the term she coined on the basis of Bakhtin's thoughts about the dialogic nature of the word; intertextuality is not Bakhtin's invention, but Kristeva's based on Bakhtin. (For Kristeva's rewriting of Bakhtin, see also Rainer Grübel's chapter on Bakhtin in this volume).

Kristeva takes as her starting point Bakhtin's interest in the word as a "minimal structural unit" (Kristeva 1986, 36) which she redefines as the "poetic word", an interest that she would later follow with a psychoanalytic turn in *La révolution du langage poétique* (1974, *Revolution in Poetic Language*, 1984). While Bakhtin is interested in the word in the novel, which he defines as dialogic, she shifts her focus to the poetic word in general. She then translates Bakhtin's concept of the (dialogic) word into the (intertextual) concept of the dialogic text. For Bakhtin, the sentence and even the word is a hybrid of two or more voices or styles; in his essay *Slovo v romane* (1934–35, *Discourse in the Novel*, 1981) he locates the novel as the place where a "heteroglot, multi-voiced, multi-styled and often multi-languaged" style is put into action (Bakhtin 1988, 265). Taking Dicken's *Little Dorrit* as an example, Bakhtin explains the meaning of a "double-accented, double-styled 'hybrid construction'":

> What we are calling a hybrid construction is an utterance that belongs, by its grammatical (syntactic) and compositional markers, to a single speaker, but that actually contains mixed within its two utterances, two speech manners, two styles, two 'languages,' two semantic and axiological belief systems. We repeat, there is no formal – compositional and syntactic – boundary between these utterances, styles, languages, belief systems; the division of voices and languages takes place within the limits of a single syntactic whole, often within the limits of a simple sentence. It frequently happens that even one and the same word

> will intersect in a hybrid construction – and, consequently, the word has two contradictory meanings. (Bakhtin 1988, 304–305)

Forty years later, Julia Kristeva transfers the heteroglossia and the dialogicity of Bakhtin's word in the novel onto the level of the text, locating it at the crossroads of a horizontal axis (the word as communication between author and addressee) and of a vertical axis (the word in the context of a literary corpus):

> each word (text) is an intersection of words (texts) where at least one other word (text) can be read. In Bakhtin's work, these two axes, which he calls 'dialogue' and 'ambivalence', are not clearly distinguished. Yet, what appears as a lack of rigour is in fact an insight first introduced into literary theory by Bakhtin; any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and the transformation of another. (Kristeva 1986, 37)

Here Kristeva here coined the term "intertextuality": "The notion of 'intertextuality' replaces that of intersubjectivity, and poetic language is read at least 'double'" (Kristeva 1986, 37).

Bakhtin's (or Kristeva's) "writing as reading" (Kristeva 1986, 39) becomes an established principle in the theory of intertextuality, and the linearity of literary influence is replaced by a spatial image in which texts enter into a dialogical relationship, independent of their timeline.

While summarising Bakhtin's ideas about dialogue and ambivalence, Kristeva introduces a further dimension, logic, or, more precisely: poetic logic and transgression. "Bakhtin's term dialogism [...] implies the double, language, and another logic" (Kristeva 1986, 42). By focusing on the subversive quality of the (intertextual) poetic word, transgressing "God, Law, Definition", "prohibition" and "Aristotelian logic" (Kristeva 1986, 41), Kristeva remodels Bakhtin's approach, based on linguistics and literature, into a cultural critique with a psychoanalytical twist. First, the word as a double thus acquires an ideological dimension, being understood as a revolt against the law. Revolt is a keyword in Kristeva's work (*La revolution du langage poétique [Revolution in Poetic Language]; Sens et non-sens de la révolte [The Sense and Non-sense of Revolt]; La revolte intime [Intimate Revolt]; Revolt, She Said* – see Payne 2010, 387) and she "believes that revolt is essential to psychic life no less than it is to social bonds" (Payne 2010, 387). And here the second aspect gains prominence: if the text – and with it, the subject – is no longer a fixed identity, intertextual analysis resembles "an intrapsychic or psychoanalytical finding" (Kristeva 1996, 190); creativity (in the subject writing the text as well as in the one reading it) is a "subject in process" (Kristeva 1996, 190); both the writer's and the reader's identity is challenged, dismantled and reconstituted in "a new, plural identity" (Kristeva 1996, 190).

While the psychoanalytic turn in relation to Bakhtin is typical for Kristeva, with her introduction of Bakhtin as the founder of a theory of intertextuality to the Western theoretical discourse she created the paths for various lines of thought. Bakhtinian terminology (the carnivalesque, dialogism, hybridity as well as Kristeva's term intertextuality) has long become part of both literary and cultural critique.

5 Conclusion

The three migrating intellectuals, Jakobson, Kridl and Kristeva, are three versions of the very special situation of academic mobility in the form of migration and exile in the turmoil of the twentieth century: a discourse founder whose influence is still visible today, a mediator of Central and Eastern European thinking and an exchange student who rewrote the ideas of a Russian thinker in the context of poststructuralist Paris and her own interests in psychoanalysis. As becomes obvious, mediators are more prone to being forgotten; today, Manfred Kridl is known mainly to a restricted number of researchers dealing with Polish intellectual history. Roman Jakobson, on the other hand, is almost a monument, an important name in the history of twentieth-century thinking. Julia Kristeva's career, once again, took a different twist: she is considered "one of the most original thinkers of our time" (McAfee 2004, 1), which in the case of Bakhtin can be illustrated by the fact that she not only transports a theory from one cultural context to another, but also transforms it, adapting it to her own mode of thinking. The memory of theory thus reacts differently to the various modes of intellectual circulation as performed by Jakobson, Kridl and Kristeva – or even by Pnin and Malinowski, although Pnin's immortality is guaranteed by the memory of literature, not of theory.

References

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Discourse in the Novel." Mikhail Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination by M. M. Bakhtin*. Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1988. 259–422.

Berndt, Frauke, and Lily Tonger-Erk. *Intertextualität: Eine Einführung*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag, 2013.

Birus, Hendrik. "Der Leser Roman Jakobson: im Spannungsfeld von Formalismus, Hermeneutik und Poststrukturalismus." Roman Jakobson, *Poesie der Grammatik und Grammatik der Poesie: Sämtliche Gedichtanalysen. Kommentierte deutsche Ausgabe*. Vol. 1:

Poetologische Schriften und Analysen zur Lyrik vom Mittelalter bis zur Aufklärung. Eds. Hendrik Birus and Sebastian Donat. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2007. XIII–XLIII.

Bloom, Harold. *A Map of Misreading*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Bujnicki, Tadeusz. "Manfred Kridl i 'rosyjska szkoła formalna'." *Pamiętnik literacki* 1 (1996): 111–126.

Clifford, James. "On Ethnographic Self-Fashioning: Conrad and Malinowski." James Clifford, *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art*. Cambridge, MA, and London: Harvard University Press 1988. 92–113.

Dervin, Fred. "Introduction." *Analyzing the Consequences of Academic Mobility*. Ed. Fred Dervin. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholar Publishing, 2011. 1–12.

Doležel, Lubomir. "Prague Linguistic Circle." *Theoretical Schools and Circles in the Twentieth-Century Humanities: Literary Theory, History, Philosophy*. Eds. Marina Grishkova and Silvi Salupere. New York, NY, and London: Routledge, 2015. 41–62.

Duff, David. "Intertextuality versus genre theory: Bakhtin, Kristeva and the question of genre." *Paragraph* 25.1 (March 2002): 54–73.

Eco, Umberto. "The Influence of Roman Jakobson on the Development of Semiotics." *Classics of Semiotics: Topics in Contemporary Semiotics*. Eds. Martin Krampen, Klaus Oehler, Roland Posner, Thomas A. Sebeok, and Thure von Uexküll. New York, NY: Plenum Press, 1987. 109–127.

Grishkova, Marina, and Silvi Salupere (eds.). *Theoretical Schools and Circles in the Twentieth-Century Humanities: Literary Theory, History, Philosophy*. New York, NY, and London: Routledge 2015.

Hacker, Hanna. "La Chine, mon amour? Feministische und queere Transfers durch den Maoismus: *Tel Quel,* 1974." *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaften* 22.1 (2011): 161–184. www.studienverlag.at/bookimport/oezgArchiv/media/data0647/5025_oezg_1_2011_s161_184_hacker.pdf (03 February 2022).

Jakobson, Roman. *Six Lectures on Sound and Meaning*. Trans. by John Mepham. Sussex: The Harvester Press Limited, 1978.

Jakobson, Roman. "Die Arbeit der sogenannten 'Prager Schule'." Roman Jakobson, *Selected Writings*. Vol. 2: *Word and Language*. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1971. 547–550.

Jakobson, Roman, and Krystyna Pomorska. *Dialogues*. Trans. by Christian Hubert. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1983.

Karcz, Andrzej. "Manfred Kridl. The Struggle for the Reform of Polish Literary Scholarship." *The Polish Review* 45/2 (2000): 171–182.

Kola, Adam. "Zwrot dokonany niedopełniony: Z dziejów nowoczesngeo literaturoznawstwa polskiego okresu międzewojennego." *'Zwroty' badawcze w humanistyce: Konteksty poznawcze, kulturowe i społeczno-instytutionalne*. Eds. Jacek Kowalewski and Wojciech Piasek. Olsztyn: Forum humanystyczny, 2010. 237–284.

Kola, Adam, and Danuta Ulicka. "From Circles to the School (and Back Again): The Case of Polish Structuralism." *Theoretical Schools and Circles in the Twentieth-Century Humanities: Literary Theory, History, Philosophy*. Eds. Marina Grishakova and Silvie Salupere. New York, NY: Routledge, 2015. 63–83.

Kridl, Manfred. "Podstawy nauki o literaturze." *Pamiętnik Literacki* 33 (1936): 291–298.

Kridl, Manfred. *Wstęp do badań nad dziełem literackiem*. Vilnius: Dom Książki polskiej, 1936a [reprint Würzburg: jal-reprint, 1978].

Kridl, Manfred. "Przedmowa." *Prace ofiarowane Kazimierzowi Wóycickiemu*. Ed. Manfred Kridl. Vilnius: Dom Książki Polskiej, 1937. 5–11.

Kridl, Manfred. "Boje o nową naukę o literaturze." *Pamiętnik literacki* 1 (1957): 297–307.

Kristeva, Julia. "Word, Dialogue and Novel." Julia Kristeva, *The Kristeva Reader*. Ed. Toril Moi. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1986. 35–61.

Kristeva, Julia. *Strangers to Ourselves*. Trans. by Leon S. Roudiez. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1991.

Kristeva, Julia. *Julia Kristeva: Interviews*. Ed. Ross Mitchell-Guberman. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1996.

Kuklick, Hannah. "Malinowski, Bronislaw." *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology*. Eds. Alan Barnard and Jonathan Spencer. London: Routledge, 2010. 436–439.

Lachmann, Renate. *Memory and Literature: Intertextuality in Russian Modernism*. Trans. by Roy Sellers and Anthony Wall. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.

Lukács, Georg. *The Theory of the Novel: A Historico-philosophical Essay on the Forms of Great Epic Literature* [1914–1915]. Trans. by Anna Bostock. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1971.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. "Structure and Form: Reflections on a Work by Vladimir Propp." [1960] Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Structural Anthropology*. Vol. 2. Trans. by Monique Layton. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1976. 115–145.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. "Preface." Roman Jakobson, *Six Lectures on Sound and Meaning*. Trans. by John Mepham. Sussex: The Harvester Press Limited, 1978. xi–xxvi.

Maguire, Robert A. "Manfred Kridl." *Between Lvov, New York and Ulysses' Ithaca: Józef Wittlin. Poet, Essayist, Novelist*. Ed. Anna Frajlich. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2001. 201–212.

McAfee, Noëlle. *Julia Kristeva*. New York, NY, and London: Routledge, 2004.

Minick, Norris. "The Development of Vygotskii's Tought: an Introduction to Thinking and Speech." *An Introduction to Vygotskii*. Ed. Harry Daniels. London and New York, NY: Routledge, 2003. 28–52.

Mrugalski, Michał. "The Polish Reception of Reception: The Transfer of *priem* within the Intellectual Morphic Field of Russian and Polish Formalisms." *Èpokha 'ostraneniia': Russkii formalizm i sovremennoe gumanitarnoe znanie*. Eds. Ian Levchenko and Igor Pilshchikov. Moscow: NLO 2017. 153–164.

Nabokov, Vladimir. *Pnin*. New York, NY: Vintage International, 1989.

Neubauer, John. "Exile: Home of the Twentieth Century." *The Exile and Return of Writers from East-Central Europe: A Compendium*. Eds. John Neubauer and Borbála Zsuzsanna Török. Berlin and New York, NY: De Gruyter 2009. 4–103.

Olshanskii, Dmitrii [Olshansky, Dmitry]. "The Birth of Structuralism from the Analysis of Fairy-tales." *Toronto Slavic Quarterly* 25 (Summer 2008). sites.utoronto.ca/tsq/25/Olshansky25.shtml (03 February 2022).

Payne, Michael. "Kristeva, Julia." *A Dictionary of Cultural and Critical Theory*. Eds. Michael Payne and Jessica Rae Barbera. 2nd edition. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, 2010. 383–388.

Plessner, Monika. *Die Argonauten auf Long Island: Begegnungen mit Hannah Arendt, Theodor W. Adorno, Gershom Scholem und Anderen*. Berlin: Rowohlt, 1995.

Prange, Regine. "Roman Ossipowitsch Jakobson." *Ästhetik und Kunstphilosophie von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart in Einzeldarstellungen*. Eds. Monika Betzler, Mara-Daria Cojocaru, and Julian Nida-Rümelin. Stuttgart: Kröner, 1998. 429–435.

Richman, Michèle. "Bataille Moralist? *Critique* and the Postwar Writings." *Yale French Studies* 78 (1990): 143–168.

Schahadat, Schamma. "Intertextualität: Lektüre – Text – Intertext." *Einführung in die Literatur-wissenschaft*. Eds. Miltos Pechlivanos, Stefan Rieger, and Michael Weitz. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1995. 366–377.

Schahadat, Schamma. "Die Warschauer und Vilnaer Polonistik in der Zwischenkriegszeit: Der Eintritt ins europäische literaturtheoretische Feld." *Laboratorien der Moderne: Orte und Räume des Wissens in Mittel- und Osteuropa*. Eds. Bernd Stiegler and Sylwie Werner. Paderborn: Fink, 2016. 235–252.

Smaszcz, Waldemar. "Dwie koncepcje polonistyki wileńskiej." *Wilno-Wileńczyzna jako krajobraz i środowisko wielu kultur*. Ed. Elżbieta Feliksiak. Białystok: Towarzystwo Literackie im. Adama Mickiewicza, 1992. 97–112.

Winner, Thomas G. "Roman Jakobson and the Czech Poetists: Language is not a Prison House." *Proceedings of the International Conference on Roman Jakobson Held in Šlapanice, Czech Republic*. Ed. Miroslav Mikulášek. Brno: Masarykova univerzita. Filozofická fakulta, 1996. 17–28.

Zavacká, Marína. "Adventures of Academic Mobility: Roman Jakobson in Slovakia." *Historický časopis* 67.5 (2019): 851–878.

Żołkiewski, Stefan. "O Franciszku Siedleckim." Franciszek Siedlecki, *Pisma*. Eds. Maria Renata Mayenowa and Stefan Żołkowski. Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1989. 5–44.

Danuta Ulicka
Spaces of Theory

1 The genius of place and time

There are but a few academic disciplines that can boast a birth certificate. East and
Central European literary studies were born in Petersburg on December 23, 1913. It
was on this very day that Victor Shklovskii delivered a lecture in the Brodiachaia
Sobaka ('Stray Dog') cabaret that would form the basis of his "Voskreshenie slova"
(1914, "The Resurrection of the Word"), commonly treated as the foundational
text of Russian formalism or – amounting to the same thing – modern literary
theory. For an academic discipline, this was quite a showy beginning, since it took
place in a cabaret and the meeting's participants recalled Shklovskii's lecture as
a "lunatic's speech", in the words of Boris Èikhenbaum (Chudakova and Toddes
1987, 12), a would-be biologist, physician, pianist, violinist, Slavist, Germanist,
Romanist, Bergson commentator, and future formalist (Curtis 1976, 112).

This was not the only paradox that accompanied the birth of the discipline.
Its future seriousness contrasts with its place of birth: a cabaret, which in con-
temporary Russia was an ordinary public bar, almost an inn, far from the French,
Swiss, German, or even Polish cabarets. The Stray Dog mainly hosted the artistic
and scientific bohemia of the Russian moderne and theorizing poets associated
with the future formalists, such as Velimir Khlebnikov, Vladimir Maiakovskii,
Aleksei Kruchenykh, and Nikolai Kulbin. The futurist-formalist manifesto by
Kruchenykh and Kulbin "Deklaratsiia slova kak takovogo" ("Declaration of the
Word as Such"), also from 1913, could also function as the foundational text of
modern literary theory, just like many other Polish, German, and Czech poetical,
academic, and academic-poetical texts.

Shklovskii's lecture, entitled "Mesto futurizma v istorii iazyka" (1913, "The
Place of Futurism in the History of Language"), contributed to a discussion about
new conceptions in poetry and art. The lecture's main thesis was a call to resur-
rect things through a resurrection of the word. It was this last phrase that inspired
the birth certificate of literary theory – Shklovskii's brochure "The Resurrection
of the Word".

This foundational story, which locates the birth of the discipline in a cabaret,
competes with two alternative stories, according to which the Society for the Study
of Poetic Language (Obshchestvo izucheniia poèticheskogo iazyka, OPOIaZ) was
born either in the Briks' apartment, during Maslenitsa, when Lili was frying blini,
"between one toast and another" (Jangfeldt 2007, 93), or in Sokolinskii's small
printing house at Nadiezdinskaia 33, which published poetic volumes of the futur-

ists and brochures of the future formalists. "Certainly, this was the beginning of the OPOIaZ", Shklovskii (1983, 80) asserted. We may supplement these simultaneously mythical and real locations – they have precise addresses – with yet another one. For instance, the Tenishev School, where on 8 February 1914 a group of poets and their friends, in future prominent scholars, continued the debate initiated two months earlier at the Stray Dog. A meeting titled "Vecher o novom slove" ("The 'New Word' Evening") was chaired by Jan Niecisław Ignacy Baudouin de Courtenay, a professor at St Petersburg University and a tutor to a students' scientific society. After a harsh clash with his pupil Victor Shklovskii, Baudouin de Courtenay published the articles "Slovo i 'slovo'" (1914a, "Word and 'Word'") and "K teorii 'slova kak takovogo' i 'bukvy kak takovoi'" (1914b, "Toward a Theory of the 'Word as Such' and the 'Letter as Such'"). It would be equally legitimate to include these two articles in anthologies and textbooks as the foundational texts of the discipline alongside "The Resurrection". Courtenay's articles are even more exciting, especially today, as they combine a Derrida-like discussion of the tension between sound and inscription with a veiled postcolonial-like discussion of linguistic politics. Courtenay's texts emphasize the futility of any attempt to suppress the 'smaller nations' – as he always calls them with full respect for their autonomy – through political actions intended to destroy their languages and alphabets.

Perhaps it would be good to begin with the founding myth of Polish theoretical literary studies. Distinct from its Russian or Czechoslovakian counterparts, Polish theory has never seen such a mythological story about itself. The story, however, may also begin with the student meetings held on Sunday mornings in the mid-1930s under the aegis of the Circle of Polish Philologists, Students of the University of Warsaw – better known as the Warsaw Circle of Polonists or, for short, the Warsaw Circle – at the office of Kazimierz Piekarski, a head of the Old Prints Department of the National Library of Poland, in the building of the Department of Law.

There are many other places, such as the cabaret, the coffeehouse, the private apartment, the printing house, or the public square, in which we may locate the birth of literary theory. Regardless of our choice, what is important is that almost all of them belong to 'unofficial' spaces, or at least not to the spaces of universities and academia. Without a proper understanding of the location of the origins of literary theory, its entire further history would remain unclear. In this respect, Polish theory seems to be a case in point. Moreover, as a cultural fact, Polish theory is the least-known case in the history of literary studies in Central and Eastern Europe – despite the fact that it played a central organizational role and set the tone for research in the entire region from the late 1950s onwards. This finds authoritative confirmation in one of Roman Jakobson's letters (probably

meant as a recommendation of Manfred Kridl's article, and probably written in 1945), in which he argues that

> [t]he last three or four decades can be characterized by an unusual growth and refinement of literary theory and methodology. Of all parts of Europe, the Slavic countries have shown [...] the most intensive development of literary scholarship, and Poland was one of the main scenes of this development. (Jakobson 1945 [?])

More than a decade later, Jakobson writes to Maria Renata Mayenowa:

> In the late December, I delivered an extensive lecture on linguistics and poetics at the annual meeting of the Modern Language Association in New York, in which I stressed, among other things, that – just like Russia in the 1920s and Czechoslovakia in the 1930s – now Poland plays the most important role in this field. (Jakobson 1971, 454–455)

Due to the relatively tolerant science policy of the Polish People's Republic compared to the neighbouring countries, and thanks to the fact that some members of interwar Polish academic circles belonged to the ministerial authorities of the new communist state and were responsible for managing important academic institutions, Polish literary studies from 1950–1980 played the role of a 'centre' and a specific repository for other theoretical activities in the region, poorly represented or utterly absent in their countries of origin. "For many foreign colleagues, Poland was the only place where they could print their texts" (Janus 2006, 163). These texts were 'smuggled', as it were, in numerous translations or invitations to seminars and conferences, which were particularly conducive to personal and scholarly contacts and resulted in several events of international importance. During a seminar in autumn 1958 in Krynica Górska, Jakobson presented a first draft of his future "Lingvistika i poètika" (1960, "Linguistics and Poetics"; Okopieniowa and Głowiński 1959, 316). A year and a half later, during the first International Conference on Poetics, which took place on 18–27 August 1960 in Warsaw, he presented an outline of "Poeziia grammatiki i grammatika poezii" (1961, "Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry"), while at the conference dinner, after a discussion with Stefania Skwarczyńska (undoubtedly ludic, but not devoid of a reference to structural anthropology), he realized "the need for a scientific history of culinary art" (Jakobson 1989 [1965], 100), which, in turn, resulted in the short text "Szczupak po polsku" (1965, "Polish-Style Pike"). This nine-day conference was unprecedented. It brought together eminent scholars from twelve different countries, including such authorities as Thomas Sebeok, Dmitrii Likhachev, Roger Caillois, Bruno Markwardt, Abraham A. Moles. But there were also researchers from the Prague Linguistic Circle (Pražský lingvistický kroužek, PLK) and their disciples (Pavel Trost, Josef Hrabák, Lubomir Doležel, Jiří Levý), not to mention

important members of interwar Polish student circles (Maria Renata Mayenowa, Irena Sławińska, Czesław Zgorzelski, Stefan Żółkiewski).

For the above reasons, the majority of the facts mentioned below in order to illustrate paradigmatic regularities that define the whole region will be drawn from the history of Polish theory. References to broadly recognized Russian and Czech theories are intended to provide an interpretative framework for understanding the spatial dimension of the development of literary theory in the entire region.

2 The official geography: a grand narrative about the time-spaces of theory

In probably the only serious attempt at the chronotopization of literary theory, Galin Tihanov (2004) considers its origins in terms of the grand European and global geopolitical processes which preceded or ensued from the World War I. Tihanov links the birth of theory to the fall of three empires and the creation of new nation states. However, if we consider the origins of literary-theoretical thinking, we must stress that geopolitics itself was merely a midwife of the new approach to literature and culture anticipated in artistic intuitions and academic discussions which announced the demise of the Romantic paradigm. Efforts to bury the history of literature burdened with national obligations spread throughout the entire region. In the process, the object of study itself was essentially transformed: literature – as a body of texts written in an ethnic language and recognized as canonical for the functions they allegedly perform for a national community – was to be replaced by a transboundary and non-canonical notion of *literariness*, described as a function of any text with a recognizable uniqueness in which the "universal law of language" is manifested (Lifshits 1989, 463). This shift meant a restoration of Goethe's idea of world literature, but reformulated in the vein of the new antinationalist world philology. Regardless of how we assess the cosmopolitan projects of literary scholars and artists, it is important to remember that they were not only located in a particular European space but also inextricably linked to its further geopolitical fate.

The central and genealogically original role of the nascent literary-theoretical thinking in the entire region played German philosophical aesthetics along with German slavistics and general linguistics. This is hardly surprising, given the role German and Habsburg universities had played in Central and Eastern Europe since the nineteenth century. Thus, we may delineate the cultural space of literary theory's birth and geometrize it on a map as a triangle, with Germany and Austria-Hungary at its base and Russia, Czechoslovakia, and Poland as its vertices.

The gradual liberation from dependence on German philosophical aesthetics was accompanied by the 'urbanization of theory' located not in the newly created states but in the cities: Moscow and St Petersburg, Prague and Brno, Warsaw, Vilnius, and Poznan. These cities gave their names to the specifically theoretical 'half-institutes' in which theory developed: the Moscow Linguistic Circle (Moskovskii lingvisticheskii kruzhok, MLK, later based in Copenhagen and New York), the St Petersburg-based OPOIaZ, the Prague Linguistic Circle, and the Polish student circles of Warsaw, Vilnius, and Poznan. This clearly indicates not only a denationalization but also a strong territorialization of the discipline.

Literary theory as distinctly spatialized was both regional and global. It was global, for there was no other theory at that time. However, its global quality was of a particular character. As in the entire Avant-Garde, "[m]odern literary theory developed at the intersection between national enthusiasms and a cultural cosmopolitanism" (Tihanov 2004, 67) which modified the ideas developed in the neighbouring country's community. This intersection of the universal, the local, and the regional manifests itself in a variety of respects. It is especially visible in the nationalized conceptions of poetic language, originally intended to be universal but eventually developed locally: in Russia in relation to the poetry of the futurists, who collaborated with the formalists; in Poland in relation to the firmly traditional poetry of the Skamander group that collaborated with the Warsaw Circle; and in Czechoslovakia in relation to the surrealists associated with the Prague Circle. As a result, there emerged three distinct local theories of universal literariness.

The strongest factor determining these local profiles was the neighbourhood. A sociologist would point out that the literary-theoretical neighbouring community was based on a unified worldview and ideological orientation. That is, on the same social and ethical ideals typically shared by the intelligentsia, which inherited its mission from the nineteenth-century elite (Sdižkov 2006). But a historian of the literary-theoretical scholarly culture would rather say that this was an intergenerational voluntary community which developed over half a century of cooperation and exchange not only of intellectual goods but also of common scientific endeavours, publications, and conferences which provided opportunities for meetings and interactions. Moreover, it was also an emotional community cemented by simple human affinities and friendships.

From such community, theory migrated to other parts of the world: first, to the USA, and then to Western Europe, Canada, South America, and finally to Asia (Israel and China). However, when mapping its migrations, one should at least provide human faces, similarly to the anthropomorphic maps created in previous centuries.

For theory requires anthropogeography. Theory never migrated on its own but always together with theoreticians: deported thinkers, refugees, forced or 'forc-

edly voluntary' *émigrés*. This is not only the case with Roman Jakobson, who fled from six successive waves of nazism, always propagating the community-oriented theory. It also applies to Manfred Kridl from Warsaw and Vilnius, who worked at Columbia University and taught courses on Slavic literary theory, to René Wellek, a graduate of the Charles University in Prague, who taught at Yale, and Lubomír Doležel and Thomas Pavel in Canada, who propagated Czechoslovakian theory, Alexander Piatigorskii and Benjamin Hrushovski, thanks to whom Russian formalism and Tartu semiotics gained popularity in Tel Aviv, and Julia Kristeva and Tzvetan Todorov, who introduced the formalists and Bakhtin to Paris circles; to some extent it also applies to Lucien Goldmann and Algirdas Greimas. All of these thinkers – exiles, escapees, and *émigrés* – spread the regional theory around the world.

Through these migrations, theory itself rapidly gained a global dimension in another (third) sense: scholars began to perceive theory as universal, timeless, and spaceless. Theory became the element of more than just academic geography with typical academic categorizations; it now meant divisions into schools, methods, tendencies, and orientations, an established canon of texts and a unified international vocabulary. One may argue that theory gained such status mostly thanks to the Bulgarian-Lithuanian-Romanian-French structuralists and semioticians who proposed their own formalized models of narrative which by the mid-1960s became synonymous with literary theory in Europe. This version of theory, however, was already deemed obsolete in the early 1970s.

Perhaps these migrations of theoreticians who settled in new local communities – often internationally renowned centres – and recognized academic institutions made the originally 'foreign' newcomers renounce their original locality. We may hear this suspension of the 'homely' in the dominant English variant of the most local and simultaneously global term of Central and Eastern European theory: *ostranenie* (estrangement). Its translation into defamiliarization can be interpreted precisely as "the possibility of 'estranging' the sanctity and naturalness of one's own literature by analyzing it in another language or by refracting it through the prism of another culture" (Tihanov 2004, 70).

Regardless of how we explain this issue, the extirpated and deterritorialized academic theory undeniably continued to migrate, even though it was deprived of its geography; now, it migrated between different disciplines, as their inspirer and repository of tools, terms, or interpretative ideas.

3 Grounding theory

Grounding theory requires a change of scale and a transition from the geopolitical map to terrain maps or even city plans and guidebooks. Certainly, theory was born in Central and Eastern Europe but its particular birth-places evade the pages of atlases.

As I have already observed, theory was born not in states, but in cities. Moreover, it was born in the city territories that can be described as 'unofficial zones'. In St Petersburg, on the left bank of the Neva, where the artistic and intellectual Avant-Garde settled, leaving the right bank for the official institutions of science and art; especially the twelve buildings of university colleges (Likhachev 1987, 347–353). The horizontal semiotic border of theory in St Petersburg, demarcated by the Neva, receives reinforcement by its vertical limits. For theory was created not only in the basement cabaret but also in the secessionist 'Ivanov's Tower' located in the most official St Petersburg park, the area of the Tauride Palace. Perhaps it is precisely this opposition between up and down that best explains the difference between the formalists and Bakhtin. We may discern a similar opposition in Cracow: between the late Renaissance space of the Collegium Maius – the oldest seat of the Jagiellonian University – and the basement cabaret Piwnica pod Baranami ('Basement under the Rams') frequented by Cracow literary scholars, poets, Avant-Garde painters, and musicians. As a historian and theorist of literature, Jan Błoński, writes on Cracow Polish studies in the 1950s that "the Basement was a true phenomenon [...]. I met a couple of very wise painters, who taught me a lot" (Błoński 2002, 76).

In short, theory was neither born nor developed only at universities, with their fixed hierarchies and customs. Instead, an important space of community formation was the editorial offices of newspapers and periodicals. In 1920s Warsaw, a popular place for meetings of writers, critics, and literary scholars like Wacław Borowy was the office of the *Rzeczpospolita* daily. In Vilnius and Poznan newspapers' editorial offices served a similar function. After World War II, various meetings and debates of the structuralists took place in the office of *Teksty*, the most important literary journal in literary theory. And if the crystallizing theory was in any way linked to the space of academic institutions, it was not their lecture halls. The locations employed were much quieter or even private. Typically, professors held *privatissima* and home seminars. "It is hard to [...] guess where science is conducted: in the halls decorated with poor portraits of scholars, a warm corridor or professors' apartments", wrote Shklovskii (2002 [1926], 347), whom we may suspect to have participated in the early seminars on Saturday afternoons and Sunday mornings in the homes of Tadeusz Zieliński and Jan Baudouin de Courtenay.

It is symptomatic that the seminars were held on Saturdays and Sundays; that is, in their free time. This was also the day when the meetings of the Warsaw Circle took place. "Every Sunday, we gathered in the empty offices of the Old Prints Department of the National Library in the Potocki Palace near the Visitationist Church", recalls Stefan Żółkiewski (1989, 5), the Circle's head. It was precisely due to this chronotope that Żółkiewski's presentations were called 'Gospels'. This perverse generic classification signalled the group's leftist orientation and its involvement in methodological as much as social and political issues. "We read [...] Carnap's *Der logische Aufbau der Welt*. But this was the subject of the second part of the debate. We started by discussing current news about the ongoing peasants' strike", Żółkiewski recalls (1989, 5).

For if the nascent theory had any academic affiliations, these were precisely student circles. They were founded throughout the region to express opposition to the stagnation of academic literary studies and hope for a brave new world – supported by the atmosphere of thoroughgoing political, social, and economic change – as well as trust in the power of the revolutionary youth. As Kazimierz Budzyk, one of the most important members of the Warsaw Circle (Ulicka 2016, 176), recalls:

> Our Polish studies group secured an independent position, although it was deprived of the guidance of an experienced master who would lead its efforts. At a time when none of the eminent professors could create their own research school, we created our school without a professor. (Budzyk 1946, 378)

Circle-ness – let us use an appropriate neologism invented by Tomáš Glanc (2015, 18) – was the real phenomenon throughout Central and East Europe. In this respect, the important exception was the Bakhtinian circles. The circles in Nevel, Vitebsk, and St Petersburg were not formally institutionalized; after all, they were not created by students or even philologists. In turn, the other were semi-institutionalized (Ulicka 2008, 18). The student circles included the Moscow Linguistic Circle, affiliated with the Moscow Dialectological Committee (Moskovskaia dialektologicheskaia komissiia) of the Tzar's Academy of Sciences. The Circle's supervisor was Fedor Korsh, followed by Alexei Shakhmatov after his death. The Warsaw Circle supervised by rector of the University of Warsaw Józef Ujejski assembled graduates in Polish Studies. In contrast, only students gathered in Kridl's circle in Vilnius and later at Columbia University – where he lectured from 1941 onwards – as well as in the Poznan Circle affiliated with Tadeusz Grabowski's chair. It is worth noting that the Polish circles emerged at newly-created or restored universities in Warsaw, Vilnius, and Poznan, where one could institutionalize collective subversive activity more easily, which the students themselves described as a 'scientific revolution' (Kola and Ulicka 2015; Ulicka 2017), distinct from the esteemed

Cracow and Lviv academies, which cultivated nineteenth-century traditions of schools and masters.

The circles created near universities formed a specific autonomous 'Academic Commonwealth' that intended to continue the Philomatic and Masonic traditions. In the early 1930s, the Academic Club of Vilnius Wanderers and Intellectuals (Akademicki Klub Włóczęgów Wileńskich, AKWW) associated with Kridl's Circle met at the rooms of the University of Vilnius that belonged to law students claimed to be of anti-clerical and anti-nationalist origin. Academics, students, and artists also frequented Rudnicki's coffeehouse located close to the university. Nearby, there was also the Scientific Research Institute of Eastern Europe, which reinforced these attitudes. The Institute's curriculum encompassed not only economics and law but also languages – Latvian, Estonian, Lithuanian, Belarusian – as well as the cultures and literatures of the neighbouring countries. The president of the Institute was the Indo-European scholar Jan Michał Rozwadowski, who directly inspired Tynianov (1977 [1929], 294), and whose works had greatly influenced modern Central and Eastern European literary studies (Rozwadowski 1922 [1911]). Teodor Bujnicki, a poet, critic, and theorist of literature, served as secretary of the Institute, while Stanisław Baczyński, left-wing author of the works *Powieść kryminalna* (1932, *Criminal Novel*) and *Rzeczywistość i fikcja* (1939, *Reality and Fiction*), taught classes in literary studies. How strongly this heteroglossic atmosphere of Vilnius influenced the Warsaw Circle is shown not only by their lectures and works but also by their attitudes toward nationalism, anti-semitism, and clericalism, which escalated in the 1930s. However, a similar resonance appeared in the attitudes of students associated with the circle in Poznan, a city which – in contrast to multinational Vilnius – was almost non-diverse ethnically and strongly influenced by right-wing Christian national democracy. To cite one symptomatic event: in 1935, a fighting squad of the anti-Semitic All-Polish Youth (Młodzież Wszechpolska) entered a conference room and wanted to beat up Dawid Hopensztand, a representative of the Warsaw Circle. The frail Konstanty Troczyński from the Poznan Circle defended his Jewish friend and invited the participants to continue the discussion in his own apartment.

The institutional affiliations were not restrictive. For the above circles functioned in a "dual structure" (Glanc and Pilshchikov 2017, 89–90), oscillating between the official status of scientific institutions and the informal character of groups of friends. Indeed, professors supervised the circles only formally, without influence on the discussions, conferences, or publications initiated by the participants. The professors only intervened when the students violated their unwritten ethical code. For instance, when the association from Poznan demanded that no Jewish speakers were to attend the 1937 Convention of Student Scientific Circles in Vilnius and the organizers accepted this condition, Kridl vigorously intervened

with the rector of Stefan Batory University, who severely reprimanded the students (Dalecka 2003, 172).

The institutional affiliations translated neither into financial support nor even a space for meetings; Shakhmatov's permission to establish the Moscow Circle clearly specified that there were "no financial means assigned" (Jakobson 1996, 361). Instead, the circle gathered in Jakobson's apartment at Lubianskii [Lubyansky] Passage, which became its official seat only after the revolution, as Jakobson wanted to avoid obligatory quartering. As I have already observed, the Warsaw Circle gathered in a small room of the Department of Law. Certainly, the Prague Linguistic Circle formed at the University of Prague on "October 6, 1926, when a group of young philologists (Bohuslav Havránek, Roman Jakobson, Jan Rypka, Bohuslav Trnka) attended the lecture of the German linguist Heinrich Becker, *Der Europäische Sprachgeist* [*The European Linguistic Spirit*], in the office of the Anglicist Vilém Mathesius" (Zelenka 2012, 56). However, the Circle's members usually gathered in the "Derby" coffeehouse, where they created the "Circle's Theses", as Tynianov (1977, 533) wrote in his letter to Shklovskii of late 1928. The Latvian communist and diplomatic courier Theodor Nette recommended the place to Jakobson (1987 [1984], 341), who wrote a number of academic texts and excellent political press compilations there (Jakobson 1934, 1938), reportedly because it was cold in his nearby apartment.

These non-academic places in which literary theory was born and tested did not diminish its importance. Since its very beginning, theory was characterized by "a bit of Pickwickism", distance, and humour (Biernacki 2005, 455). But even when presented in cabarets and coffeehouses, its goals remained strictly scientific. A symptomatic case was the poetic morning "My May" at the poets' café Pittoresque in Moscow, where on 1 May 1918, Vladimir Neustadt recited Maiakovskii's poem "Ne ponimaiut" ("They Don't Understand") in Jakobson's translation into Old Church Slavonic. This was a truly 'isomorphic spectacle'. After the recitation, the patient listeners to the translations of the work into German, English, and French whistled their rejection of the Old Church Slavonic translation. At that point, Maiakovskii took the stage and asked: "Well, you don't understand it?" "We don't," the audience replied. "This was exactly the point!" After all, the poem's title was "They Don't Understand". For Jakobson, however, this translation was not merely for fun. As distinct from his other translations – of Mallarmé into Russian, Khlebnikov into Czech, or Maiakovskii into French – the translation of "Ne ponimaiut" into Old Church Slavonic was an important inquiry into the history of versification. The translator's work, made bizarre "in Shklovskii's vein", was also the work of a versologist: Jakobson reconstructed the syllabic system of Old Church Slavonic poetry, rendering all its obligatory properties, which he later repeatedly described (Shapir 1989).

In Poland, the Scottish café plays a comparable role not only for philosophers from Kazimierz Twardowski's school but also for the humanistic elite of Lviv, including Roman Ingarden, Leon Chwistek – the self-proclaimed literary theorist, painter, philosopher, mathematician, and communist – and Hugo Steinhaus – the globally recognized mathematician and still unrecognized literary theorist. In Warsaw, where the members of the Warsaw Circle included the Skamandrites, a similar function was performed by the Picador café, modelled on Russian coffee-houses for poets and academicians. The idea of creating such an artistic-scientific café could come from Karol Wiktor Zawodziński, a member of the Warsaw Circle, who had studied in St Petersburg since 1913 and developed a close relationship with Viktor Zhirmunskii. The Picador's opening was announced by posters with the slogan: "Long live the poetarian dictatorship!" In 1937, this ludic attitude resulted in a strictly scholarly treatise by Siedlecki, the first system of Polish versification, based on the poetry of the Skamandrites (Siedlecki 1937), as its author aimed to 'dethrone' Tadeusz Peiper, the 'Pope of the Avant-Garde' in Poland (Siedlecki 1936), and would have never sat at his café table. In Cracow, scholars gathered around noon at a particular table in the café of the Grand Hotel; in Warsaw, Lourse's Cake Shop was known for such a 'professor's table'. In these spaces, the 'coffeehouse bohemia' mixed with 'Benedictine diligence' and a free exchange of humorous thoughts intermingled with academic seriousness. More official debates took place in the café Ziemiańska, which regularly hosted artists and intellectuals who were proponents of constructivism, compilation films, modern theatre, and typography. They included painters and typographers who strongly influenced theoretical literary studies, such as Mieczysław Szczuka and Aleksander Rafałowski, theatrical directors Leon Schiller and Wilam Horzyca, or an excellent scholar of psychoanalysis and Russian affairs, Stefania Zahorska. The Ziemiańska café was "cheerful and funny" (Watowa 2000, 15). Later, the participants "would go to the nearby Wróbel bar to have some sauerkraut stew and vodka" (Watowa 2000, 15).

It is impossible to determine the extent to which theoretical literary studies were influenced by these semi-official meetings of scholars, students aspiring to the role of initiators of new theoretical disciplines, poets, painters, directors, and photographers; by their official and private lectures, speeches, and talks – these "parlatories" (*gadalnie*), as Lech Piwowar (1987, 332) called them, underscoring the birth of the new discipline in oral circulation – that occurred in Cracow on a quite regular basis, both in Plastyków café on St Spirit Square, in the College of Academic Lectures and the Copernicus Hall of the Jagiellonian University; by the meetings in the Polish Artistic Club at Warsaw's Polonia Hotel and in the basements of the Europejski Hotel, where the inspirers of Polish theoretical literary studies and poets from the Picador joined the Futurist Club in early February 1919, by the famous 'Literary Wednesdays' in Vilnius; by the futurist-formalist meetings

and debates in the Hygienic Association on Karowa Street (nearby the Potocki Palace, where the Warsaw Circle met, and the Visitationist Church [Kościół Wizytek], which was very important for the anti-communist opposition as a site of free lectures) and the Pod Wiechą ('Under the Last Beam') restaurant, where writers and literary theorists met with Avant-Garde painters; by meetings at the "S" artistic club founded in 1934 by Jan Kott and Ryszard Matuszewski (who represented the section of literary criticism in the Warsaw Circle) and affiliated with Hoesick's publishing house; by debates on contemporary poetry in the Avant-Garde Juliusz Osterwa's Reduta Theatre, held for a wider public; by debates of the Circle of Intellectuals founded in Warsaw in 1930 after the delegalization of the Association of Polish Free-Thinkers (Stowarzyszenie Wolnomyślicieli Polskich, SWP) presided by Tadeusz Kotarbiński, a philosopher, teacher, and moral authority for successive generations of students, also those belonging to the Warsaw Circle; by debates of the Polish Association of Free Thought (Polski Związek Myśli Wolnej, PZMW) presided over by the cultural scholar Stefan Czarnowski, another eminent mentor of literary scholars and a supervisor of the Student Circle of Positive Sociology (Studenckie Koło Naukowe Socjologii Pozytywnej), which – like the Warsaw Circle – was open to Jewish students too. Nobody thought to buy a notebook in which literary scholars could write down their ideas, as Łucja Banach, the wife of the famous mathematician Stefan Banach, did to preserve mathematical problems written on a table in Scottish café and wiped off by the staff.

However, given the fact that the founding works of modern literary studies – those authored by Ferdinand de Saussure and partially by Mikhail Bakhtin and Roman Ingarden – also belonged to this 'parlatory' circulation, and that the Moscow Linguistic Circle developed its conceptions almost exclusively through their conversations, one may contend that their influence was considerable.

In the Polish academic culture, coffeehouse and club life was an extension of the network of intellectual and sociable contacts created during the period of the partitions of Poland. After the country regained its independence, this network proved especially valuable: it became an infrastructure of Polish science, also in the economic sense. A similar role was played by public lectures and debates in educational, academic, charitable associations like the Polish Academy of Learning or Józef Mianowski's Foundation, and 'home seminars' held by members of the intelligentsia. Even after their institutionalization, these contacts retained their unofficial or semi-official character. After World War II, such semi-official spaces of "voluntary seminars" (Paluchowski 2005, 270) and theoretical debates were scholars' private libraries, some of which encompassed thousands of volumes and were open to students. In this respect, the Library of Mieczysław Porębski (Biblioteka Mieczysława Porębskiego) in the Museum of Contemporary Art in Cracow is a globally unprecedented phenomenon, a 'quotation' from the

professor's private office, in which everyone can sit at his desk and immerse themselves in theoretical studies or hallway discussions, surrounded by an impressive collection of books and precious paintings of the Polish inter- and post-war Avant-Garde artists. In Tallinn, a similar role was played by Iurii Lotman's and his wife Zara Mints' collection of books now kept at the university at the Department of Semiotics.

The practice of informal meetings and symposia beyond official spaces also manifested itself in the conditions of emigration, expatriation, and exile. In the 'Russian Berlin', which slowly became the new capital of the Russian emigration from 1921 onwards, artistic and academic life concentrated in the café Leon on Nollendorfplatz, which hosted the "Friday meetings". Aleksander Wat – a Polish poet, leftist theorist of literature, and editor of the Marxist-communist journal *Miesięcznik Literacki* (*Literary Monthly*) who was sentenced to exile in Kazakhstan – recalls a kind of 'club' in Shklovskii's hotel room in Almaty (Wat 2011, 72). The room became a place where writers, painters, and scholars gathered in the evenings to discuss all the theories they found fascinating regardless of historical circumstances. In London, the migrant Skamandrites associated with the Warsaw Circle often met in the Regency café.

The practice of such meetings and disputes survived authoritarian conditions too. The members of the 'revived' Club of Literature and Science (Klub Literacki i Naukowy, KLiN) nurtured a monthly tradition of intellectual debate: before the Club's official meetings, some of its members gathered in the Pod Kopernikiem bar located near the University of Warsaw. Literary scholars participated in home seminars – for instance, in Warsaw in Żółkiewski's apartment in Filtrowa Street and Mayenowa's apartment in Sandomierska Street; in Tartu in Iuri Lotman and Zara Mints' apartment. Just like in the interwar period of 'storm and stress', these new *privatissima* "served, for a lack of better alternative, as forums of public opinion [...] which, in the conditions of the authoritarian regime, provided the easiest way for the society to pursue its own initiative" – as Stefan Żółkiewski (1995, 145), one of the initiators of these meetings and the first president of the Warsaw Circle, recalls. A very similar role was played by private lectures delivered within what was known as the Flying University (Uniwersytet Latający) founded in 1977 by the opposition to the official ideologized academic teaching. In 1978–1981, this underground educational enterprise operated as the Society of Science Courses (Towarzystwo Kursów Naukowych, TKN). Among the academics engaged in its work were literary theorists such as Michał Głowiński, Maria Janion, Konrad Górski, and Zdzisław Łapiński. During martial law and the hard times that followed, the meetings also moved to churches, such as the Visitationist Church near the Potocki Palace, where the founders of the Warsaw Circle and the initiators of Polish modern literary studies had often met.

4 Circles of intimacy

These non-standard places of birth and development of theory – at least for the cartographers of knowledge – had a crucial influence on its problematics, methodology, and stylistic shape. But modern literary theory would never have come into being had it not been for the interpersonal circles of intimacy – friendship, social or even love and family bonds – which strengthened the need for meetings; not because of some institutional duties but in order to cultivate common artistic, methodological, and ideological values. Such goals were even written down in the official statutes of the clubs for literary scholars. Paragraph 1 of the Statute of the Club of Literature and Science states that the Club has "to maintain its common intellectual and social atmosphere" (Biernacki 2005, 453).

The space of interpersonal bonds is the hardest to reconstruct. We have scant or no knowledge about many important relationships. Sometimes, this is due to defective or incomplete sources, destroyed by a verdict of history or consciously not collected out of fear of its verdicts. More often, however, it is because of an unwillingness to take them into account or the belief that the information provided by memories, autobiographies, letters, anecdotes, and rumours is of no use for reconstructing the historical realm of literary studies. Yet it is precisely such notes and stories that preserved many priceless traces which help explain certain scientific facts.

What is especially important is that the violent interwar period that saw the birth of literary theory was full of relationships that reached beyond state and political boundaries. These were genuine friendships which, during the war, could cost one one's life, as in the case of Siedlecki and Żółkiewski's efforts to help Dawid Hopensztand escape from the Warsaw Ghetto (Żółkiewski 1977, 365). During the war, Żółkiewski – who was already a member of the Polish Worker's Party (Polska Partia Robotnicza, PPR) – and his associates issued the underground *Educational Guide* (*Poradnik Oświatowy*) and *Library of Self-Education* (*Biblioteka Samokształceniowca*) series, which provided a continuation of their pre-war projects popularizing theory for the masses, whose emancipation and democratization was one of their primary goals from the very outset of their activity. These youthful bonds proved stronger than ideological differences. In 1947–1968, Żółkiewski held important positions in the Central Committee of Polish United Workers' Party and the Ministry of Culture, Science, and Higher Education. But Żółkiewski supported the scientific endeavours of Maria Mayenowa, whom he had known since the Vilnius Circle (she was also supported by another friend of the Circle, Eugenia Krassowska, who served as a high state official in 1946–1965). Contrary to his methodological and political preferences, Żółkiewski also helped publish academic works of his colleagues connected with the interwar periodical

of the Warsaw Circle, who were no longer in favour in communist Poland, even though he often severely criticized their academic achievements. Before Żókiewski became the director of the Institute of Literary Research of the Polish Academy of Sciences, which he co-founded, he tried to bring Manfred Kridl back from the USA and appoint him to the Institute's board of directors. At his end, Kridl supported his friends from Warsaw during the poverty-stricken post-war years by sending them packages with recent academic publications and ... winter boots.

This model of cross-ideological and cross-methodological friendship which, in fact, was deeply rooted in the pre-war relations between Russian, Czech, and Polish communities, extended its invisible network beyond state borders and political disagreements. A case in point is the collection *Prace ofiarowane Kazimierzowi Wóycickiemu* (1937, *Essays in Honor of Kazimierz Wóycicki*), prepared by members of the Warsaw and Vilnius Circles. According to Kridl, who composed the volume, "it is intended to be a collection of Polish and foreign researchers devoted to the problems of literary theory and linguistics" (Kridl 1957, 305). Among the contributors were Roman Jakobson, Josef Hrabák, and Nikolai Trubetskoi; the editors also invited Albert Willem de Groot, a distinguished Dutch versologist whose works inspired Wóycicki, and Jan Mukařovský. The representation of Polish researchers encompassed all methodological orientations of the older and younger generations: traditional positivism, formalism, structuralism, hermeneutics, personalism, Marxism; only phenomenology was absent because Roman Ingarden failed to send his text. The invitation was sent to linguists such as the Indo-European scholar Jerzy Kuryłowicz, poets and literary critics like Julian Tuwim and Leonard Podhorski-Okołów, and a member of the Warsaw Circle and future theatrical director, Jan Kreczmar.

The publication faced various difficulties: it was to be financed by the National Culture Fund (Fundusz Kultury Narodowej, FKN), which ultimately rejected the project, since "there might be some black sheep of 'non-Aryan' descent among the contributors" (Kridl 1957, 305). Nonetheless, it was still a powerful manifestation of the free community of scholars united by the ideals of democracy, emancipation, and anti-nationalism, committed to the creation of a new discipline and society. These transnational, cross-methodological, and cross-border bonds survived World War II. In the post-war years, they were to blossom into both private and institutionalized relationships. Maria Renata Mayenowa, who debuted in the volume for Wóycicki as 'Rachela Kapłanowa', corresponded with Roman Jakobson for many years and dedicated to him her most important work, *Poetyka teoretyczna* (1974, *Theoretical Poetics*), which confirms their close, long-standing friendship. It is noteworthy that the symbolic inscriptions on their graves are almost identical: "Roman Jakobson. A Russian Philologist" and "Maria Renata Mayenowa. A Philologist". Their close relationship also

manifested itself in purely academic facts like her two-volume translation of his selected works.

Translation is another space of theory which reveals the interpersonal relationships in Central and Eastern Europe. In interwar Poland there appeared a series of translations by Leo Spitzer, Karl Vossler, Heinrich Wölfflin, Viktor Vinogradov, Viktor Zhirmunskii, and Boris Tomashevskii, who were to be crowned with a comprehensive anthology titled *The Russian Formalist School of 1914–1934* (*Russkaia formal'naia shkola 1914–1934*), accompanied by Kridl's introduction, Żółkiewski's methodological afterword, and Hopensztand's historical afterword. The editors prepared the volume from the mid-1930s onwards, in permanent cooperation with Roman Jakobson. They printed it in September 1939, but the entire print run burned during the first days of the war. The 1944 Warsaw Uprising destroyed the last preserved copy. There was not much left from the years of close intellectual cooperation: only one printed sheet, four manuscripts, memories, and scarce information from the correspondence preserved in the archives.

After the war, the anthology was brought back from oblivion, if not 'resurrected'. The collection of translations titled *Rosyjska szkoła stylistyki* (1970, *The Russian School of Stylistics*), edited by Mayenowa, is dedicated "in memoriam Franciszek Siedlecki" and begins with the miraculously preserved translation of Shklovskii's "The Resurrection of the Word".

Mayenowa's role in the popularization of literary theory developed in the Russian-Czech-Polish space from the 1920s onwards is comparable to Jakobson's role in its globalization. Mayenowa imported to Poland some works of the Prague Circle written in 1926–1948 (Mayenowa 1966). Janusz Sławiński prepared a selection of Mukařovský's works (Mukařovský 1970). Sławiński was a disciple of Kazimierz Budzyk from the pre-war Warsaw Circle and the founder of the Department of Literary Theory at the University of Warsaw, where the members of the founding generation of theoretical literary studies and their disciples (Mayenowa, Żółkiewski, Okopień-Sławińska, Głowiński) studied and worked until the fateful anti-Semitic and anti-opposition campaign in Poland, Russia, and Czechoslovakia in 1968. From the 1960s onwards, there appeared numerous translations of authors who remained unnoticed in their own countries: Tynianov, Ėikhenbaum, Bakhtin, Lotman, Uspenskii, Toporov, Likhachev, Bogatyrev, or Vodička. For them, the Polish language space was a specific kind of repository. In Poland, the communist regime was far weaker than in other countries in the region; thus scholars could host many international conferences and congresses of literary studies in which some theorists from the 'fraternal countries' could participate. It is symbolic for this cross-generational, cross-border, and cross-political continuity that the collection of papers from the first textological conference "On the Coherence of the Text" ("O spójności tekstu") begins with Vilém Mathesius' 1947

essay titled "O tak zwanym aktualnym rozczłonkowaniu zdania" (1947, "On the So-Called Actual Partition of the Sentence").

The strongest manifestation of this cross-generational and cross-border intellectual cooperation – informed with mutual respect and friendship – is the Slavic Comparative Metrics, a globally unique research initiative established at the beginning of the 1960s by Mayenowa and Jakobson. For over forty years, its international team pursued the program of research on different forms of verse in Slavic literatures. Its members were scholars from Poland (Lucylla Pszczołowska, Zdzisława Kopczyńska, Teresa Dobrzyńska), Russia (Mikhail Gasparov, Mikhail Lotman), Czechoslovakia (Mukařovský's disciples: Květa Sgallová and Miroslav Červenka), and from the 1970s onwards Slovenia (Tone Pretnar), Bulgaria (Atanas Slavov), and Ukraine (Nina Chamata and Natalia Kostenko) too. There was also a section for Serbian and Croatian versification represented by Svetozar Petrović (Dobrzyńska 2012a, 2012b). Later, in the 1980s, the cooperation was limited to Czech (František Daneš, Jana Hoffmannová, Světla Čmejrková) and Bulgarian scholars (Raja Kuncheva), but is still continued (Dobrzyńska and Kuncheva 2008, 2018).

At that time, literary theory had already undergone institutionalization to find its place at universities and see the development of handbooks and dictionaries. The spontaneous private Sunday meetings from before the war turned into cyclical official conferences organized on a local, regional, and global scale. However, even those events were infused with a carnival spirit inherited, as it were, from the founding period and preserved through generations. As it turned out, neither the academic and ideological pathos nor the commitment to methodological and political disputes could contradict the slogan "Don't act like a professor" (Ginzburg 1989, 356). In fact, it was this kind of attitude that became a permanent feature of the entire neighbouring community (Ulicka 2013, 352). This development would not have come about had it not begun with the first public appearance of Shklovskii's "The Resurrection of the Word" in the Stray Dog cabaret in St Petersburg.

Translated by Jan Burzyński

References

Biernacki, Andrzej. "KLiN wskrzeszony (i zlikwidowany). W trzydziestolecie śmierci Wacława Borowego." *Zatajony artysta: O Wacławie Borowym 1890–1950*. Ed. Andrzej Biernacki. Lublin: Norbertinum, 2005. 453–458.

Błoński, Jan. "Tak się dla mnie szczęśliwie złożyło. Z Janem Błońskim rozmawiają Krystyna i Stefan Chwinowie." *Tytuł: Pismo Literacko-Artystyczne* 1–2 (2002): 73–101.

Budzyk, Kazimierz. "O Franciszku Siedleckim wspomnienie." *Pamiętnik Literacki* 36.1–2 (1946): 375–386.

Courtenay, Jan Baudouin de. "Slovo i 'slovo'." *Otkliki* 7 (1914a).

Courtenay, Jan Baudouin de. "K teorii 'slova kak takovogo' i 'bukvy kak takovoi'." *Otkliki* 8 (1914b).

Chudakova, Marietta, and Evgenii Toddes. "Nasledie i put' Borisa Ėikhenbauma." *O literature: Raboty raznykh let*. Eds. Ol'ga Ėikhenbaum and Evgenii Toddes. Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1987. 3–35.

Curtis, James. "Bergson and Russian Formalism." *Comparative Literature* 28.2 (1976): 109–121.

Dalecka, Teres. *Dzieje polonistyki wileńskiej 1919–1939*. Cracow: Towarzystwo Naukowe Societas Vistulana, 2003.

Dobrzyńska, Teresa. "Czesi w Warszawie. Inspiracje oraz obszary wspólnych badań w zakresie stylistyki, wersologii i teorii tekstu." *Strukturalizm w Europie Środkowej i Wschodniej: Wizje i rewizje*. Eds. Włodzimierz Bolecki and Danuta Ulicka. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo IBL PAN, 2012a. 252–256.

Dobrzyńska, Teresa. "Intertextual relations and axiology: Verse structures as vehicles of axiological values in poetry." *Slovo a Slovesnost* 73.4 (2012b): 299–311.

Dobrzyńska, Teresa, and Raia Kuncheva (eds.). *Slova i obrazy: Ikonichnost' teksta/Words and Images. Iconicity of the Text*. Sofia: Izdatel'skii Tsentr "Boan Peneev", 2008.

Dobrzyńska, Teresa, and Raia Kuncheva (eds.). *The Thing: Conceptual and Cultural Aspects*. Sofia: Izdatel'skii Tsentr "Boan Peneev", 2018.

Ginzburg, Lidiia. *Chelovek za pis'mennym stolom*. Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel', 1989.

Glanc, Tomáš. "The Russian Formalists as a Community." *Theoretical Schools and Circles in the Twentieth-Century Humanities: Literary Theory, History, Philosophy*. Eds. Marina Grishakova and Silvi Salupere. New York, NY: Routledge, 2015. 1–22.

Glanc, Tomáš and Igor Pilshchikov. "Russkie formalisty kak nauchnoe soobshchestvo." *Epokha "ostraneniia": Russkii formalizm i sovremennoe gumanitarnoe znanie*. Eds. Ian Levchenko and Igor Pilshchikov. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2017. 85–100.

Jakobson, Roman. "Perpetuum mobile kyvadla. Pokus o montáž." *Listy pro umění a kritiku* 2 (1934). 73–79.

Jakobson, Roman. "Ruské výpravy do budoucna." *Lidové noviny* 46.1 (1938).

Jakobson, Roman. *Letter about Manfred Kridl* [1945 ?]. Manfred Kridl Papers, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University, RBML, MKP, Box 1, 1 a. 1.

Jakobson, Roman. "Poeziia grammatiki i grammatika poezii." *Poetics / Poetyka / Poetika*. Vol. 2. Eds. Roman Jakobson and Instytut Badań Literackich. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1961. 397–417.

Jakobson, Roman. "Polish-Russian cooperation in the science of language." Roman Jakobson, *World and Language*: *Selected Writings*. Vol. 2. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1971. 451–455.

Jakobson, Roman. "Iz kommentariia k stikham Maiakovskogo 'Tovarishchu Nette – parokhodu i cheloveku'." Roman Jakobson, *Raboty po poetike*. Ed. Mikhail Gasparov. Moscow: Progress, 1987. 339–343.

Jakobson, Roman. "Szczupak po polsku." Roman Jakobson, *W poszukiwaniu istoty języka. Wybór pism*. Vol. 1. Ed. Maria Renata Mayenowa. Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1989. 100–114.

Jakobson, Roman. "Moskovskii Lingvisticheskii Kruzhok." *Philologica* 3.5/7 (1996): 361–380.

Jangfeldt, Bengt. *Med livet som insats: berättelsen om Vladimir Majakovskij och hans krets*. Stockholm: Wahlström & Widstrand, 2007.

Janus, Elżbieta. "Maria Renata Mayenowa w świetle listów rosyjskich przyjaciół." *Obecność: Maria Renata Mayenowa (1908–1988)*. Ed. Bożena Chodźko et al. Białystok: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku, 2006. 156–170.

Kridl, Manfred. "Boje Wilna i Warszawy o nową naukę o literaturze." *Pamiętnik Literacki* 48.2 (1957): 297–307.

Kola, Adam, and Danuta Ulicka. "From Circles to the School (and Back Again)." *Theoretical Schools and Circles in the Twentieth-Century Humanities: Literary Theory, History, Philosophy*. Eds. Marina Grishakova and Silvi Salupere. New York, NY: Routledge, 2015. 63–84.

Kruchenykh, Aleksei, and Nikolai Kulbin (eds.). "Deklaratsiia slova kak takovogo." Litera*turnye ob"edineniia Moskvy i Peterburga 1980–1917: Slovar'*. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2004. 308–309.

Lifshits, Benedikt. *Polutoraglazyi strelets*. Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1989.

Likhachev, Dmitrii. "Zametki k intellektualnoi topografii Peterburga pervoi chetverti dvadtsatogo veka." Dmitrii Likhachev, *Izbrannyie raboty v trekh tomakh*. Vol. 3. Leningrad: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1987. 347–353.

Mathesius, Vilém. "O tak zwanym aktualnym rozczłonkowaniu zdania." [1947] *O spójności tekstu*. Ed. Maria Renata Mayenowa. Wroclaw: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1971. 7–12.

Mayenowa, Maria Renata (ed.). *Praska szkoła strukturalna w latach 1926–1948*. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1966.

Mukařovský, Jan. *Wśród znaków i struktur*. Ed. Janusz Sławiński. Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1970.

Okopieniowa, Aleksandra, and Michał Głowiński. "Wykłady Prof. Romana Jakobsona w Krynicy." *Pamiętnik Literacki* 50.1 (1959): 315–320.

Paluchowski, Andrzej. "Borovianum." *Zatajony artysta: O Wacławie Borowym 1890–1950*. Ed. Andrzej Biernacki. Lublin: Norbertinum, 2005. 265–276.

Piwowar, Lech. *Sztuka na gorąco: Szkice literackie*. Ed. Tadeusz Kłak. Katowice: "Śląsk", 1987.

Sdižkov, Denis. *Das Zeitalter der Intelligenz: Zur vergleichenden Geschichte der Gebildeten in Europa bis zum Ersten Weltkrieg*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006.

Rozwadowski, Jan Michał. "Zjawisko dysautomatyzacji i tendencja energii psychicznej." *Kwartalnik Filozoficzny* 1.1 (1922): 19–37.

Shapir, Maksim. "Russkaia tonika i staroslavianskaia sillabika. Vl. Maiakovskii v perevode R. Jakobsona." *Daugava* 8 (1989): 65–79.

Shklovskii, Viktor. "Slova osvobozhdaiut dushu ot tesnoty. Rasskaz ob OPOIaZe." Viktor Shklovsii, *O teorii prozy*. Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1983. 91–99.

Shklovskii, Viktor. "Tret'ia fabrika." Viktor Shklovskii, *"Eshche nichego ne konchilos'…"*. Ed. Aleksandr Iur'evich Galushkin. Moscow: Propaganda, 2002. 337–393.

Siedlecki, Franciszek. "'Likwiduję Peipera'. Z zagadnień formy wierszowej." *Skamander* 10.70 (1936): 218–235.

Siedlecki, Franciszek. *Studja z metryki polskiej*. Vol. 1: *Metr sylabiczny a inne polskie systemy metryczne*. Vilnius: Dom Książki Polskiej, 1937.

Tihanov, Galin. "Why did modern literary theory originate in Central and Eastern Europe (and why it is now dead)?" *Common Knowlegde* 10.1 (2004): 61–81.

Tynianov, Iurii. "O parodii." *Poetika. Istoriia litieratury. Kino*. Ed. Viktor Kaverin. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Nauka, 1977. 284–300.

Ulicka, Danuta. "Tradycje nowoczesnego literaturoznawstwa polskiego." *Tradycje polskiej nauki o literaturze: Warszawskie Koło Polonistów po 70 latach*. Eds. Danuta Ulicka and Marcin Adamiak. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Wydziału Polonistyki UW, 2008. 13–26.

Ulicka, Danuta. "Humor strukturalistów (fotoopowieść)." Danuta Ulicka, *Słowa i ludzie: 10 szkiców z antropologii filologicznej*. Warsaw: Instytut Badań Literackich Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 2013. 319–352.

Ulicka, Danuta. "Kazimierz Budzyk (1911–1964)." *Portrety uczonych: Profesorowie Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego po 1945*. Eds. Waldemar Baraniewski et al. Warsaw: WUW, 2016. 173–183.

Ulicka, Danuta. "Polskoe modernistkoe literaturovedenie: kruzhki i shkoly." *Epokha "ostraneniia": Russkii formalizm i sovremennoe gumanitarnoe znanie*. Eds. Ian Levchenko and Igor Pilshchikov. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2017. 142–152.

Wat, Aleksander. *Mój wiek: Pamiętnik mówiony*. Vol. 2. Ed. Habielski Rafał. Cracow: Universitas, 2011.

Watowa, Ola. *Wszystko, co najważniejsze*. Warsaw: Czytelnik, 2000.

Zelenka, Miloš. "Pražský lingvistický kroužek: kapitola z dějin české meziválečné slavistiky." *Novaia rusistika* 5. Supplementum (2012): 55–64.

Żółkiewski, Stefan. "O Franciszku Siedleckim." Franciszek Siedlecki, *Pisma*. Eds. Maria Renata Mayenowa and Stefan Żółkiewski. Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1989. 5–44.

Żółkiewski, Stefan. "Do P. T. Redakcji 'Tekstów'." *Teksty* 35–36.5–6 (1977): 365–366.

Żółkiewski, Stefan. *Społeczne konteksty kultury literackiej na ziemiach polskich (1890–1939)*. Eds. Alina Brodzka, Oskar S. Czarnik, and Maryla Hopfinger. Warsaw: IBL PAN, 1995.

Valentin Peschanskyi

A Case Study of a Migrating Term: Intertextuality

Intertextuality is the meaning produced 'between' texts when they make reference to one another. The phenomenon is as old as textuality itself – intertextuality is at least one facet of textuality, if not indeed identical with it. Theorising intertextuality in the twentieth century is thus a very fundamental and consequential reflection on the concept of the 'text' and thus the authorship, reception and creation of meaning. In the following, I will highlight five key points in the theory's genesis and migration, beginning with (1) Julia Kristeva's (mis)reading of Bakhtin. The essential common ground shared by these two theorists is not so much their understanding of language and literature as it is the utopian yearning for political subversion and societal transformation that they project onto the concepts of dialogical equivocality, polyphony and semantic doubling. (2) Indeed, Kristeva owes an important portion of her theoretical foundation, particularly the idea of literature as an autonomous system, to the formalists, whom she merely mentions in passing – a marginalisation that proliferates in the histories of theory. (3) On the basis of this reconstruction of the theory's dual 'Russian' starting points, I will also take a look at the often forgotten Soviet line of development, in which reflections on *context* and *subtext* are not only primarily based on formalism and the Bakhtin School but are also, moreover, based on the highly intertextual poetry of Acmeism. (4) I will then outline some of the early lines of development leading from France to the USA and Germany. In the late 1980s, the theory expands to all countries and discourses and its proliferation (5) can only be described as a series of general tendencies, namely a "text-theoretical" perspective, a "text-descriptive" or "text-analytical" perspective, and a "critical perspective on literature and culture" that is rooted in intertextuality (Lachmann 1990, 56–57; transl. by J. H.). I would add a fourth perspective to Renate Lachmann's inventory: synthetic or hybrid concepts that seek intersections between intertextuality and other theoretical discourses without explicit political aims. (6) I conclude with reflection on how the widespread use of the term has resulted in its reduction to mere reference to other texts and advocate stricter usage that focuses primarily on that which occurs in the space 'between' texts.

1 Mikhail Bakhtin and Julia Kristeva

The term intertextuality was coined by Julia Kristeva in the late 1960s. Today, its origin is considered to be the pioneering essay "Bakhtine, le mot, le dialogue et le roman" (1967, "Word, Dialogue, and Novel"), the central thesis of which is crystallised in its much-quoted guiding metaphor: "any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another" (Kristeva 1980b, 66). The implications of this image are far-reaching and shake the foundations of the traditional concept of literature. That a text is mosaic-like implies nothing less than the dissolution of its totality, the dispersion of its meaning and the suspension of the author as an authority. The theoretical foundation already set out in the original title of this radical approach is Mikhail Bakhtin's concept of the dialogical word, as developed in his *Problemy poėtiki Dostoevskogo* (1929/1963, *Problems of Dostoevskii's Poetics*, 1973), which was (re)published four years earlier and which Kristeva now sought to hybridise with the linguistics of Saussure, especially his studies of anagrams and Jean Starobinski's reflections on them (see Renate Lachmann's chapter on "The Migration of Concepts" in this volume, especially the subchapter "Dialogism and Intertextuality"; on Bakhtin and his reception in the West, see the section "Bakhtin, Bakhtin Circles and the (Re)Discovery of Bakhtin in the West").

As a Bulgarian with knowledge of Russian, Kristeva had privileged access to Bakhtin's writings, which remained largely unknown in the West – she introduced them in Barthes' seminar as early as 1965 (Still and Worton 1990, 19) – and hence enjoyed a temporary interpretative authority which she clearly overstretched for her own ends. Hence on the one hand, Kristeva must be blamed for the distortion of Bakhtin's thought in the mirror of poststructuralist theorising that shaped some of the Western (mis)reception of his texts for decades (Lesic-Thomas 2005, 2–3). On the other hand, it is to her inestimable credit that she introduced Bakhtin to a broad readership in the first place and that her productive (mis)reading laid the foundations for the theory of intertextuality and the vast potential it holds to this day.

What are the key differences between Bakhtin and Kristeva? Subjectivity, which for Bakhtin was so extensive that he even ascribed a degree of intentionality, self-awareness and personality to literary figures if they were sufficiently 'autonomous', is reduced to a discursive effect in Kristeva. Kristeva replaces the intratextual communication between the characters' voices and hence the semantic positions within a word with the intertextual communication between texts: "The notion of *intertextuality* replaces that of intersubjectivity, and poetic language is read as at least *double*" (Kristeva 1980b, 66). While for Bakhtin (1984, 6) equivocality is rooted in the "genuine polyphony of fully valid voices", for

Kristeva ambivalence and doubling is to be found in the multiplication of signifieds that collide in a single signifier. The dialogue within a linear text is replaced by an endless three-dimensional textual universe including society, history and culture as semantic systems. What for Bakhtin is the thoroughly creative author as the dominant figure in the constitution of meaning takes on the role of a merely passive filter in which via the perpetual reading there remain mosaic-like fragments of texts that merge as if automatically to form a new text that itself immediately becomes part of a universe in which the texts endlessly refer to one another uncoupled from the chronology of their genesis and their hierarchy of values. Along with this omission of man and his lifeworld, Kristeva's lofty style would be unfamiliar to Bakhtin, who sought to develop his theoretical thought directly from practice. Although Bakhtin's efforts in this respect were not necessarily expressed in clear language and stringent argumentation, his focus was not on the abstract theoretical word isolated from its human usage; rather, he was interested in the very opposite, the living, dialogic word as a carrier of *Weltanschauung* (worldview) and ethics. On the other hand, textuality, especially in the sense of an autonomous system, is of less consequence to him.

The element of Bakhtin that remains, however, is his rejection of a static sense anchored in a uniform system of official or normative language aiming to convey a single meaning. The word, which enters the conflict between two voices (Bakhtin) or two texts (Kristeva), becomes, as Bakhtin puts it, the "arena of battle" (Bakhtin 1984, 193) in which the meanings with which it is filled compete for dominance. In Bakhtin's metalinguistics and Kristeva's (1980b, 66) "*translinguistic*" approach, the rigid, unambiguous semantic model of classical structural linguistics is replaced by a dynamic, perpetual semantic process that follows a 'poetic logic' and every element of which has a multiplicity of meanings. Another thing these two approaches have in common is that this ambivalence takes aim at rigid, hierarchical, authoritarian, monological theoretical and state systems seeking a singularity of meaning and recognising only a single truth, one norm, one law, one voice. Ultimately, they also share an uncertainty that represents the crux of this theory to this day – namely the question as to whether dialogism or intertextuality is a basic characteristic inherent to every utterance or a conscious strategy that brings to the fore this characteristic for the purposes of aesthetics, social criticism or other ends. At least in his book on Dostoevskii, Bakhtin oscillates between several answers, while Kristeva seems to opt for the former; her "typology of discourses" (Kristeva 1980b, 76–88), which she develops in the second half of her treatise and which also includes monological genres, questions this tendency.

It is, then, not so much the theoretical considerations that Kristeva borrows from Bakhtin as their political implications and potential for social criticism: the

idea of the radical opening up of text and meaning implicitly contains the utopian hope for a liberalisation of society culminating in pluralism and the polyphony of voices with equal status.

The concept of intertextuality in its original, comprehensive sense and with a decidedly political dimension is the result of the temporal and spatial migration of theory: Bakhtin developed his theoretical utopia in the context of growing repressions and increasing centralisation in the Soviet Union of the late 1920s. When the *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* appeared in 1929 (originally published as *Problems of Dostoevsky's Creative Art*), its author had already been arrested, sentenced to five years of labour on the Soloveckii Islands but eventually 'only' exiled to Kazakhstan due to ill health. It was this body of work that was mined in France in the 1960s in the context of poststructuralism in the course of a productive misreading, certainly with an eye on the '68 movement and its revolt against state and Church authority, capitalism, discrimination and war. The fact that many of the 68ers admired the Soviet system is one of the ironies of history (or at least of the history of theory). In the twenty-first century at the latest, the strategies of autocratic rulers or the ideologies of reactionary, anti-democratic (mass) movements hostile to science have made it clear that anti-rationalism, ambiguity and a fundamental rejection of all forms of authority are not necessarily a panacea for political authoritarianism; on the contrary, they can be its instruments in the struggle against the ideals of human rights, liberty and equal opportunities. However, that is a different matter altogether.

2 The formalist subtext

While Kristeva holds up Bakhtin as her most important source, he is of course not the only piece in her colourful mosaic of theories, which also includes the aforementioned anagram studies of Ferdinand de Saussure and their continuation by Jean Starobinski, philosophers from Socrates to Hegel to Derrida, the psychoanalysis of Jacques Lacan and Luce Irigaray, Georg Cantor's and David Hilbert's mathematic ideas on infinity, the names of countless men and women of letters and many other theorists such as Émile Benveniste, Benedetto Croce and Greimas. Kristeva's essay itself is thus extremely intertextual, performatively reflecting its subject matter. Quotations from a variety of sources, not necessarily faithfully reproduced, are placed in new constellations in which they take on entirely new meanings. However, this abundance conceals another central element that strictly speaking is at least as important to Kristeva's project on the theoretical level as Bakhtin: Russian formalism, to which we now turn our attention.

Curiously, as early as the second paragraph of her study Kristeva considers Bakhtin a representative of formalism, even elevating him to its most important exponent (Kristeva 1980b, 64), despite the fact that Bakhtin himself perceived the movement as diametrically opposed to his thought – an imprecision that is symptomatic of Kristeva's use of pretexts. The real formalists themselves are mentioned somewhat in passing. Besides a rather critical paragraph on Ėikhenbaum's "Kak sdelana 'Shinel'' Gogolia" (1918, "How Gogol's 'Overcoat' Is Made", 1974), Roman Jakobson appears in three incidental remarks, and the 'para-formalist' Viktor Vinogradov is merely mentioned in footnotes.

Andrea Lešić-Thomas, who demonstrates that "Kristeva [was] […] far more influenced by Russian Formalism than by Bakhtin" (Lesic-Thomas 2005, 3), assumes that her familiarity with formalism goes far beyond these sporadic quotations, since shortly before writing her Bakhtin article she must have taken note of the anthology *Théorie de la littérature: textes des formalistes russes* (1965, *Theory of Literature: Texts of the Russian Formalists*) edited by her countryman and companion Tzvetan Todorov (Lesic-Thomas 2005, 7). Kristeva does indeed cite this collection in her essay "Le texte clos" (1968, "The Bounded Text", 1980a), written around the same time as her Bakhtin essay – that is, around 1966–1967 – and thematically related to it (the terms "translinguistic" and "intertextuality" feature as early as the first page, Kristeva 1980a, 36, 60, note 8).

What are the similarities between Kristeva's intertextuality and the formalist theories? The very concept of *ostranenie* ('estrangement', sometimes translated as 'defamiliarization'), which Viktor Shklovskii introduces in his early text "Iskusstvo kak priem" (1917, "Art as Device"), is relational and only operates against the backdrop of a broad literary corpus that produces the well-worn dullness that calls for estrangement (Lesic-Thomas 2005, 8) (see Erik Martin's chapter on *ostranenie* and Igor Pilshchikov's chapter on Russian formalism in this volume). The same holds for the other artistic devices identified by the formalists and their interactions whose functions can only be determined in relation to their use in earlier texts. Hence even in early formalism, all texts are connected to each other by devices and thereby form a web clearly resembling Kristeva's textual universe. An even more obvious similarity, however, can be seen in the theoretical intersections with the stage of development Aage Hansen-Löve (1978) calls the pragmatic phase, in which the formalists turn their attention to literary history, the concept of literary evolution and so-called extra-literary series or cultural systems such as everyday life (Lesic-Thomas 2005, 10–13). Iurii Tynianov's essay "O literaturnoi ėvoliutsii" (1927, "On Literary Evolution", 2019), which also features in Todorov's anthology ("De l'évolution littéraire", Tynianov 1965), combines these three elements in almost ideal-typical fashion, thereby appearing to anticipate Kristeva, as Lešić-Thomas (2005, 11) illustrates by pointing to the following passage:

> I use the term constructive *function* (of a given element) to refer to the interdependence of each element of a literary work (a system) with its other elements and, it follows, with the system as a whole. [...] A given element is simultaneously interrelated with a number of similar elements in other works/systems, and even other series; as well as with other elements in its own system. (Tynianov 2019, 269–270)

Tynianov describes the text as a system of elements that refer not only to each other (intratextually) but also (intertextually) to the ways they are used in other literary texts and non-literary systems; in this reading, literature is a framework decoupled from authorship, subjectivity and intention that like Kristeva's textual universe autonomously evolves via permanent recombination in interaction with other arts, everyday life, history and society, with which it is connected by language. For Tynianov, the intrinsic analysis of an individual work is impossible, as is the examination of an individual element of the work in isolation – function and meaning can only be understood in relation to the system as a whole. Accordingly, literary influences are not primarily produced by one author's direct impact on another but by virtue of their belonging to the same system.

From a purely literary-theoretical perspective, Kristeva is much closer to later formalism than to Bakhtin, from whom she rather borrows the utopian-revolutionary idea and the associated pathos (Lesic-Thomas 2005, 17). Her conceptualisation of intertextuality quite incidentally reflects the collective efforts of the central exponents of Russian literary theory of the 1920s, which she updates in her new theoretical, historical and cultural surroundings.

3 The Soviet line of development

As with all efforts to determine the origin of anything, in the case of intertextuality we also encounter the difficulty that, in accordance with its own theory, it has multiplied. The widespread myth of its genesis from a wild, explosive French *creatio ex nihilo* in the 1960s (inspired a little by a Bakhtin occasionally glorified as the keeper of exotic 'Eastern' knowledge) does not reflect the truth of the matter, or at least not entirely. Another beginning to the story could be sought in several Eastern European schools of thought of the 1920s, whose ideas were later taken up in different ways as a kind of proto-intertextuality in various cultural, intellectual and theoretical contexts. (And of course these efforts are by no means original but can be traced back to fragments of thought from previous centuries.)

Elaine Rusinko (1979) was probably one of the first scholars in the West to identify the foundations of the theory in Russia and Prague – that is, in formalism, the Bakhtin School and Prague structuralism – and, on this basis, to trace its

specific Soviet development that took place at the same time as the developments in France. Its protagonists are a series of scholars belonging to or close to the Tartu–Moscow Semiotic School as well as the two Russian studies scholars then working in the USA and Israel, Kiril Taranovsky and his pupil Omry Ronen, both of whom had lived, studied and taught in various countries in Eastern and Central Europe before migrating to the West.

The key terms in this line are 'context' and 'subtext', which like 'intertext' cannot be defined uniformly and definitively but can at least be given a rough outline. The term 'context' is informed by its formalist usage and means that every text is surrounded by higher-order contexts that shape its meaning or constitute it in the first place: an author's text stands in the context of his oeuvre, which is situated in the context of the epoch, which itself must be seen in the context of literature as a whole, and so on (Rusinko 1979, 216–220). 'Subtext', on the other hand, is the repetition and reflection of one or several texts in another. The act of revealing these quotations and examining the different meanings and functions was at the heart of the theoretical work exemplified by the essay "Russkaia semanticheskaia poėtika kak potencial'naia kul'turnaia paradigma" (1974, "Russian Semantic Poetics as a Potential Cultural Paradigm"). This study written by the important subtext theorists Iurii Levin, Roman Timenchik, Vladimir Toporov, Tat'iana Tsiv'ian and Dmitrii Segal, focuses *inter alia* on the reciprocal citation, allusion, mirroring, responses and dialogues in the Acmeist poems of Osip Mandel'shtam and Anna Akhmatova (Levin et al. 1974, 70).

The essay is also paradigmatic in that like all studies of subtext and context it is almost entirely devoted to the textual universe of Acmeism, which could only be explored under the conditions of the Khrushchev Thaw. Just as the French found orientation in the *nouveau roman*, the basis and motivation for the Russian (studies) theorists was a 'new' literature permeated by extreme sub- or intertextuality and demanding new analytical methods. Conversely, such interest was virtually prefigured by the Acmeists' extensive reflection on their own writing and the remarkable intersections – which had only just been discovered – between their concepts of the word and language and Bakhtin's concept of dialogism.

This orientation around a literary movement that was yet to be explored is the common denominator between East and West. (Incidentally, this probably holds for every theory of intertextuality: each approach at least implicitly envisages certain literary formations, that is, the oeuvre of an author, a literary movement or even an epoch, each of which display their own concept of intertextuality.) The aims are very different, however: whereas in France the focus was on the demolition of the traditional canon and the subversion of the old values, Acmeism and the theories rooted in it sought to preserve (a threatened) culture; whereas the French theory and practice of intertextuality had strong political implications, the

Soviet thinkers principally limited themselves to the world of texts, for obvious reasons; after all, in the West the focus was on (uninhibited) reception, whereas the Soviet theorists tended to concentrate on intertextuality in literary production (Rusinko 1979, 230–233). And although the Russian search for subtexts also allowed a certain freedom, the focus was primarily on 'intentional' and provable quotations and their typological categorisation, certainly with an awareness of the risks of an associative arbitrariness and the resulting dissipation of meaning.

Although these considerations did not have a direct impact on the debate concerning the concept of intertextuality, they did have an indirect influence, firstly via the broad reception of Iurii Lotman (1978 [1969], 1994 [1981]) and secondly via Western Russian studies and Slavonic studies, whose ideas on intertextuality were oriented *inter alia* around Acmeism (for instance Taranovsky 1976; Ronen 1983; Lachmann 1997, 243–261).

4 After Kristeva: France, the USA, Germany

Let us return to France. Along with the countless aspects deserving of discussion and criticism, Kristeva's approach has one crucial problem which lies in its claim of universality. The price of provocative radicality is a discursive cul-de-sac, for in this unlimited form intertextuality is of no practical use either for literature studies or for further theoretical observations. If everything is a text and every text is to the same degree the product of an undifferentiated intertextuality that excludes human subjects, then there isn't much more to say about it.

Loosely speaking, all further approaches are different attempts to render productive a theory which is revolutionary in terms of its potential not only for innovation but also for destruction. That is, they sought to rehabilitate the author in some way, to limit the concept of the text somewhat and to capture the dissipated meaning, but especially to make the theory applicable via differentiation and conceptual work. To put it another way, it was all about restoring the communication system of the literary text, charting the undifferentiated textual universe that endlessly generates texts via collages of citation, and filtering out and systematising different manifestations of intertextuality, including its intersections with other discourses, without falling short of Kristeva's findings.

The most prominent of the early efforts, if we ignore the Soviet developments, are probably located in three countries: first in France and the USA, in the 1970s, and later in Germany. In France, along with numerous works by the poststructuralists and deconstructionists, 1976 saw the publication of the twenty-seventh issue of *Poétique*, entitled *Intertextualités*, including Laurent Jenny's

"La stratégie de la forme" ("The Strategy of Form", 1982) and Lucien Dällenbach's "Intertexte et autotexte" ("Intertext and Autotext"). Two years later, in the USA, the oft-cited edited volume of the New York Literary Forum, *Intertextuality: New Perspectives in Criticism* (Plottel and Charney 1978), was published, a volume which, despite its title, is less devoted to theorical questions than to practical analyses of French literature that often threaten to revert to old-fashioned searches for influences. More important studies are, for instance, Harold Bloom's psychoanalytical theory of the *Anxiety of Influence* (1973), which he constantly develops from 1973 onwards, Jonathan Culler's essay "Presupposition and Intertextuality" (1976), in which he seeks to give the concept a linguistic foundation, Thaïs E. Morgan's concise survey of the development of theory (1985) and the writings of Michael Riffaterre, who, oscillating intellectually, linguistically and geographically between France, the USA and Canada around 1980, develops a concept (Riffaterre 1978, 1979, 1981, 1983a, 1983b) that is succinctly outlined in his thoughts on intertextual "syllepsis" (Riffaterre 1980) (see Renate Lachmann's chapter on "The Migration of Concepts", especially the subchapter "Dialogism and Intertextuality", in this volume).

In the 1980s, the theory also reaches Germany, with a slight delay, in the form of several pioneering conference proceedings, including Renate Lachmann's *Dialogizität* (1982a, *Dialogism*), Wolf Schmid and Wolf-Dieter Stempel's *Dialog der Texte* (1983, *Dialogue of the Texts*) and Karlheinz Stierle and Rainer Warning's *Das Gespräch* (1996 [1984], *The Conversation*). The collections are linked by their main contributors, foremost Renate Lachmann, but above all by the fact that their ideas are not exclusively based on French approaches but are also rooted in the early Soviet tradition, which is certainly due to the strong influence of Slavonic studies. Besides Bakhtin's writings, which are evoked in the titles, the papers also consider Russian formalism, Aleksandr "Potebnja's Concept of Image" (Lachmann 1982c, 1982d) and elements of Prague structuralism. A somewhat different but no less important compilation from Germany is *Intertextualität: Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien* (1985a, *Intertextuality: Forms, Functions, Case Studies in English Literature*) by Ulrich Broich and Manfred Pfister, to which we shall return later.

In the late 1980s, the theory then disperses in all directions and into all its related discourses; the meritorious but by no means exhaustive bibliography by the German American studies scholar Udo Hebel, *Intertextuality, Allusion, and Quotation*, from 1989 alone contains over 2,000 entries, most of which were published between 1965 and 1989. This period also saw the proliferation of articles for surveys and handbooks (Morgan 1985; Schahadat 1995), monographs (Allen 2000; Orr 2003) and edited volumes (Worton and Still 1990; Clayton and Rothstein 1991; Plett 1991a) which in their myriad ways systematise the theory, test

it on various texts and also historicise it. The problem with the better-known of these contributions (that is, those written in English) is that they foreground the American theoretical canon for pragmatic reasons and the French for theoretical-historical reasons; for instance, as late as 2001 Tiphaine Samoyault exclusively cites French authors (cf. Samoyault 2001). The Russian pretexts, on the other hand, usually receive marginal treatment, the German ideas are often overlooked, and the Soviet developments from the 1960s onwards are neglected entirely. Even Mary Orr (2003, 6–13), who bemoans this situation in the introduction to her studies, herself largely follows the usual pattern. As is so often the case, latent conceit, insufficient language skills and a lack of translations are obstacles to reception.

5 Tendencies of intertextuality from 1985 to the present day

By the second half of the 1980s at the latest, it is no longer possible to trace the naturally complex and increasingly differentiated lines of development. Histories of theory that nevertheless attempt to do so tend to be selective in focusing on their authors' personal preferences and interests (and the final section of this subchapter is no exception). Overall, drawing on Renate Lachmann (1990, 56–57; transl. by J. H.) we can observe three central trends that have always polemicised and competed while by no means factually contradicting each other; rather, they examine the phenomenon from three different "perspectives": from (1) a "text-theoretical" and (2) a "text-descriptive" perspective and (3) a "critical perspective on literature and culture" that is rooted in intertextuality (for a similar classification, see: Lachmann 1982b, 8). We can add a further perspective (4) extending to synthetic or hybrid concepts of intertextuality that seek intersections between intertextuality and other theoretical discourses without explicit political aims.

(1) The *text-theoretical* or *textontological* current includes the writings of Kristeva and related theories advanced by poststructuralism, such as the ideas of Roland Barthes (1974, 1975, 1986), especially his seminal essay "La mort de l'auteur" (1968, "The Death of the Author", 1977 [1967]), Jenny's "The Strategy of Form" and the studies by Derrida (e. g. *De la grammatologie*, 1967, *Of Grammatology*, 1976). These approaches are less concerned with their application to specific questions of literary studies than with the fundamental ontological definition of the term 'text' and hence meaning and authorship from the perspective of a universal (inter)textuality. The (inter)text, in which they also include history, culture and society, is radically opened up as a mosaic, echo chamber and fabric (Barthes)

or as a rhizomatic mesh (Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari) of other texts. In addition to several problems with the details, concisely discussed in an early response by Karlheinz Stierle (1983), a central criticism must be that the textual universe of these broad approaches ultimately threatens to become a mere slurry of words isolated from the human context throwing up arbitrary text bubbles that are then lost in its mass.

(2) The *text-descriptive* or *text-analytical* perspective, which comes later in the theory's formation, involves 'narrow' theories that tend to belong to the structuralist tradition and attempt to bring intertextuality back to literature by developing terms, typologies and systematics with which the phenomenon can be differentiated "as a specific way of constituting literary sense" (Preisendanz 1982, 26; transl. by J. H.) in terms of intensity, quality and quantity. Along with several monographs by Gérard Genette – *Introduction à l'architexte* (1979, *The Architext*, 1992), *Palimpsestes: La Littérature au second degré* (1982, *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*, 1997a) and *Seuils* (1987, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, 1997b) – an important contribution is Ulrich Broich and Manfred Pfister's edited volume *Intertextuality* (1985a), especially the two introductory essays by the editors. The first provides, in addition to a brief history of theory, different scales for measuring the intensity of intertextuality in specific texts (Pfister 1985a); the second seeks to establish a taxonomy of the different intertextual markers (Broich 1985a). However, their differentiation between the single-text and the system reference (*Einzeltext- und Systemreferenz*) proved particularly persistent (Broich 1985b; Pfister 1985b); by systems, they mean groups of texts connected by a genre, motif, myth, etc. This distinction would play a crucial role in Irina Rajewsky's (2002) influential typology of the forms of intermediality, for instance.

As meritorious as these efforts to terminologically tame intertextuality are, and as much they make us more attuned to its various facets, they have largely proved unwieldy. Of course, the phenomenon's indeterminable nature and its ambivalence also hold for its definition, and hence all attempts to establish final and comprehensive clarity or indeed a closed system are doomed to failure from the outset. The best example of this is the rampant and exuberant elaboration of terminology presented by Genette in his *Palimpsest*, where he distorts a solid basic foundation consisting of five terms with so many differentiations, additions and supplements that he ends by offering ironic qualification of his own zeal (Genette 1997a, 394–400). These approaches also inevitably return the problem of authorial intent to the debate, which can sometimes certainly be objectively proven, but in most cases can only remain the subject of speculation. The key question of the phenomenon's universality implicitly posed by Bakhtin and Kristeva is manifested in the binary differentiation of the theories as 'broad' and 'narrow' (Broich and Pfister 1985b, X) or the corresponding categorisation of their

authors as "the progressives and the traditionalists" (Plett 1991b, 3) as a dilemma of universal arbitrariness and psychologistic intentionalism.

(3) The third perspective, criticism of literature and culture that is rooted in intertextuality, which goes some way to resolving this binary tendency to form camps, emphasises the theory's potential to criticise authority, a potential which is already clearly evident in Bakhtin and Kristeva and which "questions the previously accepted concepts of literature" (Lachmann 1997, 29). Theoretical movements with a socio-political thrust, particularly gender studies (e.g. Ecker 1985; Gutenberg 1999), postcolonial studies (e.g. Allen 2000, 159–173; Gymnich 2006) and the literary authors close to them, use both the narrow, analytical and the broad, text-theoretical variety of intertextuality in the sense of a counter-discursive 'writing back' (Ashcroft et al. 2002) as a strategy for the production and reception of literature in order to oppose conservative ideas of an authoritative, closed and exclusive canon consisting mainly of works by European, white, heterosexual men and 'serious' high culture (see the many early contributions in Worton and Still 1990; Clayton and Rothstein 1991). The univocal, monological voice of power expressed in literature, in plot patterns and images of the Other, for instance, is doubled and qualified by formerly oppressed counter-voices, as in Bakhtin, and its unlimited validity is thereby deconstructed. This re-evaluation necessarily demands the return of the author, albeit in an entirely different fashion – that is, not so much as the administrator of meaning than as a political actor and bearer of a certain gender, sexual, cultural or other kind of identity.

Equivocality, ambivalence, polyphony, open-endedness and equality, integral aspects of the concept of intertextuality, are used to confront ideas of society and the world oriented around absoluteness, monologism and hierarchy. In the slipstream of these theoretical movements, which today hardly leave any discourses in the globalised world untouched – including those, of course, that reject them – the concept of intertextuality has been disseminated globally, although this has necessarily caused it to become somewhat blurred.

(4) Closely related to this third group are those synthetic or hybrid concepts of intertextuality that without explicit political aims and quite undogmatically adopt both textontological and analytical perspectives and search for intersections with other theoretical movements and questions of interest to cultural studies. A predecessor can be identified in, for instance, Harold Bloom's idiosyncratic concept of *The Anxiety of Influence* (1973), which understands every poem as the result of an oedipal conflict – that is, a psychohygienic misreading and writing against a powerful poetic father figure and his text. Bloom links this psychoanalytical figure of thought with rhetorical terms and the Cabbala to create a slightly esoteric concept oscillating between poststructuralism and conservative cultural criticism in the spirit of the outdated search for a writer's influences. On the one hand, for

Bloom a text's meaning is only produced by reading other texts – and sometimes the text disintegrates entirely into connections between texts (Bloom 1975 [1973], 3) – while on the other hand he poses as the curator of the traditional Western canon, primarily examining works by white Americans and Europeans.

With the exception of this curiosity, these decidedly synthetic concepts are, like their political counterparts, probably the most recent and also the most productive: they include thoughts on the relationship between intertextuality and translation (Venuti 2009), Elisabeth Bronfen's intermedia *Crossmappings* (2018 [2009]) inspired by Aby Warburg's *Mnemosyne* picture atlas (1924–1929), the concept's development for the didactics of writing (D'Angelo 2010), textbooks for students (Berndt and Tonger-Erk 2013) and, not least, Renate Lachmann's own study on *Gedächtnis und Literatur: Intertextualität in der russischen Moderne* (1990, *Memory and Literature: Intertextuality in Russian Modernism*, 1997), which probes the connection between intertextuality and memory from all three of the perspectives she identifies. Studies on the internet as a hypertext (Orr 2003, 49–57), on intermediality, interculturality and other discourses 'in between', which have become especially virulent in recent decades, can be placed in this group. To take this a step further, we could also include such theories that either implicitly entail a theory of intertextuality and/or something resembling one in certain central figures of thought, such as Lotman's *semiosphere* and Itamar Even-Zohar's polysystem theory – which, like Kristeva, evokes Bakhtin and the formalists – or Claude Lévi-Strauss's *bricolage*, which served as one of the inspirations for Genette's theory (1997a, 398–399) along with Borges, Philippe Lejeune, Jakobson and Barthes. As in the search for intertexts, here too it is important to avoid becoming lost in arbitrary associations when looking for related theories.

Of course, the first two perspectives never appeared in pure form either. Almost every theory of intertextuality contains elements of all four tendencies, one or two of which always dominate. Kristeva's broad approach was already a synthesis (of semiotics, mathematics, psychoanalysis, philosophy, etc.), an outright criticism of traditional ideas of literature and culture, and also contained a typology of intertextual forms which is admittedly rather arbitrary and hence not particularly convincing (Kristeva 1980b, 76–88). The latter element can also be observed in rudimentary form in Bakhtin (1984, 185–199), when he establishes, in a sense, the genre of typological ideas on intertextuality that are neither general nor differentiated enough to be practicable in any way (Jenny 1982, 50–59; Stierle 1983, 18–21), traces of which can still be found in Genette. (Like the unbridled terminological proliferation that otherwise begins very early in relation to the field of intertextuality [Mai 1991, 30–31; Lachmann 1997, 28], here we see the ancient yearning for an [original] terminological understanding and measurement of the intangible and infinite, which, incidentally, also satisfies quite profane needs to create order and

receive recognition.) Conversely, the narrow theories also ask more far-reaching or more fundamental questions beyond their taxonomy and attempts at categorisation, and the more liberal among them certainly do not necessarily question the fact that intertextuality is a universal phenomenon (Pfister 1985a, 11–20) inherent to any text by virtue of its very textuality (Pfister 1985b, 53–54).

6 The present situation: an over-used concept, and a plea

Intertextuality is at once both a migrating theory and a theory of the migration of words, texts and ideas. Julia Kristeva's productive (mis)reading of Bakhtin and formalism has led, quite in line with her theory, to what is now a vast jungle of texts that has spread into all forms of media and discourses. The term's plasticity resulting from its intangibility has resulted in a rapid dissemination at the price of inflationary usage and a loss of precision. Today, even some literary scholars are happy to elevate a mere quotation to an instance of intertextuality. This overstretching of the term is, however, a relapse into influence studies, as Pfister complained with reference to Kristeva's criticism as early as 1985 (Pfister 1985a, 10).

A very general definition of intertextuality in which all today's theoretical approaches can find consensus, albeit reluctantly, describes it as "one text's relation to another" (Broich 2000, 175; transl. by J. H.). It is questionable, however, whether such a broad and watered-down definition of the concept is useful. The insight that texts are simply related is as old as the concept of the text itself. The same holds for an awareness that no text is produced in a text-free vacuum and that no text can be received from this vacuum, that both writing and reading presuppose familiarity with other texts. This connection was theorised, at the very latest, in classical rhetoric; the idea of imitating predecessors (*imitatio veterum*) and surpassing them (*aemulatio*) introduced fundamental concepts of production aesthetics that only began to lose their value as marks of quality with the rise of the cult of the genius. Plato, Aristotle, Horace, Longinus, Cicero und Quintilian can thus be considered the proto-theorists or prefigurers of intertextuality (Still and Worton 1990, 2–8). And it is also in antiquity that we must observe the genres defined by their relation to other texts, above all the most renowned: *parody* (a term that appears in almost all of the typologies of intertextuality). The vapid definition of intertextuality as one text's reference to another thus only makes sense if we regard literature through the aesthetics of genius, which subscribes to the (naive) ideal of original creation. It is only from this perspective, which no one

would seriously adopt today, that recognition of the fact that one text is related to another is in any way remarkable.

Intertextuality only makes sense as an independent term if its definition focuses not merely on 'one text's relation to others' but on the excess of meaning, the "semantic surplus value" (Lachmann 1997, 18), produced by this relationship and hence between the texts. If we look beyond the boundaries of the individual text into this space in between, the space in which the text encounters other texts with their social, cultural, historical and aesthetic contexts, it becomes clear that the elements of form and content from which it is made have already been used before and bear traces of other meanings. In this intertextual in-between, then, there develops a specific kind of equivocality, and hence a vagueness resulting in a semantic multilayeredness which in turn increases the semantic intricacy of the individual text. Whether or not this specific intertextual equivocality applies to all of the text's elements – and the extent of its scope – is the crucial point of all theories of intertextuality. Every conception that falls short of this fundamental assumption ultimately risks relapsing into the patterns of traditional studies of influence, which in its most banal form exhausts itself in the search for 'sources' from which lineages of 'great' authors are constructed – and the concept of intertextuality is too unwieldy and above all too sophisticated for this idle undertaking.

Translated by John Heath

References

Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures*. 2nd edition. London and New York, NY: Routledge, 2002.

Allen, Graham. *Intertextuality (The New Critical Idiom)*. London and New York, NY: Routledge, 2000.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Trans. by Caryl Emerson. Introduction by Wayne C. Booth. Minneapolis, MN, and London: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.

Barthes, Roland. *S/Z* [1970]. Trans. by Richard Miller. New York, NY: Hill and Wang, 1974.

Barthes, Roland. "The Death of the Author." [1967] Roland Barthes, *Image Music Text*. Trans. by Stephen Heath. London: Fontana Press, 1977. 142–148.

Barthes, Roland. *The Pleasure of Text* [1973]. Trans. by Richard Miller. New York, NY: Hill and Wang, 1975.

Barthes, Roland. "From Work to Text." [1971] Roland Barthes, *The Rustle of Language*. Trans. by Richard Howard. New York, NY: Hill and Wang, 1986. 56–64.

Berndt, Frauke, and Lily Tonger-Erk. *Intertextualität: Eine Einführung*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag, 2013.

Bloom, Harold. *A Map of Misreading* [1973]. New York, NY, and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Bloom, Harold. *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*. New York, NY, and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973.

Broich, Ulrich. "Formen der Markierung von Intertextualität." *Intertextualität: Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien*. Eds. Ulrich Broich and Manfred Pfister. Tübingen: De Gruyter, 1985a. 31–47.

Broich, Ulrich. "Zur Einzeltextreferenz." *Intertextualität: Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien*. Eds. Ulrich Broich and Manfred Pfister. Tübingen: De Gruyter, 1985b. 48–52.

Broich, Ulrich and Manfred Pfister (eds.). *Intertextualität: Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien*. Tübingen: De Gruyter, 1985a.

Broich, Ulrich and Manfred Pfister. "Vorwort." *Intertextualität: Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien*. Eds. Ulrich Broich and Manfred Pfister. Tübingen: De Gruyter, 1985b. IX–XII.

Broich, Ulrich. "Intertextualität." *Reallexikon der deutschen Literaturwissenschaft: Neubearbeitung des Reallexikons der deutschen Literaturgeschichte*. Vol. 2. Eds. Harald Fricke et al. Berlin and New York, NY: De Gruyter, 2000. 175–179.

Bronfen, Elisabeth. *Crossmappings: On Visual Culture* [2009]. London and New York, NY: I.B. Tauris, 2018.

Clayton, Jay and Eric Rothstein (eds.). *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991.

Culler, Jonathan. "Presupposition and Intertextuality." *Modern Language Notes* 91.6 (1976): 1380–1396.

D'Angelo, Frank J. "The Rhetoric of Intertextuality." *Rhetoric Review* 29.1 (2010): 31–47.

Ecker, Gisela. "'A Map for Re-Reading': Intertextualität aus der Perspektive einer feministischen Literaturwissenschaft." *Intertextualität: Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien*. Eds. Ulrich Broich and Martin Pfister. Tübingen: De Gruyter, 1985. 297–310.

Genette, Gérard. *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree* [1982]. Trans. by Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1997a.

Genette, Gérard. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation* [1987]. Trans. by Jane E. Lewin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997b.

Genette, Gérard. *The Architext: An Introduction* [1979]. Trans. by Jane E. Lewin. Berkeley, Los Angeles, CA, and Oxford: University of California Press, 1992.

Gutenberg, Andrea. "Schielender Blick, double-voiced discourse und Dialogizität: Zum Dopplungskonzept in der feministischen Literaturwissenschaft." *Gender – Culture – Poetics: Zur Geschlechterforschung in der Literatur- und Kulturwissenschaft. Festschrift für Natascha Würzbach*. Eds. Andrea Gutenberg and Ralf Schneider. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 1999. 249–276.

Gymnich, Marion. "'Writing back' als Paradigma der postkolonialen Literatur." *Kulturelles Wissen und Intertextualität: Theoriekonzeptionen und Fallstudien zur Kontextualisierung von Literatur*. Ed. Marion Gymnich. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 2006. 71–86.

Hansen-Löve, Aage. *Der russische Formalismus: Methodologische Rekonstruktion seiner Entwicklung aus dem Prinzip der Verfremdung*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1978.

Hebel, Udo. *Intertextuality, Allusion, and Quotation*. New York, NY, Westport, CT, and London: Greenwood Press, 1989.

Jenny, Laurent. "The strategy of form." [1976] *French Literary Theory Today: A Reader*. Ed. Tzvetan Todorov. Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 1982. 34–63.

Kristeva, Julia. "The Bounded Text." *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. Ed. Leon S. Roudiez. Trans. by Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, and Leon S. Roudiez. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1980a. 36–63.

Kristeva, Julia. "Word, Dialogue, and Novel." *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. Ed. Leon S. Roudiez. Trans. by Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, and Leon S. Roudiez. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1980b. 64–91.

Lachmann, Renate (ed.): *Dialogizität*. Munich: Fink, 1982a.

Lachmann, Renate. "Vorwort." *Dialogizität*. Ed. Renate Lachmann. Munich: Fink, 1982b. 8–10.

Lachmann, Renate. "Der Potebnjasche Bildbegriff als Beitrag zu einer Theorie der ästhetischen Kommunikation. (Zur Vorgeschichte der Bachtinschen 'Dialogizität')." *Dialogizität*. Ed. Renate Lachmann. Munich: Fink, 1982c. 29–50.

Lachmann, Renate. "Potebnja's Concept of Image." *The Structure of the Literary Process Studies dedicated to the Memory of Felix Vodička*. Eds. Peter Steiner, Miroslav Červenka, and Ronald Vroon. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1982d. 297–319.

Lachmann, Renate. *Gedächtnis und Literatur: Intertextualität in der russischen Moderne*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1990.

Lachmann, Renate. *Memory and Literature: Intertextuality in Russian Modernism*. Trans. by Roy Stellaris and Anthony Will. Minneapolis, MN, and London: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.

Lesic-Thomas, Andrea (2005). "Behind Bakhtin: Russian Formalism and Kristeva's Intertextuality." *Paragraph* 28.3 (2005): 1–20.

Levin, Iurii, Dmitrii Segal, Roman Timenchik, Vladimir Toporov, and Tat'iana Tsiv'ian. "Russkaia semanticheskaia poètika kak potencial'naia kul'turnaia paradigma." *Russian Literature* 7/8 (1974): 48–82.

Lotman, Iurii [Yury]. "Language and Reality in the Early Pasternak." [1969] *Pasternak: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. Victor Erlich. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1978. 21–31.

Lotman, Iurii [Yuri]. "The Text within the Text." [1981] *PMLA* 109.3 (1994): 377–384.

Mai, Hans-Peter. "Bypassing Intertextuality: Hermeneutics, Textual Practice, Hypertext." *Intertextuality*. Ed. Heinrich Plett. Berlin and New York, NY: De Gruyter, 1991. 30–59.

Morgan, Thaïs E. "Is There an Intertext in This Text? Literary and Interdisciplinary Approaches to Intertextuality." *The American Journal of Semiotics* 3.4 (1985): 1–40.

Orr, Mary. *Intertextuality: Debates and Contexts*. Cambridge: Polity, 2003.

Pfister, Manfred. "Konzepte der Intertextualität." *Intertextualität: Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien*. Eds. Ulrich Broich and Manfred Pfister. Tübingen: De Gruyter, 1985a. 1–30.

Pfister, Manfred. "Zur Systemrefenz." *Intertextualität: Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien*. Eds. Ulrich Broich and Manfred Pfister. Tübingen: De Gruyter, 1985b. 52–58.

Plett, Heinrich F. (ed.). *Intertextuality*. Berlin and New York, NY: De Gruyter, 1991a.

Plett, Heinrich F. "Intertextualities." *Intertextuality*. Ed. Heinrich F. Plett. Berlin and New York, NY: De Gruyter, 1991b. 3–30.

Plottel, Jeanine Parisier, and Hanna Kurz Charney (eds.). *Intertextuality: New Perspectives in Criticism*. New York, NY: New York Literary Forum, 1978.

Preisendanz, Wolfgang. "Zum Beitrag von R. Lachmann 'Dialogizität und poetische Sprache'." *Dialogizität*. Ed. Renate Lachmann. Munich: Fink, 1982. 25–28.

Rajewsky, Irina O. *Intermedialität*. Tübingen and Basel: A. Francke, 2002.

Riffaterre, Michael. *Semiotics of Poetry*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1978.

Riffaterre, Michael. "Sémiotique intertextuelle: l'interprétant in Rhétoriques." *Revue d'Esthétique* 1–2 (1979): 128–150.

Riffaterre, Michael. "Syllepsis." *Critical Inquiry* 6.4 (1980): 625–638.

Riffaterre, Michael. "Interpretation and Undecidability." *New Literary History* 12.2 (1981): 227–242.

Riffaterre, Michael. *Text Production* [1979]. Trans. by Teres Lyons. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1983a.

Riffaterre, Michael. "Production de roman: l'intertexte du *Lys dans la vallée*." *Texte: revue de critique et de théorie littéraire* (*L'intertextualité. Intertexte, autotexte, intratexte*) 2 (1983): 23–33.

Ronen, Omry. *Approach to Mandel'štam*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1983.

Rusinko, Elaine. "The Soviet Approach to Subtext." *Dispositio* 4.11/12 (1979): 213–235.

Samoyault, Tiphaine. *L'Intertextualité, Mémoire de la littérature*. Paris: Éditions Nathan, 2001.

Schahadat, Schamma. "Intertextualität: Lektüre – Text – Intertext." *Einführung in die Literaturwissenschaft*. Eds. Miltos Pechlivanos, Stefan Rieger, Wolfgang Struck, and Michael Weitz. Stuttgart and Weimar: Metzler, 1995. 366–377.

Schmid, Wolf and Wolf-Dieter Stempel (eds.). *Dialog der Texte: Hamburger Kolloquium zur Intertextualität*. Vienna: Gesellschaft zur Förderung slavistischer Studien, 1983.

Stierle, Karlheinz. "Werk und Intertextualität." *Dialog der Texte: Hamburger Kolloquium zur Intertextualität*. Eds. Wolf Schmid and Wolf-Dieter Stempel. Vienna: Gesellschaft zur Förderung slavistischer Studien, 1983. 7–26.

Stierle, Karlheinz, and Rainer Warning (eds.). *Das Gespräch* [1984]. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1996. http://nbn-resolving.de/urn/resolver.pl?urn=urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb00042996-3 (3 February 2022).

Still, Judith, and Michael Worton. "Introduction." *Intertextuality: Theories and Practices*. Eds. Michael Worton and Judith Still. Manchester and New York, NY: Manchester University Press, 1990. 1–44.

Taranovsky, Kiril. *Essays on Mandel'štam*: *Harvard Slavic Studies*. Vol. 6. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1976.

Tynianov, Iurii [J.]. "De l'évolution littéraire." *Théorie de la littérature: textes des formalistes russes*. Ed. and trans. by Tzvetan Todorov. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1965. 120–137.

Tynianov, Iurii [Yuri]. "On Literary Evolution." Yuri Tynianov, *Permanent Evolution: Selected Essays on Literature, Theory and Film*. Ed. and trans. by Ainsley Morse and Philip Redko. Boston, MA: Academic Studies Press, 2019. 262–277.

Venuti, Lawrence. "Translation, Intertextuality, Interpretation." *Romance Studies* 27.3 (2009): 157–173.

Worton, Michael, and Judith Still (eds.). *Intertextuality: Theories and Practices*. Manchester and New York, NY: Manchester University Press, 1990.

II Formations of Literary Theory: Schools and Institutions, Concepts and Methods

II.1 Institutions of Interdisciplinary Research from the 1910s until the 1930s

Michał Mrugalski
Journal and Society of Aesthetics and the General Science of Art

1 General Historical Information

The *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* (*The Journal of Aesthetics and the General Science of Art*, henceforth *Journal*) has appeared since 1906, when it was founded by Berlin-based philosopher and physician Max Dessoir (1867–1947), who published a book with a similar title the same year: *Ästhetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft in den Grundzügen dargestellt* (*An Outline of Aesthetics and the General Science of Art*). Dessoir headed the editorial board until volume 37 (1943). A vibrant network of students of art and literature with many different branches sprang up around Dessoir and the *Journal*, the first scientific congress of Aesthetics and General Science of Art was held in October 1913 and in 1925 a Society with the same name was officially registered in Berlin. (A special issue of the *Journal* was devoted to the history of the congresses of 1913–1937 in 2016, vol. 61, no. 2). Its members included such researchers, thinkers, and artists as Benedetto Croce, Ernst Cassirer, Viking Eggeling, Rudolf von Laban, Richard Müller-Freienfels, and Emil Utitz. In the post-war period, the *Journal* resumed under the direction of Heinrich Lützeler before morphing into the *Jahrbuch für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* (*Yearbook of Aesthetics and General Science of Art*) in the period from 1951–1965. Subsequent editors-in-chief were, in recent years, Maria Moog-Grünewald, Josef Früchtl, and Philipp Theisohn. Of interest for the reader of the present volume is the first phase of the *Journal*'s history (spanning the first two decades of the twentieth century), since, as the hub of modernist research on art and subsequently an organ of the mighty Society for Aesthetics and the General Science of Art, it presented innovative and yet generally accepted views of the European scientific community. The content of the articles published in the *Journal* enables assessment of the innovativeness of the emerging literary theory in Eastern and Central Europe, with its special focus on formalism and phenomenology, as they convey the intellectual climate, background, and standard toolbox of the era's philosophy of art as well as literary and art studies. This chapter presents, of course, the wisdom of hindsight, since it took the geniuses of the Formalists, the Phenomenologists and, later, the Structuralists to bring about the synergy, as an effect of which the fragments of theory scattered around different issues of the *Journal* unified and solidified into literary theory in its various, but related, forms.

Max Dessoir was born in Berlin, where he studied medicine, before moving to Würzburg, a bastion of the life sciences at the time. There, he took further medical training as well as his *Habilitation* in philosophy. An acclaimed orator and violinist with a penchant for parapsychology (Dessoir 1925), he was certainly a colorful and charismatic character (Ziegenfuß 1949, 231–232). Dessoir's training was an early indicator of the character of the aesthetics and the general science of art he would practice and endorse. Both disciplines are based on psychology and psychologically-informed philosophy; in this kind of psychologism, like Wilhelm Wundt's *Völkerpsychologie* (1900–1920, *Ethnopsychology*) and Theodor Lipps's *Ästhetik* (1903–1906, *Aesthetics*), the expressive body takes center stage: emotions and other ideas coincide with bodily states. While Wundt claims that the gestural performance of emotions triggered the emergence of language and art, Lipps opens the first issue of the *Journal* with a conception of "aesthetical mechanics" ("Zur '*ästhetischen Mechanik*'", 1906), a discipline dealing with aesthetically enjoyable movements and based on the assumption that free movement (comprising development) is the source of all aesthetic pleasure, while inhibitions cause discontentment. The preferred kind of psychologism was, then, an instance of the larger paradigm, which was also a starting point, albeit a negative one, for Formalist aesthetics (Shklovskii 2018c [1917]): aesthetic pleasure relates to expenditure of energy – both mental and physical (for example an eye tracing a line). It is of secondary importance whether one assumes, as Spencer or Avenarius or Lunacharskii did, that what causes aesthetic pleasure is saving energy or, conversely, its expenditure, as maintained by the Expressionist and Futurist avantgarde and its spokespersons in the Formalist movement.

Still, in the spirit of eclecticism, which Dessoir professed openly as a reaction to skepticism or agnosticism with regard to the object of aesthetics (Dessoir 1906, 6; Dessoir 1907), psychologistic aesthetics did not exhaust the scope of the positions presented. The pages of the *Journal* were graced by early attempts to apply phenomenological philosophy to aesthetics (Conrad 1908–1909; Geiger 1913; 1925; see also Patrick Flack's chapter on phenomenology in this volume) as well as György Lukács's *Theorie des Romans* (1916, *The Theory of the Novel*). The *Journal* also nurtured an ambition to provide insights into Eastern European thought, although no cutting-edge research was presented, with the exception of Poland's Julius (Juliusz) Tenner, whose lengthy study of the melodic features of verse (Tenner 1913) was state of the art. From Russia, a translation of the 1889 essay "Krasota v prirode" (1889, "Die Schönheit in der Natur", 1930, *Beauty in Nature*) by Vladimir Solov'ev was published alongside the essay "Der *Dichter im Sprachkunstwerk*" (1932, "The Poet in the Literary Work of Art"), penned by the forgotten student of aesthetics with an affinity to Mikhail Bakhtin, Boris Erofeev (1932). Another author from Poland, Stephanie (Stefania) Zahorska, endeavored to positively re-evaluate

Impressionism in 1929 (Zahorska 1929), which at the time was already 60 years old and all too well established in art history. Characteristic of the Journal's position towards the new developments in literary theory is Karel Svoboda's report on Czech aesthetics (Svoboda 1935), which makes no mention of the Prague Linguistic Circle, while Jan Mukařovský is listed as one of Otakar Zich's pupils.

In view of the purposeful eclecticism of Dessoir's enterprise, in this chapter I do not so much focus on particular articles and conceptions, but rather try to extract common features or themes running through different contributions representing various approaches. Instead of summarizing separate arguments, I handpick the recurring elements that would soon build up or were shaping Central and East European formalism and, subsequently, structuralism (I leave aside phenomenology, as a separate chapter is devoted to it). In the *Journal*, a constellation of motives rose that the formalists would strive to unify in a single scientific theory – whether to derive literary studies from the single principle of estrangement (Hansen-Löve 1978) or to define the "general phonetic principle of all poetic technique" (Polivanov 1963 [1930], 106 – the principle being "the principle of the return of phonetic representations") and the like. (Note the special circumstances in which Ėikhenbaum denied that formalism's ambition had ever been to create a unified theory, insisting instead that it dealt with specific problems, Ėikhenbaum 2001 [1926]; Ėikhenbaum was bent on dispelling the impression that formalism competes with Marxism, which certainly had pretensions to being a general theory.)

The formalists, and more so the structuralists, clearly endeavor to elaborate a scientific, consistent, unified method, while Dessoir claims that both the polymorphic nature of beauty and the work of art as well as the methods of both general science and aesthetics prompt skepticism and eclecticism (Dessoir 1907, 452–453). Different disciplines pertain to the general science of art, on the one hand, and to aesthetics on the other. The following quotation demonstrates Dessoir's understanding of the difference between the general science of art and aesthetics, while at the same time pointing to their respective entanglements with diverse disciplines, all ridden with their specific problems that instigate skepticism.

> Two groups of sciences offer us their help. The first group includes the sciences of literature, fine arts, and music, including the material accumulated by ethnology; in the second group, I count philosophy and psychology. The former sciences ensure that the works of all arts are preserved or restored in the purest possible form; they contextualize the works; they inform us about the life and work of the artists; they examine many facets of the artistic product's composition and illuminate the objective foundations of its impression. Of these problem fields, the last-mentioned is the most unsatisfying. Philologists and art scholars approach it from an historical, especially biographical perspective, instead of elucidating the structure [*Gefüge*] and the potent components it contains by impartial dissection. An exception is the somewhat highly developed metrics. (Dessoir 1907, 453)

The general science of art is thus supposed to describe and historically explain the formal basis of aesthetic experience, which for its part is explained with the help of (physiologized) psychology and philosophy.

A couple of cross-sections of the *Journal*'s corpus will now demonstrate the rootedness of emerging literary theory in the general discourse of aesthetics and the science of art.

2 Aesthetics vs. the General Science of Art

In keeping with its title, Dessoir's monograph on aesthetics and the general science of art comprises two principal sections. In Dessoir's approach, the two disciplines are at once inseparable and incongruent, which undoubtedly constitutes a central aspect of his eclecticism. The disciplines' respective scopes do not overlap, but merely intersect in art, the most basic definition of which is "the presentation of the beautiful" (Dessoir 1906, 4), the compound experience of beauty on the part of the creator and the perceiver being the object of aesthetics. However,

> the aesthetic factor does not exhaust the content and purpose of that field of human production that we collectively call "art". Every true work of art is extraordinarily composed according to specific motives and effects; it does not merely spring from aesthetic playfulness and does not insist only on aesthetic pleasure, let alone pure beauty. The needs and forces in which art exists are by no means exhausted with the quiet pleasure that, according to tradition, characterizes the aesthetic impression and the aesthetic object. In truth, the arts have a function in spiritual and social life through which they connect with our entire knowledge and desire. (Dessoir 1906, 4–5)

Just as art concerns all areas of human life (aesthetic, practical, and intellectual – to put it in the Kantian tradition, to which in this respect Dessoir belongs), beauty does not limit its purview to art, but occurs – and by no means marginally – in nature and society. The two parts of Dessoir's book bear different characters: whereas the general science of art deals with the genesis, the function, and the nature of works of art according to their material (the word, the body, space; on the general science of art see also Utitz 1922), the aesthetic focus comprises a history of the discipline, an overview of general categories and ruminations on the natures of the object and the impression, and finally a synopsis of common views as to the relationship between art and reality (quite predictably, a blend of subjectivism and objectivism satisfies the eclectic Dessoir most, cf. Dessoir 1906, 74–75). Aesthetics and the general science of art resemble "tunnel workers" (Dessoir 1906, 5) set to meet halfway inside a mountain. The attempts to synchronize the subjective

and the objective approaches would dominate the history of the movement in the first decades of the twentieth century (Collenberg-Plotnikov 2013).

The differentiation between technique and experience will be a consistent feature of East and Central European literary theory. The most obvious example is the doubling of the poetic in Jakobson's theory: poetic function as a technical and material-based procedure only coincides with poetry; the latter's dynamic essence relies rather on aesthetical presuppositions and attitudes (Jakobson 1981a [1933–1934]; Jakobson 1981b [1960]). The most persistent upshot of Dessoir's dichotomy would be, then, the distinction between artistic and aesthetic objects, which pertained to phenomenology, whence it spread to the program of the State Academy of Arts (Gosudarstvennaia Akademiia khudozhestevennykh nauk, GAKhN; until 1925 – Rossiiskaia (Russian) Akademiia khudozhestevennykh nauk, RAKhN) formulated by Gustav Shpet and Akim Kondrat'ev (see Nikolaj Plotnikov's chapter on GAKhN in this volume), according to whom the academy was supposed to work along the lines of aesthetics/general science, as well as to formalism, Central European structuralism, and reception theory. All these schools tried to pin down the relation between the aesthetic and the technical aspects of artworks, the problem assigned to future generations by Dessoir's watchword.

Broder Christiansen's theory of the differential qualities of the theologically constructed aesthetic object, which made a great impact on Shklovskii and other Formalists (Shklovskii 1929 [1919], 30–31), likewise depends on the distinction between the artifact and the aesthetic experience; Christiansen's *Philosophie der Kunst* (1909, *Philosophy of Art*) was favorably reviewed (Ripke-Kühn 1910) and extensively quoted (i.a. Janzten 1911; Panofsky 1915, 455; Wulf 1917, 18) in the *Journal*. For the formalists, the distinction between the aesthetic and the artistic objects (*ästhetische and künstlerische Objekte*) was a given (Hansen-Löve 1985), and not only in the theories of the living word and declamation. In contrast, the first chapter of the most in-depth criticism of formalism, *Formal'nyi metod v literaturovedenii* (1928, *The Formal Method in Literary Scholarship*) by Pavel Medvedev, a close collaborator of Mikhail Bakhtin's, mobilizes Dessoir and his followers Emil Utitz and Richard Hamann for the fight against the immature formalism of OPOIaZ in the name of the ideal of sociological aesthetics (Medvedev 2000 [1928], 188, 206).

As for structuralism's take on the duality as a debt to Dessoir, Jan Mukařovský makes the most explicit case. In his very first attempt to produce a structuralist literary history, *Polákova Vznešenost přírody* (1934, *Polák's "Sublimity of Nature"*), Mukařovský discriminates – as Felix Vodička would later, drawing on the phenomenology of Roman Ingarden (Vodička 1982 [1941], 109–111) – between the physical vehicle and the aesthetic object as the phenomenological correlate of the work of art. A discussion two years earlier of the relationship between stan-

dard and poetic languages proves that the duality goes back directly to Dessoir, as Mukařovský quotes Dessoir's statements on beauty exceeding "the specific forms of the arts" towards, for example, "sexual selection, fashion, the social amenities, the culinary arts", etc. (Mukařovský 2014 [1932], 48). However, it is this relative mutual autonomy of the aesthetic and the artistic that prompts Mukařovský to formulate his functional theory of art (including literary art as the art of language) as prioritizing the aesthetic function:

> In the arts, aesthetic valuation necessarily stands highest in the hierarchy of the values contained in the work, whereas outside of art its position vacillates and is usually subordinate. Furthermore, in the arts we evaluate each component in terms of the structure of the work in question, and the yardstick is in each individual case determined by the function of the component within the structure. (Mukařovský 2014 [1932], 48)

I shall now cursorily address the remaining building blocks of emerging literary theory.

3 Body-centred Psychologism

Psychology formed the basis of most work in both aesthetics and general science of art. The kind of psychologism that prevails in the *Journal* elucidates the paradoxical nature of formalism, especially Russian formalism, on which Dawid Hopensztand predicated a dichotomy of psychologism (Expressionism) and anti-psychologism (structural linguistics) as early as 1938. Hopensztand, who influenced the first monographer of Russian formalism, Victor Erlich (Erlich 2006, 127–128), propagated, if not invented, the narrative of formalism's departure from psychologism in search of its true nature. However, the general position taken by the scholarly community involved in the *Journal* contradicts the popular view that the formalists only commenced their work in the framework of psychological aesthetics, but gradually moved on towards conventional linguistics. This is because in Wundt's ethnopsychology, the *Journal*'s most salient point of reference (cf. Poppe 1906, 101; Schmarsow 1907, 316–317), a vision of language is present which encompasses both Expressionism and standardized conventionality. No wonder, then, that Wundt's linguistics appeared in Russian formalist writings (Shklovskii 2018b [1916], 231–235). As late as 1924, in the last year of relative freedom for formalist research in the USSR, Iurii Tynianov bases the semantics of verse language on Wundt's writings (Tynianov 1965 [1924], 77–89). Not only was verse semantics (as a new take on the linguistics of poetic language) to a large degree rooted in psychology, but it also had an aesthetic character. In Wundt,

gesture – be it manual or made using the speech organs – is the origin of both language and the fine arts. The primitive human cannot not express his feelings and representations; being moved and performing a movement are one. A sound gesture or a movement of the limbs initiates the means by which humans communicate and claim acknowledgement – art and language. Communication as a process that involves a distance and a comparison between mental state and sign is a product of a much later stage of humanity's development than a direct expression; however, already in Wundt there exist the two poles of formalism as discerned by Hopensztand (1938): Expressionism and scientific conventionalism. The development of humanity shifts the accent from expression to convention in order to communicate more unambiguously, more precisely; however, in this shift the body is never completely forsaken. Even structuralism – albeit distancing itself from Expressionism – cannot do without the body, which it only relegates to the background: the names of distinctive features in Structuralism's poster branch, phonology, relate to the physical places of articulation and thus to bodily actions (labial, coronal, dorsal, etc.). And without introspection, inaugurated by Franz Brentano's *Psychologie vom empirischen Standpunkt* (1874, *Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint*), structural semantics cannot describe the nature of meaning (Mayenowa 1978, 3–4). Brentano's pupil Husserl introduced the concept of *Leib*, the living body, in order to explain the existence of the first-person position (Husserl 1989 [1912]; 2008).

All this, reinforced by the programmatic translation of the eighteenth-century Scottish philosopher Thomas Reid (Reid 1906 [1785]), who is considered a forerunner of embodied cognitive science, helps provide a better understanding of the interest in corporeality, gesture, and performance prevailing in the *Journal*. Perhaps its most evident expression in the literary scholarship of the day was the study of the living word. Juliusz Tenner published in the *Journal* an insightful overview of research on the living word, as seen from the perspective of speech melody, the year in which Russian formalism seems to have taken off (Tenner 1913).

4 Interart in Psychology, not Craft

Bodily-rooted psychologism mediates not only between linguistics and aesthetics, but also between different arts. The question cannot be narrowed down to the psychology of synaesthesia (Fischer 1907); rather, the possibility of comparison coincides with the distinction between aesthetics and the general science of art. In the first issue of the *Journal*, Theodor Poppe, while elaborating on "Von Form

und Formung in der Dichtkunst" (1906, "Form and Forming in Poetry"), points to the double meaning of form in the spirit of Dessoir: there are "aesthetic and technical forms of the work of art" (Poppe 1906, 88). Only the former, existing in the imagination of the perceiver, allows a comparison with other arts:

> aesthetic form as the imaginary experience, modified in one way or another, that emerges from external stimuli according to the laws of one and the same imagination. The comparison [between the arts] must remain fruitless if it pertains to technical form, since the devices of different arts simply do not offer anything comparable. And the discussion remains unfruitful when in questions of 'form', one interpreter has the aesthetic, the other the technical one in mind. It has to result in oblique analogies. (Poppe 1906, 91)

The rootedness of the aesthetic experience in the expressive body inspires August Schmarsow in his programmatic article "Kunstwissenschaft und Völkerpsychologie" (1907, "The Science of Art and Ethnopsychology") to formulate an interart relationship: sculpture and architecture, which model the body in space or the space around bodies, relate to painting in the same way in which music and mime relate to poetry, growing out of corporal expressions and rhythms (Schmarsow 1907, 317). A method popular in the *Journal* milieu consists in reducing the whole purview of the arts to one primitive mechanism, as when Schmarsow, by himself (1910) and together with Fritz Ehlotzky (1922–1925), endeavors to derive the formal aspect of all arts from ornament, beginning with poetic meter no less (or its representation via visual schemes of metrical patterns). Drawing on Friedrich Theodor Vischer, Lipps, and Wundt, Karl Büchler proposes another universal and corporal key: tension (Büchler 1908). Tension is an enabler of the aesthetic experience of an artwork, as it arbitrates between the perceiving subject and the object. Felicitously, the tension triggered by a form appeals to the entire being, as the phenomenon shows in all aspects of the human, from movement and, generally, haptics and breathing, which is vital for rhythmic forms, to perception and the highest of human capacities, memory, thinking, and attention.

Even though some of the *Journal*'s authors enable formalist and structuralist theorizing, they differ from the Formalists and the Structuralists by virtue of not being followers of the avant-garde. In other words, they prepare models based on tension or, as we shall see, energy, which literary theoreticians in the narrow sense will apply to different works of art pertaining to different currents. Büchler belongs to this aesthetically conservative party. Firstly, he correlates by tradition aesthetics with pleasant feelings and, secondly, he repeats the opinion customary for the nineteenth century, expressed for example by Vischer, that being enjoyable and thus aesthetically valuable is what prevents a tension from surpassing the endurance of the perceiver. The pulsating sequence of tensions and relaxations open up humans to the temporal dimension of their existence; and this

temporality, alongside attention and pleasure, defines the role of tension in aesthetics. Shklovskii (2018c [1917]), while defining the attention-engaging device of estrangement, famously remarked that time is an autonomous value in art. Nevertheless, some authors of the *Journal*, but not Büchler, privileged the energetic, difficult, and new form apparently sought by the OPOIaZ Formalists.

5 Form as Energetic Unity

The *Journal*'s eclecticism accommodated *inter alia* the notion of unity in diversity, which pertained above all to style and form. Formalism and Structuralism foregrounded unity. Kazimierz Wóycicki described in the founding text of Polish formalism, *Jedność stylowa utworu poetyckiego* (1914, *Style Unity of the Poetic Work*), precisely the style unity of the poetic work (see my chapter on Polish formalism in this volume). A year earlier, Johannes Volkelt had presented in the *Journal* an analogous view of the unity as the essential quality of style and form (Volkelt 1913, 209) that allows one to speak of the unity or the synonymy of style and form; the notion of style

> differs from the notion of form only inasmuch as, in artistic form as such, the characteristic of that which preserves itself consistently in a multiplicity of cases is not expressly set, but precisely this feature pertains to the concept of style. The multiplicity in question may be the artwork of a particular artist or a whole period or the works of art from a certain area. If the artistic form is regarded as something that remains the same through a multiplicity of cases, it fulfils the concept of style. If it is about a single work of art, then the elements of this work of art replace the multiplicity of cases.
> If one disregards the characteristic of the unification of a multitude of cases, then the concept of style completely coincides with the concept of artistic form in general. (Volkelt 1913, 212)

Style and form would be, then, functions of a diversity which they energetically unite.

Form thus amounts to the "unity in multiplicity", as Utitz reminds us with reference to Lipps (Utitz 1912, 303). As such, form is an energetic occurrence: it has to overcome the plurality of elements to achieve "apperception". Utitz, too, represents a classical taste according to which a form must not be too simple in order not to be boring for the perceiver, but it cannot be too difficult either. However, his taste is accidental, while the dynamism of form is vital for modern literary theory.

6 Newness as an Aesthetic Quality vs. the Principle of Least Effort

As the make-it-new aesthetics of modernism and the avant-garde was gaining momentum, the *Journal* re-introduced via a translation of Thomas Reid's essay *On Taste* (Reid 1906 [1785]) the aesthetics of novelty, formulated in eighteenth-century British aesthetics by John Addison and Reid. As distinct from the formalists and the structuralists, who oftentimes recognized newness as *the* aesthetic quality, Reid admits that the fact that newness, even though it is one of the main characteristics of humans, wears off and stops drawing attention to itself disqualifies it as a fundamental aesthetic quality. "This quality of objects may therefore be compared to the cypher in arithmetic, which adds greatly to the value of significant figures; but, when put by itself, signifies nothing at all" (Reid 1785, 494). The German translation renders the "cypher" as "zero" (Reid 1906 [1785], 330). However, newness is especially important in view of the hiatus between the subject and the object, which the "and" in "aesthetics and the general science of art" is trying to bridge. Newness is a reflexive value mediating between the object and knowledge of the subject: "Novelty, it is plain, is no quality of the new object, but merely a relation which it has to the knowledge of the person to whom it is new" (Reid 1785, 502; Reid 1906 [1785], 340). A road is thus open for positing the great gnoseological value of art, realized by making it strange, new. This would become the OPOIaZ approach.

In 1912, Richard Müller-Freienfels formulated a commonsensical position of sorts, buttressed by the authorities of Wundt and Lipps (Müller-Freienfels 1912, 69). This position further substantiates the avant-garde claim to revolutionize life with the help of new forms, as Müller-Freienfels agrees with Lipps that "feelings of familiarity and novelty (*Bekanntheits- und Neuheitsgefühle*) […] play an extraordinarily important role in our inner life because no single sensation is not accompanied by them" (Müller-Freienfels 1912, 70). Müller-Freienfels is, nevertheless, another representative of the *juste milieu*, who facilitate formalism, but does not take its path. According to Müller-Freienfels, it is neither the known that pleases (as Lipps would have it), nor the unknown (the OPOIaZ stance in general), but their balanced mixture as in the notion of tension, which he draws on to support his case:

> Both very strong novelty and too deep a familiarity can cause feelings of displeasure. In the former case, the impressions require too much tension; they disturb and thus arouse discomfort. If, on the other hand, the knownness is too great, external stimuli either do not evoke any feeling at all, or, as is the case with aesthetic enjoyment, where one expects feelings, they appear worn out, dull, boring. (Müller-Freienfels 1912, 71–72)

The interplay of novelty and tension introduces the notion that will be of vital importance for the theory of estrangement: the principle of least effort. As is known, Shklovskii (2018c [1917]) criticizes the thinkers who equate poetry with thinking in images, which is supposed to save mental energy. Thus, the main adversary of the Formalist is the concept that aesthetical pleasure operates according the principle of least effort; that it, in other words, stems from a satisfied desire to save energy. The overwhelming majority of the *Journal*'s authors subscribe to the latter view. Again, they furnish the Formalists with a principle, which the Formalists then reverse in the name of their aesthetic tastes or ideals. For instance, in the first issue of the *Journal*, Poppe claims that, in contradistinction to the painter and the sculptor, who are quasi-naturally limited by the volume of their work, the poet has to produce his material (*Stoff*) himself: "The material of the poet consists in a limited, i. e. a thought-emotional connection that leads from the beginning to the end, a connection he reads from the fragmentarily grasped reality, into which he has an insight, out of which he constructs, in which he cognizes" (Poppe 1906, 97). While producing his or her material, the poet adheres to the principle of least effort: "One can only say that the poet 'experiences' his connection. This 'experience' is a movement of the imagination within the whole according to the principle of the smallest measure of force" (Poppe 1906, 99). The unity in multiplicity – form itself – thus emerges according to the principle of least effort.

Additionally, Büchler postulates in said article on tension that the principle functions on all levels of human activity and refers in this respect, as otherwise customary, to Robert Vischer and Wundt and Lipps. He, too, is skeptical towards novelty and strangeness, hackneyed by the Romantics and his contemporaries (Büchler 1908, 331–332), as it may even disturb the aesthetic appreciation (Büchler 1908, 227).

7 The Peculiarity of Poetic Language

Formalism and structuralism set out from the distinction between poetic and communicative language; literary theory (or poetics in some instances) is tantamount to the description of the former. The corpus of the *Journal* articles proves that researchers before the advent of literary theory in the narrow sense also found the distinction operative. In the very first issue, Poppe singles out poetic language among other variances; however, his tripartite division foreruns Ingarden's rather than the formalist division, as the phenomenologist wrote about similarities and dissimilarities between poetic, everyday, and scientific language (Ingarden 1991

[1955]). Poppe correlates three kinds of language, which he distinguishes with three basic activities, poeticizing, speaking, and thinking (*dichten*, *reden*, *denken*; Poppe 1906, 106). Everyday language boils down to referring to objects; it can be described as a "reflex movement effected by reality. The content of words here is the content of objectively given reality" (Poppe 1906, 106). This kind of language fulfills, as a structuralist would say, the referential function in which the perceptible elements of the utterance withdraw themselves for the benefit of the referent. For Poppe, its distinctive quality lies in the passivity and impassivity of the speaking subject, which thinking and poeticizing overcome. As this kind of language rests on habituation, it necessarily adheres to the principle of least effort. In contrast, both in "logic" and in "poetic" language, the subject demonstrates an active approach to the semantic matter itself, which he or she shapes with a goal in mind, teleologically (Poppe 1906, 107). Poppe's approach to thinking resembles the "structuralist activity", which its proponents regarded as equivalent to the avant-garde creation (Barthes 1971 [1963]; Balcerzan 1973). This is a major difference with regard to the tripartite division proposed by Ingarden, who opposed precise scientific language to both other kinds of speech as replete with almost unmanageable connotations. Poppe makes no bones about the physiological-psychological underpinning of his theory in general and poetic teleology in particular: "The urge for liveliness, which the older poetics has confused with the urge for vividness and which is common to poetry and all other arts, demands of the poet an increased energy of linguistic expressiveness" (Poppe 1906,107). Hence, here we have one of the rare cases in which the poetic effect depends on a breach of the principle of least effort.

8 Poetic Intuition (Poetic Images)

As later in Shklovskii, the problem of poetic language corresponds with the problems of images and energy: the vital question is whether images are generalizations of experiences for the sake of saving life energy or whether they have an autonomous value and therefore do not succumb to the principle of least effort. Poppe leans towards a proto-formalist stance, according to which poetic language demands energetic expenditure and not thrift. A year later, in 1907, Jonas Cohn tackled the issue of images and presentiveness (*Anschaulichkeit*) in poetry. Cohn taps into a hundred-year-old discussion initiated by the iconoclast Lessing and the iconodule Herder (Cohn 1907, 182); he does this, however, with modernism in mind, a period that foregrounds language as a self-sufficient material to be artfully shaped by an artist and not as a stimulus of potential mental images. In

Maurice Maeterlinck, Parnassians, Oscar Wilde, Stefan George, "[t]he art of poetry becomes the art of the word" (Cohn 1907, 184). The focus on the shaping of the material also characterizes the fine arts of the period – in this aspect visual art corresponds with poetry.

Moreover, to the disadvantage of poetic images, Wundt's authority attests that oftentimes "words are understood without eliciting conscious images", just as we do not have to analyze consciously the logical implications of conjunctions (Cohn 1907, 185). "Oftentimes" means, nevertheless, everyday communication, but not necessarily poetry, even though Theodor A. Meyer (1901), Fritz Mauthner (1901, 113–124) and, under the influence of Stefan George, Max Dessoir (1906, 353–368) deny any essential connection between poetry and images of the imagination (Cohn 1907, 185–186).

Nevertheless, Cohn attempts to redeem images by reinforcing his stance with the position of Wilhelm von Humboldt, according to whom "poetry is art through language" (Humboldt 1799, 63). Cohn sees this sentence as a paradox, a contradiction. And, indeed, in this sentence aesthetics and the material science of art overlay. Poetry, according to Humboldt, whom Cohn follows, should not so much dissolve the contradiction between art, which "lives in the imagination and wants only individuals", and language, "which exists only for the intellect and turns all things into abstract notions", as unite the sides of the contradiction into a whole which is more than a sum total of its elements (Humboldt 1799, 63; Cohn 1907, 186). Why this combination of art and language might have seemed paradoxical to the post-Kantian thinkers can best be explained with the aid of the more contemporary Niklas Luhmann, who posited the very paradox in the center of his sociology of art. Post-Romantic art, Luhmann says, is supposed to mediate between perception (images, art) and communication (language) and thus holds a paradoxical position: communication and perception are two self-contained systems between which there is actually "no overlap whatsoever" (Luhmann 2008, 248). Whereas perception is performed by the (individual's) conscious mind, communication is carried out by social systems. By linking individual perception and communication, art elevates the individual to the status of the universally valid, or at least the communicable (Luhmann 2008, 248–256). The fact that language and art – and in particular the art of language – have to communicate the incommunicable, the individual, is a paradox reminiscent of Kant's pure judgment of taste. This judgment claims to "be valid for everyone, and thus must be universally communicable"; nevertheless, it is not based on communicable concepts, but on each individual person's sensibility (Kant 2005 [1789], 17). The experience of art, Kant explains, is "the sensation whose universal communicability is postulated by the judgement of taste" (Kant 2005 [1789], 19). In Cohn, the paradoxical nature of the poetic utterance invites anti-psychological approaches (Cohn 1907, 188–189),

resembling mathematical anti-psychologism: the objective analysis of utterances follows the principle of holism, which was already introduced in Humboldt's definition in the form of a unity of art and language. According to Cohn, "only the co-ordination of means of expression among themselves and with the meanings renders an experience a poet expected" (Cohn 1907, 196). Actually, it is the unity that one experiences and hence the very unity should be declared presentiveness in poetry. As we have seen, Lipps and Volkelt, along with many others, referred to the unity of style and form using the Kantian term "apperception". If, then, poet manages to communicate a unique sense of unity, he has already transmitted his vision.

Stimulatingly, when the factor of the unifying energy, the power of expression, is introduced to the equation, Cohn produces a proto-theory of the difference between the languages of poetry and prose. The lyrical style constructs the unity in a way which increases the power of every expression, every word, and every sentence, while the epic style subsumes the powers in order to construct, as Sławiński would say, the grand semantic figures (Cohn 1907, 196; Sławiński [1967]). Here too, the energy which binds elements in apperceptions is the expression of the vital impetus which Wundt called sound gesture: "Poetry's means of representation is language – but language in all its meaning, not only as the communication of certain ideas, but at the same time as a manifestation of feelings and volitions, as a sound gesture" (Cohn 1907, 199–200). Poetry is the resuscitation of the word as a shadow of the agile body.

9 Conclusion: The Resurrection of the Word through Entanglements

The first article in the first issue of the *Journal*, Lipps's "Zur '*ästhetischen Mechanik*'" (1906, "Aesthetical Mechanics") sets the vitalist tone of the endeavor.

> All spatial forms, be they linear or surface forms, or forms of space extending in three dimensions, or, in short, "bodily" forms, owe their aesthetic impressionability or their aesthetic value to their inherent life – not for themselves, but for aesthetic consideration. However, life is activity. And the possibility of activity or the magnitude of the activity's tension is force. A spatial form is beautiful when its forces unfold freely, i. e. following their own laws, when the forms, by virtue of such forces, seem to call themselves into being and maintain their existence. (Lipps 1906, 1)

If language is supposed to be poetic, it must be aesthetic, i. e. cause a surge of life energies, a *resurrection* as in Shklovskii's (2018a) "Voskreshenie slova" (1914,

"Resurrection of the Word"). This is the connecting link between aesthetics and revolution, be it merely the revolution of poetic language: "The freedom of my activity, [...] the free-acting tendency of self-activity is the cause of pleasure. And the pleasure from the freedom of one's own activity is self-enjoyment, a happy self-affirmation" (Lipps 1906, 9). Aesthetic pleasure *par excellence* lies in the freedom of the individual. Owing to the consciousness of the difference between aesthetics and the general science of art, this freedom pertains to different kinds of art whose theories met in the *Journal* and which can be compared and combined. By distinguishing between aesthetics and the science of art, the student of art gains freedom to conduct interdisciplinary research, which, moreover, relates art to different aspects of life. Again, it proves that in this physiologically charged psychologism, mimic expression and systemic linguistics are intertwined so that the researcher can refer to both experience and systemic thought, while at the same time reflecting on diverse forms of action. In his programmatic article, Lipps states that the feeling of movements stands on the threshold of science and is thus equivalent to the sense of language and the sense of tact:

> And this mechanical feeling [the feeling of movement] is not something quite different from our experiential knowledge, but is a form of its sedimentation. Its relationship to it is analogous to that between the sense of language and the knowledge of the laws of a language or that between the sense of propriety or tact and the clear insight into what, under given circumstances, is decent. That is, the mechanical feeling is basically nothing other than that very knowledge. This knowledge is not merely broken down intellectually and specified with intellectual sharpness but condensed in an overall impression. (Lipps 1906, 11)

Art, in as many physical forms as the mind can comprehend and linguistically express, takes root in different forms of life mapped by *savoir-vivre*, including the life of scientists.

References

Barthes, Roland. "*The Structuralist Activity.*" [1963] *Critical Theory Since Plato. Ed.* Hazard Adams. New York, NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1971. 1128–1130.

Balcerzan, Edward. "I ty zostaniesz strukturalistą." *Teksty: teoria literatury, krytyka, interpretacja* 6.12 (1972): 1–8.

Brentano, Franz. *Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint* [1874]. London: Routledge, 2005.

Büchler, Karl. "Die ästhetische Bedeutung der Spannung." *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 3.12 (1908): 207–254.

Christiansen, Broder. *Philosophie der Kunst*. Hanau: Clauß und Feddersen, 1909.

Cohn, Jonas. "Die Anschaulichkeit der dichterischen Sprache." *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 2.2 (1907): 182–201.

Collenberg-Plotnikov, Bernadette. "'Zoologen und Physiker als die berufensten Forscher in Sachen der Aesthetik?' – Zur Bestimmung der experimentellen Ästhetik in der Allgemeinen Kunstwissenschaft." *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 58.1 (2013): 11–34.

Conrad, Waldemar. "Der ästhetische Gegenstand: eine phänomenologische Studie." Parts 1–3. *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 3.1 (1908): 71–118; 3.4 (1908): 469–511; 4.3 (1909): 400–455.

Dessoir, Max. *Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft in den Grundzügen dargestellt.* Stuttgart: Enke, 1906.

Dessoir, Max. "Skeptizismus in der Ästhetik." Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft 2.4 (1907): 449–468.

Erlich, Victor. *Child of a Turbulent Century*. Chicago, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2006.

Erofeev [Jerofejew], Boris. "Der Dichter im Sprachkunstwerk." *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 26.4 (1932): 374–386.

Èikhenbaum [Eikhenbaum], Boris. "The Theory of the Formal Method." [1926] *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*. Eds. Vincent B. Leitch et al. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company, 2001. 1062–1080.

Fischer, Ottokar. "Über Verbindung von Farbe und Klang: Eine literar-psychologische Untersuchung." Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft 2.4 (1907): 501–534.

Geiger, Moritz. "Beiträge zur Phänomenologie des ästhetischen Genusses." *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung* 1.2 (1913): 567–684.

Geiger, Moritz. "Phänomenologische Ästhetik." *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 19.1 (1925): 29–42.

Hansen-Löve, Aage A. *Der russische Formalismus: Methodologische Rekonstruktion seiner Entwicklung aus dem Prinzip der Verfremdung.* Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1978.

Hansen-Löve, Aage A. "Bytologiia mezhdu faktami i funktsiiami." *Revue des Études Slaves* 57.1 (1985): 91–103.

Hopensztand, Dawid. "Filozofia literatury formalistów wobec poetyki futuryzmu." *Życie Literackie 3.5* (1938): 182–192.

Humboldt, Wilhelm von. *Ästhetische Versuche: Über Goethes Hermann und Dorothea*. Braunschweig: Friedrich Vieweg, 1799.

Husserl, Edmund. *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy*. Vol. 2: *Studies in the Phenomenology of Constitution*. Trans. by Richard Rojcewicz and André Schuwer. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1989.

Husserl, Edmund. *Die Lebenswelt: Auslegungen der vorgegebenen Welt und ihrer Konstitution. Texte aus dem Nachlass (1916–1937)*. Ed. Rochus Sowa. *Husserliana* 39. Dordrecht: Springer, 2008.

Ingarden, Roman. "On Translations." [1955] *Ingardeniana III. Analecta Husserliana* (The Yearbook of Phenomenological Research) 33 (1991): 131–192.

Jakobson, Roman. "What is poetry." [1933–1934] Roman Jakobson, *Selected Writings*. Vol. 3: *Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry*. Ed. Stephen Rudy. The Hague: Mouton, 1981a. 740–750.

Jakobson, Roman. "Linguistics and Poetics." [1960] Roman Jakobson, *Selected Writings*. Vol. 3: *Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry*. Ed. Stephen Rudy. The Hague: Mouton, 1981b. 18–51.

Jantzten, Hans. "Review of *Impressionismus: Ein Problem der Malerei in der Antike und* Neuzeit, by Werner Weisbach." *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 6.2 (1911): 297–300.

Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Judgement* [1789]. New York, NY: Barnes & Noble, 2006.

Lipps, Theodor. *Ästhetik: Psychologie des Schönen und der Kunst.* Vols. 1–3. Hamburg and Leipzig: Voss, 1903–1906.

Lipps, Theodor. "Zur 'ästhetischen Mechanik'." *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 1.1 (1906): 1–29.

Lukács, György. "Theorie des Romans: Ein geschichtsphilosophischer Versuch über die Formen der großen Epik." Parts 1–2. *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 11.3 (1916): 225–271; 11.4 (1916): 390–431.

Luhmann, Niklas. *Schriften zu Kunst und Literatur*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 2008.

Mayenowa, Maria Renata. *Poetyka teoretyczna: Zagadnienia języka*. Wroclaw: Ossolineum, 1978.

Medvedev, Pavel. "Formal'nyi metod v literaturovedenii: Kriticheskoe vvedenie v sotsiologicheskuiu poėtiku." [1928] Mikhail Bakhtin. *Freidizm: Formal'nyi metod v literaturovedenii. Marksizm i filosofiia iazyka. Stat'i*. Ed. I. V. Peshkova. Moscow: Labirint 2000. 195–348.

Mauthner, Fritz. *Beiträge zu einer Kritik der Sprache*. Vol. 1. Stuttgart: Cotta, 1901.

Meyer, Theodor A. *Das Stilgesetz der Poesie*. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1901.

Müller-Freienfels, Richard. "Neuheit und Wiederholung im ästhetischen Genießen." *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 7.1 (1912): 68–81.

Mukařovský, Jan. *Polákova 'Vznešenost přírody': Pokus o rozbor a o vývojové zařadění básnické struktury*. Prague: Československá Akademie Věd. Sekce Jazyka a Literatury, 1934.

Mukařovský, Jan. "Standard Language and Poetic Language." [1932] *Chapters from the History of Czech Functional Linguistics*. Ed. Jan Chovanec. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2014. 41–53.

Panofsky, Erwin. "Das Problem des Stils in der bildenden Kunst." *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 10.4 (1915): 460–468.

Polivanov, Evgenii. "Obshchii foneticheskii printsip vsiakoi poėticheskoi tekhniki." [1930] *Voprosy iazykoznaniia* 12.1 (1963): 99–112.

Poppe, Theodor. "Von Form und Formung in der Dichtkunst." *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 1.1 (1906): 88–112.

Reid, Thomas. *Essays on The Intellectual Powers of Man*. Edinburgh: J. Bell et al., 1785.

Reid, Thomas. "Über den Geschmack." [1785] *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 1.3 (1906): 323–354.

Ripke-Kühn, Leonore. "Review of *Philosophie der Kunst,* by Broder Christiansen." *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 5.1 (1910): 100–103.

Schmarsow, August. "Kunstwissenschaft und Völkerpsychologie: Ein Versuch zur Verständigung." *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 2.2 (1907): 305–339.

Schmarsow, August. "Anfangsgründe jeder Ornamentik." *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 5.2 (1910): 191–215; 5.3 (1910): 321–355.

Schmarsow, August, and Fritz Ehlotzky. "Die reine Form in der Ornamentik aller Künste." *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 16.4 (1922): 491–500; 17.1 (1924): 1–17; 17.2 (1924): 129–145; 17.3 (1924): 209–234; 17.4 (1924): 305–320; 18.1 (1925): 83–107.

Shklovskii, Viktor. "Sviaz' priemov siuzhetoslozheniia s obshchimi priemami stilia." [1919] *O teorii prozy*. Moscow: Federaciia, 1929. 24–67.

Shklovskii, Viktor. "Voskreshenie slova." [1914] Viktor Shklovskii, *Sobranie sochinenii*. Vol. 1. Ed. Ilia Kalinin. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2018a. 205–212.

Shklovskii, Viktor. "O poèzii i zaumnom iazyke." [1916] Viktor Shklovskii, *Sobranie sochinenii*. Vol. 1. Ed. Ilia Kalinin. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2018b. 226–244.

Shklovskii, Viktor. "Iskusstvo kak priem." [1917] Viktor Shklovskii, *Sobranie sochinenii*. Vol. 1. Ed. Ilia Kalinin. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2018c. 250–268.

Sławiński, Janusz. "Semantyka wypowiedzi narracyjnej." [1967] *Dzieło – język – tradycja*. Krakow: Universitas, 1998. 94–125.

Solov'ev, Vladimir [Solowjoff, Wladimir]. "Die Schönheit in der Natur." [1889] *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 24.2 (1930): 97–117.

Svoboda, Karl. "Neuere Richtungen in der tschechischen Ästhetik." *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 29.3 (1935): 228–238.

Tenner, Juliusz [Julius]. "Über Versmelodie." *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 8.2 (1913): 247–297; 8.3 (1913): 353–402.

Tynianov, Iurii. *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka: Stat'i*. Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1965.

Utitz, Emil. "Zur Lehre von der Einheit in der Mannigfaltigkeit." *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 7.2 (1912): 303–307.

Utitz, Emil. "Das Problem einer allgemeinen Kunstwissenschaft." *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 17.4 (1922): 433–451.

Vodicka, Felix. "The Concretization of the Literary Work: Problems of the Reception of Neruda's Work." [1941] *The Prague School: Selected Writings*, *1929–1946*. Ed. Peter Steiner. Austin, TX: University of Austin, 1982. 103–134.

Volkelt, Johannes. "Der Begriff des Stils." *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 8.2 (1913): 209–246.

Wulf, Oskar. "Kritische Erörterungen zur Prinzipienlehre der Kunstwissenschaft." *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 12.1 (1917): 1–34.

Wundt, Wilhelm. *Völkerpsychologie: Eine Untersuchung der Entwicklungsgesetze von Sprache, Mythus und Sitte*. Vols. 1–10. Leipzig: Engelmann, 1900–1920.

Zahorska Stefania [Stephanie]. "Zum Umwertung des Impressionismus." *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 23.3 (1929): 258–268.

Ziegenfuß, Werner. "Dessoir, Max." *Philosophen-Lexikon: Handwörterbuch der Philosophie nach Personen*. Vol. 1. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1949. 231–232.

Danuta Ulicka
Institute of the History of the Arts

1 The site of memory

Among the numerous institutions, official, semi-official and utterly unofficial, in which modern Russian literary studies emerged, one should pay special attention to the Institute of the History of Arts (Institut istorii iskusstv, III). Its originator, founder, patron, and first director was Count Valentin Platonovich Zubov, whose family owned the neo-Renaissance palace in St Petersburg at Isaakievskaia ploshchad' (St Isaac's Square) 5, vis-a-vis the monumental St Isaac's Cathedral. This is where the III has been located since 1912.

However, it is only the seat that has remained unchanged. For instance, between 1912 and 1992, the institute had changed its very name ten times – hardly a wonder in the three-name city. Of course, the Institute was also subject to the pressure of Great History and great politics. This is evidenced not only by its new and official names but also the common names both its opponents and collaborators coined. Some, for instance, said the acronym III stood for "Instiut Ispugannych Inteligentov" ("Institute of Scared Intellectuals") (Druskin 1977, 176). Another, no less venomous name, used by Marxists in the mid-1920s – also at the State Institute of Artistic Culture (Gosudarstvennyi istitut khudozhestvennoi kul'tury, GINKHUK), located right next to the III, in Myatleva's Palace at Isaakievskaia ploshchad' 9, and incorporated to the institute in 1926 – was: "a monastery on the state's dime" (Seryi 2003 [1926], 242; Bowlt 2013). The supporters and collaborators of "Tonych," as Count Zubov was called, used to say with self-irony that from the authorities' point of view the III was a "den of formalism" (Ginzburg 1990, 280).

To be sure, it is impossible to identify the Institute with the institution of Russian formalism, even if we focus on the area of St Petersburg exclusively, setting aside the Moscow Linguistic Circle (Moskovskii lingvisticheskii kruzhok, MLK) (Shapovalova 1972). However, given similar sources of inspiration and a similar (unforced) evolution from aestheticism to sociologism, similar dates of birth and the converging period of their "golden years", and finally the equally unfavorable attitude toward the official policy for science from 1923 onwards, culimating in attacks on and persecution of researchers associated with both the institute and Formalism, this identification is not utterly unfounded. To some extent, it is justified by the very term "formalism", rarely used in a neutral manner and gradually extended to embrace all artistic currents and scientific orientations (Bagrii 1924; Beskin 1933).

Nevertheless, regardless of these affinities, the equation is merely partial. The III was an institution with a much greater scientific and didactic momentum than formalism; it also had an incomparably wider social impact. In his institute, Count Zubov employed literary, art, architecture, and music scholars from different generations and with different methodological orientations. He created an unofficial, informal milieu centered around the modernist ideals and scientific values. And only opponents of these intellectual trends lumped them together under the label of 'formalism', which was considered reprehensible until the mid-1920s. In fact, "Zubov's House", as it was commonly called – not without allusions to the close relations between its employees and the researchers associated with it – played a pioneering role in the modernization of the Russian humanities as a whole and a historically invaluable part in its preservation during the difficult years of the authoritarian rule.

2 1912

In his characteristically brief speech at the ceremony inaugurating the III on 2 March 1912, Zubov declared:

> In Russia, art history has not been an independent discipline to date: it has been practised within the framework of political history, social history and the history of ideas. Apart from only few exceptions, it has not been taught as a history of forms, i. e. the evolution of man's formal consciousness. Only the closest context of the creation of the work have been considered interesting, while the genesis of its formal content [...] has hardly attracted attention. (Zubov 2003 [1912], 9)

In other words, the archaeological method of registration, at the service of other sciences, obscured the laws of aesthetic genesis. The expressions used in Zubov's speech ('evolution of consciousness', 'laws of aesthetic genesis', 'formal memory of humankind', 'consciousness of form', cf. Zubov 2003 [1912]) bring to mind the key formulas of German philosophical aesthetics and German art history of the late nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century. Certainly, they resemble the formalists' early declarations and manifestos, but we would hardly find anything similar to Zubov's comparative project in these texts, let alone his emphasis on social and cultural functions, which the III aimed to perform.

Zubov's idea is well-illustrated by a photograph from the opening ceremony (Sėpman 2003, 11). In a blurry newspaper photograph, we may identify the then St. Petersburg artistic and academic elite: professors of the Russian Academy of Sciences, the Archaeological Commission, humanistic departments of St Petersburg University, directors of imperial theatres, the Russian Museum and the Her-

mitage Museum, collaborators of the periodicals *Starye gody* (*Old Times*) and *Apollon*, professors from the French Institute – historians, historians and theoreticians of literature, language, painting and music, philologists, and philosophers. Anna Akhmatova, the "Assyrian goddess" – as she was called due to the fact that her second husband was the Assyriologist, Vladimir Shileiko – stands right next to the count. In the last row, we recognize Lev Gumilev, a future collaborator of the III.

Regretfully, the professors who later taught at the III do not appear in the photograph. This would give a tangible idea of the institute's research practice. The list of people employed in "Zubov's House" between 1912 and 1931 reveals that it integrated research on different kinds of arts and that it never separated "aesthetic genesis" from historical and sociological genesis or avant-garde "innovators" from "archaists", as Tynianov titled his book (Tynianov 1929). Tadeusz Zieliński and his favourite disciple, Mikhail Rostovtsev, worked for Zubov and later for his successor, Fedor Shmidt. Among the Institute's lecturers, there were: Zieliński's son, Adrian Piotrowskii, an innovator not only in translation from classical languages but also theatre and film, a playwright who headed the sociology of art section (Gurevich 2007), and Nikolai Radlov, an eminent scholar of both antiquity and modernity. Music was taught by Alexander Glazunov, a traditionalist, Ivan Sollertinskii (who, in turn, was an expert on Gustav Mahler and Arnold Schönberg, a friend of Dmitrii Shostakovich and Mikhail Bakhtin, as well as the founder of ethnomusicology), and Boris Asaf'ev. Boris Kruzhevskii taught courses about old folk and Renaissance theatre – accompanied by Aleksei Gvozdev, the founder of modern theatre studies (Pesochinskii 2007), and Vsevolod Meierhol'd, who directed rehearsals at the institute. Baron Vrangel' lectured on eighteenth-century painting, Vasilii T. Georgievskii on the art of Novgorod, but they never interfered with Malevich, who propagated Suprematism. Ignatii Krachkovskii and Nikolai Konrad taught old Arabic poetry and the poetics of the Quran, while Gumilev interpreted Aleksandr Blok.

There were more such combinations of archaists and innovators. Perhaps, only the cinema section of the Theatre History Department, from which the world's first institute of film studies emerged, did not follow this pattern, but film experts like Sergei Èisenstein, Vsevolod Pudovkin, Leonid Trauberg, and Grigorii Kozintsev collaborated closely with theatre historians (Likhachev 1927). The Muses – as the institute's first four departments, founded in 1920–1921, were commonly called (Muse LITO or SLOVO: Literary History Department, IZO: Art History Department, TEO: Theatre History Department, and MUZO: Music History Department) – did not get into conflicts over remits. There was also a photo lab: FOTO, which operated until 1923, attracting the innovators of Russian photomontage, and the Office of Research on Artistic Speech (Kabinet po Izucheniiu

Khudozhestvennoi Rechi, KIRKH), which operated until 1924. Artists employed at the Institute, who also represented extremely different orientations, did not get into conflicts with academics. In Zubov's house, Gumilev was a professor, while Osip Mandel'shtam, Nikolai A. Tikhonov, Evgenii Zamiatin, the poets from the Serapionovy brat'ia (Serapion Brothers) group, Mikhail Zoshchenko and Vladimir Maiakovskii frequented the meetings of LITO. This was also where poetic meetings of the OBERIU group were held.

Against this backdrop, the copy laboratory (kopiroval'naia masterskaia) seems to be the most 'archaic', while LITO appears as the most 'innovative' unit. However, the aim of the former was much more challenging: it was to prepare reproductions of the frescos from the Orthodox churches in Novgorod and Pskov – natural copies, as faithful as possible in colour and form, which could not be rendered by photography at that time. In fact, Zubov founded the laboratory in anticipation of the frescos' mournful fate. The copyists were later joined by architects, who carried out detailed measurements of the churches (it is thanks to their documentation that both of them could be reconstructed after World War II). In principle, the III treated all Old Russian artefacts (language, painting, theatre, music) with special care. For according to Zubov, it was these artefacts that granted Russian art a unique place in Europe (Tolmachevskaia 2003).

LITO was officially opened on 28 November 1920. The novelty of its work is already evidenced by the list of its lecturers: the dean was Viktor Zhirmunskii, grammar, semantics and stylistics was taught by Viktor Vinogradov, metrics and textology by Boris Tomashevskii, history of literature by Tynianov and Viktor Shklovskii, poetics by Sergei Baluchatyi, and methodology by Boris Ėikhenbaum. However, LITO was not a simple continuation of Society for the Study of Poetic Language (Obshchestvo izucheniia poėticheskogo iazyka, OPOIaZ), as it combined theory with historical and sociological research based on empirical foundations. In the Office of Research on Artistic Speech, a unit operating near LITO from 1921 onwards, the "fanatical phonetician", as Sergei I. Bernshtein was affectionately known, recorded the voices of poets (he prepared more than 800 records) and conducted a seminar in which he developed a phonetic method for poetry research (Bernshtein 1972 [1921]). Pioneering studies in sociology of literature were also created in LITO. Boris Bukhshtab addressed the problem of multilingualism in the historical novel (Bukhshtab 2007 [1926]), while Boris Larin devoted his seminar to an analysis of urban languages. On 2 November 1926, Larin delivered a lecture titled "The Problems of Linguistic Research on the City", in which he discussed methodological issues related to the analysis of urban 'dialects', i. e. languages of various social groups inhabiting city spaces. Two years later, Lev Uspenskii analyzed the language of the revolution (Uspenskii 1928). During their numerous ethnographic research expeditions to unexplored areas of the

empire, the III's associates collected records of traditional 'bylina' poems, fairy tales, and rituals, which provided a basis for the development of ethnolinguistics, ethnomusicology, and theory of folk spectacles. As a result of these expeditions, particularly intensive in the years 1926–1930 (Zelenin 1926), the country's first phonographic archive was created. Earlier, the Institute tried to launch a project of Central Folklore Sound Library, which was supposed to collect records of oral and musical stories. However, it has never come into being (Paskhalov 1926). The so-called Young Formalists, the disciples of the founders of OPOIaZ (Lidiia Ginzburg, Boris Bukshtab, Grigorii Gukovskii, Nikolai Kovarskii, Veniamin Kaverin), were much closer to literary history, psychology, and sociology of art than pure poetics. But they were equally fascinated with the approach to the thought-language problem in terms of phenomenological aesthetics, which Boris Ėngelgardt taught at the III, and for which they "betrayed" Ėikhenbaum's seminar on literary life (Ginzburg 1989, 24).

In short, Zubov's project has often exceeded the boundaries between disciplines, methods, and worldviews. For it was not struggles for the only correct method of research on art that gave rise to the Institute's establishment. From the very onset, the idea was connected to the Russian modernization movements of the nineteenth century. Zubov, born in 1884, grew up in an atmosphere of political change, as multiple questions about Russia and Europe dominated Russian philosophical, social, legal, artistic, and scientific thought of the turn of the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries. As a descendant of Decembrists, the great-grandson of the assassin of Tsar Paul (Zubov 2007 [1963], 82) and great nephew of the last Catherine's favourite, related to Aleksandr Gertsen [Alexander Herzen] and Nikolai Ogarev through his wife, and acquainted with Mikhail Bakunin, Zubov inherited these questions from his family tradition (Ismagulova 2004). However, contrary to the programs of the Vekhi ('Landmarks') group and thinkers associated with the periodical *Logos*, Count Zubov placed Russia neither outside Europe nor in a superior position among European nations: he was far from both nationalists and Slavophiles as well as from the proponents of the Third Renaissance, who envisaged Russia as the Third Rome. Distancing himself from these disputes, and later also from the Tsar, Aleksandr Kerenskii, and the Bolsheviks, the descendant of two powerful families (the Zubovs and the Shcherbatovs) and the only heir to their fortune placed Russia into Europe and Europe into Russia with a single move, namely – by establishing the III. And if he ascribed any mission to his work, it was precisely the idea which the aristocratic intelligentsia had regarded as part of its vocation since the beginning of the nineteenth century: the emancipation of the 'people-nation'. Zubov – the future Freemason – combined this mission with the modernist idea of enlightenment and the commitment to unquestionable values deposited in art and science.

By a twist of Great History, these new ideas coincided with the emergence of the Bolshevik ideology, which, in the area of culture, was propagated by Lunacharskii in People's Education Commission (Narodnyi komissariat prosveshcheniia). Lunacharskii supported Zubov and his institute. It is probable that he pursued his own project of a new Soviet Academy of Arts on two different scales: on a large scale in Moscow, where he created State Academy of Arts (Gosudarstvennaia Akademiia khudozhestvennykh nauk, GAKhN), and on a small scale in Petrograd-Leningrad, where he helped transform Zubov's Institute into a GAKhN miniature (both institutions were almost identical in terms of organizational structure). No matter the actual facts, the point is that, thanks to this coincidence, and Zubov's cleverness, the Institute operated officially until 1931, when it was transformed into the Leningrad Division of the State Academy of Art Studies (Leningradskoe otdelenie Gosudarstvennoi akademii iskusstvoznaniia). In the years 1933–1937, it officially functioned as State Academy of Art Studies (Gosudarstvennaia Akademiia iskusstvoznaniia), then it was reduced to State Research Institute of Musicology (Gosudarstvennyi muzykal'nyi nauchno-issledovatel'skii institute; 1937–1939), to the State Research Institute of Theatre and Music (Gosudarstvennyi nauchno-issledovatel'skii institut teatra i muzyki; 1939–1958), the State Research Institute of Theatre, Music and Cinematography (Gosudarstvennyi nauchno-issledovatel'skii institut teatra, muzyki i kinematografii; 1958–1962), and to the State Research Division of the Leningrad Institute of Theatre, Music and Cinematography (Nauchno-issledovatel'skii otdel Leningradskogo gosudarstvennogo instituta theatra, muzyki i kinematografii; 1963–1992). It was only in 1992 when the Institute returned to the name it received in 1920: Russian Institute of the History of the Arts (Rossiiskii Institut Istorii Iskusstv). However, this was not the original name. The first one, from 1912, was free from the national determination. Indeed, this was yet another feature that the III shared with European modernism.

3 The Institute and the Institution

The golden era of the III is 1912–1924, when it conducted the most intensive and bold scientific work in teaching and publishing. Although, Zubov's initial intent was for the III to also have a socio-cultural function.

The plan to create the Institute first emerged in 1905–1906, in Leipzig. Having abandoned philological studies, which he started in 1904 at St Petersburg University, Zubov went to Germany. Before going to Leipzig, he completed several semesters of art history at Heidelberg University. There, he learned from Heinrich Thode; later, in Berlin, from Heinrich Wölfflin; in Leipzig from Frank Studnick;

and in Halle from Adolf Goldschmidt. "It all began with a drinking spree, which I obviously avoided," Count Zubov remarks in the first sentence of his memoirs, modestly ascribing the idea to his two friends, Mikhail N. Semenov and Trifon G. Trapeznikov, while he was only to pay for the Institute: "I only assigned a little sum" (Zubov 2004, 93–94). All three departed from Leipzig to Florence. They studied there at the German Institute of the History of Art, directed by Heinrich Brockhaus, amazed at its grand library, free access to the books, and public lectures. It was then that they thought of establishing a similar institute in Russia. About 1910 they began gathering the book collection – which initially numbered three thousand volumes and more than fifty thousand in 1925 – and subscribed all the most important European journals in the field of art history. From Strasbourg, they imported library furniture of the newest design.

The most difficult part was to receive the consent of the Petersburg administration – not for the Institute itself but for its localization. Zubov humorously recalled the difficulty with the phrase, "in the end, I was thinking about presenting the issue even to the State Stud Farms" (Zubov 2004, 95). After prolonged pleas with three ministries, Zubov's mother suggested that the Institute could occupy their representative family palace at St. Isaac's Square 5. As it developed, the Institute took over rooms in the house of Prince Paskevich on Galernaia Street 7; from 1920 onwards, this was the place of the literature and music divisions.

Throughout its first year of operation, in 1912, the III functioned only as an open access library. In January 1913, Zubov received the right to offer public lectures, which he gave in four languages to such great popularity among the public that the organizers had to enforce – free – ticketing. Zubov inaugurated the meetings himself on 24 January (6 February N.S.), 1913, with a lecture entitled "On the Methods in Art History". Other talks were offered by, among others, the Prince Sergei M. Volkonskii, the director of imperial theatres, with a 1913 cycle about "Human as the Material of Fine Arts", Baron Nikolai N. Vrangel', a specialist in Russian and French eighteenth- and nineteenth-century painting, and lawyer and collector Pavel Delarov, who lectured in the spring of 1913 on "The History of Painting in the Netherlands". Interested scholars could have freely used the library and even the private collection of the Zubov family. The Institute established cooperation with similar institutions abroad and, in 1915, added music to the lecture series.

Until 1916, the Institute was mostly a meeting place for the Petersburg elite. Zubov owned it and paid for it. Although on 28 August 1916, the Institute received a charter that deemed it "a special private higher education school for men and women who finished secondary education [...] which offers tri-annual courses" (Zubov 2004, 21), the new organizational form and public mission still failed to serve Count Zubov's main idea: to intellectually enlighten and emancipate the

"nation". This idea unexpectedly accelerated with the February Revolution – and ended with the October Revolution.

In February 1917, Zubov asked for and received state subsidies for the Institute. However, as he humorously added, since the Provisional Government did not manage to transfer the subsidies, the Institute nevertheless recognized the October Revolution as a legal state institution that served the common good. And this is what saved it. What allowed the Institute to survive was the rights of an academic institution with the ability to nominate professors and offer special summer courses for secondary education teachers.

However, the Institute owed its salvation not only to the administration-legal actions of its founder but also to Zubov's understanding of history. Aware of the historical events, the chaos and ineptitude of their main actors, Zubov began a game with the Bolsheviks to preserve his work. This made him unpopular among Russian enemies of the revolution and the émigré community. But as a true modernist, Zubov appreciated cultural values more than political loyalty and his own good name. Due to these values, was Zubov ready to relinquish the Gatchina Palace into German hands in 1916 so that the collections would not suffer during a disorderly evacuation (from the summer of 1917 on, he was a member of a committee appointed by the Provisional Government, which oversaw the takeover and registration of palaces around Petersburg, looted and devastated in the turmoil of World War I and the February Revolution). It was also due to these values that Zubov recognized in 1917 that he could possibly cooperate with Lunacharskii as he had with Kerenskii.

After the October Revolution, Zubov first confiscated his own Palace himself. He merely handed Lunacharskii a piece of paper – with a stamp made with a rubber – on which he himself wrote: "Count Zubov is appointed director of the Institute and both the Institute and Palace become state property along with all the assets accumulated inside and, thus, become subject to the Provisional Workers' and Peasants' Government" (Zubov 2004, 42).

Just in case, Zubov occupied for the Institute not only the ground floor but the whole palace, by placing appropriate plaques on all doors. The magnificent Green Room thus became the Grand Council Hall, while the ballroom the Small Council Hall. It was not easy to find such use for all eighty chambers, reminisces Zubov. Then, he made a fictitious inventory by placing numbers by the most important works collected by the Zubov and Shcherbatov families. As it turned out – it was enough, at least until 1924.

Further funding for the Institute's activities stemmed from covert and overt sales of property. As the director of the nationalized library, Zubov could buy entire collections that the aristocracy had to sell. He always offered the owners the highest price while silently guaranteeing them the preservation of the collection.

As a director of a scientific state institution, he was also able to save people. Zubov hired his previous servants at the Institute as janitors, watchmen, and cleaners. Homeless students found accommodation in the Palace while the audience could always expect a samovar ready with sandwiches.

In the years 1917–1925, "Zubov's House" was more than just a research institute in which scholars freely developed the history and methodology of the humanities, conducted bibliographic and documentary works, published dissertations – mainly in a publishing house of the III 'Academia' operation from April 1923 on, and not integrated into the State Literary Publishing House (Goslitzdat) until 1937 – and organized courses and seminars that prepared specialist-practitioners and public lectures for broader circles of the society. The contemporaries thought of the III as an oasis, one of several such places in Petersburg at the time, along with the House of the Miatlevs, home to Matiushin and Elena Guro, and the House of Arts (Dom iskusstv). However, the III was the most important such oasis because it was egalitarian, open to all. Listeners were deprived of public transport in Petersburg/Leningrad but still travelled on foot even for three hours to attend classes to escape the nightmare of the real life; one only imagine such difficult travels in winter time. The Institute was remembered by Nina Berberova, Lidiia Ginzburg, Ida Napelbaum, and Veniamin Kaverin as a place that helped to survive the cultural values shared by both archaists and innovators. It acted against reality, as Ėikhenbaum writes in the nursery rhyme arranged for the celebrations marking the Institute's second birthday:

> When struck by hunger, cold, despair,
> Shootings, policing, and hurt,
> We – created out of thin air,
> A faculty in the Art of the Word. (Ėikhenbaum 2003 [1922], 110)

A clear sign of such a preserving function was the ball organized at the Institute in 1920 – with all the guests in sweaters and shawls due to cold weather – during which the poet Nikolai Gumilev ostentatiously appeared clothed in a tailcoat with a lady in a black dress, both shaking from the cold (Khodasevich 1996 [1939], 85; Struve 1981, 73). An even more vivid sign is a memory of everyday life by Nina Berberova, who reminisces on the lectures on Flaubert and Stendhal conducted by "Tomashevskii, with clothes all in patches, with puffy eyes, and Ėikhenbaum with shoe soles fastened with a string" (Berberova 1996, 168).

In these two functions – simultaneously scientific and social – the III survived until 1925, when Zubov decided to emigrate as soon as he noticed that he could do no more. Zubov did not leave Russia after the first repressions against the intellectual elite in 1918, nor did he after the second repressions in 1922 – when many deported people fled on the famous 'philosophers' ship', some of

them professors that Zubov previously employed – nor after his arrest and four months in prison (2 August – 2 December 1922). After many years, Zubov recalled his imprisonment with humour, intentionally stylizing his memoirs as an anti-necrography. He thus created a polemical genre against necrography – an invention which became popular in Russian memoir literature (Zarankina 2007): "If I ignore several unpleasant minutes, I must admit that I have enjoyed myself greatly" (Zubov 2004, 151).

4 1925–1931: Years of Struggle for the III

Zubov managed to stop the first attempts to close the Institute in late 1923, under the guise of 'reorganization', when the Institute was under the control of a special commission of the Petersburg board of science led by Nikolai Marr. He did not believe that the next attempts (in September 1924) would be successful, though he decided then (or in January 1925) to resign from the director's function and save his 'home'. His place was taken by Fyodor I. Shmidt – an art historian like Zubov – who strived to preserve the original methodological orientation, integrating formal-aesthetic, socio-historical, and empirical research, and reconciling them with the requirements of the imposed "sociological method" already officially called "Marxist" or "Marxist-Leninist" (Shmit 2003, 190–220).

Shmidt was supported by the old employees who defended the 'formal method' by proving its agreement with the sociological one. On 25 April 1925, the lecture "The Formal Method in Literary Studies" was delivered by Ėikhenbaum; on 13 February Tynianov gave one similar in tone, about the method of studying cinema. From 1924 to 1927, both held a joint seminar dedicated to Russian prose, during which they discussed the issues of literary life and the historical process in literature and art disguised by Tynianov as 'literary evolution'. The meetings were organized not in the III, but in Ėikhenbaum's apartment (Ginzburg 1989, 356). Despite these efforts, after Zubov's departure, the III gradually lost its scientific position and original function. The count's legacy fell on the shoulders of successors incapable of such games with the authorities and the official scientific policy, which was much more restrictive in the second half of the 1920s and in the 1930s than in the first, golden decade of the Institute's activities. At the time, there were no longer any professors of the pre-revolutionary formation in the state bodies, who previously supported Zubov's plans. What especially burdened the perspectives of the III was the dismissal of Lunacharskii from the position of the Soviet People's Commissioner, in whose works some unmasked 'bourgeois anachronisms'. His place was then seized by the toady party activist, Andrei S.

Bubnov. Lunacharskii's dismissal coincided with the formal dismissal of the 'New Economic Policy' (NEP) that was decisive for the radicalization of policy toward scientific institutions and scientists.

Testimonies and memoirs describing the time that remain public and private archives are not only rare but also biased. We must read them mindful of the circumstances in which they were written, carefully deciphering their camouflage formulas – those purely rhetorical concessions to the enforced phraseology – and separating them from the real content. Received literally, they can lead to misinterpretation. Certainly, these testimonies testify to the situation and fate of the entire Russian humanities in the late 1920s and 1930s, rather than the III exclusively.

Iakov A. Nazarenko competed with Shmidt in the Institute, and the former began to gradually play an increasingly important role: from 1926 as chairman of the Sociological Committee and the director's representative for administrative affairs; from 1928 as a board member of the Institute's publishing house Academia; and from 1929 as official deputy director of the Institute – its only member of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Nazarenko had neither the respect of scholars nor scientific authority, but he did have official entitlement, for example, to ban open admission students from the lectures of Viktor Vinogradov and Ėikhenbaum. With the support of worker-communists invited to join the 1928 presiding committee of the III, Nazarenko closed the General Aesthetics and Philosophy Section headed by Ėngelgardt and Radlov. There began to emerge "an institute within the institute", as Gvozdev called it, that is, the Sociological Committee (Kumpan 2011, 554).

Both of the last administrators of the Institute, Shmidt and Nazarenko, were arrested in 1932. Zubov's house slowly moved to the centre of the game between the officially propagated sociologism and politically interpreted formalism that previously mostly occupied the press. In the face of increasingly ruthless discussion, disputes about the strategy even set the Institute's employees against themselves, often lost in chaotically unfolding events. For example, the activity of the Section of Research on Artistic Culture of the Soviet Union – approved on 28 May 1928, and led by Zhirmunskii – caused a conflict between him and former members of the OPOIaZ, who suspected he compromised on this matter for the sake of own career; they could not appreciate his scientific interest in similar research conducted in Europe. Similarly, they treated Ėikhenbaum's seminar on the literary life as a betrayal of Formalism.

Regardless of political pressures and official decisions by science management institutions, in 1927–1929 Zubov's co-workers strove to continue research in an interdisciplinary, methodologically non-dogmatic, and multifaceted manner. The Kino Committee was reborn, and the experimental work on synaesthetic per-

ception continued in the Kinolaboratorium. Such writers as Konstatin Vaginov, Boris Pil'niak, and Evgenii Zamiatin lectured at the Committee for Contemporary Literature. At the beginning of 1928, the Institute held a discussion on the poetry of the Union of Real Art (Ob''edinenie real'nogo iskusstva, OBėRIu) and, at the end of that year, a poetry meeting with Zabolotskii, Kharms, and Vaginov. The manuscripts of Kliuev, Kuzmin, and Elena Guro entered the archives of the III (Kopytova 2003; 2008). On October 19, 1928, Oskar Walzel gave a guest lecture. On 9 November of the same year, Bernstein initiated an exchange of recordings of poets with the archives of the Sorbonne and the Berlin Institute of Psychology. A group of Tynianov's students continued work on the book *Istoriia russkoi literatury v parodiakh* ('The History of Russian Literature in Parodies'). The Zhirmunskii-led Folkloric Office collected materials for the study of urban folklore.

The end of the Institute began with drastic personnel decisions: the dismissal of Punin, who managed the Contemporary Art Committee from the beginning of the III; the dismissal of Tynianov, who always led the Committee for Contemporary Literature, along with its secretary, Boris Kazanskii; the dismissal of Zhirmunskii from the presiding committee of the III. The most painful for the further functioning of the Institute was the retraction of the right to teach students and doctoral candidates in November 1929. A year earlier, the Institute lost its publishing house Academia. These provisions practically closed the Institute, something officially attempted four times previously in the summer and autumn of 1930. In the place of the Institute, the authorities established the Leningrad Branch of the State Academy on Study of Art (Leningradskoe otdelenie gosudarstvennoi akademii iskusstvoznaniia) in 1931.

In the historical and popular memory of the III, there mostly remains the name "Zubov's House", used more often than all the subsequent official names from the very outset, which testifies to the success of this missionary enterprise (Kliavina 2008, 3). Only Count Zubov remained homeless in the Institute's history until the 1990s. Zubov's archives went to Columbia University (Bakhmeteff Archive), his scientific work received false attributions, and his memoirs were ruthlessly altered by the émigré publishers. The "golden books" of Russian emigration remained silent on him (Struve 1984 [1956]). His 1917 theoretical article about the "Will of form and consciousness of form in the study of art" (sources give different titles) is probably lost to us. Zubov's forty-sheet monograph about the monuments of the Gatchin Palace was never published, although he strived to do just that at the Institute's publishing house, Academia (Krolenko 2003, 167–191). Research on the history of the institution created by Zubov did not include his own scientific work, which he wrote in the conviction that the goal of the art historian is "to consolidate the facts that refer to the 'small history'" (Zubov 2004, 141; Zubov 1968) and keep every detail in its rightful place – an approach that remains in agreement

with our contemporary outlook. Zubov implemented such an approach when he bought a wax relief after the war in a Paris antiquarian shop and had it returned to its original place – in Gatchina (Becker 1990, 122–124).

However, in the consciousness of not only Russian humanists, "Zubov's House" has had a mythical character. Indeed, it functions as a collective *lieux de mémoire* (Nora 1974, 401) – a "place of memory" related to a pioneering project of interdisciplinary and even intersemiotic research developed by scholars from different generations, methodological orientations, and disciplinary backgrounds who shared common scientific and ethical values suppressed at their very inception by Great History, which was well-aware of the dangers posed by Little History. This place continues to be surrounded by a legendary aura whose role is primarily to remind the humanistic intelligentsia of its duties and exemplary attitudes under the threat of authoritarianism. That is why, in recent decades, the III has continued to provoke resistance from various proponents of authoritarian tendencies, expressed in successive attempts to liquidate the "House". Happily, they have so far proved unsuccessful: the informal, trans-generational intellectual community is still working, also on its own history.

Translated by Jan Burzyński

References

Bagrii, Aleksandr. *Formalnyi metod v literature*. Vladikavkaz: Tip. 1 Vladikavkazskoi arteli invalidov-pechatnikov, 1924.

Becker, Anastasia. "Exiles in Finland." *The Other Russia: The Experience of Exile*. Eds. Norman Stone and Michael Glenny. London and Boston, MA: faber and faber, 1990. 122–124.

Berberova, Nina. *Kursiv moi*. Moscow: Soglasie, 1996.

Bernshtein, Sergei. "Golos Bloka." *Blokovskii sbornik*. Vol. 2: *Trudy Vtoroi nauchnoi konferentsii, posviashchennoi izucheniiu zhizni i tvorchestva A. A. Bloka*. Ed. Iurii Lotman. Tartu: Tartuskii gosudarstvennyi universitet, 1972. 454–525.

Beskin, Osip. *Formalizm v zhivopisi*. Moscow: Vsekhudozhnik, 1933.

Bowlt, John. "Prekrasnyi i stradal'cheskii Pavel Filonov." *Tret'iakovskaia Galereia* 40.3 (2013). https://www.tg-m.ru/articles/3-2013-40/prekrasnyi-i-stradalcheskii-pavel-filonov (11 February 2022).

Bukhshtab, Boris. "Pervye romany Weltmana." *'Mladoformalisty': Russkaia proza*. Ed. Ian Levchenko. St. Petersburg: Petropolis, 2007. 73–103.

Druskin, Mikhail. *Issledovaniia. Vospominaniia*. Moscow and Leningrad: Sovetskii kompozitor, 1977.

Ėikhenbaum, Boris. "Fakslis." *Rossiiskii Institut Istorii Iskusstv v memuarakh,* Ed. I. V. Sėpman. St. Petersburg: Ministerstvo Kul'tury Rossiiskoi Federatsii, Rossiiskaia Akademiia Nauk, Rossiiskii Institut Istorii Iskusstv, 2003. 110–111.

Ginzburg, Lidiia. *Chelovek za pis'mennym stolom*. Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel', 1989.

Ginzburg, Lidiia. "Vspominaia Institut istorii iskustv." *Tynianovskii sbornik*. Vol. 5: *Chetvertye Tynianovskie chteniia*. Eds. V. A. Markov, E. A. Toddes, Iu. G. Tsiv'ian, and M. O. Chudakova. Riga: Zinatne, 1990. 278–289.

Gurevich, Semen. "Adrian Piotrovskii, leningradskii entsiklopedist." *Stranitsy khudozhestvennoi zhizni 1920-kh godov*. Ed. Anna Nekrylova. St. Petersburg: Federal'noe Agentstvo po Kul'ture i Kinematografii, 2007. 35–51.

Ismagulova, Tamara. "'Stradnye gody' grafa V. P. Zubova na fone 'serebrianogo veka'." Valentin P. Zubov. *Stradnye gody Rossii: Vospominaniia o revolutsii (1917–1925)*. Ed. T. D. Ismagulova. Moscow: Indrik, 2004. 6–38.

Khodasevich, Vladislav. *Nekropol': Vospominaniia*. Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1996.

Kliavina, Tat'iana. [untitled]. *Zelenyi zal*. Ed. Iurii Smirnov-Nesvitskii. St. Petersburg: Federal'noe Agentstvo po Kul'ture i Kinematografii, 2008. 3.

Kopytova, Galina (ed.). *Iz fondov kabineta rukopisei Rossiiskogo instituta istorii iskusstv*. St. Petersburg: Ministerstvo Kul'tury Rossiiskoi Federatsii, 2003.

Kopytova, Galina (ed.). *Putevoditel' po kabinetu rukopisei Rossiiskogo Instituta Istorii Iskusstv*. St. Petersburg: Ministerstvo Kul'tury Rossiiskoi Federatsii, 2008.

Krolenko, Aleksandr. "Institut i 'Academia': Iz zapisnykh knizhek 1923–1924 goda." *Rossiiskii Institut Istorii Iskusstv v memuarakh,* Ed. I.V. Sėpman. St. Petersburg: Ministerstvo Kul'tury Rossiiskoi Federatsii, Rossiiskaia Akademiia Nauk, Rossiiskii Institut Istorii Iskusstv, 2003. 167–191.

Kumpan, Kseniia. "Institut Istorii Iskusstv na rubezhe 1920-kh–1930-kh gg." *Instituty kul'tury Leningrada na perelome ot 1920-kh k 1930-m godom*. St. Petersburg: Pushkinskii dom, 2011. http://www.pushkinskijdom.ru/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=lSfRoURS2-k%3D&tabid=10460 (11 February 2022).

Likhachev, Boris. *Istoriia kino v Rossii (1896–1926): Materialy k istorii russkogo kino*. Vol. 1: *1896–1913*. Leningrad: Academia, 1927.

Nora, Pierre. "Mémoire collective." *Faire de l'histoire*. Eds. Jacques Le Goff and Pierre Nora. Paris: Gallimard, 1974. 395–410.

Paskhalov, Viacheslav. "K voprosu o fonograficheskoi zapisi pesen' i tsentral'noi pesennoi fonoteki." *Trudy gosudarstvennogo instituta muzykal'noi nauki: Sbornik rabot Ėtnograficheskoi sektsii* 1 (1926): 83 – 90.

Pesochinskii, Nikolai. "Nachalo teatrovedeniia: Gvozdevskaia shkola." *Stranitsy khudozhestvennoi zhizni 1920-kh godov*. Ed. Anna Nekrylova. St. Petersburg: Federal'noe Agentstvo po Kul'ture i Kinematografii, 2007. 71–107.

Sėpman, I. V. (ed.). *Rossiiskii Institut Istorii Iskusstv v memuarakh*. St. Petersburg: Ministerstvo Kul'tury Rossiiskoi Federatsii, Rossiiskaia Akademiia Nauk, Rossiiskii Institut Istorii Iskusstv, 2003.

Seryi, Grigorii [Ginger, Grigorii]. "Monastyr' na gossnabzhenii." [1926] *Rossiiskii Institut Istorii Iskusstv v memuarakh*. Ed. I.V. Sėpman. St. Petersburg: Ministerstvo Kul'tury Rossiiskoi Federatsii, Rossiiskaia Akademia Nauk, Rossiiskii Institut Istorii Iskusstv, 2003. 242.

Shapovalova, Liubov' [Lubov]. "The Russian state institute of art history: Its contributions to literary scholarship and its liquidation: A Study on Russian Formalism." *Zapiski Russkoi akademicheskoi gruppy v SSHA – Transactions of the Association of Russian-American Scholars in the USA*. Vol. 6. California: Association of Russian-American Scholars in U.S.A., 1972. 115–159.

Shmit, P. F. "Vospomonaniia ob ottse." *Rossiiskii Institut Istorii Iskusstv v memuarakh*. Ed. I.V. Sėpman. St. Petersburg: Ministerstvo Kul'tury Rossiiskoi Federatsii, Rossiiskaia Akademiia Nauk, Rossiiskii Institut Istorii Iskusstv, 2003. 190–220.

Struve, Gleb. *O chetyrekh poėtakh*. London: Overseas Publications Interchange, 1981.

Struve, Gleb. *Russkaia literatura v izgnanii*. Paris: Ymca Press, 1984.

Tolmachevskaia, Natalia. "Moi put' v iskusstve." *Rossiiskii Institut Istorii Iskusstv v memuarakh*. Ed. I.V. Sėpman. St. Petersburg: Ministerstvo Kul'tury Rossiiskoi Federatsii, Rossiiskaia Akademiia Nauk, Rossiiskii Institut Istorii Iskusstv, 2003. 40–47.

Tynianov, Iurii. *Arkhaisty i novatory*. Leningrad: Priboi, 1929.

Uspenskii, Lev. "Iazyk revolutsii." *Piat' iskusstv: Vremennik*. Leningrad: Academia, 1928.

Zarankina, Iulia. "Literaturnaia nekrografia," *Novyi zhurnal/The New Review* 247 (2007): 247.

Zelenin, Dmitrii. *Krest'ianskoe iskusstvo Severa: Ob iskusstvovedcheskoi ėkspeditsii na Russkii Sever*. Leningrad: Academia, 1926. 105–106.

Zubov, Valentin. *Karlik favorita: Istoriia zhizni Ivana Andreevicha Iakubskogo, karlika Svetleishego kniazia Platona Aleksandrovicha Zubova, napisana im samim*. Eds. Dmitrij Tschiževskij, Dietrich Gerhardt, Ludolf Müller, Alfred Rammelmeyer, and Linda Sadnik-Aitzetmüller. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1968.

Zubov, Valentin. "Otkrytie Instituta istorii iskusstv." *Rossiiskii Institut Istorii Iskusstv v memuarakh*. Ed. I. V. Sėpman. St. Petersburg: Ministerstvo Kul'tury Rossiiskoi Federatsii, Rossiiskaia Akademiia Nauk, Rossiiskii Institut Istorii Iskusstv, 2003. 9–10.

Zubov, Valentin. *Stradnye gody Rossii: Vospominaniia o revolutsii (1917–1925)*. Ed. T. D. Ismagulova. Moscow: Indrik, 2004.

Zubov, Valentin. *Pavel I* [1963]. Trans. by V. A. Semenova. St. Petersburg: Aleteiia, 2007.

Craig Brandist

The Institute for the Comparative History of the Literatures and Languages of the West and East (ILIaZV)

The Institute for the Comparative History of the Literatures and Languages of the West and East (Nauchno-issledovatel'skii institut sravnitel'noi istorii literatur i iazykov Zapada i Vostoka, ILIaZV) was an important research institute in Leningrad throughout the 1920s. It was originally founded as the Aleksandr Veselovskii Institute (Institut im. A.N. Veselovskogo), which was organised by the Slavist Nikolai Derzhavin (1877–1953) within Petrograd University in 1921, and was renamed ILIaZV in 1923. It changed its name again to the State Institute for Discursive Culture (Gosudarstvennyi institut rechevoi kul'tury, GIRK) in 1930, and after a series of further reorganisations was merged into the philology faculty of Leningrad (now St Petersburg) State University, which still exists today. Here the acronym ILIaZV will be used throughout.

The heyday of the institute spans the period between the end of the Russian Civil War (1918–1921) and the so-called 'Great Break' that coincided with Stalin's launch of the first Five Year Plan (1928, but especially from 1929). At this time there was a parallel structure of Party and state institutions, with the latter maintaining considerable autonomy from the ideas of the governing Party. Nevertheless, the institutes were clearly framed by government policy and the availability of funds for certain kinds of research had significant effects on the work carried out. This is, however, hardly something that was peculiar to the USSR, though it might be noted that autonomy narrowed in the period in question. While beginning work under the auspices of the Faculty of Social Sciences of Petrograd (later Leningrad) University, the institute came under the administrative and budgetary controls of the Russian Association of Scientific Research Institutes in the Social Sciences (Rossiiskaia assotsiatsiia nauchno-issledovatel'skikh institutov obshchestvennykh nauk, RANION), formally in May 1927 but in practice to an increasing extent from 1925. RANION had originally been formed in October 1921 to administer the institutes of history, scientific philosophy, economics, Soviet law, linguistics and the history of literature, archaeology and art studies, and experimental psychology within Moscow State University (MGU). In 1924, RANION and the institutes it coordinated were separated from the MGU's Social Sciences Faculty and it gradually incorporated several more scientific institutes from Moscow and Leningrad including institutes for the study of the ethnic and national cultures of the east of the USSR, material culture (GAIMK), Marxism, and art scholarship (GAKhN).

In March 1926 the Presidium of RANION instructed ILIaZV to develop a Marxist seminar for postgraduates (*aspiranty*), more firmly link its linguistic work with national minorities and literary work with the requirements of practical life (RGALI [SPb] 288/1/15/49-49ob). From May 1927 the institute's production plan and the composition of its governing college had to be approved by RANION. The institute's plan and work had to be reflected in the work of all its sections and members and themes had to have "a scientific-topical character both from the point of view of the theory and methodology of science and from the point of view of the interests of socialist construction" (GARF A-4655/1/94/5-7ob). The sphere for research activity within this remit remained quite broad, however. As Zinder and Stroeva note:

> A characteristic feature of the time was an urge to derive something of directly practical usefulness from all research. And the field for activity in this sense was vast: in the first place the majority of languages were essentially unstudied and had no written form, the national language policy of the fledgling Soviet state introduced the study of a native language and in a native language; there was the spread of the literary language among the laboring masses: worker-correspondents, peasant correspondents, agitators and propagandists; a method of teaching foreign European languages widely took root among the masses, a method that had to be decisively distinguished from the "method of the governess" (L.V. Shcherba). New types of grant were created in connection with all these tasks. (Zinder and Stroeva 1999, 207)

The institute was particularly important in that it brought together a range of prominent scholars working in areas of linguistics and literary studies and organized them into what were then radically new collective research projects. From these projects emerged a range of intellectual trends and texts that were to have a considerable impact on the future development of linguistic and literary scholarship. Perhaps the clearest statement of the focus of the institute's research was as follows:

1) Problems of international and intra-national linguistic and literary exchange on the basis of the socio-economic, political and general cultural interaction of peoples and countries.
   a) The interaction of linguistic units (national and class languages, ethnic and social dialects and so on);
   b) International literary exchange in connection with the social development of peoples and countries that are in literary interaction.
2) The study of the languages and the oral art (*tvorchestvo*) of the contemporary city, village and the national minorities of the USSR, along with the peoples bordering East and West on the basis of their socio-economic, political and general-cultural development. (RGALI [SPb] 288/1/39/1ob)

A number of observations can be made about this. Firstly, it combined an evolutionary approach to discursive phenomena with attention to issues of the diffusion of linguistic and literary innovations. It thus broke out of the dominant paradigms in European philology of the time, which either traced the internal evolution of societies and cultures in time or sought to trace the spread of lexical units and literary motifs across space. At the same time there was no strict division between the methods of linguistic and literary analysis since the category of 'verbal art' (*slovesnoe tvorchestvo*) pertained both to oral and written phenomena. Relations between regional and sociological dialects and the national language one the one hand, and between folklore and literature on the other were seen as being different dimensions of a single research problematic. Linguistic and literary scholars thus worked in close connection, with individual scholars often publishing in areas that we would not define as linguistics and literary studies.

A sense of this can be gained from the early structure of the institution. In 1923 there were three general sections and four regional sections: 1) The Theory and Methodology of Literature; 2) General Linguistics; 3) Modern and Recent Literatures; 4) The Romano-Germanic World; 5) The Slavic-Greek world and the Near East; 6) The Central-Asian, Indian, and Far Eastern World; 7) The Ancient Irano-Hellenic World (RGALI [SPb] 288/1/13/10). While 1 and 2 were aimed at establishing the methodologies of specific disciplines, 4, 5, 6 and 7 were only defined regionally, encouraging cross-fertilization between disciplines. Meanwhile 3 encouraged literary studies across regions. The structure of the institution underwent many changes throughout the decade, but this stress on comparative history was retained, as was reflected in the very name of the institute.

As the original name of the institute suggests, the legacy of Aleksandr Veselovskii, one of the founders of comparative literature, was powerfully present and the Romance scholar and Veselovskii's senior student Vladimir Shishmarev (1875–1957) played a leading role in the work of the literary section. Indeed, in some respects the original institute was a recomposition of Veselovskii's Neo-philological Society, which brought together linguists, literary scholars and orientologists at St Petersburg University, but in very different, post-revolutionary conditions. One of the earliest projects was to publish the work of Veselovskii, and a number of the senior scholars at the institute had, in one way or another, been involved in the Society and their subsequent research grew out of its shared concerns with the nature of 'verbal art'. Veselovskii's search for constitutive features of literature as such, which transcended national languages and traditions, were taken up by Russian formalist theorists at a neighboring institute, the Russian (later State) Institute for the History of the Arts (Gosudarstvennyi institut istorii iskusstv, GIII), while his concerns with the rise of poetic forms from earlier states of 'verbal art' such as myth and folklore were taken up by literary historians

and those seeking to develop sociological approaches to literature at a number of different institutions. ILIaZV was particularly interesting because it was here that exchanges between those seeking to develop the different trends took place within common research projects.

The staff of the institute included such notable and varied scholars as the controversial linguist and orientologist Nikolai Marr, the biblical scholar Izrail Frank-Kamenetskii, the classicist Ol'ga Freidenberg, the formalist literary critics Boris Tomashevskii (1890–1957) and Boris Ėikhenbaum (1886–1959), and the linguist students of Jan Baudouin de Courtenay (1845–1929), Lev Shcherba (1880–1944), and Lev Iakubinskii (1892–1943), and the literary scholar and germanist Viktor Zhirmunskii (1891–1971). The institute also hosted the art historian Ieremiia Ioffe and members of what is now generally (and not unproblematically) known as the Bakhtin Circle: Pavel Medvedev and Valentin Voloshinov. As well as publishing a series of significant monographs and collections, the institute also published a journal *Iazyk i literatura* (*Language and Literature*).

1 Terminology

Given the centrality of the notion of 'verbal art' here, it is worth pausing to consider terminology since translation between Russian and English of related terms proves very problematic. The Russian *slovo* means 'word' but not only the individual lexical unit – it corresponds better to the Greek term *logos*, meaning both word and logic, way of thinking. It may therefore be translated by the term 'discourse' in certain cases, though this emphatically does not correspond to the term that has come to be associated with the French philosopher Michel Foucault. It has the general sense of language in use whether oral or written. Unfortunately the term *rech'*, meaning speech, may also be translated as 'discourse' in this sense since it may correspond to communication in speech, writing or even gestures. Some of the work at ILIaZV is therefore better considered as a forerunner of communication studies, which incorporated both literary studies and linguistics into a wider discipline along with performance studies and social theory.

2 The *living word*

One of the most interesting projects pursued in the linguistic section of the institute was concerning the so-called 'living word' (*zhivoe slovo*), meaning primarily oral speech, or at least language as used in concrete situations. The idea of the

living word was in contrast to the printed word (*pechatnoe slovo*), and had some history behind it, not least because the dichotomy between 'living' and 'printed' word had been mapped onto the dialectic of agitation and propaganda that had been developed in Lenin's 1902 book *Chto delat'?* (*What Is To Be Done?*), and which achieved canonical status after his death. Research on the 'living word' had initially been established at the short-lived Institute of the Living Word (Institut zhivogo slova, IZhS) in 1919, which aimed to teach the masses to speak publicly and to bring about a situation in which there was an 'equality of speech' based on the principle of Athenian democracy, *Isegoria*. The performative dimensions of language were of special interest at this institute, and it was closely associated with performance and theatre studies. Many of the figures who participated in the IZhS ended up as researchers at ILIaZV. This included the formalists and students of Baudouin de Courtenay, as well as the philosopher of the Symbolist movement Konstantin Èrberg. In the meantime the oratory section of the IZhS morphed into courses in public speech and then, in the 1930s, into the Volodarskii Institute of Agitation, with a narrow focus on training Party functionaries and managers. The term "agitation" had by this time been severed from all connections to deliberation and democracy.

One of the earliest projects at ILIaZV was on the speech of the recently deceased leader Lenin, which resulted in a number of fine essays by, *inter alia*, Viktor Shklovskii, Iurii Tynianov, Èikhenbaum, Iakubinskii and Grigorii Vinokur. These were published in the journal *Lef* in 1924. After this a Laboratory of Public Discourse (*rech'*) was established to analyze recordings of 'masters of the living word,' ranging from certain speeches of Lenin, Trotskii and Lunacharskii to performances of poets such as Maiakovskii and Esenin. The laboratory also surveyed various theoretical approaches to public discourse, only some of which was published as a result of changes in the structure of the institution and in the wider socio-political environment. The notable exception is Konstantin Èrberg's article "O formakh rechevoi kommunikatsii" (1929, "On the Forms of Speech Communication"), which critically surveys works on the social functions of language by French linguists like Michel Bréal, Charles Bally and Antoine Meillet and their Soviet followers Rozalia O. Shor and Mikhail N. Peterson. For Èrberg all functions of language are communicative functions and 'social facts' that may be ordered in an ascending line from the most passive to the most active:

> 1) *nominative*, 2) *interrogative* and 3) *informational* deal only with thoughts. 4) *Aesthetic* deals with thoughts and emotions. 5) *Imperative* transmits the speaker's decisions of the will, emotions and thoughts. (Èrberg 1929, 178)

This fledgling communicative theory was developed in a much more thorough way in a number of articles that still languish in Èrberg's archive. Here the simple

division for discourse into oral and written forms of communication is questioned on a number of bases, one of which is the spread of electronic media and the consequent transformation of any notion of 'mass listener.' Much more significant were patterns of potential interaction between speakers and the effects this has on the structure of communication. This leads to a more elaborate and sophisticated categorization of types of public discourse, on which see Brandist (2007).

In the last years of the Institute Iakubinskii developed the idea that forms of public discourse had typical forms, or generic qualities, and while they are more likely to be written than forms of conversational speech, this distinction is by no means absolute. With the rise of capitalism "public discourse begins to 'flourish' in parliament and at court, in higher education institutes and at public lectures, at rallies and congresses; even the square becomes its platform":

> Parliamentary discourse, a diplomat's address to a conference, a statement in a dispute or at a rally, a political speech, the discourse of a lawyer or prosecutor, agitational speech on the street etc. etc. These are genres of public discourse characteristic of capitalism as opposed to feudalism, regardless of the fact that we find their embryos under feudalism. Capitalism speaks publicly incalculably more and in a different way than feudalism. Public speaking under feudalism is narrowly specialized, limited by the narrow domains of sociality; public speaking under capitalism pretends to universality; it wants to be as universal a form as conversational language... In accumulating the various genres of oral public discourse, capitalist sociality also accumulates corresponding written genres. (Iakubinskii 1930, 89–90)

While capitalism develops a wide variety of genres of public discourse and aims to transform them into universal forms of verbal interaction adopted by all members of a particular society, it simultaneously restricts them to those genres. This necessarily leads to an unequal distribution of linguistic resources within a society and, consequently, the idea of having a common unified language shared by all classes remains a myth, for the conflict created by the class-structure of a capitalist society sets limits to the unifying tendencies (Iakubinskii 1930, 92). This is something that was to be taken up by Mikhail Bakhtin in his widely received essays on the novel of the 1930s.

3 Voloshinov, *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, 1929

The concerns of the linguistic section of the Institute made their way into what is now one of the best-known works to emerge from the Institute, Valentin Voloshinov's 1929 monograph *Marksizm i filosofiia iazyka* (1929, *Marxism and the*

Philosophy of Language). Significantly, however, Voloshinov worked in the literature section of the institute, and the work straddles the two areas. Apart from an early, critical work on Freudianism in the USSR, Voloshinov's work came out of a project to construct a 'sociological poetics' at ILIaZV, and he was originally planning a work on that very subject (see the draft in Brandist 2008, 190–195). Starting from the idea that speaking is a type of acting, as discussed by the philosophers of language Anton Marty and Karl Bühler, Voloshinov began, in an article of 1926, by distinguishing between the word (*slovo*) in life and in poetry, showing how in the former meaning is derived both from linguistic context and social situation, while in the latter it is derived only from linguistic context. This he later developed into an argument that language and ideology are co-extensive in his monograph. Here Voloshinov took issue with two theories of language: a) that of Saussure, which, like many others at the time, he understood to be based on the idea that language *is* a stable, normative system of signs (Saussure actually argued linguistics views language from the synchronic *point of view*), and b) the Romantic idea that language is the expression of an individual, pre-linguistic meaning (the works of Benedetto Croce and Karl Vossler are held up as examples of this position). Voloshinov argues that language exists only in the exchange of utterances (dialogue), oral or written, and that social evaluation and forms of inter-subjective interaction are registered in the way in which language is employed in these social acts. For Voloshinov there is a constant struggle over definitions of certain important words, such as 'freedom,' 'democracy' and the like, and that the ruling class aims to impose its own definition as a 'neutral' standard. This struggle between socially specific perspectives is, furthermore, registered in all concrete discursive acts and can be detected in their stylistic structure. This notion allowed him to maintain that there is continuity between everyday forms of verbal exchange and more crafted and finalized forms of artistic utterance, while not erasing the distinction.

Voloshinov's work appeared just as the political situation was changing fundamentally, as a result of Stalin's so-called 'revolution from above,' and even though a second edition appeared in 1930 it was soon buried beneath partisan criticism and then largely forgotten until the 1970s when it appeared in English translation, and was then translated into a number of other European languages. Unfortunately, many of these translations were not very rigorous. Perhaps most problematic was Marina Yaguello's flawed 1977 French translation, the problems of which were compounded when it, rather than the Russian original, was made the basis of the first translations into Italian and Portuguese. This led to many problems conveying the main concepts developed in the work. Important terminological distinctions were obscured, while the philosophical resonance of certain ideas was lost. This led to a range of wayward interpretations in which the differences between Voloshinov's theoretical perspective and that of the French

structuralist and poststructuralist thinkers of the late twentieth century was effaced. These kinds of problems were to multiply when Bakhtin's works on the novel began to appear in translation in the 1980s.

4 Sociological poetics

The project out of which Voloshinov's book emerged proved to be a very productive one. It was initially led by Shishmarev, but it was perhaps the head of the Institute's literary section Vasilii Desnitskii who shaped the research project most energetically. Desnitskii had been a Party member at the time of the 1905 Revolution, and was associated with the early attempts to promote proletarian culture led by Aleksandr Bogdanov, Anatolii Lunacharskii and Maksim Gor'kii, but he was now the Dean of the Philology Faculty at the Herzen Institute, from where he recruited a number of young scholars for the project. Voloshinov was one such scholar, and Desnitskii supervised his research work. Other recruits were the literary scholar and member of the Bakhtin Circle Pavel Medvedev, and the art scholar Ieremiia Ioffe. In 1926, Voloshinov and Medvedev produced critiques of the work of Pavel Sakulin (Medvedev 1926; Voloshinov 1926), the Moscow-based literary scholar, who sought to develop a sociological method in literary studies (Sakulin 1925), because they thought he had failed to construct a 'synthetic' approach to literary studies that could account for the complex elements of literary phenomena and present a fully-rounded account of the process of literary development. While having identified the necessary goal of creating a unified methodology for such a study, Sakulin had fallen back into the very dualism he tried to overcome. 'Immanent' and 'causal' factors were still separated so that formal and stylistic analyses proceeded apart from considerations of the social factors that shaped literature. Stylistic factors, they argued, need to be viewed as the manifestation of social evaluations.

Like Zhirmunskii, Sakulin did, however, provide erudite overviews and critical discussions of the work of a number of important German literary scholars who, they felt, made progress in the sociological study of literary form. One such figure was Oskar Walzel, who brought the methodologies of German art scholarship to bear on literary texts. Trends within literary history, including generic and stylistic features, were now viewed as embodiments of the worldview of authors and their social environment. Walzel's works were translated into Russian and he visited Moscow and Leningrad at the end of the 1920s. It was, however, Ioffe who produced the first sustained attempt to provide a unified methodology for the sociological study of style. In his 1927 book *Kul'tura i stil* (1927, *Culture and Style*)

Ioffe argued that the separation of form and content can only ever be an abstract conception since they are but two aspects of a single phenomenon. Expounding a monistic perspective, Ioffe argued that it would make more sense to consider "formed content" or "contentual [*soderzhatel'naia*] form" as dimensions of a particular social worldview or "mental set" [*ustanovka*]. The 'social' is thus the very fabric of the aesthetic object, and style is but a manifestation of social thought. The history of the arts should therefore be considered as a unity with the history of forms of social thought, with each different sphere manifesting, in specific ways, the same historically defined and socially articulated worldviews.

Another major product of the project was Pavel Medvedev's 1928 book *Formal'nyi metod v literaturovedenii* (1928, *The Formal Method in Literary Scholarship*). This has quite often been read as a critique of Russian formalism but, as the book's subtitle suggests, it is primarily *A Critical Introduction to Sociological Poetics* (*Kriticheskoe vvedeniie v sotsiologicheskuiu poėtiku*). It appeared in the wake of a prominent discussion about formalism at the Institute, at which there were acrimonious exchanges between some of the polemical formalists and certain rather doctrinaire Marxists. Desnitskii, who chaired the discussion, brought proceedings to a close with a vote in which the formalists were a minority. Medvedev's book gave the formalists significant credit for seeking to specify the object domain of literary studies, but held that the way they had gone about achieving this specification, based on the opposition of literary and everyday language, was seriously flawed. After summarizing the problems with the formalist case, Medvedev went on to outline a positive programme in which the specificity of the literary domain would be related to other spheres of social discourse. The formalists had themselves begun to move in this direction, most notably in Iurii Tynianov's essay "O literaturnoi ėvoliutsii" (1929, "On Literary Evolution"), but Medvedev focused on the formalists' earlier and more polemical pronouncements in order to draw a contrast between the 'formal' and 'sociological' methods. Literary scholarship would not become one of a number of so-called 'sciences of ideologies,' which corresponded to the academic disciplines of the social sciences and humanities then in the process of formation. This programme drew heavily on the German neo-Kantian philosophy, phenomenology, and the thinkers who had been popularized in Russia by Zhirmunskii and Sakulin. The history of literature, Medvedev argued, needs to be understood as a dialectic of 'intrinsic' and 'extrinsic' factors, with ideological phenomena from various parts of the social world being incorporated into literary works where they acquire an 'aesthetic validity' and, in turn, influencing other spheres. The 'essence' of the ideological structure may now become perceptible.

There is little doubt that the project proved to be extremely productive of new approaches and laid the foundations for a non-reductive, sociological approach to literature. The changing political and institutional situation was, however, to limit

the further development and influence of this work for a number of decades. Nevertheless, the new approach did exert a significant influence on Mikhail Bakhtin, who recast his early phenomenological approach to author-hero relations in the terms of sociological poetics. Voloshinov and Medvedev helped Bakhtin who, at the time, was unable to work at an institute for health reasons, to publish his resulting monograph, *Problemy tvorchestva Dostoevskogo* (1929, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Art*) in the project's series of monographs.

5 Semantic palaeontology

Ioffe's idea of the unitary process of intellectual and stylistic development in many respects reformulated the German idealist notion of the becoming of mind or spirit (*Geist*) in various concrete manifestations. However, it also focused on changing forms of labour and socio-economic stages of historical development. This corresponded to Nikolai Marr's notion of the 'single glottogonic process' through which all languages progress, punctuated by shifts in the relations of production. Forms of thought, of language, of art and literature are, in Ioffe's analysis, but aspects of a single monistic process of development. Each has its own specificities and immanent features, but they nevertheless constitute aspects on one single process. Ioffe avoided mechanical correlations between styles, historical periods and intellectual movements by arguing that any given cultural phenomenon combined various layers, where survivals of earlier stages were deposited in a given work or style. They constituted modes of life that had undergone modernization, semantic phenomena that had undergone a historically conditioned reworking.

It was Izrail' Frank-Kamenetskii and Ol'ga Freidenberg who worked out the philosophical and methodological implications for literary studies in a project to update Veselovskii's 'poetics of plot' (Veselovskii 2004 [1897–1906], 493–596) according to contemporary thought. The project aimed

> to place the traditional comparative study of plots on the soil of primordial, ancient and medieval sociality: the reason behind the migration of plots lies in the convergence of the social structures of those peoples from which and with which they are transferred; alongside this an independent birth of plots on the basis of convergent social conditions of life is also possible. In the most ancient periods the group works in connection with [Marr's] Japhetic Theory. (RGALI (SPb) 288/1/27/11ob.)

The methodological principles were developed in Frank-Kamenetskii's 1929 article "Pervobytnoe myshlenie v svete iafeticheskoi teorii i filosofii" (1929, "Primordial thinking in the light of Japhetic Theory and Philosophy") that was published in the Institute's journal. Here we find strong parallels made between Ernst

Cassirer's work on "mythical thinking" and the role of the symbol in the history of social consciousness, with Marr's semantic palaeontology. For Frank-Kamenetskii, "Marr's theory of the single glottogonic process" posed a new task for those studying metaphor and plot, "the problem of the derivation and transformation of folkloric motifs from the shifts of successive stages of development of society and worldview" (SPF ARAN 77/1 (1934)/21/64). While the specificities of a national culture need to be recognised, they now needed to be viewed as the result of historical development, with each culture "passing through the same stages, but complicated in each particular region by the specific conditions of space and time and authentically completed through interactions and influences" (Frank-Kamenetskii 1935, 113). The deepening division between mental and manual labour and the rise of class society leads mythical plot forms to become 'rationalized,' first into forms of folklore and ultimately into poetic or literary forms.

It was not until 1932 that this resulted in a full-scale collective study in which the Mediaeval romance *Tristan and Isolda* was subject to paleontological analysis until the various manifestations of the same plot and metaphors, in a wide variety of different cultures, were traced back to the myth of the Afro-Eurasian goddess Ishtar (Marr 1932). Behind the tale of forbidden love, the personification of cosmic forces was revealed. This constituted something of a collective manifesto for literary palaeontological semantics, and throughout the 1930s Frank-Kamenetskii and Freidenberg produced a number of valuable studies of biblical myths, ancient Indian literature and the Greek classics. Such focus on the remote past was of little concern to the cultural bureaucrats of the time and proceeded with relatively little interference in a number of institutes in the 1930s. It also exerted a significant influence on Zhirmunskii's work in comparative literature and on Mikhail Bakhtin's work on the so-called 'chronotope' and on 'carnival,' in which ancient structures of plot and the characters therein reappear at various stages of literary history, but always in a new form. (See also Galin Tihanov's chapter on semantic paleontology in this volume.)

6 Closure

ILIaZV (by now GIRK) became a victim of the wholescale restructuring of the scientific field at the beginning of the 1930s. After a considerable period of uncertainty both sections were incorporated into a Leningrad Institute of History, Philosophy, Literature and Linguistics (LIFLI) before being absorbed into the Philology Faculty of Leningrad University in 1937. Many of the directions of research developed at ILIaZV influenced future developments, but the specific dynamic that led to much path-breaking research in the 1920s was unfortunately lost.

References

Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovich. *Problemy tvorchestva Dostoevskogo*. Leningrad: Priboi, 1929.

Brandist, Craig. "The Word Made Self: Russian Writings on Language." *Slavonic and East European Review* 85/3 (2007): 569–571.

Brandist, Craig. "Sociological Linguistics in Leningrad: The Institute for the Comparative History of the Languages and Literatures of the West and East (ILIaZV) 1921–33." *Russian Literature* 63.2–4 (2008): 171–200.

Ėrberg, K. A. "O formakh rechevoi kommunikatsii. K voprosu o iazykovykh funktsiiakh." *Iazyk i literatura* 3 (1929): 156–179.

Frank-Kamenetskii, Izrail' G. "Pervobytnoe myshlenie v svete iafeticheskoi teorii i filosofii." *Iazyk i literatura* 3 (1929): 70–155.

Frank-Kamenetskii, Izrail' G. "Akademik N.Ia. Marr." *Front nauki i tekhniki* 1 (1935): 109–114.

Iakubinskii, Lev P. "Klassovyi sostav sovremennnogo russkogo iazyka: iazyk krest'ianstva. Stat'ia chetvertaia." *Literaturnaia ucheba* 4 (1930): 80–92.

Ioffe, Ieremiia I. *Kul'tura i stil'*. Leningrad: Priboi, 1927.

Lenin, Vladimir Il'ich [N. Lenin]. *Chto delat'? Naibolevshie voprosy nashego dvizheniia.* Stuttgart: Verlag von J. H. W. Dietz Nachf., 1902

Marr, Nikolai Ia. (ed.). *Tristan i Izol'da: Ot geroini liubvi feodal'noi Evropy do bogini matriarkhal'noi Afrevrazii. Kollektivnyj trud Sektora semantiki mifa i fol'klora.* Leningrad: Izd. AN SSSR, 1932.

Medvedev, Pavel N. "Sotsiologizm bez sotsiologii (o metodologicheskikh rabotakh P.N. Sakulina)." *Zvezda* 2 (1926): 267–71.

Medvedev, Pavel N. *Formal'nyi metod v literaturovedenii: kriticheskioe vvedeniie v sotsiologicheskuiu poetiku*. Leningrad: Priboi, 1928.

Sakulin, Pavel Nikolaevich. Nauka o literature-ee itogi i perspektivy: Sotsiologicheskii metod v literaturovedenii. Moscow: Mir, 1925.

Tynianov, Iurii. "O literaturnoi evoliutsii." Iurii Tynianov, *Arkhaisty i novatory*. Leningrad: Priboi, 1929. 30–47.

Veselovskii, Aleksandr N. *Istoricheskaia poetika* [1897–1906]. Moscow: URSS, 2004.

Voloshinov, Valentin N. "Slovo v zhizni i slovo v poezii." Zvezda 6 (1926): 244–67.

Voloshinov, Valentin N. *Marksizm i filosofiia iazyka: Osnovnye problemy sotsiologicheskogo metoda v nauke o iazyke.* Leningrad: Priboi, 1929.

Zinder, Lev Rafailovich, and Tatiana V. Stroeva. "Institut rechevoi kul'tury i sovetskoe iazykoznanie 20-30-kh godov." *Iazyk i rechevaia deiatel'nost'* 2 (1999): 206–211.

Archival materials

Gosudarstvennyi arkhiv rossiiskoi federatsii. GARF (Moscow)

Fond #A–4655 Rossiiskaia assotsiatsiia nauchno-issledovatel'skikh institutov obshchesvennykh nauk (RANION).

Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv literatury i iskusstva. RGALI (St Petersburg)

Fond #288 Nauchno-issledovatel'skii institut sravnitel'noi istorii literatur i iazykov Zapada i Vostoka (ILIAZV).

Sankt Peterburgskii filial arkhiva rossiiskoi akademii nauk. PFA RAN (St Petersburg)

Fond #77 Institut iazyla i myshleniia im. N.Ia. Marra.

Nikolaj Plotnikov

The State Academy of Art Studies in Moscow (RAKhN/GAKhN)

1 The scope of activity and the formation of the Academy

The State Academy of Art Studies (Gosudarstvennaia [until June 1925: Rossiiskaia] akademiia khudozhestvennykh nauk, RAKhN/GAKhN) was a scientific, art- and cultural-political institution in Soviet Russia, founded in Moscow to further the "comprehensive exploration of all kinds of art and artistic culture" (Sidorov 1927, 78, § 1) in order to function as an advisory body to the People's Commissariat for Education (Narodnyi Komissariat Prosveshcheniia, Narkompros) on cultural-political decisions. The Academy was active from 13 October 1921 (the date of its board's convocation under President Petr S. Kogan) to 3 January 1930, when it underwent complete reorganisation due to an ideologically motivated 'purge'; it was finally dissolved on 10 April 1931 (see Iakimenko 2005).

The Academy's concept was born of the spirit of 'synthesis'. It was developed in the meetings of Narkompros' scholarly-artistic commission (Nauchno-khu-dozhestvennaia komissiia) called by People's Commissar Anatolii Lunacharskii, held from 16 June to 13 October 1921. Prestigious exponents of Russian culture joined in the commission's work: artists Wassily Kandinsky, Konstantin Youn, and others), scholars and philosophers (Aleksandr Gabrichevskii, Aleksei Sidorov, Gustav Shpet, Semen Frank, and others) as well as cultural politicians and ideologists (A. Lunacharskii, P. Kogan) all agreed to create a new institution for the fusion of scholarship, art, and cultural politics (see Kogan 1927).

As a *research institution*, the Academy was supposed to create a platform for the new 'history and theory of art' (hence the Academy's protagonists' central slogan; see Gabrichevskii 2002) in which all kinds of scholarly explorations of art (in the cultural, social, and natural sciences and philosophy) constituted a transdisciplinary union intended to overcome the methodical and thematic frag-mentation of the individual disciplines of the history and theory of art. Studies on the arts yet to be acknowledged by academia (dance, theatre, poster art, film, folklore), on contemporary art and on applied arts and design were also included in this 'synthesis' of the history and theory of art (Sidorov 1927, 78, § 3) along with the traditional studies on the history of fine arts. This synthesis was supposed to form an organisational and methodical framework in which experimental research would be combined with the historical and theoretical analysis of art.

In the *field of the arts*, the Academy was tasked with taking over the coordination of art institutions as well as the promotion of exhibitions. Large national and international art and art industry exhibitions presenting the contemporary revolutionary art of Soviet Russia and the West were held at the Academy itself and, with its support, at other places. GAKhN participated in approximately 100 exhibitions (Kogan 1925) in Russia and abroad. Another goal was the systematic development of art criticism on the new basis through its connection to scholarship and the practice of art (examples from the theatre section of GAKhN: see Gudkova 2019).

Finally, the academy was also founded with a 'cultural-political purpose' to be at the Soviet power's disposal as an expert authority on art and culture, the formation of a 'new man' explicitly being one of the state's main objectives. Within this educational objective, art, which was supposed to have a direct effect on the masses, took on a central role in the attainment of a 'reformation of morality' (*pererabotka nravov*; Lenin). Yet, as Lunacharskii explained at one of GAKhN's founding sessions, the development of art as a cultural-political endeavour required the elaboration of a scholarly aesthetic which would have to establish "that the art presented is indeed art and not a surrogate, and also an art that is needed by the masses" (Lunacharskii 1921, 4).

The Academy's organisational concept was influenced by three main designs; these designs provided an integration of research into the field of art and culture. First of all, there were the ideas of GAKhN's president, literary scholar Petr Kogan, who called for Marxist art studies that proved the historical connection of the old and the revolutionary culture sociologically and intellectual-historically, making that connection the basis of the understanding and critical evaluation of art (Kogan 1923).

Kandinskii's ideas on the connection between a scholarly investigation of the 'elements of art' and artistic practice constituted the second design (Kandinskii 2001). Kandinskii's design sees scholarship as the servant of art, which it assists through its scientific and perceptual-psychological analyses. Associates of GAKhN's physical-psychological department founded by Kandinskii accepted the independent position of art scholarship, yet treated art studies as a branch of psychology, viewing the psychological experiment as the main method of gaining insights on art.

Finally, there were the suggestions of Gustav Shpet (1879–1937; Vice President of GAKhN 1924–1929) concerning the elaboration of the philosophical-methodical framework of cultural studies, which were supposed to ensure a continuous cooperation of all disciplines concerned with art (Shpet 1926). However, his ideas on that organisation did not propose a 'synthesis' of art and science, which he rejected as 'Romantic', but tended towards a phenomenological-hermeneutical

conception of art which differentiated between scholarly and artistic approaches (on Shpet's conception of art, see Haardt 1994; Tihanov 2009). Instead of a unity of knowledge or a unified science, a continuum of knowledge was supposed to unfold within art studies. In that sense, the efforts of GAKhN's philosophical department, planned and organised by Gustav Shpet, especially tried to counteract a reductionism from the scientific-psychological as well as the sociological side that was fatal to art research.

All differences considered, these three designs shared an opposition to the ambitions of leftist art theorists and practitioners to interpret *Proletkul't* ('proletarian culture') as a radical breach with previous culture and to install it as the leading ideology of cultural politics.

2 The Academy's structure and the main directions of art research

The plan adopted during the Academy's founding period between late 1921 and early 1922 eventually called for three departments: one *physical-psychological*, one *sociological* and one *philosophical*, using all three designs at least partially. The first department was supposed to "investigate the inner positive laws according to which works of art are created in each single field of art" (Kondrat'ev 1923, 415). Kandinskii himself took over its leadership. After he left for Germany at the end of 1921, the art historian and psychologist Anatolii V. Bakushinskii (1883–1939) became his successor, subsequently organising a broad spectrum of experimental psychological research on art production and reception reaching all the way to the analysis of art-relevant psychic processes in children, people with mental illness, and 'primitive peoples'.

The sociology department, led by Marxist art sociologist Vladimir M. Friche (1870–1929) until 1923, aimed to "investigate art from the perspective of its social genesis and meaning" (Kondrat'ev 1923, 417), which essentially represented an application of Marxist class analysis to art history. Friche's concept tried to explain the function of art using sociological laws, thus showing it as a means in the social struggle for existence. Here, too, the intended sociology of art followed the model of exact nomothetical sciences. "If the development of a sociology of art is successful, then it will be just as exact a science as chemistry or physics. It will be able to restore the history of art to a set of 'mathematically' exact laws governing art in its statics and dynamics" (Friche 1924, 4, in the foreword to the Russian translation of art sociologist Wilhelm Hausenstein's treatise *Versuch einer Soziologie der bildenden Kunst* [1913, *Essay on a Sociology of Fine Arts*]).

The philosophy department, led by Gustav Shpet from February 1922 until 1925, was supposed to analyse "the principal questions as well as the methodical questions of art studies in general" (Kondrat'ev 1923, 419), i. e. questions of the philosophy of art and aesthetics on the one hand and the problematic nature of 'general art studies' as the scientific theory of '*Geisteswissenschaften*' (the humanities) on the other. These two focuses – the philosophical and the scientific-theoretical – were treated systematically as well as historically. In this instance, Shpet explicitly resorted to the concept of 'general art studies' as opposed to 'aesthetics' developed in Germany by Max Dessoir and Emil Utitz.

Behind this combination of institutional entities of GAKhN and its fields of research lay the idea of reaching a 'synthesis' (according to Shpet's explicit correction: a 'synechology'; see Shpet 1926; Plotnikov 2013) of theoretical disciplines reflecting on the practice of art, art education and art presentation. According to the model of the 'synthesis of arts', the Academy's concept subsumed not only the fine arts under the term 'art', but the entire range of arts, including literature, theatre, music, film, and also dance, industrial design, and book art. The cooperation was supposed to be designed 'horizontally', i. e. according to the kind of research on the arts in the three departments (psychology and physiology, philosophy, sociology), as well as 'vertically', i. e. according to the respective field of art in the different sections. Hence the development of an interdisciplinary concept that not only encompasses the entire spectrum of cultural studies, but also includes psychology, sociology, and the natural sciences in art research.

3 The Academy's research programme: the concept of art as language

The central link connecting the different research institutions and approaches as well as establishing the synthetic claim of the Academy's founding concept was the 'idea of language' as the medium of all arts and sciences. From the perspective of language, the arts, sciences, and philosophy were seen as various forms of language with their own specific sets of 'grammar': the 'language of science', acquiring its terminology through a critical evaluation of history and the systematics of aesthetic and art-theoretical terms, correlates with the 'language of art', which enables the articulation of meaning in artistic expression through the constructive connection of the 'elements of art'. Finally, both – the languages of science and of art – correlate with the 'language of things' (*iazyk veshchei*; Gabrichevskii 2010). After all, even things in their primary actuality are not dead objects, but tools and signs of the social and cultural circumstances constituting the encom-

passing horizon of each act of material perception. The analysis of these constitutional processes forms the task of a philosophy of culture legitimising arts studies as studies of cultural reality.

The idea of language as a link between arts studies and philosophy found its organisational realisation in the Academy's central concern to compile the terminological *Ėntsiklopediia iskusstvovedeniia* (*Encyclopaedia of Arts Studies*; Shpet 1926, 18) and *Slovar' khudozhestvennoi terminologii* (*Encyclopaedia of Art Terminology*; Sidorov 1925, 29) that critically examines and newly arranges the entire traditional terminology of discourses about art in order to account for the revolutionary developments in the arts, the sciences, and philosophy (see Plotnikov 2022a, 2022b). The Academy's original concept developed by Kandinskii already considered a central task to be the "examination of existing terminology and the establishment of certain new terms" (Kandinskii 2001, 73). From this task, the Academy's encyclopaedic project evolved to subject the traditional organisation of terminology to a critical evaluation and redefinition in all areas of art research. The project, which considerably gained in differentiation and saw the increasing commitment of research personnel, was discontinued due to the dissolution of the Academy and remained a collection of preliminary studies (fragments are edited in Chubarov 2005 and Chubarov 2017).

But this encyclopaedic project, which embraced the pan-European art discourse of the early twentieth century and at the same time was a predecessor of the great encyclopaedias of *Begriffsgeschichte* (conceptual history) in the post-war era (J. Ritter, R. Koselleck, K. Barck), did not only mean the extension of the terminological field in the analytic consideration of art-historical terms through the integration of philosophical terms and as the language of art technique. At GAKhN this endeavour also triggered a broad theoretical debate about the art-scholarly concept formation and thus the epistemological function of cultural studies in general that accompanied work on the encyclopaedia and has only been sparsely analysed to date. One of the main points of this debate was the question of the meaning of the 'linguisticality' of art. The various interpretations of what art means as a language and the different forms of linguisticality in various arts constituted the spectrum of the European discussion that, long before the 'linguistic turn' and analytical philosophy's entry to aesthetics, takes into account the linguistic constitution of all cultural achievements of mankind (on the various language concepts discussed at GAKhN, see Plotnikov 2014 and Hansen-Löve/Obermayr 2022).

4 'Hermeneutical structural research' in art philosophy and art studies (Gustav Shpet and his Circle at GAKhN)

Gustav Shpet developed the idea of language and 'the word' as the basic principle of his phenomenological-hermeneutical philosophy centred on the problem of understanding meaning; this was a crucial idea for GAKhN. The specifics of his phenomenology lie in the distinction of reasonable understanding (*urazumenie*) as a basis for the cognition of reality, which he primarily sees as socio-cultural, thus deviating from his teacher Edmund Husserl, for whom the cognition of a physical thing forms the first access to truth. From Shpet's point of view, all objects of experience are mainly to be seen as cultural units of meaning that are constituted in the mind. The so-called 'physical things' are only isolated through abstraction from the context of meaning in the culture in which they originally occur (Shpet 1923).

According to Shpet, 'structure' is the central concept for the disclosure of the context of meaning of reality; drawing on the hermeneutics of Wilhelm Dilthey, he introduces this concept as a methodical key concept to cultural theory in contrast to Heinrich Rickert's concept of 'value relations' and Max Weber's theory of 'ideal types'. "Intellectual and cultural entities have an essentially structural character, so one may say that 'intellect' and culture are structural" (Shpet 1922–1923, Vol. 2, 12). Yet the intellect is not structural 'per se' if it can only objectify itself, i. e., express itself externally, in external signs. In other words, structure is the 'concrete expression of meaning'.

Shpet elaborated this concept of structure into a hermeneutical phenomenology of culture following the guidelines of speech comprehension: since, from this point of view, objects in originary experience primarily appear as signs open to understanding, Shpet sees the 'structure of the word' as the paradigm for the constitution of intellectual objectivation in general.

In his *Ėsteticheskie fragmenty* (1922–1923, *Aesthetic Fragments;* see also Hansen-Löve/Obermayr 2022, 158–208), Shpet explains:

> By 'structure of the word' we do not mean the morphological, syntactical, or stylistic edifice, and certainly not its arrangement 'on the horizontal level', but rather the organic, in a way the in-depth structuring of the word – from the sensually tangible to the formal-ideal (eidetic) object and the [layers] on all intermediate levels. Structure is a concrete edifice whose individual parts may change in 'circumference' and even in quality, but from which not a single part of the whole may be removed *in potentia* without destroying the whole. (Shpet 1922–1923, Vol. 2, 11)

Shpet principally analyses the structure of the word, which he sees not only as a single word but as meaningful speech in general, in a communicative perspective. He primarily defines the word as a 'message' that imparts meaning and wants to be understood. From this perspective, two aspects to the structure of the word may be distinguished: 'what' is imparted (the object, the meaning) and 'how' it is imparted (the expression of the imparting subject). Consequently, the word is received differently: the expression representing the mental appearance of the speaker is grasped through 'sympathetic understanding' (or simply 'sympathy' as empathy), the meaning of the message, however, through 'reasoned understanding'. Yet only the latter form of understanding can be seen as a culturally relevant fact. The sympathetic understanding of the individual is a fact of nature, since in the apprehension of the expression there is no increase in meaning.

Shpet analyses the structure of the word as an objectified expression of meaning from a language-phenomenological point of view. This means that in the structure of the word he differentiates between layers and aspects of the correlation of object and consciousness which constitute the meaning of every linguistic expression. The first layers to be examined are the 'external forms of the word' – phonemes and morphemes – which constitute the word as an articulated sound. Through these forms the word manifests itself not only as an acoustic complex but as an organised entity of language with a nominative function. In their basic form, the words of a language are therefore 'names' helping us to designate the objects of the world. While they are already a tool for communication, they are not yet bearers of meaningful messages. Hence, in Shpet's opinion, the name is only a rudimentary form of language. It is only an index of things, but not yet an imparting of meaning, a 'lexis' (articulated sound, the word in its nominative function), but not a 'logos' (meaningful word in its semasiological function as message) (Shpet 1922–1923, II, 28–31).

Meaning first appears on another level, that of 'logical predication'. Here the word appears in its 'predicative function', which it shows through the act of attribution or withdrawal of predicates. It is the area of 'logical forms' (terms and assertions) constituting this first layer of articulation of meaning. This layer of word structure is indispensable because the meaning (object of thought) always has to appear 'within' the logical-linguistic forms, i. e. in definable terms and assertions. Thinking beyond language is plainly impossible, which is why each articulation of meaning has to be linguistically structured and must be based on the forms of logical predication. However, it cannot be reduced to such forms, as these forms as general and abstract forms merely constitute the necessary but not the sufficient basis of meaning.

According to Shpet, the 'poetic forms' of language must be understood correlatively to the logical forms (Shpet 1922–1923, II, 65). They form an analogon of the

terminological language of logics and, for that reason, belong to 'poetical logics' or poetics (the theory of verse, metaphor, and tropes). Accordingly, the word as a term and the word as image have to be differentiated as two fundamental forms of predication. However, they do not stand in contrast, but instead build upon each other. The logical forms (the word as a term) constitute the basis for the poetic forms of the word (the word as image). Together, they constitute the formal framework of language, which Shpet in reference to Wilhelm von Humboldt calls the "inner form of the word" (*vnutrenniaia forma slova*; see Shpet 1927b, see also Hansen-Löve/Obermayr 2022, 221–239). The 'inner form' denotes the 'algorithm' of the constitution of meaning of all reasonable speech – scientific, ordinary, poetic – designed for meaningful messages.

Finally, Shpet distinguishes the last layer of the word's structure that constitutes its core – the word's content or the meaning as such. The meaning is the idea of the thing that is talked about in its relation to the existing thing itself; it is this relationship of the thing in its ontic form (as the object of designation) to this thing as an ideal object (as an object of reasonable understanding) itself. Passing through these levels of word structure (phonetic, morphological, logical-syntactical, objective, or the level of meaning), one arrives at an understanding of the meaning of reality, which, according to Shpet, is the central task of both science and art.

The studies conducted by Shpet's students and associates at GAKhN drew on his concept of structure and developed it in a considerable number of studies at the Academy. In the course of these studies, traits of a scientific direction or even a 'school' became visible that made the project of a 'hermeneutics of culture' the basis of its research (also called the 'formal-philosophical school'; see Hansen-Löve 2012). Here, the term 'structure' was 'operationalised' for the first time by transforming it from a basic term of cultural-philosophical reflection into an 'instrument of humanistic theory and research'. This direction was clearly manifested in GAKhN's activity (and was perceived by its opponents as a unified position), yet was interrupted by the circumstances of the Academy's dissolution and was soon ousted from the contemporary view and that of the researchers participating in the scientific discussions of the 1920s. This direction may be described as 'structural-hermeneutical analysis' (a seemingly paradoxical term in the light of the subsequent developments in the liberal arts; see Ricœur 1974) whose methodical principle was the understanding and interpretation of the structures of meaning of cultural phenomena. Using the terminology of the later philosophy of language, one may say that, within this framework, the focus was placed on the analysis of the semantics of cultural phenomena; the understanding of linguistic expression functioned as the paradigm of this framework (Shpet 1927a, 12–13).

Art – the object of research for Shpet and his colleagues at GAKhN – was interpreted as a language showing a specific structure of meaning which is not under-

stood as a sum of forms, procedures, and combinations of procedures, but as the context of expression accessible to interpretation, i. e. as articulated meaning or as an immanent aim of the work of art and of art in general. The formulation of essential specifications of art as a special language allowed the definition of the aesthetic object in its independent being and thereby the legitimisation of art studies as an autonomous field of study or as a class of cultural studies. Here, language is not seen as a code or a sign system with prescribed grammatical and syntactical rules, but as a semantic and pragmatic complex, as a 'meaningful' and 'communicative' medium. This is connected with the concept of literature or poetics, which Shpet saw as the universal linguistic expression of a nation's cultural consciousness and therefore as art par excellence (in the sense of Hegelian aesthetics; Shpet 2007 [1929]).

In order to outline the spectrum of subjects and the boundaries of research conducted along the lines of 'structural-hermeneutical analysis', some examples of studies conducted at GAKhN shall be mentioned that show a common tendency to investigate the structure of meaning. The specifications of the structural concept occurred in the research conducted by followers of Shpet in the field of art studies as well as historical and literary theory. In this context, mention must be made of the studies by the philologist Grigorii Vinokur (1896–1947), who actively influenced the discussions in Moscow's linguistic circles and functioned as an important mediator between the work of this circle and the research at GAKhN in the 1920s.

Vinokur's early studies are mainly dedicated to the treatment of concrete problems of art studies within the framework of that programme. He already defined the main method of philological studies as a method of interpretation or 'structural critique' (*kritika struktury*; Vinokur 1990, 27), aiming to clarify the stylistic 'task' or the function of the work of art as a distinct object (and not just a form) in his essay "Poètika. Lingvistika. Sotsiologiia" (1923, "Poetics. Linguistics. Sociology").

Vinokur's studies in literary and cultural theory are closest to Shpet's hermeneutical-phenomenological approach in emphasising "the insight into the *structural* edifice of our entire cultural-social existence" as well as the understanding of "culture as an *expression*, an externalisation, and a realisation of meaning" (Vinokur 1990, 87). This approach is especially visible in Vinokur's study *Biografiia i kul'tura* (1927, *Biography and Culture*; see also Hansen-Löve/Obermayr 2022, 285–334), in which he disputes with Wilhelm Dilthey and Eduard Spranger about the position of biographical research in the humanities, criticising the psychological interpretation of 'structure'. The idea of personal life as a historic fact is at the centre of his interest. In continuation of Shpet's thoughts about the 'structure of the word' as a general form of existence of the intellectual world,

Vinokur does not see the task of biography in extrapolating the experience of the historical person, but in reconstructing the context of cultural expressions of meaning or objectifications of the person as the core of his or her individuality. Accordingly, he sees biography as an individual 'structure of meaning' realised in cultural objectifications (see Vinokur 1927).

Another protagonist of the approach of 'structural-hermeneutical analysis' was Mikhail Petrovskii (1887–1937), who laid out the principles of "poetic" or "artistic hermeneutics" (*poėticheskaia* or *khudozhestvennaia germenevtika*) in an essay on the relationship between poetics and art studies (Petrovskii 1927a, 121–122; see also Hansen-Löve/Obermayr 2022, 402–435), and who explained a non-metaphorical understanding of art as a special 'language' with a specific structure of articulation of meaning in a polemic against Oskar Walzel. Petrovskii further developed these propositions in a concrete analysis of the structure of the novella (in the anthology *Ars Poetica*), showing that "even in verbal art we do not detach structure from meaning (because the word is a bearer of meaning)", and that, consequently, "in the novella, the general structure and the general meaning have to depend on each other. Therefore the novella must be simultaneously defined from the perspective of its subject and that of its form of presentation. Together they constitute the structure of the novella" (Petrovskii 1927b, 71).

These propositions later found their continuation in the anthology *Khudozhestvennaia Forma* (Tsires 1927, *Artistic Form*; see also Grübel 2013 and Hansen-Löve/Obermayr 2022, 143–147), which constituted an important result of the discussions at GAKhN about the semiotic-hermeneutical development of art studies. Here, Petrovskii analysed the structure of poetic form in its dual function as expression and as image, while his co-author Andrei Gruber (1900–1970) addressed the structure of the poetic symbol in order to identify the 'minimal' unit of meaning of poetic language (Tsires 1927, 125–155, and Hansen-Löve/Obermayr 2022, 543–577).

The productivity of the new line of research not only manifested itself in the area of the verbal arts, which may be seen as specific forms of language. In this context the application of hermeneutical principles in the interpretation of fine arts as a specific language deserves special attention. The GAKhN anthology *Iskusstvo portreta* (Gabrichevskii 1928, *The Art of the Portrait*) is dedicated to this subject. One of its authors, Aleksei Tsires (1889–1967), designed a "hermeneutics of the painting" and specified it in his "hermeneutics of the portrait" (Tsires 1928, 135, 113) while analysing the 'semantics' of portraiture. Here, too, the focus is on the question of the 'language of portraiture' and the 'structure' of meaning of the person portrayed, who cannot be reduced to the external impression of his or her psychological condition. The research of Nikolai Zhinkin (1893–1979) took a

similar direction; it focused on the personal structure of meaning and its 'embodiment' in the portrait (Zhinkin 1928).

Within the spectrum of positions of GAKhN scholars, a special position is taken by art theoretician Aleksandr G. Gabrichevskii (1891–1968) in his writings on the theory of art studies and spatial arts. The basic theme is also very tightly connected with the thrust of the hermeneutical analysis of the structure of works of fine art, even though Gabrichevskii increasingly interpreted Shpet's structural ideas in line with Goethe's morphology. In an early programmatic sketch entitled *Novaia Teoriia Iskusstva* (*New Theory of Art*), Gabrichevskii defined this theory as "an exploration of the build-up of the artistic object in its entirety, i. e., not only as an exterior formal structure, but also as a special form of expression, as a cultural sign sui generis that requires its own understanding" (Gabrichevskii 2002, 26).

5 Other Directions of Literary and Cultural Theory at GAKhN

Even though contemporaries saw GAKhN's research programme as largely associated with the approach of Shpet and his circle, alternative directions of art research that discussed the structural-hermeneutical approach, at times in an explicitly critical way, became established at the Academy. At the centre of this discussion was the question of the analysis of the artistic form, its autonomy, and its relation to mental reception processes as well as to the social reality in which art originates.

The scientific nature of literary criticism was established via the orientation of its methods along the model of biology in the project of an 'exact literary criticism' advanced by Boris I. Iarkho (1889–1942; Iarkho 2006, 19–30). The analysis of literary form was to be practised similarly to the exploration of the biological organism. Here, 'form' was taken to mean all elements of a literary work that are "capable of developing an impact on aesthetic emotion (be it positively or negatively)" (Iarkho 1927b, 48). It was precisely these elements (described as 'sensuous images', *chuvstvennye obrazy*) and their relations that represented the object of literary criticism. The wholeness of the literary work and its aesthetic value was inductively determined via the analysis of these formal elements, only the experiment, the statistical, and the comparative method being considered 'scientific' (Iarkho 1925; 1927a; see also Hansen-Löve/Obermayr 2022, 245–277). The formal structure of the work and its genesis was reconstructed with these methods, which brought the circle of 'scientifically' characterised tasks in literary criticism to an end. Consideration of the works' sociological, biographical, ideological,

and other references was excluded from literary criticism as 'unscientific'. The narrowing of the field of literary criticism became the object of a controversy at GAKhN between Shpet and Iarkho concerning the meaning and the reliability of the 'inner' or the 'meaningful' form of the linguistic work of art (Venditti 2014).

The other focus of theory formation at GAKhN was constituted by approaches to a historic-sociological analysis of art and literature that were mainly developed by the Academy's sociology department. The activities of this department were carried out with the explicit aim of establishing a 'Marxist' theory of literature and art in contrast to formal aesthetic positions, as there was no exact definition in the 1920s what could be considered a 'Marxist theoretical canon' in literary criticism and arts studies. The ideological leadership of Narkompros was convinced that Marxism was still lacking a consistent doctrine of art, of its social function, or of the determinants of its historical development. As late as 1923, Lunacharskii mentioned in the prologue to the new edition of his 20-year-old essays on aesthetics that he still regarded the task of developing a "positive" (i. e., Marxist) aesthetic as a task for the future (Lunacharskii 1923, 4). Therefore highly varying concepts developed at GAKhN could claim the title 'Marxist' – from the attempt by Pavel N. Sakulin (1868–1930) to convey the immanent formal analysis of the literary work with the sociological consideration of its genesis (Sakulin 1925) all the way to the sociological reductionism of Valerian F. Perevertsev (1882–1968; Perevertsev 1928). In the late 1920s, GAKhN (along with and in competition with the Communist Academy) became one of the central battle grounds for the Marxist monopoly on interpretation in aesthetics and art theory, which is why the activities of the sociology department came to dominate the Academy's entire field of research.

6 German–Russian Transfer of Ideas at GAKhN

The orientation of GAKhN's theoreticians and organisers along the lines of the development of German aesthetics and art studies in the 1920s is seen as the Academy's virtual trademark (and, as an ideological pretext, played an important role in its destruction). On the one hand, this orientation concerns the theoretical debate at GAKhN which took up the reception and continuation of the German debates about the status of the liberal arts and especially art studies. Among the focal points of this discussion were the art theory of Konrad Fiedler, the subsequent theories of general art studies (of Max Dessoir, Emil Utitz, Richard Hamann, and Edgar Wind) and concepts that attempted to develop the legitimacy of autonomous art studies in other ways (Broder Christiansen, Heinrich Wölfflin, Erwin Panofsky, Georg Simmel; see Plotnikov 2014).

On the other hand, the German–Russian transfer was carried out on the level of scholarly organisation. It is a general characteristic of the Russian scholarly community in the early twentieth century that its institutional design was based on the German academic model. This led to several new academic foundations, especially in the field of the liberal arts, which set the benchmark for the further development of Russian academia. By way of example, in 1912 the first psychological institute at Moscow University was founded under Professor Georgii Chelpanov (with the assistance of his student Gustav Shpet) and modelled on Wilhelm Wundt's Leipzig institute. In the same year, the first art-historical institute (Institut istorii iskusstv) was established in Russia; it was fashioned after the model of the German art-historical institute in Florence and, as an extra-academic institution, was financed by a Russian patron, Count Valentin Zubov.

Continuing this tendency, the founders and leaders of GAKhN (especially Kandinskii and Shpet) drew on their knowledge of the institutionalisation of art research in Germany in their proposals for the Academy's organisation. Here the ongoing specialisation of research was not only seen positively as the liberation of the liberal arts from the rule of metaphysics, but, in view of the fragmentation of knowledge, there was a search for new concepts and forms of integration capable of explicating and organising the theoretical horizon of these disciplines as the study 'of art'. Hence special attention was paid to the movement toward the institutionalisation of 'general art studies' in Germany (on this topic in particular, see Shpet 1926).

Finally, direct contact with German scholars constituted a significant aspect of the German–Russian transfer of knowledge and ideas at GAKhN. These included invitations of cultural scholars from Germany to Moscow, among them Oskar Walzel, who travelled to Moscow in 1928 and was made an honorary member of GAKhN (Nebrig 2013), as well as travels by GAKhN members to Germany, as exemplified by the efforts of Vassili Kandisky to found a German branch of GAKhN in Berlin during his trip to Germany in 1921. Even though these initiatives proved unfeasible with the increasing isolationism of the Soviet regime, they stand for the Academy's research concept which, from the outset, was aimed at an intercultural analysis of art, and which was able to achieve it at least in rudiments.

References

Chubarov, Igor' (ed.). *Slovar' khudozhestvennykh terminov GAKhN*. Moscow: GAKhN, 2005.
Chubarov, Igor. "The GAKhN Dictionary of Artistic Terms, 1923–1929." *October* (162) 2017, 41–107.
Friche, Vladimir. "Vil'gel'm Gauzenshtein." Wilhelm Hausenstein [Vil'gel'm Gauzenshtein], *Opyt sotsiologii izobrazitel'nogo iskusstva*. Moscow: Novaia Moskva, 1924, 3–24.

Gabrichevskii, Aleksandr (ed.). *Iskusstvo portreta*. Moscow: GAKhN, 1928.

Gabrichevskii, Aleksandr. "Novaia nauka ob iskusstve." Aleksandr Gabrichevskii, *Morfologiia iskusstva*. Eds. A. M. Kantora and F. O. Stykalova-Pogodina. Moscow: Agraf, 2002. 25–26.

Gabrichevskii [Gabričevskij], Aleksandr. "Die Sprache der Dinge." *Über die Dinge: Texte der russischen Avantgarde*. Ed. Anke Henning. Hamburg: Philo Fine Arts, 2010. 567–579.

Grübel, Rainer. "Sinn versus Präsenz: '(Innere) Form' bei Špet, in der GAChN, im Formalismus und bei Bachtin." *Form und Wirkung: Phänomenologische und empirische Kunstwissenschaft in der Sowjetunion der 1920er Jahre*. Eds. Aage A. Hansen-Löve, Brigitte Obermayr, and Georg Witte. Munich: Fink, 2013. 19–54.

Gudkova, Violetta. *Teatral'naja sekcija GAKhN: Istorija idej i ljudej. 1921–1930*. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2019.

Haardt, Alexander. *Husserl in Russland: Phänomenologie der Sprache und Kunst bei Gustav Špet und Aleksej Losev*. Munich: Fink, 1994.

Hansen-Löve, Aage A. "Die 'formal-philosophische Schule' in der russischen Kunsttheorie der zwanziger Jahre: Ein Überblick." *Zwischen den Lebenswelten: Interkulturelle Profile der Phänomenologie (Alexander Haardt zum 60. Geburtstag)*. Eds. Nikolai Plotnikov, Meike Siegfried, and Jens Bonnemann. Berlin: LIT, 2012, 205–257.

Hansen-Löve, Aage A., and Brigitte Obermayr (eds.) *Phänomenologische und empirische Kunstwissenschaften in der frühen Sowjetunion: Eine Anthologie*. Paderborn: Brill/Fink, 2022.

Iakimenko, Julia. "Iz istorii chistok apparata: Akademiia khudozhestvennykh nauk v 1929–1932 gg." *Novy istoricheskii vestnik* 12.1 (2005): 150–161.

Iarkho, Boris. "Granitsy nauchnogo literaturovedeniia." *Iskusstvo* 2 (1925): 45–60; 3.1 (1927a): 16–38.

Iarkho, Boris. "Prosteishie osnovaniia formal'nogo analiza." *Ars poetica: Sbornik statei*. Vol. 1. Ed. Mikhail Petrovskii. Moscow: Izdanie GAKhN, 1927b. 7–28.

Iarkho, Boris. *Metodologiia tochnogo literaturovedeniia: Izbrannye trudy po teorii literatury*. Eds. M. I. Shapir, M. V. Akimova, and I. A. Pil'shchikov. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kul'tur, 2006.

Kandinskii, Vassilii. "Tezisy k dokladu 'Plan rabot sektsii izobrazitel'nykh iskusstv'." Vassilii Kandinskii, *Izbrannye trudy po teorii iskusstva*. Vol. 2. Eds. N. B. Avtonomova, D. B. Sarab'ianov, and V. S. Turchin. Moscow: Gileia, 2001. 70–75.

Kogan, Petr. "O zadachakh Akademii i ee zhurnala." *Iskusstvo: Zhurnal Rossiiskoi Akademii khudozhestvennykh nauk* 1 (1923): 5–12.

Kogan, Petr. "Akademiia khudozhestvennykh nauk (K chetyrekhletiiu so dnia osnovaniia)." *Izvestiia* 247 (27 October 1925).

Kogan, Petr. "Gosudarstvennaia Akademiia khudozhestvennykh nauk." *Pechat' i revoliutsiia* 7 (1927): 293–299.

Kondrat'ev, Akim. "Rossiiskaia Akademiia Khudozhestvennykh nauk." *Iskusstvo: Zhurnal Rossiiskoi Akademii khudozhestvennykh nauk* 1 (1923): 407–449.

Lunacharskii, Anatolii. "O zadachakh Akademii." [1921] *Lecture in the scholarly-artistic commission on 16 June 1921*. Transcript, preserved in the State Archives for Literature and Art in Moscow (RGALI, Fonds 941, Op. 1, ed. chr. 4, L., 3verso–4).

Lunacharskii, Anatolii. *Osnovy pozitivnoi èstetiki*. Moscow: Giz, 1923.

Nebrig, Alexander. "Künstlerische Form: Oskar Walzel und die Staatliche Akademie der Kunstwissenschaften in Moskau." *Form und Wirkung: Phänomenologische und empirische Kunstwissenschaft in der Sowjetunion der 1920er Jahre*. Eds. Aage A. Hansen-Löve, Brigitte Obermayr, and Georg Witte. Munich: Fink, 2013. 93–110.

Perevertsev, Valerian (ed.). *Literaturovedenie: Sbornik statei*. Moscow: GAKhN, 1928.

Petrovskii, Mikhail. "Poètika i iskusstvovedenie." *Iskusstvo* 3.2/3 (1927a): 119–139.

Petrovskii, Mikhail. "Morfologiia novelly." *Ars poetica*. Vol. 1. Ed. Mikhail Petrovskii. Moscow: GAKhN, 1927b. 69–100.

Plotnikov, Nikolai. "Kunstwissenschaft als Thema der philosophischen Reflexion: Zur kunst-theoretischen Debatte im Russland der 1920er Jahre. Eine Problemskizze." *Form und Wirkung: Phänomenologische und empirische Kunstwissenschaft in der Sowjetunion der 1920er Jahre*. Eds. Aage A. Hansen-Löve, Brigitte Obermayr, and Georg Witte. Munich: Fink, 2013. 225–241.

Plotnikov, Nikolai (ed.). *Kunst als Sprache – Sprachen der Kunst: Russische Ästhetik und Kunsttheorie der 1920er Jahre in der europäischen Diskussion*. Special issue of *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 12. Hamburg: Meiner, 2014.

Plotnikov, Nikolaj. "Knowledge of Art versus Artistic Knowledge. I. The GAKhN 'Encyclopedia of Artistic Terminology' in the Context of European Intellectual History." *Studies in East European Thought* (2022a), https://doi.org /10.1007/s11212-022-09488-9.

Plotnikov, Nikolaj. "Knowledge of Art versus Artistic Knowledge. II. The GAKhN 'Encyclopedia of Artistic Terminology': Conceptions and Chronology of the Project." *Studies in East European Thought* (2022b), https://doi.org /10.1007/s11212-022-09486-x.

Ricœur, Paul. *The Conflict of Interpretations: Essays in Hermeneutics*. Ed. Don Ihde. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1974.

Sakulin, Pavel. *Sotsiologicheskii metod v literaturovedenii*. Moscow: Mir, 1925.

Shpet, Gustav. *Èsteticheskie fragmenty*. Vols. 1–3. Peterburg: Kolos, 1922–23.

Shpet, Gustav. "Problemy sovremennoy èstetiki." *Iskusstvo* 1 (1923): 43–78.

Shpet, Gustav. "K voprosu o postanovke nauchnoi raboty v oblasti iskusstvovedeniia." *Biulleteni GAKhN* 4–5 (1926): 3–20.

Shpet, Gustav. *Vvedenie v ètnicheskuiu psikhologiiu*. Moscow: GAKhN, 1927a.

Shpet, Gustav. *Vnutrenniaia forma slova: Ètiudy i variatsii na temy Gumbol'ta*. Moscow: GAKhN, 1927b.

Shpet, Gustav. "Literatura." [1929] Gustav Shpet, *Iskusstvo kak vid znaniia*. Ed. Tat'jana Shchedrina. Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2007. 164–172.

Sidorov, A. A. (ed.). *Biulleteni GAKhN* 2–3. Moscow: GAKhN, 1925.

Sidorov, A. A. (ed.). *Biulleteni GAKhN* 6–7. Moscow: GAKhN, 1927.

Tihanov, Galin (ed.). *Gustav Shpet's Contribution to Philosophy and Cultural Theory*. West Lafayette: Purdue University Press, 2009.

Tsires, Alexei (ed.). *Khudozhestvennaia forma*. Moscow: GAKhN, 1927.

Tsires, Alexei. "Iazyk portretnogo izobrazheniia." *Iskusstvo portreta*. Ed. Aleksandr Gabrichevskii. Moscow: GAKhN, 1928. 86–158.

Venditti, Michela. "Philosophische Grundlagen der Literaturtheorie an der GAChN." *Kunst als Sprache – Sprachen der Kunst. Russische Ästhetik und Kunsttheorie der 1920er Jahre in der europäischen Diskussion*. Ed. Nikolai Plotnikov. Hamburg: Meiner, 2014. 349–365.

Vinokur, Grigorii. "Poètika. Lingvistika. Sotsiologiia: (Metodolicheskaia spravda)." *Zhurnal levogo fronta isskustv* 3 (June–July 1923): 104–113.

Vinokur, Grigorii. *Biografiia i kul'tura*. Moscow: GAKhN, 1927.

Vinokur, Grigorii. *Filologicheskie issledovaniia: Lingvistika i poètika*. Moscow: Nauka, 1990.

Zhinkin, Nikolai. "Portretnye formy." *Iskusstvo portreta*. Ed. Aleksandr Gabrichevskii. Moscow: GAKhN, 1928. 5–52.

II.2 Formalism in Russia, Poland, Bohemia, and Germany

Alexander Nebrig
Formalism in Germany

1 A typological introduction

In the history of German thought on form theory, at least five main types of form have been identified. The *first* concept, the Neoplatonic idea of inward form, goes back to the poetics of the *Sturm und Drang* period in the 1770s and was subsequently developed further, predominantly by Goethe. The *second* concept is that of formalistic form and derives from Kantian philosophy. The founder of aesthetic formalism in the Kantian sense was Johann Friedrich Herbart (1776–1841), whose ideas were spread within the academia of the Austro-Hungarian empire, especially in Prague by the anti-idealistic Austrian theorist Robert Zimmermann (1824–1898) (Stöckmann 2015, 2016). The *third* concept is the ethical Hegelian concept of form, which privileges '*Gehalt*', content. It was last transformed in the 1960s by critical theory on the one hand and Marxist aesthetics on the other. This 'idealistic concept of form' was the most influential concept in German thought on the subject. In fact, driven by its ethical imperative, it made free reflection on aesthetic form almost impossible. After 1900, these three concepts – those of Goethe, Kant, and Hegel – mostly influenced one another or were differentiated and pluralized. The *fourth* type also derives from Kant: it is the idea of form as *a priori* or the transcendental form of beholding (Tatarkiewicz 1973, 223), which became popular around 1900. Instead of 'form', theorists of this paradigm often use the term 'style'. The *fifth* type of form has become important in recent decades: the differential concept of form developed in the writings of Niklas Luhmann. Form as difference is not correlated to content or material, but to its medium. And of course, for Luhmann form is not what it is (a substance or essence), but what it is not, i. e. the difference between itself and other formal elements.

A history of German form theory has to follow the evolutions, modifications, and interferences which these five concepts underwent. One encounters Goethe's inward form, Kant's formalism and Hegel's ethical form in very different guises. After referring to lexical aspects (2.), I will first discuss the development of the concept of *inward form* (3.) and then that of formalism (form as form) and ethical content (form as '*Gehalt*') as each moves its way through the academic discipline of aesthetics in the nineteenth century (4.). The fifth part is devoted to the high tide of German form theory, which is marked by the pluralization, differentiation, and intersection of the first four concepts in very different disciplines, discourses and types of texts after 1900 (5.). The sixth part examines the work of Oskar Walzel, an author who synthesizes and popularizes the various

concepts of form of the modern period (6.). The final part reflects on the dissolution of the concept of form as a dissolution of the concept of holistic and privileged art (7.).

2 Lexical aspects

The German word *Form* is, like *Figur,* a borrowing from the Latin. It began to appear in German texts in the thirteenth century and was used synonymously with *Bild* (Old High German *biladi*). In Middle High German literature, we find *bilde* as well as *forme* (Grimm 1862, column 1897). Another synonym, especially for aesthetic things, is *Gestalt*. Both *Bild* and *Gestalt* have in common the visual aspect, like the Greek *εἰδώς*. The etymological equivalent to the Greek *εἰδώς* is in fact the German *Wissen* (Greek ἰδεῖν, Latin *videre*), which originally connected seeing and knowing (F. Kluge 1905, 427).

Bild means both the mental (*imago*) and the physical form (*μορφή, frame* or *pattern*). In opposition to form, *Bild* can emphasize the mental concept. The difference between *Form* (*forma*) and *Bild* (*imago*) is sometimes understood as that of inward and outward form. Goethe writes in the poem *Prometheus*: "Here sit I, forming mortals / After my image [*Bilde*]" (Goethe 1901 [1772–74], 212). With the idealist notion of '*Bildung*' in mind, the philosophical and aesthetic relevance of the *Bild*-concept becomes clear. '*Bildung*' means the ethical formation and pedagogical education of the individual. The concept of '*Gestalt*', too, became a relevant term in the context of '*Gestalttheorie*'.

3 Goethe's inward form, or the emergence of German form theory

Until the twentieth century, German form theory largely consists of remarks on and interpretations of the aesthetic writings of Goethe. It was Goethe and his generation who discovered form as an aesthetic category.

Incidentally, the concepts of form inherited from scholastic philosophy were not developed for aesthetics but rather for describing physical and metaphysical reality. In philosophy, the scholastic discussion of form was part of the mind–body problem and under the control of theology. In general, form was regarded as the essence of a thing (*causa interna*). The human soul was understood, for instance, as a *forma informans*, like God, invisible in relation to his creation. The

scholastic system of form with its numerous distinctions (Hederich 1748) was criticized as confusing as early as 1735 (Zedler 1735, 1491). However, it was the main Aristotelian idea, that form is the substance or the essence of a thing (Aristotle 1933, 339; *Metaphysics* 1032b 1), that more modern thinkers on form inherited from the scholastic tradition.

The "exploration of the world of aesthetic forms" (Cassirer 1922, 99–200), which became a major task of poets and thinkers in the eighteenth century, was encouraged by the new discipline of aesthetics, namely by the *Aesthetica* (1750–1758) of Alexander Gottlieb Baumgarten. Leibniz's philosophy of the monad (1714), written in French, was also significant, and in art history Johann Joachim Winckelmann played a major role in the discussion on form with his *Gedanken über die Nachahmung der griechischen Werke in der Malerei und Bildhauerkunst* (1755, *Thoughts on the Imitation of Greek Works in Painting and Sculpture*). In poetics, the reflection on form was a rhetorical one (Willems 1996, 680–681), as theorists had a tendency to analyse art by cataloguing linguistic and mental patterns. The rhetorical meaning of form as outward forms or patterns served as a reference for a new and original understanding of aesthetic form. One can say that in the 1770s, the period in which German form theory was constituted, the discoverers of aesthetic form were paradoxically driven by a certain hostility towards it. The most influential theorist of this period was Johann Wolfgang Goethe for whom form became a leading aesthetic concept. From his literary beginnings in the 1770s until his death in 1832, form was Goethe's principal concern in his reflections on art and science. Inward form, the triadic relationship between form, content, and material, the eidetic and epistemic concept of 'Gestalt' and of course his transdisciplinary method of morphology, were adapted by scientists like Ernst Haeckel (1834–1919), philosophers like Ernst Cassirer (1874–1945), Rudolf Steiner (1861–1925), or Oswald Spengler (1880–1936), and literary critics like Günther Müller (1890–1957) and Emil Staiger (1908–1987), and remained important references in the discourse of form until the second half of the twentieth century.

Besides morphology, Goethe often treated problems of form in an unexpected and brief manner. One of his most influential reflections on form is found in his notes on the *West-östlicher Divan* (1819, *West-Eastern Divan*) (Goethe 1819, 360). He distinguishes between *Form* (form), *Gehalt* (content), and *Stoff* (material). Although in idealistic theory the binary model of form and content, and in materialistic theory that of form and material were dominant, Goethe's triadic model was adopted by literary criticism. For the positivist critic Wilhelm Scherer (1888) and for the practitioners of *Geistesgeschichte* ('history of ideas') (Ermatinger 1926, 620; Müller 1944), discussing problems of form means redefining the relationship between form, content, and material (Holl 1917). In the same context, Goethe's theory of form was used in discussions on poetic genre. The epic, the dramatic,

and the lyric, Goethe's "natural forms of poetry" (Goethe 1819, 379) became commonly accepted in German poetics.

Goethe himself took part in an emerging philosophical discussion on questions of form, a discussion which resulted from the paradigm shift from imitation to innovation in the system of the arts (Städtke 2001, 463). As original forms, works of art were considered epistemic creations. After Johann Gottfried Herder (1744–1803) brought an end to the normative understanding of art by declaring all aesthetic forms to be historical forms, the main task consisted in identifying art and form (Städtke 2001, 464) and in liberating works of art from social, theological, moral, or rhetorical needs. Autonomic theories of form were formulated by Immanuel Kant (1724–1804), Karl Philipp Moritz (1756–1793), and Friedrich Schiller (1759–1805). To understand art as autonomous is to understand forms without special interests, art as a "disinterested satisfaction" (Kant 1914 [1790], 46–48, § 2). Kant's concept of beauty means exactly this: "*Beauty* is the form of the *purposiveness* of an object, so far as this is perceived in it *without any representation of a purpose*" (Kant 1914, 90, § 17).

The "aesthetical turn" in form theory took place in dialogue with English form theory and the rhetorical tradition; German thinkers of the Enlightenment criticized the paradigm of French rhetorical poetics (Boileau) by privileging the new English aesthetics. Besides Shaftesbury (1671–1713) and his reception of Plotin's concept of the ενδον εἰδώς, it was Greek art in general that became influential for German writers. Shaftesbury's paradigm of inward form as an ethical, but not as an aesthetic term was applied to works of art in general, namely by Herder and Goethe. The protagonists of the *Sturm und Drang* period in the 1770s not only transferred the concept to the field of art (Schwinger 1935, 13–21), but also brought the dead work of art to life by treating it like a being with a body and a soul (Schwinger 1935, 21). Especially for Goethe, who first used the term "inward sense" ("*der innere Sinn*", Goethe 1776, 485) in 1776, inward form guaranteed the epistemological mediation between nature and subject. He describes it as the "glass through which we capture the holy rays of diffused nature to the heart of men into a fiery gaze" (Goethe 1776, 486).

James Harris (1709–1780), a nephew of Shaftesbury, had already claimed that inward form was localized in the observer of art (Schwinger 1935, 21). But Herder's and the young Goethe's understanding of art vitalized the work of art itself. Thus, the inward form of a poem, for instance, was considered an organic form (Schwinger 1935, 31–41). This analogization of nature and art allowed Goethe to develop his later ideas on morphological change. The German idea that art in general and poetry in particular has to be like nature differs from ancient rhetorical belief because by this time, nature was no longer understood as a static phenomenon in space (*natura naturata*) but as something dynamic evolving

over time (*natura naturans*). Goethe and Herder could find the idea of the *natura naturans* in the *Ethics* (Spinoza 1977, 72; I, Propositio XXIX, Scholium) of Spinoza (1632–1677), who identifies it with God. For Goethe, the principle of transformation or metamorphosis is supreme in nature, ethics, and aesthetics (Cassirer 2006, 22–29). In *Zur Morphologie* (1817, *On Morphology*, Goethe 2016) he recommends using, instead of the term '*Gestalt*' (*natura naturata*), that of '*Bildung*'. By looking at the '*Gestalten*' (*forms*), "we will discover that nothing in them is permanent, nothing is at rest or defined – everything is in a flux of continual motion. This is why German frequently and fittingly makes use of the word *Bildung* [formation] to describe both the end product and what is in the process of production" (Goethe 2016, 979).

The idealistic amalgam of formal, physical and metaphysical concepts in the last third of the eighteenth century was crucial for German formalistic theory until the middle of the twentieth century because of the authority of the classical poets. At least two recurring problems disturbed the future development of German thinking on form: first, the disinterest in outward forms understood as patterns, and second, the belief that form is a substance or idea.

By psychologizing art, Goethe founded *Erlebnislyrik* (poetry of experience) in a coherent framework. If aesthetic forms have an inner soul which corresponds to the author's soul, it is evident that the *pathos* and the *ethos* detected in the work of art could affect the psychological disposition of the recipient, allowing the reader to identify with the author. Consequently, the work of art functions like a medium. When form embodies the soul, reading Goethe's literary forms, for instance, means that readers could incorporate his soul. The linguistic and rhetorical patterns were secondary, and hermeneutics tended to psychologize art and forget grammatical and rhetorical analyses. This continued to occur even after the founder of literary hermeneutics, Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768–1834), emphasized that psychological and grammatical interpretation had to be conducted together. The idea of a work of art in general or the content (*Gehalt*) had to be the object of interpretation, or the critics concentrated on particular aspects of the content or on paradigmatic aspects. Additionally, tropes such as metaphors were discussed. But syntagmatic aspects and rhetorical figures were regarded with less interest. Of course, running parallel to this critical practice of psychological hermeneutics was the old rhetorical practice of analyzing outward form as patterns, which was especially prevalent in schools.

The concept of inward form had implications for the production of art. If the real form is inward form, the outward form is less important. So Novalis, i. e. Friedrich von Hardenberg (1772–1801), can say that the translation of Shakespeare by August Wilhelm Schlegel (1767–1845) is more authentic than its English original (Hardenberg 1880, 42). The idea is that while the English poet could not really

freely develop the (inward) form of *Hamlet*, his German successor could. By using German, Schlegel had found a better way to express the idea of the tragedy. His brother Friedrich Schlegel (1772–1829) understood the role of the literary critic in the same way (Burdorf 2001, 139): he should crystallize the inward form which the original author had put into poetic form. This focus on problems of content helped the research of ideas progress and helped prepare the German paradigm of *Geistesgeschichte* in the early twentieth century. *Geistesgeschichte* can be interpreted negatively as an avoidance of positivism but positively due to shared similarities such as the continuity of classical and Romantic form theory.

During this time, Gustav Shpet, who theorized the concept of inward form, treated Goethe as naive (Shpet 2006 [1927], 53). It is true that Goethe did not create a comprehensive theory of inward form, but in his poetical and scientific writings Goethe tries in many ways to reflect on the implications of inward form (Cassirer 2006). And of course, inward form enjoyed a productive reception. It became a guiding idea for Wilhelm von Humboldt's philosophy of language (Städtke 2001, 473). In general, Humboldt's attention to form is remarkable if we consider that the formal impact of the ancient languages was the reason why they played such a dominant role in German secondary schools. For Humboldt, Greek is a medium of 'formal *Bildung*' like mathematics. Humboldt's *inward form*, through the writings of Heymann Steinthal, was discussed in Russia (Aumüller 2005, 25–29). Thus, in the nineteenth century, Humboldt, rather than Goethe, was considered the founder of the discourse (Scherer 1888, 226). Additionally, the notion of inward form had a regulative significance in German juridical discourse; for Josef Kohler, the original author is not only the creator of the linguistic form (*Sprachform*), but also of the *inward form* (Kohler 1880, 209) which he owns. As a hermeneutic concept, inward form became prominent around 1900 and beyond (R. M. Meyer 1892; 1895; Alt 1987) as literary critics in Germany and Austria used it not only as an analytical category but also as a means to distinguish their work from French poetics (Arend 2010, 197–263). In Aestheticism around 1900 and Expressionism after 1910, inward form was further used by poets to refer to different aesthetic values: inward form could be understood as kinetic form (Hatvani 1917), as a principle of emanation (Wolf 1919, 14), or as perfect form (Zweig 1922, 294, 300). Pragmatically, using the term inward form increased the significance of the work in question, underlining that there was an emphatic understanding of form (Burdorf 2001, 2) in Germany which allowed form to communicate aesthetic, ethical, political and theological values; Burdorf observes in the poetics of authors of the age that there were two ways of thinking about form: one emphatic and the other technical, while conservative authors like Rudolf Borchardt, but also authors who were irritated by the chaos of World War I, like Hefele (1919), saw in intelligible form a principle of political order.

Linked with this idea is the belief that form is a substance. In fact, art critics who spoke about form as ethical or psychological content not only forgot to mention the outward patterns, but also postulated that treated (inward) form is substantial. In this way, German form theory became an aesthetical essentialism that had nationalistic implications.

4 The aesthetics of form in German idealism and Austrian formalism in the nineteenth century

Besides Goethe, the second factor in German form theory of the twentieth century is the conflict between Kant's and Hegel's aesthetics, which began during the nineteenth century. A description of nineteenth-century German form theory must differentiate between at least two different academic communities. Although Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel's (1770–1831) philosophy and his school of German idealism dominated aesthetic discourse, this was only true for Protestant universities, especially in Prussia. In Austria and the Habsburg territories, due to its theological impact, Hegelianism was either forbidden or played no role at all in philosophical academic teaching, given that such teaching was controlled by theology departments. Prussian philosophy became the main philosophy of the German Empire after 1871. Until the end of the Habsburg Empire in 1918, form theory in Austria was a transnational project of German, Slavic and Hungarian philosophers. Consequently, it is no coincidence that formalism as the alternative to idealistic form theory emerged in Prague and Vienna (Maigné 2017).

After Goethe's form theory was linked to poetic production, academic form theory had a greater interest in reception. By identifying form with beauty, Kant, unlike Goethe, analyzed the reception process of aesthetic form (Kant 1914 [1790], § 1–9). Aesthetic judgment results from a change of position vis-à-vis the object: not asking whether the object is useful or satisfies a physical desire, but observing it in a liberated way. The free play of cognitive faculties enables a sense for beauty. For Kant, a kind of disinterested perception process makes the anthropological difference. A perception of the pleasant (*das Angenehme*) is what human beings have in common with animals, and a perception of the good (the rational relationship to an object) is what they have in common with all rational beings, but beauty is only perceived by men (Kant 1914 [1790], § 5, 15).

Kant's revolution consists in separating the pleasant and the good from the beautiful. Kant emphasizes the idea of disinterested pleasure (Kant 1914 [1790], § 2, 7), i. e. pleasure without purpose (Kant 1914 [1790] § 5, 14). In relation to the question of form, one can say that when form is perceived as form, any

purpose disappears (i. e. perception with an interest) and the sensation of beauty begins.

The sensation of beauty as perception of form lies not in the object, but in the subject. This shift became the crucial point in Kant's aesthetics. Kant does not need artefacts for perceiving beauty because beauty as form affects the self (Kant 1914 [1790], § 1, 4).

For Hegel, only art can guarantee the perception of beauty. Hegel's concept of form is part of a systematic theory of art and of a philosophy of history. By integrating Herder's imperative that all form is historic, by taking the art of sculpture as a model for art in general and by identifying form with content, Hegel, in his *Vorlesungen über die Ästhetik* (1835–38, *Aesthetics: Lectures on Fine Art*, 1973) understands the work of art as "the pure appearance of the Idea to sense" (Hegel 1973, 111). 'Idea' means *Gehalt* (content), which is a major concern in idealistic aesthetics. This is why the critics of idealistic form theory call it '*Gehaltsästhetik*'. But even if Hegel prioritizes content, his *Aesthetics* could also be read as a knowledgeable history of aesthetic forms (Städtke 2001, 475).

The most eminent critic of idealist form theory was Robert Zimmermann (1824–1898), professor of philosophy in Olomouc, Prague, and Vienna (Burdorf 2001, 179–191). He was inspired by the Kantian philosopher and pedagogic psychologist Herbart, who discussed, not systematically, but for the first time, the concept of form separated from content, describing it as a relational issue (Walzel 1915; Jäger 1982; Stöckmann 2015; 2016). In fact, Herbart is more of an *argumentum auctoritatis*, engaging in a polemic against Hegel, than a real theorist of aesthetic form. Although Zimmerman focuses on Kant's imperative of a conscious perception of form (Städtke 2001, 475), he criticizes Kant's disinterest in objects of art and his concentration on the subject, calling it "adoration of the self" (Zimmermann 1870, 228). Zimmermann examines form in order to find the principles of aesthetic pleasure, and he finds a precedent in Herbart's formalism. Herbart had "protected Kant against Kant" (Zimmermann 1870, 255). Zimmermann recognizes aesthetic form as the "relationship" between various elements ("*Verhältnis*", Zimmermann 1870, 256): the work of art consists, he argues, of relationships which create harmony and beauty. The interesting point is that the harmonic relationships correspond to universal principles. With Kant in mind, he believes that the harmony of cognitive faculties is reflected or transformed in art (Zimmermann 1870, 230). Thus, moral values become less important. Unlike Friedrich Theodor Vischer (1807–1887), a popular pupil of Hegel, who, in his *Aesthetik, oder Wissenschaft des Schönen* (1846–58, *Aesthetics, or the Science of the Beautiful*), connects the beautiful to the good and the truth, Zimmermann liberates aesthetic forms from epistemic and ethical considerations (Burdorf 2001, 181).

Another important reference for Austrian Formalism is the book by the Bohemian music critic Eduard Hanslick (1825–1904), *Vom Musikalisch-Schönen: Ein Beitrag zur Revision der Ästhetik der Tonkunst* (1854, *The Beautiful in Music: A Contribution to the Revision of Musical Aesthetics*, 1891). For Hanslick, the materiality of each artwork is decisive for form (Städtke 2001, 478–479). Hanslick's theory of form (Schmidt 1989; Städtke 2001, 478–479) and the formalism of Zimmermann are both based on music, rather than the visual art of sculpture. Hence they could speak about form without reflecting on content as a moral issue. Methodically, Zimmermann develops his discipline of aesthetics as though it were an empirical science in search of the laws of the beautiful. In fact, this was problematic because Zimmermann's aesthetics was normative and not descriptive. Even he was not interested in the ethical impact of forms; rather, he believed that he himself knew which laws of form were better than others.

An innovative contribution by Hegelian theorists comes from Karl Rosenkranz. By equating ugliness with formlessness in his *Ästhetik des Häßlichen* (1853, *Aesthetics of Ugliness*), he demonstrates that he approves of the converse identification of beauty with form (Städtke 2001, 480). By reflecting on formlessness, Rosenkranz develops a concept of form which anticipates differential ones of the twentieth century: "All beauty must represent itself as entity, but not simply as an entity closed off from the outside; rather it must also distinguish itself in itself and from itself as an entity" (Rosenkranz 2015, 63). Symmetry and harmony represent the two main principles of the "rational ordering of differences" (Rosenkranz 2015, 63). More than this last example, Vischer's critique of the formalist Zimmermann shows that idealist aesthetics, *Gehaltsästhetik*, was in reality an ethics. For idealist form theorists, the demand that art has to be *gehaltvoll* meant that it must be filled not only with content, but also with ethical content. Art had to be *sittlich* (moral).

A kind of compromise can be found in form theory, which considers the psychology of aesthetics. One of its founders, Robert Vischer, a son of Friedrich Theodor Vischer, did not neglect the ethical content but examined both that and the perceptible elements of the work of art. Writing in *Über das optische Formgefühl: Ein Beitrag zur Ästhetik* (1873, *On the Optical Sense of Form: A Contribution to Aesthetics*, Vischer 1994) about '*Formgefühl*' ('sense of form'), he introduces the concept of '*Einfühlung*' ('empathy') into the work of art: the creation of form is the result of the artist's being astonished (*obstupescere*) by what he sees. He transfers his subjective apperception to the objects of reality, and the amalgam of the two becomes the work of art. Vischer believes that this subjective vision contains universal anthropological elements which guarantee the understanding between the artist and the public. The paradigm of psychological aesthetics was further represented by Theodor Lipps (1851–1914), who also discussed the concept of aesthetic empathy (Städtke 2001, 483). The other important psychologist of art was Johannes Volkelt

(1848–1930). While Lipps identified form with content, Volkelt, in his *Aesthetics*, claims that form merely appears on the surface (Walzel 1923, 145–146).

5 The pluralization of form discourse around 1900

At the end of the nineteenth century, one can observe a pluralization of form theory (Städtke 2001, 465). Around 1900, there was discussion of all branches of German form theory, including Austrian formalism. Besides idealist and formalist academic aesthetics, noteworthy reflections on form came from nineteenth century artists and are especially evident in the poetics of literary authors like Heinrich Heine, Friedrich Hebbel, Gustav Freytag, or Otto Ludwig. And of course, the form theory of the German classical period, of Herder, Goethe, and Schiller and their Romantic successors, played a considerable role in modernist discourse, the main impulses of which came from the philology and criticism of modern German literature (Burdorf 2001, 272–300).

Around 1900, "form" was one of the most important categories in aesthetics and was frequently discussed. But not only was "form" now valued in and of itself, it also lost its connection with beauty in some instances (Willems 1996, 683–688). Philosopher Wilhelm Dilthey (1833–1911), in several works on literature (e. g., *Das Erlebnis und die Dichtung*, 1906 [1905], *Poetry and Experience*), used psychological methods to explain the new connection between aesthetic form and life. He was one of the first in the field of psychology to substitute the paradigm of relation for that of substance (Willems 1996, 689).

The relationship and the tension between aesthetic form and everyday life was now one of the major issues in poetry. Stefan George (1868–1933), who had initially separated form from the everyday in the name of beauty, overcame this view in his later poems and radically connected his poetry to life experience. The Expressionist artists in particular sought to renew interest in everyday life by destroying form. 'Form and life' now meant not an antithesis, but an identity. The experience of life is organized by forms, and hence the quest for authentic forms became crucial in the arts. In the poetry of Ernst Stadler (1883–1914), one of the first Expressionists, the relationship between form and life was thought of dialectically. On the one hand, form was the antithesis of life, a kind of mortification; on the other hand, it made the "experience of the moment" (*Erlebnis*) possible (Nebrig 2013a, 248–286).

The paradigm shift from beauty to everyday life was but one of many changes which occurred in the process of the pluralization of concepts of form. Even in the nineteenth century, the opposition in aesthetics between the idealist and the

formalist approaches did not cover the whole spectrum of the theory of form. Besides aesthetics, the category of form was used in various contexts. The architect Gottfried Semper (1803–1879) published the very influential book *Der Stil in den technischen und tektonischen Künsten oder praktische Ästhetik* (2 vols. 1860–1863, *Style in the Technical and Tectonic Arts, or Practical Aesthetics*). Semper's concept of form was functional and technical. The work also announces that the form paradigm is in concurrence with the style paradigm, which was becoming increasingly popular. Modernist historians and critics of art, such as the Austrian Alois Riegl (1858–1905), the Germans Hermann Grimm (1828–1901) and Adolf von Hildebrand (1845–1921) (*Das Problem der Form in der Bildenden Kunst*, 1893, *The Problem of Form in the Fine Arts*, Hildebrand 1994), and the Swiss Heinrich Wölfflin (1864–1945) were important authorities in Formalist discourse. In psychology, Sigmund Freud (1856–1939) related aesthetic form to the suppression of desire. A materialistic theory of form was adapted by members of the Expressionist Sturm circle. In poetics, Herwarth Walden identifies spoken words with the material and rhythm with the form of poetry (Walden 1918–1819) by neglecting poetry's semantic dimension. In poetics, Bertolt Brecht (1898–1956) understood form in more economic and pragmatic ways. His materialism is not formalistic at all but is instead connected to the Hegelian idea that form means something beyond itself.

Furthermore, the discourse itself changed. The systematic aesthetic treatise in the philosophy of art was no longer the main genre of form theory as essayists and non-systematic philosophers like Nietzsche identified form as a significant problem in cultural theory (Burdorf 2001, 301–350). In reaction to the new interdisciplinary interest, the discipline of *Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* (the general study of art) became an attractive paradigm for theorists of form. Max Dessoir's journal *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* (1906–1943, *Journal for Aesthetics and the General Science of Art*; see also Michał Mrugalski's chapter on the Journal and the Society of Aesthetics and the General Science of Art in this volume) was the primary medium of the new transmedia theory of form.

In order to understand the pluralisation of form theory, one can also consider changes in media systems. Increasingly, theorists recognized that form theory is often implicitly connected to a particular medium. From Herder to Hegel, the visual arts dominated the terminology; Zimmermann's and Hanslick's formalistic conceptualization of form was inspired by music; in poetics, the conception of literature as a visual art lost its authority, and its temporality gained more recognition (T. A. Meyer 1901).

This revolution in form aesthetics led to a kind of Neo-Kantianism. According to Władysław Tatarkiewicz, Kant created a new tradition in the history of form: "He described form as a property of mind which compels us to experience things in a particular 'form'" (Tatarkiewicz 1973, 223). In the *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*

(1781, *Critique of Pure Reason*), the *a priori* forms are space and time or, on a different plane, causality. *A priori* forms we find "in objects only because it is imposed upon them by the subject. Thanks to its subjective origin, [this type of] form [...] is endowed with the unusual attributes of universality and necessity" (Tatarkiewicz 1973, 223). Kant "did not detect in aesthetics any *a priori* forms analogous to those he found in the theory of knowledge" (Tatarkiewicz 1973, 223). Konrad Fiedler (1841–1895), inspired by the Kantian Herbart, began searching for what he called forms of vision, and Wölfflin studied Fiedler's successors Adolf von Hildebrand (1893) and Alois Riegl, and found inspiration in Cassirer (G. Kluge 1977, 576–577); in his *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe* (Wölfflin 1915, *Principles of Art History*), he detected fundamental forms of beholding in art history (linear, plastic, closed, open). Wölfflin's 'forms of beholding' (*Anschauungsformen*) were immediately adapted by literary critics such as Oskar Walzel (Walzel 1923, 282–327), who later inspired younger scholars like Volker Klotz and his *Geschlossene und offene Form im Drama* (1960, *Open and Closed Forms in Drama*).

Broder Christiansen's *Philosophie der Kunst* (1909, *Philosophy of Art*) was less important in Germany but was translated into Russian and Polish in 1911 and 1914 respectively, and diverges from traditional German form theory; form is no longer understood as substance but as a network of differences compared to reality or other aesthetic forms (Christiansen 1912, 49–131: "the aesthetic object"). For Christiansen, understanding the work of art is contingent upon understanding its form (Christiansen 1912, 73). He argues that the material, the treated subject, and the form itself have a specific *Formgehalt* (formal content). The critic has to harmonize the three dimensions of form, which are the results not only of differences to reality or to tradition but also of differences which lie within the artwork itself – like symmetry or the dialectic of tension and solution. For Christiansen, the sense of form is a sense of differences (Christiansen 1912, 118–119), and the differences are organized in a "teleological structure" (Christiansen 1912, 130).

At the same time, in literary criticism, aesthetic form was analyzed by the Graz School as a whole, which focused on the relationship between its elements (Seuffert 1909). Like Christiansen's *Philosophy of Art*, Seuffert's composition theory influenced Russian form theorists, particularly Rozaliia Shor.

Nonetheless, the opposition between form and content had lost credit. With the concept of symbolic form, Ernst Cassirer (1874–1945) had demonstrated new ways to do cultural philosophy (Städtke 2001, 489). With his voluminous *Philosophie der symbolischen Formen* (1923–1929, *Philosophy of Symbolic Forms*, 1953–1957), it became evident that everything that had been called abstract material in the arts was in reality already a symbolic form (Willems 1996, 696). Like Cassirer, philosopher Nicolai Hartmann (1982–1950) returns to Kant to develop his concept of different levels of form. Denouncing the tautology of the opposition between

form and content, he discusses form in different aesthetic media, connecting it to materiality on the one hand and to the *Sujet* (subject) on the other (Städtke 2001, 486).

Cassirer reminds us that the modern epoch was also the heyday of interpreting Goethe's thinking on form. Goethe's morphology had already influenced the Darwinist Ernst Haeckel (1834–1919). His *Kunstformen der Natur* (1899–1904, *Art Forms in Nature*) is an analogue of Goethe's (1819, 187–189) "natural forms of poetry" (Burdorf 2001, 355). In 1928, the German-Russian folklorist Vladimir Iakovlevich Propp (1895–1970) published *Morfologiia skazki* (1928, *Morphology of the Folktale*), in which he also takes up some of Goethe's ideas. In Germany, the literary scholar Günter Müller adapted Goethe's morphology (Müller 1944) and André Jolles's concept of 'simple forms' (*einfache Formen*; Jolles 1930) is also linked to morphology. Clemens Lugowski's idea of a formal myth (Martínez 1996), which, like Jolles' simple forms, utilizes the theory of Goethe and Cassirer, speaks of form as marking the moment when we distance ourselves from art. Without critical distance, art functions like myth; we believe in literature like ancient peoples believed in myths as long as we do not analyse its form.

Around 1920, the idealistic concept of form which had transformed the medieval scholastic 'substance' form into the German 'idea' form of Goethe and Hegel, while not entirely rejected, was made to comply with autonomous concepts of form in the Kantian tradition.

6 Synthesis and mediation of the various concepts of form (Walzel)

Although Oskar Walzel's (1864–1944) book *Gehalt und Gestalt im Kunstwerk des Dichters* (1923, *Content and Shape in the Artistic Work of the Poet*) does not develop a method for the study of aesthetic forms, it does rehabilitate and popularize the study of form for form's sake. By referring to Kant and Herbart, Walzel shows that the study of form must not be at all connected to the study of epistemic, ethical and emotional content.

The plurality in form theory around 1900 indicates a wider interest with which Walzel tried to comply. As a professor of German literature in Bern (1897), Dresden (1907) and Bonn (1921), he popularized the different concepts in form theory. The Austrian Walzel not only knew the different historical theories of form, including Herbart's, but also observed the aesthetic practice of contemporary poets, artists, and musicians, taking notice of how that practice problematized form and created formal solutions.

Walzel's methodical text *Wechselseitige Erhellung der Künste* (1917, *Mutual Illumination of the Arts*) condensed his ideas on the relationships between the arts. For him, artistic form was not bound by media or material; in his article *Die künstlerische Form des Dichtwerks* (1916, *The Artistic Form of the Poetic Work*), he complemented the material (*stofflich*) dimension of poetry with its spiritual (*geistig*) dimension. As in other arts, the material of literature was not only the empirical and sensuous parts of language, but also the inward images. This higher perception beyond the five senses is, for Walzel, the common ground shared by all the arts. The one and only law of form which characterizes the entire work of art rules all of them. This conclusion allows Walzel to use the terminology of music ('composition') for visual arts and poetry and vice versa ('tectonic', *Leitmotiv*, etc.).

Later, Walzel changed 'form' to '*Gestalt*' for a number of reasons. First, there are rhetorical reasons, of course. The conceptual pair of '*Gehalt*' and '*Gestalt*' sounds less technical, appeals through alliteration, and avoids anti-formalist prejudice. However, Walzel's explicit reason is more confusing (Walzel 1923, 178): he no longer wanted to speak of form because it was too similar to Plotin's *eidos*, which, due to Shaftesbury, perhaps, was translated into German as *Form*. Walzel himself actually translated the *endon eidos* as *künstlerische Vision* ("artistic vision", Walzel 1923, 154). Indeed, *Gestalt* has not only visual but also holistic implications, and for the Greek *eidos* the German *Gestalt* would be more adequate. Additionally, *Form* is also used in non-holistic contexts. Thus *Gestalt* is less technical, but, more importantly, it can, "when necessary", be reconnected to the epistemic, ethical, and emotional *Gehalt* ("*Erkennen*, *Wollen*, *Fühlen*", Walzel 1923, 179) – which is more specific than English 'content'. 'When necessary' means that Walzel understands himself not as a 'formalist' but as a scholar with a formal interest in the Kantian tradition of Herbart: art is the perception of beauty, and that means aesthetic form (*Gestalt*). As Kant said, one cannot speak about beauty by speaking about ethics, knowledge or feelings. The ethical impact of art (*Gehalt*) can be studied, but then the interest has shifted, Walzel argues. For him, the organisation of all sensual elements, and only this, is the subject of formal analysis. In contrast to music and plastic forms, poetry and literature have forms which affect not only the outward senses (the sounds and graphics of language) but also the inward senses of hearing and vision, i. e. the fictional sounds and images (Walzel 1923, 178). In other words, Walzel is interested in what Volkelt calls "surface" (Walzel 1923, 146). However, literature has a surface perceptible not only for the outward but also for the inward senses. Contrary to his own claim, Walzel very often connects the *Gestalt* with the *Gehalt*. Nonetheless, his claim was original, and he was followed by the Russian philosophical formalist school of the GAKhN (Nebrig 2013b).

7 After 1945

In literary criticism, Paul Böckmann's (1949) ambitious project on *Formgeschichte* ('history of form') organizes the history of German literature by principles of form such as the allegorical (Middle Ages), the didactic (sixteenth century), the rhetorical (seventeenth century), and the expressive (around 1800). The most persuasive principle is the principle of wit, which ruled the first half of the eighteenth century (Böckmann 1949, 471–552). Böckmann's approach again confirms the German focus on substantial concepts of form. In fact, his principles are comparable to inward forms. Böckmann differed from the Russian formalists, for whom the evolution of literary forms was a relational movement (see Schamma Schahadat's chapter on literary evolution in this volume), and, as a representative of *Geistesgeschichte*, he understood his principles as historical ideas.

The priority of content or ideas in idealist aesthetics implied the ethical and political significance of art and aesthetic forms. Form for form's sake was suspect. On the one hand, after 1933 and during the GDR period (1949–1989), "formalism" was both treated pejoratively and used polemically (Burdorf 2001, 197), and on the other hand, art was used as a "vehicle of ideology" (Städtke 2001, 465). Hegelian theorist Georg Lukács, a philosopher of the history of aesthetic forms, became a Marxist in the 1920s and from 1933 onwards denounced all art which privileged formal problems as bourgeois and hostile to the socialist system. In Western Germany, by re-interpreting Hegel, Theodor W. Adorno developed a critical understanding of aesthetic forms in his *Ästhetische Theorie* (postum 1970, *Aesthetic Theory*). He emphatically rejected all social engagement of art, and he insisted on the difference between good critical art and bad commercial and kitschy art. For him, the latter was an affirmation of social power relations. On the other hand, aesthetic forms which neither affirm nor attack society earned his praise for exhibiting freedom in unity, freedom through which a socially utopian element could shine. In this way, the focus on pure forms eventually gave way to a focus on content, the grand narrative of the Messianic future.

Obviously, the intensive concern with form is linked to modernity. Although in the second half of the twentieth century 'form' remains a leading category, this postmodern period lacks the development of the theory of form which is observable in previous periods. The reception of the Russian formalists was remarkable, and the transnational paradigm of structuralism had a major impact on the practice of literary form analysis. Through these influences, however, the concept of form was increasingly replaced by the concept of structure. Additionally, in the postmodern period, after 1980, the emphasis on form became less important because the emphatic concept of art as a privileged object was contested. Just as the emergence of the concept of form in the eighteenth century was linked to the

emergence of the emphatic concept of art, at the end of the twentieth century the crisis of art also meant a crisis of form. Following Wolfgang Welsch, Städtke argues that postmodern culture, which integrates popular and commercial culture with more traditional art forms, neglects the difference not only between high art and low art but also between art and life. Hence form is no longer used to delimit and privilege art as a special aesthetic and epistemological sphere. The rejection of the difference between art and non-art also entails the rejection of an aesthetic conception of form (Städtke 2001, 466).

In the final decade of the twentieth century, Niklas Luhmann (1927–1998) introduced a radically new approach to form: the sign is conceived as form. The reference of the sign to physical reality is not important. But in contrast to the poststructuralists, Luhmann retains the relationship between the *signifiant* and the *signifié* (Luhmann 1993, 59), pointing out that form is the difference between the two sides of the sign; additionally, the sign is different from other signs in the system. Rather than reality, it is the system itself (the medium) which gives significance to the sign. Accordingly, form is analyzed in relation to its medium. Forms, Luhmann argues, are built through fixed potentialities of the medium; they are thus contingent. Luhmann distinguishes between set forms (inside) and other forms which the medium offers (outside), i. e. yet to be realized, but possible forms (Luhmann 1997, 169). For Luhmann, art is a means of communicating perception. In this sense, Luhmann goes back to the Kantian paradox of a universal acknowledgment of aesthetic values taking place without notions. Like beauty for Kant, perception for Luhmann is a purpose in itself. The work of art allows the observer to vary forms; it stimulates one to see other possible forms (Luhmann 1997, 170). This idea of switching between medium and form is productive because the perception of forms ("form building") can generate a new medium (Luhmann 1997, 176). The influence of Luhmann's semiotic thinking is evidenced by an encyclopaedia of cultural theory's using only Luhmann's notion to explain form (Simonis 1998). On the one hand, Luhmann's semiotic understanding of form radically breaks with the tradition of understanding form as substance. On the other hand, he connects this shift from substance to difference with Goethe's notion of the "symbol" (Luhmann 1996, 66–69) in order to demonstrate that the aesthetic object lies on another epistemological plane than objects considered 'real'.

In the history of form theory, German theorists developed various concepts of form: Goethe's inward sense, Kant's aesthetic object as a result of the free play of cognitive faculties, Hegel's sensuous idea, T. Vischer's sense of aesthetic and moral value, Rosenkranz's external and internal limitation of the aesthetic object, R. Vischer's visual empathy, Zimmermann's relationship mirroring the free play of cognitive faculties, Christiansen's internal and external difference of the aesthetic object, the neo-Kantian form of beholding, or Luhmann's differential concept.

What is needed is a comparison of these concepts, from Goethe to Luhmann, in order to discuss both the different assumptions of these various ideas of form as well as how they interfere with one another and conceptually overlap.

References

Alt, Peter-André. "Das Problem der inneren Form: Zur Hölderlin-Rezeption Benjamins und Adornos." *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte* 61.3 (1987): 631–663.

Arend, Stefanie. *Innere Form: Wiener Moderne im Dialog mit Frankreich*. Heidelberg: Winter, 2010.

Aristotle. *The Metaphysics*. Vol. 1. Trans. by Hugh Tredennick. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1933.

Aumüller, Matthias. *Innere Form und Poetizität: Die Theorie Aleksandr Potebnjas in ihrem begriffsgeschichtlichen Kontext*. Frankfurt/M.: Peter Lang, 2005.

Böckmann, Paul. *Formgeschichte der deutschen Dichtung*. Vol. 1. Hamburg: Hoffmann & Campe, 1949.

Burdorf, Dieter. *Poetik der Form: Eine Begriffs- und Problemgeschichte*. Stuttgart and Weimar: J.B. Metzler, 2001.

Cassirer, Ernst. *Freiheit und Form: Studien zur deutschen Geistesgeschichte*. Berlin: Bruno Cassirer, 1922.

Cassirer, Ernst. "Goethes Idee der inneren Form." Ernst Cassirer, *Nachgelassene Manuskripte und Texte*. Vol. 10. Ed. Klaus Christian Kähnke. Hamburg: Meiner, 2006. 15–55.

Christiansen, Broder. *Philosophie der Kunst*. Hanau: Clauss & Feddersen, 1909.

Ermatinger, Emil. "Zeitstil und Persönlichkeitsstil: Grundlinien einer Stilgeschichte der neueren deutschen Dichtung." *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistes- geschichte* 46 (1926): 615–650.

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang. "Anhang aus Goethes Brieftasche." Louis-Sébastien Mercier, *Neuer Versuch über die Schauspielkunst*. Leipzig: Schwickert, 1776. 483–508.

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang. *West-Östlicher Divan*. Stuttgart: Cotta, 1819.

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang. *The Works*. Vol. 9. Ed. Nathan Haskell Dole. London and Boston, MA: F. A. Niccolls, 1901.

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang. "[From] On Morphology." *The Essential Goethe*. Ed. Matthew Bell. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2016. 977–983.

Grimm, Jacob and Wilhelm. *Deutsches Wörterbuch*. Vol. 3. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1862.

Hardenberg, Friedrich von [Novalis]. "[Letter of November 30, 1797, to A.W. Schlegel]." *Novalis Briefwechsel mit Friedrich und August Wilhelm, Charlotte und Caroline Schlegel*. Ed. Johann Michael Raich. Mainz: Verlag von Franz Kirchheim, 1880. 42.

Hatvani, Paul. "Versuch über den Expressionismus." *Die Aktion* 7.11/12 (1917): 146–150.

Hederich, Benjamin. "forma accidentales, forma assistens, forma essentialis, forma generica, morma immaterialis, forma informans, forma materialis, forma metaphysica, forma partialis, forma physica, forma specifica, forma substantialis, forma totalis." *Reales Schul-Lexicon*. 3rd edition. Leipzig: Gleditsch, 1748. 1323.

Hefele, Hermann: *Das Gesetz der Form: Briefe an Tote*. Jena: Diederichs, 1919.

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *Aesthetics: Lectures on Fine Art*. Vol. 1. Trans. by Thomas Malcolm Knox. London: Clarendon Press, 1973.

Hildebrand, Adolf von. "The Problem of Form in the Fine Arts." [1893] *Empathy, Form, and Space: Problems in German Aesthetics, 1873–1893*. Ed. and trans. by Harry Francis Mallgrave and Eleftherios Ikonomou. Santa Monica, CA: Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1994. 227–279.

Holl, Karl. *Stoff, Gehalt, Form: Ein Beitrag zu Goethes Wortgebrauch und Ästhetik*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1917.

Jäger, Georg. "Die Herbartianische Ästhetik – ein österreichischer Weg in die Moderne." *Die österreichische Literatur: Ihr Profil im 19. Jahrhundert (1830–1880). Eine Dokumentation ihrer literarhistorischen Entwicklung*. Vol. 3. Ed. Herbert Zeman. Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1982. 195–219.

Jolles, André. *Einfache Formen: Legende, Sage, Mythe, Rätsel, Spruch, Kasus, Memorabile, Märchen, Witz*. Halle/S.: Niemeyer, 1930.

Müller, Günther. *Die Gestaltfrage in der Literaturwissenschaft und Goethes Morphologie*. Halle/S.: Niemeyer, 1944. 55–66.

Kant, Immanuel. *The Critique of Judgement* [1790]. Trans. by John Henry Bernard. London: Macmillan & Co, 1914.

Kluge, Friedrich. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. Strasbourg: Trübner, 1905.

Kluge, Gerhard. "Die Rezeption der Wölfflinschen Grundbegriffe in der deutschen Literatur-wissenschaft." *Neophilologus* 61.4 (1977): 575–586.

Kohler, Josef. *Das Autorrecht: Eine zivilistische Abhandlung, zugleich ein Beitrag zur Lehre vom Eigenthum, vom Miteigenthum, vom Rechtsgeschäft und vom Individualrecht*. Jena: Fischer, 1880.

Luhmann, Niklas. "Zeichen als Form." *Probleme der Form*. Ed. Dirk Baecker. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1993. 45–69.

Luhmann, Niklas. "Medium und Form." Niklas Luhmann, *Die Kunst der Gesellschaft*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1997. 165–214.

Martínez, Matías (ed.). *Formaler Mythos: Beiträge zu einer Theorie ästhetischer Formen*. Paderborn: Schöningh, 1996.

Maigné, Carole. *Une science autrichienne de la forme: Robert Zimmermann (1824–1898)*. Paris: Vrin, 2017.

Meyer, Richard M. "'Innere Form'." *Goethe-Jahrbuch* 13 (1892): 229–231.

Meyer, Richard M. "'Zur 'inneren Form'." *Goethe-Jahrbuch* 16 (1895): 190–191.

Meyer, Theodor A. *Das Stilgesetz der Poesie*. Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1901.

Müller, Günther. *Die Gestaltfrage in der Literaturwissenschaft und Goethes Morphologie*. Halle/S.: Niemeyer, 1944.

Nebrig, Alexander. *Disziplinäre Dichtung: Philologische Bildung und deutsche Literatur in der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts*. Berlin/Boston: de Gruyter, 2013a.

Nebrig, Alexander. "Künstlerische Form: Oskar Walzel und die Staatliche Akademie der Kunstwissenschaften in Moskau." *Form und Wirkung: Phänomenologische und empirische Kunstwissenschaft in der Sowjetunion der 1920er Jahre*. Eds. Aage A. Hansen-Löve, Brigitte Obermayr, and Georg Witte. Paderborn: Fink, 2013b. 93–110.

Rosenkranz, Karl. *Aesthetics of the Ugliness: A Critical Edition*. Ed. and trans. by Andrei Pop and Mechtild Widrich. London: Bloomsbury, 2015.

Scherer, Wilhelm. *Poetik*. Ed. Richard Moritz Meyer. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1888.

Schmidt, Lothar. "Arabeske: Zu einigen Voraussetzungen und Konsequenzen von Eduard Hanslicks musikalischem Formbegriff." *Archiv für Musikwissenschaft* 46 (1989): 91–120.

Schwinger, Reinhold. "Innere Form: Ein Beitrag zur Definition des Begriffes auf Grund seiner Geschichte von Shaftesbury bis W. v. Humboldt." Reinhold Schwinger and Heinz Nicolai, *Innere Form und dichterische Phantasie: Zwei Vorstudien zu einer neuen deutschen Poetik*. Ed. Karl Justus Obenauer. Munich: Beck, 1935. 1–89.

Seuffert, Bernhard. "Beobachtungen über dichterische Komposition 1." *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift* 1 (1909): 599–617.

Simonis, Annette. "Form." *Metzler Lexikon Literatur- und Kulturtheorie*. Ed. Ansgar Nünning. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1998. 159.

Shpet, Gustav. *Vnutrenniaia forma slova: Ètiudy i variatsii na temy Gumbol'ta* [1927]. Moscow: KonKniga, 2006.

Spinoza. *Die Ethik*. Lateinisch/Deutsch. Trans. by Jakob Stern. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1977.

Städtke, Klaus. "Form." *Ästhetische Grundbegriffe*. Vol. 2. Ed. Karl-Heinz Barck. Stuttgart: Metzler, 2001. 462–494.

Stöckmann, Ingo. "'Überhaupt stammt der Strukturalismus ja aus Deutschland.' Zur theoriegeschichtlichen Bedeutung der formalen Ästhetik im 19. Jahrhundert." *Scientia Poetica* 19 (2015): 88–135.

Stöckmann, Ingo. "Form, Theorie, Methode: Die formale Ästhetik des 19. Jahrhunderts." *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte* 90.1 (2016): 57–108.

Tatarkiewicz, Władysław. "Form in the history of aesthetics." *Dictionary of the History of Ideas*. Vol. 2. Ed. Philip P. Wiener. New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1973. 216–225.

Vischer, Robert. "On the Optical Sense of Form: A Contribution to Aesthetics." [1873] *Empathy, Form, and Space: Problems in German Aesthetics, 1873–1893*. Ed. and trans. by Harry Francis Mallgrave and Eleftherios Ikonomou. Santa Monica, CA: Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1994. 89–123.

Walden, Herwarth. "Das Begriffliche in der Dichtung." *Der Sturm* 9.5 (1918–1919): 66–67.

Walzel, Oskar. "Herbart über dichterische Form." *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 10.4 (1915): 435–454.

Walzel, Oskar. *Gehalt und Gestalt im Kunstwerk des Dichters*. Berlin-Neubabelsberg: Akademische Verlags-Gesellschaft Athenaion, 1923.

Willems, Gottfried. "Form/Struktur/Gattung." *Fischer Lexikon Literatur*. Vol. 1. Ed. Ulfert Ricklefs. Frankfurt/M.: Fischer, 1996. 680–703.

Wolf, Friedrich. "Vom Untergang der Sprache." *Die Neue Schaubühne* 1.1 (1919): 11–14.

Wölfflin, Heinrich. *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe: Das Problem der Stilentwicklung in der neueren Kunst*. Munich: Bruckmann, 1915.

Zedler, Johann Heinrich (ed.). "Form/Forma." *Grosses vollständiges Universal-Lexicon aller Wissenschaften und Künste*. Vol. 9. Halle/S. and Leipzig: Zedler, 1735. 768–769.

Zimmermann, Robert. "Zur Reform der Aesthetik als exacter Wissenschaft." Robert Zimmermann, *Zur Philosophie: Studien und Kritiken*. Vienna: Braumüller, 1870. 223–265.

Zweig, Arnold. "Versuch über Sternheim." *Juden in der deutschen Literatur: Essays über zeitgenössische Schriftsteller*. Ed. Gustav Krojanke. Berlin: Welt-Verlag, 1922. 293–320.

Peter Steiner
Herbartian Aesthetics in Bohemia

Commemorating the centenary of Johann Friedrich Herbart's birth in 1876, Josef Durdík – the man whose own theories I will engage soon – took a short historical overview of the study of beauty in his native land. Aesthetics, he told his listeners, has been taught in Prague since 1763 first by Karl Heinrich Siebt (1735–1806) and after him by many others, among "which the most famous were [August Gottlieb] Meissner and [Ignaz] Cornova" (Durdík 1876, 319). The subsequent development of this discipline in the lands of the Bohemian crown was quite contentious, he added, with several philosophical systems and traditions competing for general acceptance. But there was not a shadow of a doubt in Durdík's mind that by the second half of the nineteenth century the winner of this intellectual contest was Herbartianism.

We might suspect that Durdík, an ardent Herbartian himself, had an axe to grind. He might well have, but his bias should in no way lessen Herbart's impact on Central European thought, the historians of ideas concur. William Johnston, for example, mentions Herbart as "the philosopher [...] most widely taught in Austria between 1820 and 1880" even without visiting there once (Johnston 1972, 281). His concepts were particularly influential insofar as the study of beauty was concerned. "The most sweeping wave of Kantianism in nineteenth-century aesthetics," Günter Zöller opines, "originates with Johann Friedrich Herbart, a follower of Kant and opponent of G. W. F. Hegel" (Zöller 2014, 60). But since "oblivion has engulfed Herbart with unusual speed" (Dunkel 1970, 3) a short presentation of his ideas could help us to grasp what aestheticians found so attractive about them some hundred fifty years ago.

1 Relations *über alles*

Yet this is easier said than done for plenty of reasons. Herbart's intellectual horizon, first of all, was rather far-flung with his most lasting legacy in the fields linked to aesthetics only obliquely – psychology and pedagogy (cf. e. g., Gubser 2006, 98). Secondly, the unfriendly style of his writings combined with the sheer quantity of output (collected in some nineteen hefty volumes) makes an explication of Herbart's ideas a life-long project. And the pitfalls stemming from an ineluctable reliance on secondary sources often proceeding from mutually incompatible perspectives multiply the problems. Furthermore, as Frederic Beiser informs us, "Herbart's intellectual development was not stable and con-

tinuous but tumultuous and fragmented" (Beiser 2014, 93), not fitting neatly into the conventional history of philosophy. Even his self-avowed Kantianism can be questioned because in different stages of his career Herbart disregarded some of the most cherished principles of this system. Given all these obstacles (my own age notwithstanding), one can but endorse Beiser's astute observation that "a proper understanding and appreciation of Herbart is the task for a future generation" (Beiser 2015, 1058).

For the sake of simplicity, it seems warranted to divide Herbart's philosophizing into two correlated parts – the theoretical and the practical ones –, the former concerned with 'is' and the latter with 'ought.' The place of aesthetics within this natural/normative distinction is rather obvious and, for this reason, my treatment of Herbart's metaphysics will be quite perfunctory. An heir to the intellectual lineage Leibnitz-Wolf-Kant, Herbart strongly believed that "mathematics is the ruling science of our time" (Herbart 1890, 105) and this insight guided him in advancing a metaphysics quite different from the similar projects of the German idealists and romantics. At the highest level of abstraction, one could say that his "method of relations" (Herbart 1887a [1806–1808], 181) conceived of all forms of experience (whether pertaining to the perceived phenomena, which he termed 'realia,' or their cognitive representations) as complex units whose identity stems from the interdependencies among constitutive elements. In the spirit of Leibnizian *mathesis universalis* Herbart strove to construct a mental combinatorics that would study all possible types of relations among psychological components and their interactions (cf. Zumr 1965, 419).

Chronologically speaking, Herbart's first attempts to formulate his practical philosophy preceded his metaphysics, going back to the early 1800s (see e. g., Mohns 1914, 3). Whether swayed by British moral philosophy or by Schiller's essay "Über Anmut und Würde" (1793, "On Grace and Dignity"), Herbart assumed that the human attitude toward both the good and the beautiful is a matter of taste and, therefore, he circumscribed ethical judgment in terms of aesthetics. By denying "that there is a single principle of morality" while insisting, "that reason is not the source of moral obligation" (Beiser 2014, 126) he clearly stepped out of the sandbox of Kantian ethics. This, however, should not lead to an erroneous conclusion that Herbart was a moral relativist. *Au contraire*; the subordination of ethical judgment to the aesthetic one derives from the "absolute validity" of the latter – its independence from any ulterior motives on the beholder's part and its self-evident nature –, for such judgments are, as Herbart put it, "immediate" and "voluntary" (Herbart 1897 [1831], 80). In other words, "under identical subjective and objective conditions, the same aesthetic judgment must recur" (Kim 2015). Why? The answer lies in Herbart's "method of relations." The object of an aesthetic judgment is always complex, a set of relations, like "the outline of a statue,

characters in the drama, tones in a musical chord" (Herbart 1897 [1831], 329). An isolated, simple element can be neither beautiful nor ugly. And it is the self-same formal structure of an aesthetic object that compels the audience to perceive it again and again in a uniform fashion.

Although Herbart did not advance any appurtenant template for aesthetic relations, he did so for ethics. Here the dialectics of pleasure and displeasure concerns the structure of volitional acts. The five ethical principles, he outlined in the form of binary oppositions, are important for my further discussion because Herbart's followers subsequently adopted them with some modifications as the organon for their formal analysis of beauty: (1) The idea of 'inner freedom' (inclinations, desires, passions vs. our intuitive grasp of what is right or wrong); (2) the idea of 'perfection' (the will vs. its quantifiable strivings: intensity, extension, concentration); (3) the idea of 'benevolence' (one's own will vs. the other's will as an object); (4) the idea of 'right' (one's own will vs. the other's will as a competitor); (5) the idea of 'requital' (one's own will vs. the other's will as a foe) (Herbart 1887b [1808], 355–375).

"It is these possible relations 'among wills'," Alan Kim paraphrased Herbart, "that constitute the possible forms of the will, and that are judged fine or shameful by practical judgment" (Kim 2015).

2 "Prague never lets you go…"

"After 1850," observed Johnston, "the University of Prague became the stronghold of Herbartian thought" (Johnston 1972, 284). Its faculty, according to Ivo Tretera's detailed exposition, received Herbart's ideas with open arms for more than one reason (Tretera 1989, 129–298). Some valued their overt political neutrality, to others they provided welcome ammunition against the 'dodgy' Hegelianism, the third were captivated by the sober empiricism of this approach. Despite this or perhaps because of this, Herbart's presence on the local intellectual scene was overwhelming. With some dozen prominent Prague professors (both Czech and German) entering Herbart's intellectual orbit, it lasted for some seventy years (from 1832 to 1902) with the apex between 1861 and 1887, after which belated positivism began to replace it (Tretera 1989, 209). Given my task, I will deal only with those Praguers who applied Herbart's "method of relations" to aesthetics, concentrating above all on two Czech thinkers, less known abroad: Josef Durdík (1837–1902) and Otakar Hostinský (1847–1910).

The man who made the Herbartian aesthetic go mainstream was Robert Zimmermann (1824–1898), a pupil of the Prague philosopher Bernard Bolzano

(1781–1848) under whose wing he wrote on Leibniz's monadology in general and Herbart's relation to it in particular (Zimmermann 1849). More important for my subject, though, is his *Aesthetik* (*Aesthetics*) published in two volumes. The first installment, *Geschichte der Aesthetik* (1858, *The History of Aesthetics*), appeared during Zimmermann's tenure at Prague University (1852–1861) and its sequel, *Allgemeine Aesthetik* (1865, *The General Aesthetics*), followed seven years later, when Zimmermann was already teaching in Vienna. Both volumes are pioneering contributions to the discipline. The former is usually considered the first history of aesthetics from Plato to the mid-nineteenth century; the latter a systematic study of beauty based on the quintet of Herbartian moral principles mentioned above. The term used in the title of the second volume – *Formwissenschaft* (*Science of Form*) – conveniently sums up Zimmermann's conception of aesthetics – a science of form – the idea already implicit, as George Weiss remarked (1928, 109), in Herbart's writings. "The discovery of [the concrete aesthetic relations]" Zimmermann declared in his programmatic essay of 1861, "will open up for aesthetics an enormous new field of research" making it eventually "a science as exact as that of chemistry or physiology" (Zimmermann 1861, 354). The death knell of idealistic, content-oriented philosophies of beauty was sounded.

Zimmermann unveiled "the concrete aesthetic relations," some four years later in *The General Aesthetics*. This, however, was less the matter of a discovery and more of a creative conversion of Herbart's quintet of ethical principles into "the primary aesthetic forms" of: (1) The 'characteristic'; (2) the 'magnitude'; (3) the 'harmony'; (4) the 'correctness'; and (5) the 'balance' (Zimmermann 1865, 35–70). But how faithful was he to Herbart in this endeavor? Zimmermann himself was a rather self-effacing author, presenting himself in the "Introduction" to the volume as a mere synthetizer of Herbart's thought "elaborating aesthetics from the Herbartian perspective" (Zimmermann 1865, V) who, if fallible, "would prefer to err together with Herbart" (Zimmermann 1865, X). Otakar Hostinský, on the other hand, even though quite respectful of Zimmermann's contribution to the discipline, felt obliged to append his painstaking reconstruction of Hebart's original aesthetic ideas with a lengthy "Historical and Critical Commentary", to put the record of what he perceived as Zimmermann's deviations from the master's thought straight (Hostinský 1891, 71–135).

I will not recapitulate the main points of Zimmermann's aesthetics for they reoccur *mutatis mutandis* in Josef Durdík's *magnum opus* – his 700-page-long *Všeobecná aesthetika* (1875, *General Aesthetics*) –, the first and the last attempt at this genre in Czech intellectual history. "Durdík's premises," Oleg Sus summed up the derivative nature of this work, "are the *loci communes* of Herbartianism which he learned at the university from Robert Zimmermann" (Sus 1960, 783). "Aesthetics is," predictably, "the science of the general laws of beauty" (Durdík 1875, 3), pro-

ceeding from the following three axioms: (1) Beauty is free of all subjective connotations. Neither profit, nor interest, nor pleasure could be identified with the aesthetic experience because of their ad hoc nature. (2) Aesthetic judgment must have an *a priori* character. Since there are certain phenomena that are beautiful for everyone, aesthetic judgment is self-explanatory and needs no proof. (3) "'Complexity' is the essential sign of all beauty" (Durdík 1875, 15). A single element – one tone, color, or representation – is a psychic rather than aesthetic phenomenon. In other words, since aesthetically indifferent isolated elements are the material and their aesthetically valorized correlations are the form, aesthetics, if it is to be science-like, must concern itself solely with the latter. It must be formal.

Durdík's elaboration of the basic forms of beauty came (with some minor variations) directly from Zimmermann's quintet mentioned above (cf. Hostinský, 1882, 122). His ruminations on the subject, however, are rather loquacious, and I will be able to provide just the skeleton of his disquisition (with a small sample of binary oppositions he proposed). Representations, Durdík upheld, regardless of their actual content, can be associated either on the basis of quantity or of quality. In the first case we arrive at the form of (1) the 'force' (a variation on Zimmermann's magnitude borrowed from physics) that encompasses oppositions like big vs. small or complex vs. simple. The qualitative relations among representations derive either from their accord (the similarity between the paired items exceeds the dissimilarity) or, conversely, from their discord. Those based on the former are either the forms of (2) the 'characteristic' (prototypal vs. ectypal, symbolic vs. allegoric) or of (3) the 'harmony' (symmetric vs. asymmetric, rhythmic vs. irregular). The ones generated by the latter are the forms of (4) the 'correctness' (prescribed vs. arbitrary, pure vs. mixed) or of (5) the 'balance and closure' (free vs. necessary, original vs. trite) (Durdík 1875, 36–83).

After outlining the basic forms of beauty, Durdík moved on to their actual manifestations. For the sake of brevity, I will limit my discussion to art alone. The Czech formalist bifurcated this category into two types. Music and painting, on the one hand, are of the sensory nature, literature, on the other hand, of the spiritual one. Or, more precisely, the latter "stands at the boundary" between the two, observed Durdík: "Though embodying sensory beauty through its phonic quality and rhythm it also pertains to spiritual beauty" (Durdík 1875, 225). Given this dual nature of poetic beauty, representations – for Durdík the proper material of literature – can be correlated into two types of form. Since each and every representation "must have its sign [...] to become sensory perceptual" (Durdík 1875, 310), the palpable elements of such signs can be organized into specific patterns comprising the outer form of poetry. The relations among the mental representations themselves would, then, constitute the inner form of poetry. Of these two, Durdík insists, it is inner form alone that is essential to literature. A proof of this is,

in his eyes, artistic prose which, though devoid of outer form and based solely on the relations of representations, is still considered an artistic phenomenon. And this in contrast to non-artistic everyday language or scientific prose whose lack of inner form prevents them from gaining, in Durdík's opinion, an artistic status even if deliberately furnished with an outer form by being, say, versified.

Arts are not different from each other solely according to the type of beauty they embody but also according to whether they have a subject or not. There are arts that are a priori void of any subject like architecture and music, and there are others that can be subjectless by choice. Painting, for instance, may either depict situations and characters or, with equal ease, dispose of them – the arabesque being an oft-quoted example. But the subject *per se*, Durdík is never tired of repeating, does not carry any intrinsic aesthetic value. It is only one of many components within a complex whole, an integral part of the immanent set of relations – artistic form. "Anything in the subject that is not reworked," states he, "is just a raw, rough material, a remnant (residuum) which [...] the artist failed to overcome" (Durdík 1875, 599). Only secondarily and only in comparison with other works of art can the subject contribute to the aesthetic value of a work. This happens, for example, when two paintings are equally perfect from the formal point of view and one has a more valuable subject. But this said, "the value of a work of art is" for Durdík "not based on what the work *signifies*, but on *what it is* [Durdík's italics]." (Durdík 1875, 598) And because "anything can be an art's subject" (Durdík 1875, 656), the main task of the aesthetician is to study actual artistic forms, rather than the extra-aesthetic *valeur* of their constitutive elements, which may be utterly subjective. In Durdík's own words: "If we say that the aesthetician should study the 'object' itself, not what the creator intended, what he wanted to express, etc., we mean that an aesthetician's object is form, that 'his 'what?' is 'how?''. Not 'what' the artist expressed, but 'how' he expressed it is the question" (Durdík 1875, 656; emphasis in the original).

As expected, fire and brimstone are poured on the heads of content-oriented or idealistic aestheticians recklessly ignoring the category of form and finding instead "the essence of beauty in 'content'" because of their inscrutable believe that "it is the content's value that makes its manifestation pleasing to us" (Durdík 1875, 107). For Durdík such a stance borders on mysticism, relegating those who subscribe to it (Hegel, Schelling, Vischer, et al.) to the proverbial dustbin of history. The utility of their theorizing might be propaedeutic for "just as all men at the boundary between alchemy and chemistry had to know alchemy, we should know the idealist systems" (Durdík 1875, 116). But you don't need the weatherman, Durdík intimates to his readers, to know which way the wind blows: "And as astronomy arose from astrology and chemistry from alchemy, idealist aesthetics will be succeeded by the scientific one, i. e., formal aesthetics" (Durdík 1875, 116).

Durdík's successor at Prague University and the first holder of the chair of aesthetics endowed in 1883 was Otakar Hostinský (see Jůzl 1985, 81). He himself never wrote a systematic general aesthetics, and this task befell his pupil Zdeněk Nejedlý who compiled Hostinský's lectures together with the notes of his students into a unified theoretical work, the posthumous *Otakara Hostinského esthetika* (1921, *Otakar Hostinský's Aesthetics*) which, however, never progressed beyond its first volume. If Durdík strove to combine empiricism with an all-encompassing deductive theoretical system, Hostinský was a strict inductive empiricist. In Nejedlý's informed assessment, for Hostinský, "aesthetics had value only insofar as it is based on empiricism as the source of aesthetic facts and on induction as the scientific method. Without empiricism and induction, aesthetics" in Hostinský's mind, "is not a science" (Nejedlý 1907, 4). Harking back at Nejedlý's essay, Mirko Novák contrasted Durdík's "abstract formalism" to Hostinský's "concrete" one (Novák 1941, 107).

A lecture Hostinský delivered to the Royal Bohemian Society of Sciences on March 21, 1881, summarized comprehensively all his major grievances about the then current interpretations of Herbart's aesthetics. Its leitmotif can be paraphrased as: 'back to the original Herbart.' Such recourse is a must, Hostinský maintained, because the modern Herbartians (Zimmermann and Durdík in his stead) distorted the original empiricist thrust of Herbart's philosophy by grounding aesthetics in the five "practical ideas" initially formulated for ethics. It was, therefore, incumbent on the modern formalist to ask: "First, is it consistent with Herbart's spirit and thrust to accept uncritically his five practical ideas as the basis of general aesthetics? Second, are the universal aesthetic forms truly parallel to the practical ideas?" (Hostinský 1882, 122).

His answer to both questions was a resounding no. The Herbartian followers eager to create a comprehensive conceptual system, Hostinský charged, readily substituted a series of ad hoc decisions for the study of data at hand. For Herbart, first of all, aesthetic was not derived from ethics but *vice versa* and his quintet was just one particular configuration of relations valid for volitional affairs but hardly for another normative domain. Second, Zimmermann's equation of the five practical ideas with the five universal aesthetic forms was, more often than not, the matter of their tropological extension, not of any genuine kinship. Finally, without any proof, the Herbartian formalists indiscriminately applied the five universal aesthetic forms to all types of beauty (whether natural or artistic) turning a blind eye to their substantive differences. And even though formalist aesthetics was, Hostinský acquiesced – insofar as it conceived of this inquiry as an autonomous discipline, independent of any philosophical presuppositions – superior to all other existing schools of thought, his overall evaluation of its current state was rather blunt: "Herbartian school," Hostinský did not mince his words, "had

not yet succeeded in establishing a rock solid and unshakeable basis for an exact general aesthetics" (Hostinský 1882, 138).

Mistrust of speculative theorizing not only prevented Hostinský from writing a general aesthetics but also made him look with suspicion on the general concept of art. Rather than seeking what its major constituents have in common, he focused on its individual representatives and, in particular, on that which separated them – their materials. In doing so he was always ready to apply the most recent methods of the natural sciences – physics, acoustics, physiology, etc. – in his own research, perhaps with the best results in music. For literary studies he accepted the venerable concept of poetic beauty as the relation of representations. Hostinský, however, argued forcefully against the simple opposition of form and material advocated by Durdík. There is no raw, formless material, he insisted. "The poet [...] receives his material already pre-formed; but he reshapes this form [...] Thus we cannot oppose the principle of material to form and believe that only in the second stage of artistic re-creation do we arrive at form" (Nejedlý 1921, 53).

This observation carries a special significance in regard to literary plot, which is already a set of relations prior to its entering into the text. The connections among the elements of plot are for Hostinský "objective relations, that is, relations among things themselves, independent of a perceiver" (Nejedlý 1921, 354). In the literary work, these relations comprise both the plot of the work as well as its temporal succession. In a move somewhat resembling the Russian formalist distinction between 'story' and 'plot,' Hostinský proposed to distinguish two kinds of elements: those "which compose the narrated subject of the poem" and those that "arise through the way this story is presented" (Nejedlý 1921, 354).

In contrast to the radical Russian formalists, though, Hostinský did not completely banish the 'narrated matter' or, more generally, represented reality, from the purview of aesthetics. As he declared in a lengthy study on artistic realism, the "verisimilitude of artistic representation is as much an aesthetic element" as the formal features of the work, that is, the "shapely lines and forms, harmony of colors and tones, continuity and contrast of poetic representations, proportionality of the total composition" (Hostinský 1890, 4). Nejedlý interpreted the essay's apparent 'anti-formalism' in the following way: "If the entire beauty rests completely in the relation between two representations (formalism), then verisimilitude (realism) is indeed an important aesthetic element based on the relation of reality to its depiction in the work of art" (Nejedlý 1907, 23). Hostinský, however, was rather cautious not to confuse the programmatic aesthetics of a single artistic movement with aesthetics as a scholarly discipline. He was keenly aware that in contrast to 'realistic art' there is what he termed 'idealistic art' (e. g., absolute music, ornament, fantastic literature) whose works lack, to a considerable degree, any relation to the real world. For this reason, "idealism and realism are

not the highest universal principles of art, exhausting and delimiting the essence of artistic creation. [...] [They] are merely principles of style which vary with circumstances, substitute for one another, or even co-exist in the course of history" (Hostinský 1890, 41). For scholarly aesthetics, the two are fundamentally equal and one of them cannot be extoled to the detriment of the other.

Providing an overall view of Hostinský's aesthetics has its hiccups. The last great Czech formalist was too much of an inductivist to willingly subsume all aesthetic phenomena under a few general rules. As pointed out above, he never produced a systematic theoretical aesthetics, and the wealth of his ideas is dispersed over dozens of publications. We are thus forced to rely on Nejedlý's belated systematization, produced, *nota bene*, only after he had already left the theories of his late teacher behind. Nevertheless, insofar as it can be reconstructed, Hostinský's system was based on the following four postulates: (1) aesthetics is the science of beauty in all its particular manifestations; (2) it is an empirical discipline which accepts aesthetic phenomena as sensory perception furnishes them to our cognition; (3) it is an independent discipline and cannot be deduced from any other discipline; (4) its method is analytic-synthetic: aesthetic phenomena are first dissolved into elementary self-evident aesthetic relations from which higher combinations are subsequently constructed (see also Novák 1941, 126). Hostinský's failure to subsume all his theorizing in an overarching system notwithstanding, in the history of formalism he was a major figure. According to Josef Zumr's recent appraisal: Hostinský "might be rightly considered the most significant systemizer and the creative personality of Herbartianism in aesthetics [...] its consummator" (Zumr 1998, 61).

3 "Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose?"

The popular adagio that history does not repeat itself but it often rhymes has a curious relevancy for the Czech aesthetics's trace dependence. True, Hostinský's death brought the great Herbartian tradition in Prague to its end with his most gifted pupils – Zdeněk Nejedlý (1878–1962) and Otakar Zich (1879–1934) – decamping for the research methods and theoretical programs more attuned to the intellectual atmosphere of their own era (see, e. g., Nejedlý 1912–1913; Zich 1921). Yet, as the prominent Czech critic, F. X. Šalda (1867–1938), noted already in mid-1930, the Herbartian conceptualization of aesthetics found its echo among the next generation of local students of art: in the structuralists coalescing around the Prague Linguistics Circle. According to this view, reiterated many times since (cf. e. g., Novák 1941, 136; Sus 1958, 310; Wiesing 2016, 7), what apparently brings

these two schools of thought together is their decidedly anti-substantivist stance, their perception of the aesthetic object as a relational whole.

Should we thus assume that the Prague School was simply a continuation of the Herbartian aesthetics by other means as some Czech scholars suggest (cf. e. g., Zumr 1958, 306)? This question defies an easy answer, and given the focus of my current presentation, I will not try to provide it (for a detailed discussion of this issue, see Steiner 1982). Let me just point out that the purported historical rhyming between the two schools, to play up the prosodic metaphor, is somewhat imperfect because the *poiesis* of structuralism involved yet a third party, exogenous to the Czech scholarly tradition. For even a cursory look at the output of Jan Mukařovský (1891–1975) and his cohorts makes it clear that much more than from Durdík or Hostinský, they drew their theoretical inspiration from the Russian formalism. Yet, triangular liaisons are notoriously tenebrous and the relationship of the nascent structuralism to the two preceding formalisms is no exception to the rule. The three cameos of this tangled theoretical *ménage à trois* proffered by otherwise perceptive Šalda prove the point: (1) "Mukařovský's formalism [!] besides its domestic roots is [...] an autonomous likeness of the Russian formalism" (Šalda 1934–1935, 61). (2) From some statements in Shklovskii's *O teorii prozy* (1929, *Theory of Prose*) "it is evident how this new conception of literary science is affined with our good acquaintance – the Herbartian aesthetics" (Šalda 1934–1935, 63). (3) "The crux of Mukařovský's contribution is his ability to transform the static structure of the relational aesthetics into a new, developmentally dynamic principle [...] he arched the way from Herbart to Hegel" (Šalda 1934–1935, 65). Go figure! But, then, who ever told you that intellectual history should be a cakewalk?

References

Beiser, Frederick C. *The Genesis of Neo-Kantianism, 1796–1880*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Beiser, Frederick C. "Herbart's Monadology." *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 23.6 (2015): 1056–1073.

Dunkel, Harold B. *Herbart and Herbartianism: An Educational Ghost Story*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Durdík, Josef. *Všeobecná aesthetika*. Prague: I. L. Korber, 1875.

Durdík, Josef. "O významu nauky Herbartovy, hledíc obzvlášť k poměrům českým." *Časopis Musea království českého* 50 (1876): 294–328.

Gubser, Michael. *Time's Visible Surface: Alois Riegel and the Discourse on History and Temporality in Fin-de-Siècle Vienna*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 2006.

Herbart, Johann Friedrich. *Hauptpunkte der Metaphysik* [1806–1808]. *Sämtliche Werke*. Vol. 2. Ed. Karl Kehrbach. Langensalza: Herman Beyer und Söhne, 1887a. 175–216. https://archive.org/details/smtlichewerkei02herbuoft/page/174/mode/2up (14 February 2022).

Herbart, Johann Friedrich. *Allgemeine praktische Philosophie* [1808]. *Sämtliche Werke*. Vol. 2. Ed. Karl Kehrbach. Langensalza: Herman Beyer und Söhne, 1887b. 329–458. https://archive.org/details/smtlichewerkei02herbuoft/page/328/mode/2up (14 February 2022).

Herbart, Johann Friedrich. "Ueber die Moeglichkeit und Nothwendigkeit, Mathematik auf Psychologie Anzuwenden: Vorgelesen in der Königlichen Deutschen Gesellschaft, am 18. April 1822." [1822] Johann Friedrich Herbart, *Sämtliche Werke*. Vol. 5. Ed. Karl Kehrbach. Langensalza: Herman Beyer und Söhne, 1890. 90–122. https://archive.org/details/johannfriedrichh05unse_0/page/90/mode/2up (14 February 2022).

Herbart, Johann Friedrich. *Kurze Encyclopädie der Philosophie aus praktischen Gesichtspuncten entworfen* [1831]. *Sämtliche Werke*. Vol. 9. Ed. Karl Kehrbach. Langensalza: Herman Beyer und Söhne, 1897. 17–338. https://archive.org/details/johannfriedrichh09herb/page/16/mode/2up (14 February 2022).

Hostinský, Otakar. "O významu praktických ideí Herbartových pro všeobecnou esthetiku." *Zprávy o zasedání Královské české společnosti nauk v Praze: Ročník 1881*. Prague: Královská česká společnosti nauk, 1882. 120–139.

Hostinský, Otakar. *O realismu uměleckém*. Prague: Bursík a Kohout, 1890.

Hostinský, Otakar. *Herbarts Ästhetik in ihren grundlegenden Teilen quellenmässig dargestellt und erläutert*. Hamburg: Verlag von Leopold Voss, 1891.

Johnston, William M. *The Austrian Mind: An Intellectual and Social History 1848–1938*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1972.

Jůzl, Miloš. *Hostinského pojetí estetiky a filozofie dějin umění*. Prague: Univerzita Karlova, 1985.

Kim, Alan. "Johann Friedrich Herbart." *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Ed. Edward N. Zalta (Winter 2015). https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2015/entries/johann-herbart/ (14 February 2022).

Mohns, Walter. *Herbarts Stellung zur Englischen Moralphilosophie*. Langensalza: Herman Beyer und Söhne, 1914.

Nejedlý, Zdeněk. "Otakar Hostinský." *Česká mysl* 8 (1907): 3–43.

Nejedlý, Zdeněk. "Krise estetiky." *Česká kultura* 1 (1912–1913): 19–23, 42–47, 76–78.

Nejedlý, Zdeněk. *Otakara Hostinského esthetika*. Vol. 1: *Všeobecná esthetika*. Prague: Leichter, 1921.

Novák, Mirko. *Česká estetika od Palackého po dobu současnou*. Prague: Fr. Borový, 1941.

Šalda, František Xavier. "Příklad literárního dějepisu strukturálního." *Šaldův zapisník* 7 (1934–1935): "Stati" 59–68. http://www.digitalniknihovna.cz/nkp/uuid/uuid:3e5480d0-bc92-11e4-9ade-005056825209 (14 February 2022).

Steiner, Peter. "The Roots of Structuralist Esthetics." *The Prague School: Selected Writings, 1929–1946*. Ed. Peter Steiner. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1982. 174–219.

Sus, Oleg. "Theoretické základy Hostinského estetiky: Hostinský a Herbart." *Filosofický časopis* 6.1–3 (1958): 301–314.

Sus, Oleg. "Sémantické problémy umění u Josefa Durdíka." *Filosofický časopis* 8 (1960): 776–790.

Tretera, Ivo. *J. F. Herbart a jeho stoupenci na pražské univerzitě*. Prague: Univerzita Karlova, 1989.

Weiss, Georg. *Herbart und seine Schule*. Munich: Verlag Ernst Reinhardt, 1928.

Wiesing, Lambert. *The Visibility of the Image: History and Perspectives of Formal Aesthetics*. Trans. by Nancy Ann Roth. London: Bloomsbury, 2016.

Zich, Otakar. "Úkoly české esthetiky." *Česká mysl* 17 (1921): 40–47.

Zimmermann, Robert. *Leibnitz und Herbart: Eine Vergleichung ihrer Monadologien*. Vienna: Wilhelm Braumüller, 1849.

Zimmermann, Robert. "Zur Reform der Aesthetik als exacter Wissenschaft." *Zeitschrift für exacte Philosophie im Sinne des neuern philosophischen Realismus* 2 (1861): 309–358.

Zimmermann, Robert. *Aesthetik*. Vol. 2: *Allgemeine Aesthetik als Formwissenschaft*. Vienna: Wilhelm Braumüller, 1865.

Zöller, Günter. "History of Kantian Aesthetics." *Encyclopedia of Aesthetics*. 2nd edition. Vol. 4. Ed. Michael Kelly. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. 59–61.

Zumr, Josef. "Theoretické základy Hostinského estetiky: Hostinský a Herbart." *Filosofický časopis* 6 (1958): 301–314.

Zumr, Josef. "Herbartova filosofie ve vztahu ke Kantovi, Leibnizovi a Hegelovi." *Filosofický časopis* 13 (1965): 413–422.

Zumr, Josef. *Máme-li kulturu, je naší vlastí Evropa: Herbartismus a česká filosofie*. Prague: Filosofia, 1998.

Igor Pilshchikov
The Four Faces of Russian Formalism

1 Introduction

This chapter focuses on the research agenda advanced by the scholars who belonged to the groups associated with the Russian formalists: the Society for the Study of Poetic Language (Obshchestvo izucheniia poėticheskogo iazyka, OPOIaZ) and the Moscow Linguistic Circle (Moskovskii Lingvisticheskii Kruzhok, MLK). These groups were not, in fact, unified or consolidated, but their members shared similar concerns: they conceived of art (first, verbal art; then, all kinds of art) as a type of human activity governed by its own intrinsic laws rather than predetermined by ideological, social or psychological conditions (Tihanov 2012, 1239). They all agreed that what makes art different from everything else is artistic form, but they had differences of opinion regarding why artistic form matters and how it 'works.'

Russian formalism was born on the eve of the First World War. The whole world was about to change entirely and irreversibly. Arts and sciences were already changing to accommodate new visions and new perspectives. Literary criticism was about to change too.

Late nineteenth-century Russia acknowledged two non-intersecting types of criticism. One type was the positivist literary scholarship of cultural-historical and psychological schools which addressed the past and treated it in an academic manner. The other type was 'literary journalism,' which reacted to contemporary phenomena and treated them either ideologically or aesthetically – depending on a given critic's attitude. However, the Modernist literature and art of the early twentieth century gave rise to new attitudes. Russian Symbolism brought the figure of the poet-craftsman to the foreground. Not only did such poets as Valerii Briusov, Viacheslav Ivanov and Andrei Belyi aspire to be masters of verse – they also wanted to describe their poetic craft in technical terms.

A new mode of non-realist writing focused the attention of poets on issues of verse form. From this point of view, there was no big difference for them between contemporary poetry and the poetry of previous periods. When Andrei Belyi discovered the dichotomy of meter and rhythm that constitutes the basis of Russian syllabic-accentual versification, he applied a statistical analysis of verse rhythm not only to eighteenth- and nineteenth-century poetry, but to his own poems as well. He tried to reveal the general rules that apply to the evolution of Russian poetry from eighteenth-century Classicism through twentieth-century Symbolism. Moreover, when he realized that some varieties of rhythm were very rare, he

himself composed more lines using this rhythm (Belyi 1910, 289–300; Gasparov 1988a).

The Symbolists argued that if you want to compose a poem, you should be able to explain how you make it. Viktor Shklovskii, the leader of the Russian formalists, later reversed this claim: "every decent literary critic should, if necessary, be able to write a novel" (Ginzburg 1987, 170). Both the Symbolists and the formalists were writers and scholars at the same time. There was, however, a significant difference: the Symbolists were first and foremost writers and only then scholars, while the formalists were first and foremost scholars and only then writers (Levchenko 2010).

When exactly did Russian formalism emerge? It was 'born' several times, and several conventional dates of birth could be cited (Levchenko and Pilshchikov 2017, 9). The earliest of them is 23 December 1913 (Old Style) – the day when a 20-year student of St Petersburg University named Viktor Shklovskii gave a scandalous lecture "Mesto futurizma v istorii iazyka" ("The Place of Futurism in the History of Language") at the Stray Dog (Brodiachaia Sobaka) Cabaret in St. Petersburg. The next important date is May 1914, when a substantially revised version of this lecture was published under the title *Voskreshenie slova* (1914, *Resurrection of the Word*).

However, at this moment there was no actual association of 'formalist' scholars. The first such association was officially established on 16 February (1 March) 1915. It was called the Moscow Linguistic Circle – MLC for short (Jakobson 1996, 361–362). The president of the MLC was Roman Jakobson (then a student of Moscow University), who held this office until he left Russia in 1920. The meetings of the Circle became regular from 5 April 1919. Among the Circle's most active members in 1919–1921 were the verse theorists Sergei Bobrov and Boris Tomashevskii, the folklorist Petr Bogatyrev (a co-founder of the MLC), the linguist Grigorii Vinokur (secretary of the Circle and its president in 1922–1923), the leftist critic Osip Brik, the mediaevalist Boris Iarkho, as well as Viktor Shklovskii, who came from Petrograd to attend the MLC meetings, and some other scholars (Shapir 2001; Pilshchikov and Ustinov 2018a; 2018b).

The next important mile marker is the publication of the first volume of the formalist essay collection *Sborniki po teorii poėticheskogo iazyka* (1916, *Studies on the Theory of Poetic Language*), edited by Shklovskii and sponsored by Brik. The censorship approval for the publication of the first volume was issued in Petrograd – formerly St. Petersburg – on 24 August 1916 (Old Style). In 1917 the second volume was published (approved by the censorship on 24 December 1916). The collection opens with Shklovskii's programmatic article "Iskusstvo kak priem" (1917, "Art as Device", 1990; also translated as "Art as Technique", 1965). It is generally believed that these volumes were published by the Society for the

Study of Poetic Language (OPOIaZ) but technically this is not true. The designation OPOIaZ, now globally known, was invented as late as 2 October 1919 (Krusanov 2003, 296–297), although "the creation of this new association was decided upon" much earlier, in February 1917, according to the memoir of Roman Jakobson, who was an active member of both the Moscow group and the Petrograd group (Jakobson 1971b [1965], 529–530).

By that time the Petrograd group had already been joined by the literary historian and critic Boris Èikhenbaum, who authored an article whose title also became emblematic of the formalist movement: "Kak sdelana 'Shinel'' Gogolia" (1918, "How Gogol's 'Overcoat' Is Made," 1974). It was published in the third volume of the *Studies on the Theory of Poetic Language*, entitled *Poetics* (1919). In 1920, the literary historian Iurii Tynianov joined OPOIaZ (Shubin 1994, 75) and became the third member of the celebrated formalist 'triumvirate.' Tomashevskii, who left Moscow for Petrograd in 1921 and also joined OPOIaZ, explained later that it had "never been a regular society with a list of members, a registered office, and statutes. Nevertheless, during the most active years, it had a semblance of organization in the form of a committee consisting of a president, Viktor Shklovskii; his assistant, Boris Èikhenbaum; and Iurii Tynianov as the society's secretary" (Tomashevskii 2004 [1928], 132, fn. 2).

Who is considered a formalist and who is not? In his explanatory article "Teoriia 'formal'nogo metoda'" (1925, "The Theory of the 'Formal Method'", 1971a), Èikhenbaum defined belonging to the 'Formalist School' in terms of affiliation with the association that was, in fact, only semi-formal (pun intended): "By 'formalists' I mean only that group of theorists who banded together in the Society for the Study of Poetic Language (OPOIaZ), and who began issuing their own publication in 1916" (Èikhenbaum 1971a [1925], 35, fn. 1, translation modified). This point of view strongly influenced later interpretations of formalism, in spite of Jakobson's continual efforts to include in the history of formalism not only OPOIaZ, but also the MLC (Jakobson 1971b [1965]; 1996; Dmitriev 2009; Depretto 2008; Sanmartín Ortí 2008).

In the present article, formalism is interpreted in Jakobson's sense and even more broadly, to include the output of all the branches of both associations, which together are viewed as a heterogeneous community. Formalism is understood here not as a unified theory but as a shared vocabulary of methods and approaches, created by the intellectual efforts of the members of this community both individually and collectively. Their theoretical quest was driven by a common set of assumptions and anticipations, although they tended to give different answers to the questions they were all interested in, and propose different research programs. Furthermore, the proposed schema incorporates not only the 'hardcore' central figures, but also some of those scholars who were traditionally consid-

ered 'formalist fellow travelers' or 'paraformalists' (such as Viktor Zhirmunskii and Viktor Vinogradov) and even their antagonists (such as Gustav Shpet and his followers). Finally, there is at least one scholar whose legacy may be linked to all formalist trends – Roman Jakobson.

However different the various branches of formalism were, they all shared a few basic assumptions (Pilshchikov 2011, 80–81; 2015, 320).

(i) Literature (verbal art) should be regarded as a phenomenon *per se*, rather than a manifestation of extra-literary phenomena, such as social relations as in Marxism or psychological complexes as in Freudianism.

(ii) The study of literature should become an autonomous discipline, similar in many respects to an exact science.

(iii) Since the specificity of art is its focus on form, any analysis of art (literature included) is an analysis of its forms.

(iv) Form in art is the result of processing (transforming) its material. The material of literature is language: literature is 'made' of language, in the same way as sculpture is made of wood, clay or stone. At the same time, narrative is extra-linguistic: the same narrative can be embodied in different languages and different physical materials.

(v) Poetic (artistic) language is opposed to everyday (practical) language, and the former is defined as an intentional transformation of the latter.

(vi) This intentional transformation, which creates an unusual form, is the essence of all art: in art, including verbal art, the questions 'how?' (form) and 'for what purpose?' (teleology) are more important than 'what?' (content) and 'for what reason?' (causality).

The last point is of utmost importance, although not all the members of the formalist associations agreed on it. Exceptions were Zhirmunskii and Iarkho, who insisted that "in reality, the distinction between 'what' and 'how' in art is only a conventional abstraction," and "a conventional opposition of form and content ('how' and 'what') in a scholarly study has always led to the confirmation of their inseparability in the aesthetic object" (Zhirmunskii 1921, 52). In art, form is always charged with meaning and meaning (content) always manifests itself in form. Therefore, "the question 'how?' is the same question as 'what?' but addressed to the act, and not to the fact. However, in art [...] fact and act coincide," *ergo*, "the question 'how?' [...] should be reduced to the question 'what?'" (Iarkho 1925, 50–51). Similarly, if "the focus moves from the psychology of the author to the work of art itself," then "the question 'for what purpose?' will also be reduced to the question 'what?'" (Iarkho 1925, 52–53; Pilshchikov 2011, 81, fn. 39; 2015, 335–336, fn. 2).

Though the agenda and research principles were the same, the approaches were different. In the development of Russian formalist theories from the mid-1910s to the late 1920s, at least four different trends with specific focuses and approaches to the problem of form can be distinguished.

2 The 'morphological' formalism of early OPOIaZ

According to Ėikhenbaum, the first stage of the development of the formalist School was characterized less by the desire to develop new methods of literary analysis and formulate a new theory or methodology than by an attempt to specify the object of literary studies. Scholars from other disciplines can study literature for their purposes: psychologists can examine it as an expression of the author's psyche, historians of ideas – as an expression of a particular ideology, etc. Literature was 'no man's land'– *res nullius*, as Aleksandr Veselovskii, a forerunner of Russian formalism, described the situation with literary studies in the nineteenth century (Veselovskii 2016 [1894], 40). The aim of formalist scholars was "to create an autonomous discipline of literary studies based on the specific properties of literary material," i.e. "of the properties that distinguish such material from material of any other kind" (Ėikhenbaum 1971a [1925], 4, 7). Or, as Jakobson put it, "the subject of literary scholarship is not literature but literariness [*literaturnost'*], i.e. that which makes a given work a work of literature" (Jakobson 1921, 11; 1973 [1921], 62).

How can literariness be defined? Alexander Potebnia, another nineteenth-century predecessor of formalism, sought the specificity of verbal art in the specificity of poetry as opposed to prose, the former being understood as "thinking in images," and the latter as non-artistic thinking and writing (Erlich 1965 [1955], 23–26; Cassedy 1990, 43–44; Svetlikova 2005, 41–61). The formalists elaborated on this dichotomy and started to search for a specific quality of literature in the dichotomy of 'poetic' and 'practical' language. This concept was introduced by the linguist Lev Iakubinskii, an active contributor to the first three collections of formalist essays and a former student of Jan Baudouin de Courtenay, whose ideas he developed (Erlich 1965 [1955], 73–74): "The phenomena of language ought to be classified according to the purpose for which the speaker uses his language resources in any given instance. If the speaker uses them for the purely practical purpose of communication, then we are dealing with a system of 'practical language' [...], in which language resources (sounds, morphological segments, and so forth) have no autonomous value and are merely a means of communication. But it is possible to conceive (and in fact to find) language systems in which

the practical aim retreats to the background [...] and language resources acquire autonomous value" (Iakubinskii 1916, 16, quoted in Èikhenbaum 1971a [1925], 9). Practical language is used for practical, utilitarian purposes. Poetic language has no utilitarian purpose: as Kant argued in his *Kritik der Urteilskraft* (1790, *Critique of the Power of Judgment*, 2000), art "is purposive in itself" (Kant 2000 [1790], 185).

The formalists, however, did not look to Kant or the neo-Kantians as much as to the Russian avant-garde poets – the Futurists. For them, "poetic speech became an end in itself, rather than a medium for conveying ideas and emotions" (Erlich 1965 [1955], 44). The Futurists' poetic revolution made the formalists reconsider the role of sound in poetry. Sounds were not 'the music of language' or just the poem's 'instrumentation' (sound orchestration), as the Symbolists had thought, but a self-sufficient essence valuable in and of itself. Shklovskii and Iakubinskii contended that "sounds are the initial point of poetic creativity" (Iakubinskii 1916, 29) and therefore the fundamental nature of poetic language is best of all revealed in the Futurist 'trans-sense' (*zaum'*) or 'transrational language' (*zaumnyi iazyk*) (Shklovskii 1916). Poetry can exist even without lexical meanings! Ironically, both moderate sympathizers and radical critics of OPOIaZ perceived this avant-garde gesture as a step back to Kant's oft-quoted "That is beautiful which pleases universally without a concept" ["Schön ist das, was ohne Begriff allgemein gefällt"] (Kant 2000 [1790], 104; see Zhirmunskii 1923a, 16; 1966 [1925], 20; Vygotskii 1971 [1925], 62–63; Medvedev 1934, 135).

Why do we then enjoy the sounds in verse? Repetition itself delivers aesthetic pleasure, Brik posited. Rhyme and alliteration are not obligatory – they are only particular cases of sound repetition (Brik 1917). It was not at all troubling that 'transrational language' violates all rules of common language. Poetic language should be understood as the deformation of practical language (Tynianov 1981 [1924]) or even "organized violence" toward everyday speech, as Jakobson (1923, 16) put it, transposing the definition of political power in the Russian translation of Marx' and Engels's *Manifesto of the Communist Party* (the word *Gewalt* used in the German original means both 'power' and 'violence').

Very soon the formalists gave poetic language a broader meaning, interpreting it as artistic language, i. e. the language of both poetry and prose fiction. The differential quality of poetic language is, according to Shklovskii, its *oshchutimost'* (translated as 'perceptibility' or 'palpableness'): "Poetic language is distinguished from prosaic [= practical] language by the palpableness of its construction" (Shklovskii 1919b, 4; quoted in Èikhenbaum 1971a [1925], 14). "The palpableness of form results from special artistic devices acting on perceivers so as to force them to experience form" (Èikhenbaum 1971a [1925], 13). *Priem* (translated normally as 'device,' but also as 'technique,' 'procedure' or '[artistic] means') is the first of

Shklovskii's terms that are notoriously difficult to translate into other languages. The devices underlying "the construction of the work" are "the ways in which the verbal material is combined into literary unities" (Tomashevskii 1925, 6). The term *priem* was used before Shklovskii (notably, in Lev Tolstoi's self-descriptions), but it was Shklovskii who made the device a cornerstone of the theory of art. 'Art *as* Device' actually means 'Art *is* Device', or, as Shklovskii himself famously put it, "the content [...] of the literary work equals the sum total of its stylistic devices" (Shklovskii 1921b, 8; Erlich 1965 [1955], 90; Steiner 1984, 66).

The consequences of this proposition are numerous. First and foremost, Potebnia's assertion that poetry is 'thinking in images' is now abandoned. Images in art (either verbal or iconic) are neither the quintessence nor the content of the artistic work, but devices alongside other devices such as repetition, simile, hyperbole etc. Poetry (art) is characterized by new form, rather than new content, and images are part of form, rather than of content. Furthermore, the dichotomy of form and content is also left behind. There remains the dichotomy of form and material – form being the transformation of material. If material is used without being deformed, then the relationship between materials creates form: "The literary work is a pure form, it is not a thing or material, but a relation between materials" (Shklovskii 1921b, 4). A synonym for 'form' is 'construction,' the latter being the arrangement or disposition of material. The principle of formal organization of a given work is called the 'constructive (constructional) principle.'

Contrary to the old positivist theories, the postulate of the economy of forces and means cannot be applied to art. Artistic form should be perceptible, palpable, and therefore difficult, impeded. 'Impeded form' (*zatrudnennaia forma*) is created by means of *ostranenie*, Shklovskii's now-famous neologism. This term, a trademark of formalist theory, is usually translated as 'making strange' or 'estrangement,' or, alternatively, as 'defamiliarization' (Tihanov 2005). In "Art as Device", Shklovskii describes *ostranenie* and gives examples (in *War and Peace*, Tolstoi depicts the Council of Fili through the incomplete understanding of a little girl; in *Kholstomer*, he portrays human life from a viewpoint of a horse; etc.), but does not define it. An appropriate definition is found in Tomashevskii's article about Russian formalism "La nouvelle école d'histoire littéraire en Russie" (1927, "The New School of Literary History in Russia," 2004) written in French for European Slavists and published in French and, in an abridged version, in Czech: Shklovskii's *ostranenie* is a way "to look at known or even familiar objects through an outsider's eye, in order to describe them in an original manner" (Tomashevskii 2004 [1928], 127).

Ostranenie is both the most important device in and of itself, and the principle of any artistic device (Hansen-Löve 1978, 19–24). Practical language, subordinated to practical aims and devoid of aesthetic qualities, has automatized the means of

expression – an idea Shklovskii borrowed from Bergson (Curtis 1976). The function of *ostranenie* is deautomatization of perception, or the resurrection (to use Shklovskii's word) of palpableness. This is why 'defamiliarization,' though not a literal translation of *ostranenie*, perfectly renders the idea it implies. Art cannot offer a deeper understanding of things – it can suggest a new way of seeing things. Or, as Shklovskii explains it in "Art as Device": "The purpose of art is to impart the sensation of things as they are perceived and not as they are known. The device [*priem*] of art is the device of defamiliarization [*ostranenie*] of things and the device of impeded form [*zatrudnennaia forma*], which increases the difficulty and length of perception" (Shklovskii 1917, 8; 1965 [1917], 12).

In story-constructing, the dichotomy of material and form is realized as the dichotomy of *fabula* – the material of the story – and *plot* (Russian: *siuzhet*; French: *sujet*) as its form. Fabula is the series of events of the story's fictional world in their chronological order. Plot is the story as it is narrated by the author or other narrators (Shklovskii 1921c, 39; Erlich 1965 [1955], 239–243). In a detective story, a detailed exposition of the committed crime is normally presented at the end of the narrative, while this crime is the starting point of its fabula. Lermontov's *Geroi nashego vremeni* (1840, *A Hero of Our Time*), in which the order of events radically differs from the order of the novel's chapters, is "a triumph of art over the logic of facts or, in other words, a triumph of the plot over the fabula" (Ėikhenbaum 1961, 282). The main character's story begins in the middle of the novel (the chapter "Taman"), and the novel ends in the middle of his story (the chapter "Fatalist", "The Fatalist"). The plot is thus created by the disposition of the materials. 'Retardation' or 'suspension' of action are among the most typical techniques for making the plot 'difficult'.

In formalist theory, the issue of realistic vs. non-realistic narrative is resolved by introducing the concept of *motivirovka* (Hansen-Löve 1985). *Motivirovka* ('motivation') is "the system of devices which justifies the introduction of the separate motifs and their complexes" (Tomashevskii 1925, 147, quoted in O'Toole and Shukman 1977, 39). Disguising the artificiality of literary form and introducing an extraliterary, 'real-life' motivation (the Russian language has an apt adjective: *bytovoi*, i. e. related to *byt* – 'everyday life') is what is usually referred to as realism. *Motivirovka* is the "'real-life' explanation of plot construction" (Shklovskii 1923, 50). Nevertheless, this type of motivation is not a direct description of reality: "Real life is not reflected in novels: it is deformed there" (Tomashevskii 2004 [1928], 126). This is, in particular, the reason why works of fiction should not be used as sources for social history.

Shklovskii used the concept of motivation to explain the difference between two types of plots. For him, Cervantes's *Don Quixote* (1605 and 1615) and Lawrence Sterne's *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy* (1759–1767) represent two oppo-

site attitudes to novelistic form; however, these attitudes share the same feature: lack of *motivirovka* (Shklovskii 1921c, 1921a). "*Don Quixote* is viewed as a point of transition from story collections (like the *Decameron*) to the single-hero novel, structured on the device of concatenation, with a journey serving as motivation" (Èikhenbaum 1971a [1925], 19). It is not sophisticated enough in terms of plot construction and is not therefore fully motivated. *Tristram Shandy* is, on the contrary, over-sophisticated and self-reflexive: it is a novel that "deliberately tears away motivation and bares its construction" (Èikhenbaum 1971a [1925], 20). Shklovskii emphasizes the aesthetic value of 'laying bare' (*obnazhenie*) of conventional artistic means – yet another example of *ostranenie*. Awareness of form and demonstration of its artificiality is the meaning of a Sternian parody novel.

The main problem in novel construction is thus how its plot elements are put together. Lermontov's *A Hero of Our Time* consists of several 'short stories' of various genres (traveller's sketch, 'high society story,' etc.) unified by the figure of the protagonist. In Tolstoi's novels, a contraposition of several plots is motivated by the fact that their protagonists are relatives. The history of the novel can be modelled as the history of the connective tissues and the forms of their assemblage.

The theory of plot was further complemented by the theory of *skaz* (Titunik 1977; Schmid 2003). *Skaz* (from the verb *skazyvat'*, 'to tell a story') is a written imitation of oral speech presented "as if it were being immediately uttered," with all kinds of "defective forms which copy various kinds of speech disturbance" (Vinogradov 1926, 33, 37, quoted in O'Toole and Shukman 1977, 26, 24). *Skaz* and the shifting of speech masks make up "the constructional principle of the plotless story" (Èikhenbaum 1971a [1925], 21). Such a "literary masquerade" (Vinogradov 1926, 39) can be motivated (e. g. by the progression of the main character's mental illness in Gogol's *Zapiski sumasshedshego* (1835, *Diary of a Madman*)), or completely unmotivated, as in Gogol's *Shinel'* (1842, *The Overcoat*). In "How Gogol's 'Overcoat' is Made", Èikhenbaum demonstrates the role of *skaz* and reinterprets Gogol's story – which nineteenth-century critics had considered a milestone of Russian naturalism and a powerful statement in support of civic values – as a kind of a stand-up absurdist comedy with the narrator mimicking various types of discourses.

The application of this concept to the history of literature enables us to identify the *skaz* tradition in Russian prose: from Gogol to Leskov and further to Remizov, Zamiatin, Babel and Zoshchenko, contemporaries of the formalists (Èikhenbaum 1924 [1918]; 1927 [1925]; Stepanov 1928; Shklovskii 1928; Vinogradov 1928). The *skaz* forms are also important in contexts other than Russian. Thus, in his influential essay "Der Erzähler: Betrachtungen zum Werk Nikolai Leskows" (1936, "The Storyteller: Reflections on the Work of Nikolai Leskov"), Walter Ben-

jamin starts from the same point of departure as Ėikhenbaum to develop his own theory of narrative (Striedter 1989, 55–58).

Staking out the specific boundaries of literary studies as an autonomous discipline ('specification' of literature, as the formalists called it) had an important result: the birth of 'literary theory' as such (Tihanov 2019). A synonym for this new term was the old Aristotelian term 'poetics,' already revived and reinterpreted by Veselovskii (Kliger and Maslov 2016; Merrill 2017; Tihanov 2017). However, in contrast to Veselovskii's 'historical poetics,' formalist poetics was first and foremost theoretical. Tellingly, Tomashevskii's 'formalist' textbook, first published in 1925, is entitled *Teoriia literatury (Poėtika)* (*Theory of Literature (Poetics)*). Furthermore, unlike Aristotle's, Horace's or Boileau's poetic codices, formalist poetics was descriptive, rather than prescriptive, so the formalists "resented any parallelism drawn between their poetics and Aristotle's" (Steiner 1984, 38, fn. 45).

The object of literary studies, according to early OPOIaZ scholars, is the construction of the artistic work. Another term the formalists used to describe their vision was 'morphology.' In the foreword to his book *Molodoi Tolstoi* (1922, *The Young Tolstoi*, 1972) Ėikhenbaum explained that 'poetics' is a discipline that focuses on the artist's

> [...] system of stylistic and compositional devices. We are accustomed to call such a method of investigation 'formal,' although I prefer to call it 'morphological' in distinction to others (psychological, sociological, etc.) where the object of investigation is not the artistic work itself, but what the work 'reflects' in the opinion of the investigator. (Ėikhenbaum 1972 [1922], 4)

Just as in linguistics and biology, a 'morphological' analysis of a literary text reveals its constituent parts and demonstrates their workings. The next logical step in the development of this approach was the transformation of 'morphological' Formalism into 'functionalist' Formalism (see Section 3 below).

These versions of formalist literary theory – 'morphological' and 'functionalist' formalism – were canonized in Victor Erlich's monograph *Russian Formalism: History – Doctrine* (1965 [1955]) and in Tzvetan Todorov's anthology of Russian formalist writings in French translation, significantly entitled *Théorie de la littérature* (1965). The same title was earlier used for Wellek and Warren's *Theory of Literature* (1963 [1949]), which incorporates and accommodates many concepts of Russian formalist and Czech structuralist origins. I have myself called the 'morphological' and 'functionalist' formalist approaches 'qualitative' – as opposed to the 'quantitative' formalism represented by several scholars of the Moscow Linguistic Circle (Pilshchikov 2018; Pilshchikov and Ustinov 2020a). It is time now to have a look at the second face of Russian formalism, which is much less familiar to readers, especially outside Russia.

3 The 'quantitative' formalism of the MLC

While OPOIaZ represented 'journalistic-style' (i.e. anti-academic but not dilletantish) literary criticism, as Ėikhenbaum (1971a [1925], 6) put it, the Moscow Linguistic Circle represented academic scholarship: it was founded by the Moscow University students, functioned under the auspices of the Moscow Dialectological Commission associated with the Imperial Academy of Sciences, and its Statute was approved by Aleksei Shakhmatov, chair of the Section of Russian Language and Literature of the Academy of Sciences. Shakhmatov's letter of approval authorized Jakobson, Bogatyrev and their associates "to form a circle of young linguists [...] having as its aim the study of linguistics, poetics, metrics, and folklore" (Jakobson 1971b [1965], 530). Unlike OPOIaZ, with its focus on the object, rather than methods, of literary studies, the MLC sought "to elaborate new methods of linguistic analysis with particular reference to the diverse functions of language, and especially to its poetic function" (Jakobson 1971b [1965], 531).

One of the ways to find a uniform approach to the study of all forms of verbal art was the use of the mathematical methods of variation statistics, which had proved their effectiveness in contemporary biology. If biology – formerly a purely descriptive and classificatory discipline – had managed to become an 'exact science,' why could linguistics and poetics not do the same, or at least make the first steps toward this noble aim? The domain of poetry to which such methods were most applicable was versification. The reason was that "the elements that make up the phonic level in the structure of the literary work (syllables, stresses, vowel lengths) yielded to isolation and computation significantly more easily than the elements of higher levels (stylistic figures, plot motifs, and so on)" (Gasparov 1980 [1973], 1; translation modified).

In 1919, two scholars who had previously (independently from each other) developed some statistical methods for the study of verse – Boris Tomashevskii and Boris Iarkho – began regularly attending the MLC meetings. On 21 June 1919, following Jakobson's proposal, they were both elected full members of the Circle (MLC Papers, folder 2.II.10, fol. 61). It should be noted here that Tomashevskii, who is usually remembered as a Petersburg scholar and a member of OPOIaZ, produced a significant part of his research on Russian verse in Moscow, where he lived from 1918 to the end of 1920, and presented the results at meetings of the MLC (Fleishman 1977). Tomashevskii's OPOIaZ works belong to the next period (1922–1927). His quantitative verse studies from the Moscow period were published as a separate collection entitled *O stikhe* (*On Verse*) as late as 1929 in Leningrad. To add to the misconception, Todorov's anthology includes only the sections of *On Verse* that do not contain calculations, diagrams or tables (see Todorov 1965, 154–169).

These new developments were elaborations on the findings of nineteenth-century German empirical positivist scholars of classical philology such as Moritz Wilhelm Drobisch and Arthur Ludwich, who had used statistical data for the attribution and dating of ancient Greek and Roman hexameters (the distribution of dactylic and spondaic feet). They were likewise built on the more recent discoveries of Andrei Belyi, who had applied statistical methods in analyzing the rhythm of Russian syllabic-accentual verse (the distribution of stressed and unstressed feet). However, the Moscow formalists considered their predecessors' attempts inconsistent and self-contradictory, and their data – incomplete and approximate (Pilshchikov and Ustinov 2020a).

At a meeting of the MLC on 8 June 1919, Tomashevskii presented a paper, "O piatistopnom iambe Pushkina" ("On Pushkin's Iambic Pentameter"). It was published much later, in 1923, and reprinted in an abridged version in Tomashevskii's *On Verse* (1929, 138–253). In this study, he compared the statistical characteristics of the rhythm of Pushkin's iambic pentameter with the rhythm of the iambic pentameter of other Russian poets and the European meters of the same syllabic length (Italian endecasillabo, French décasyllabe, English and German syllabic-accentual iambic pentameter). In particular, this enabled Tomashevskii to reveal the influence of the rhythm of French 10-syllable verse on Petr Viazemskii's iambic pentameter of 1821–1825 – the years when Viazemskii, one of Pushkin's best friends, had been translating the epigrams of J.-B. Rousseau.

In this and other studies of verse from the late 1910s, Tomashevskii also used a statistical method of his own invention that compares empirical indicators of verse rhythm with a theoretical model (Gasparov 1980, 3). A theoretical frequency of the occurrence of a line containing words of a particular accentual structure results from the frequency of these words in the works of the given author (or in contemporary prose – Tomashevskii left this question open). To draw conclusions about poetic rhythm, it is necessary to "compare the theoretical frequency with the actual one," i. e. the one observed in the poetic lines under examination (Tomashevskii 1923a, 40). The bigger the divergence, the more significant the power of prosodic constraints. This method (later amended by scholars including the prominent verse theorist Kiril Taranovsky and the mathematician Andrei Kolmogorov – probably the greatest Soviet mathematician) was even christened "the Russian linguistic-statistical method for studying poetic rhythm" (Bailey 1979: 251). In 1960, Jakobson called Tomashevskii's approach to prosody "an example of the longest and, until recently, perhaps the most spectacular tie between linguistics, in particular the study of poetic language, on the one hand, and the mathematical analysis of stochastic processes on the other." This approach "gave surprising clues for descriptive, historical, comparative, and general metrics on a scientific basis" (Jakobson 1971c [1960], 579).

Boris Iarkho went even further than Tomashevskii: he was convinced of the possibility of a total quantification of poetics (Gasparov 2016 [1969]; Margolin 1979; Depretto 2018). In addition to the statistical-probabilistic approach to verse (in particular, he explored medieval Latin poetry, opposing his statistical methods to those of Meyer aus Speyer), Iarkho extended the use of quantitative methods to all domains of artistic form – sound, grammar, and meaning. His *Metodologiia tochnogo literaturovedeniia* (1935–1938, *Methodology of Exact Literary Studies*) and studies of dramatic genres in synchronic and diachronic aspects are of primary importance. These works were completed between the late 1920s and the late 1930s – the most important ones written in exile in Omsk between 1935 and 1938 – but published much later, between 1997 and 2006.

Iarkho specified the genre features of tragedies and comedies using such formal quantitative parameters as the total number of characters (dramatis personae); the number of scenes with a particular number of speaking characters and the standard deviation from the mean number of speaking characters in a scene; the number of scenes in the play (the measure of mobility of the action); the average length of speeches and the percentage of verse lines divided between the remarks of different speaking characters (the measures of mobility and coherence of the dialogue); and the like. Their proportion in different plays is different. The history of a genre can be described as an evolution of its features and feature clusters. The differences between literary trends can be described as the difference in the proportions of particular features and groups of features. Iarkho's calculations enabled him to demonstrate that the history of the five-act tragedy in verse can be divided into four periods (Early Classical, Late Classical, Early Romantic, Late Romantic) and that it is possible to determine the boundaries between these periods (Iarkho 2019 [1929–1935]). At the same time, when he compared two genres which co-exist at a given period in time (Iarkho focused on the tragedies and comedies of Pierre Corneille), he was able to formally differentiate between the two. He established quantifiable features which distinguish one genre from the other, calculated the proportions of their combinations in various texts, and placed the intermediary works (tragicomedies) on a scale between a prototypical tragedy and a prototypical comedy (Iarkho 2006, 403–449).

In Iarkho's *Methodology*, the outcomes of these studies are used as only a few examples among hundreds of others. Of special interest is a section in which he shows how the study of literature can benefit from applications of basic statistical methods (obtaining the series of order statistics, calculating variation ranges, medians, modes, arithmetic averages, standard deviations, etc.) and the meaningful interpretations these data can contribute to, i. e. how these data explain the particulars of the literary structure or literary evolution (Iarkho 2006, 117–206). Iarkho did not consider his research a finished work, but merely the beginning

of a huge undertaking, an outline for future investigations: "We have demonstrated the technique; the path has been cleared for those more fortunate than us" (Iarkho 2019 [1929–1935], 72).

According to Iarkho, there exist three domains of poetic form:
(i)   phonics (sound forms: rhythm and euphony),
(ii) stylistics (language forms, including grammatical and rhetorical forms), and
(iii) eidology, or iconology, or poetics *sensu stricto* (conceptual and emotional forms, as well as imagery, motifs and plots)

The fourth domain of form, composition, is of a combinational nature and describes the interrelation between the levels or their elements (see Iarkho 2016 [1927]).

Iarkho gave examples of statistical studies for all the aforementioned domains. The most impressive is perhaps his approach to eidology – an example is a comparative statistical analysis of the ideological conception of *La Chanson de Roland*. Iarkho resolved a dispute between the two reigning theories about the *Chanson* (the old one assumed that the *Chanson* was composed in a military environment, while a newer one claimed it was a clerical environment). Iarkho affirmed the old theory with statistical data, showing that the Christian topics occupy much less space in *Roland* than in a clerical reworking of the same plot (Priest Konrad's *Rolandslied*), and therefore the ideology of the original version was secular and knightly (Gasparov 2016 [1969], 139–140).

Iarkho was clearly inspired by the application of statistics in biology. He wrote, referring to Wilhelm Johannsen, an eminent Danish botanist, who developed the methods of biostatistics for the study of genetic variability:

> Although biology cannot be considered an 'exact science' to the same extent as mathematically-based sciences, but, as compared to the study of literature, it possesses such a high level of precision and demonstrativeness, which [...] is a desirable and [...] a pursuable goal. Therefore, if I speak of an 'exact study of literature,' I mean the same as Johannsen who entitled his book *Elemente der exakten Erblichkeitslehre*. (Iarkho 2006, 29–30)

René Wellek described the members of OPOIaZ as "positivists with a scientific ideal of literary scholarship" (Wellek 1961, 106). This characteristic looks more like a description of Iarkho than that of the Petrograd formalists, although some of their early pronouncements about the sound laws of poetic language (e. g. Iakubinskii's) indeed seem positivistic.

Should we then include Iarkho in the formalist School? Although Ėikhenbaum's answer was 'no,' Iarkho's own answer was 'yes'. He described the basic principles of literary analysis that should precede any statistical operations in an article titled "Prosteishie osnovaniia formal'nogo analiza" (1927, "The Elementary Foundations of Formal Analysis," 2016). In a letter to Zhirmunskii of 8 November

1919 Iarkho unambiguously called himself "a partisan of the 'formal method' and a 'formalist'" (Iarkho 2006, xxvi, fn. 34). This definition carries at least as much weight as Ėikhenbaum's categorical exclusion of non-OPOIaZ scholars (Polilova 2011).

Although both Tomashevskii and Iarkho have been defined here as 'quantitative formalists,' there is an important difference between their methodologies. They calculated different things and in different ways (Pilshchikov 2020, 29). Most of the time, Iarkho – just like his German predecessors – counts everything and proceeds inductively. He discovers patterns and anomalies, exploration of these anomalies reveals new patterns, and so on and so forth. Tomashevskii proceeds deductively from the theory of meter and rhythm, which he verifies and refines. In the end, these differences can be reduced to the differences between two types of empiricism – Baconian (inductive generalizations based on the unbiased observation of sensory experience) vs. Cartesian (deduction of hypotheses from primary principles, with their subsequent verification and/or refinement). This is also one of the main differences between nineteenth-century positivism and twentieth-century post-positivism. In this perspective, Tomashevskii is closer to such 'qualitativists' as Zhirmunskii than to Iarkho. Unlike his research articles, Tomashevskii's treatise on Russian prosody (Tomashevskii 1923b) and the section of his textbook of poetics devoted to comparative metrics (Tomashevskii 1925, 72–132) contain no calculations. As regards Zhirmunskii, one telling fact can clarify the point: in his book *Rifma, ee istoriia i teoriia* (1923b, *Rhyme, its History and Theory*), he used statistics a lot to substantiate his statements, but never published the data (Zhirmunskii 1923b, 308–310; Gasparov 1980, 13).

Iarkho also insisted on the necessity of a qualitative ('morphological') analysis that should both precede and follow quantitative analysis. Indeed, the precondition for the application of statistics is an accurate philological analysis of the text structure. On the one hand, the only features of a text suitable for critical interpretation are those which were obtained as a result of an objective statistical examination. On the other hand, "no statistic can be introduced without a morphological analysis, i. e. examination of the real literary phenomena that it reflects" (Iarkho 2006, 7). Moreover, Iarkho sometimes followed the path of deduction instead of induction. His studies of drama are intended to 'falsify' (in a Popperean, post-positivist sense) the descriptions of generic and stylistic differences, derived from the realm of content and ideology, on the basis of quantitative analysis of various formal features (Pilshchikov 2020, 29). At the same time, for Iarkho, ideas as such are not the 'content' of the work, but its material, just as sounds, tropes or images. A statistical analysis of religious ideas or sentiments as opposed to chivalresque ideas or sentiments is as legitimate for him as a statistical analysis of stressed vowels as opposed to unstressed vowels.

The formalist verse theory is not purely quantitative – it combines quantitative and qualitative approaches. Several innovative ideas were initially formulated by Osip Brik, whose role as an inventor can be compared with that of Shklovskii (Jakobson 1964). Here I will mention only two of Brik's ideas that had a formative influence on the development of formalist verse theory.

At the meeting of the MLC on 1 June 1919, Brik presented a paper titled "On Verse Rhythm" and discussed the same topic at an OPOIaZ meeting sometime in 1920, in a paper titled "On the Rhythmico-Syntactic Figures" (see Pilshchikov 2017b). Then he started (but never finished) his monograph *Ritm i sintaksis* (*Rhythm and Syntax*), excerpts from which were published in *Novyi Lef* (*The New Left Front of Arts*) in 1927, after the dissolution of both the OPOIaZ and the MLC (several sections were reprinted in translation as Brik 1971). These groundbreaking works raised the question of how meter and rhythm are bound up with vocabulary, grammar and syntax. One aspect of this problem – intonation as an interrelation between syntactic and poetic segmentations – is thoroughly investigated in Èikhenbaum's book *Melodika russkogo liricheskogo stikha* (1922, *The Melodics of Russian Lyrical Verse*), which begins with an explicit reference to Brik's OPOIaZ paper as a source of inspiration (Èikhenbaum 1922, 5–6, fn. 1; Hansen-Löve 1978, 310–314). This is how Èikhenbaum described the new domain of verse studies:

> The poetic phrase is not a general syntactic phenomenon, but a rhythmic-syntactic phenomenon. [...] In a verse line, the syntax, which actualizes intonation, is articulated not in semantic segments, but in rhythmic ones: sometimes the syntax coincides with a rhythmic segment (a line = a phrase), and sometimes it surmounts it (enjambment). Thus, it is *in syntax regarded as a construction of phrasal intonation* that we observe the factor which connects language with rhythm. (Èikhenbaum 1922, 6)

In his book, Èikhenbaum distinguished three types of poetic intonation: declamatory, melodic, and conversational.

Elaborating on the dichotomy of meter and rhythm proposed by Andrei Belyi (1910, 396), Tomashevskii and Zhirmunskii developed the concept of rhythmical impulse put forward by Brik. This is what Tomashevskii writes in his treatise on Russian prosody, *Russkoe stikhoslozhenie. Metrika* (*Russian Versification. Metrics*):

> When initially conceiving a poem, the poet adopts a metrical scheme which he feels to be a kind of rhythmical-melodical contour, a framework, into which words are 'inserted.' As it is realized in words, the rhythmical impulse finds expression in the actual rhythm of individual lines. [...] The listener perceives the rhythm in inverse order. First he is confronted with the actual verse-line rhythm. Then, under the impression of the reiteration of rhythmical configurations, due to his perception of a sequence of verse-lines, the listener grasps the rhythmical impulse [...]. At a still higher degree of abstraction from the rhythmical pattern he grasps the metrical scheme which may be uncovered by scanning. (Tomashevskii 1923b, 83; compare Zhirmunskii 1966 [1925], 67, 71)

The concept of rhythmical impulse describes a stochastic, not deterministic, norm (Červenka 1984, 30): it manifests itself in the statistics of rhythmical forms. At this point the qualitative and the quantitative approaches meet again.

'Quantitative' formalism can also be defined as 'data-driven formalism' (Fischer et al. 2019). Its main outcome was the creation of the statistical-stochastic verse theory and quantitative poetics. However, unlike 'qualitative' formalism, the basic impetus for the 'quantitativists' was methodological, rather than theoretical. Today, we tend to agree with Tynianov's insights, but prefer using Tomashevskii's and Iarkho's methods to obtain new results. The latest developments of formal, quantitative and computational methods for the analysis of literary texts have awakened interest in the quantification of literary studies. With the advent of computer information technologies and the Digital Humanities, with machine learning and neural networks, some of the statistically-based projects that seemed too large-scale and labor-intensive eighty or even twenty years ago – such as Iarkho's program for the synchronic and diachronic statistical study of all levels and aspects of literary texts – are now well within our reach.

4 The 'functionalist' formalism of the 1920s (OPOIaZ and after)

The second phase in the development of formalist ideas was marked by a transition from the general to the concrete and from theory of literature (poetics) to history of literature (literary evolution). This transition was closely linked to the idea of 'function': "The purely descriptive studies of the first period were followed by 'functional' studies that connected particular observations to general conceptions" (Tomashevskii 2004 [1928], 131). The dialectics of the particular and the general suggested by Tomashevskii can be better understood if we compare his explanation with Ėikhenbaum's:

> [T]he formalists' original attempt to pin down some particular constructional device and trace its unity through voluminous material had given way to an attempt to qualify further the generalized idea, to grasp the concrete 'function' of the device in each given instance. This concept of functional value gradually moved into the foreground and overshadowed our original concept of the device. (Ėikhenbaum 1971a [1925], 29; translation modified)

It is impossible, Jakobson argued, to study a natural language without studying poetry and folklore because they are also modes, even if very special modes, of the workings of the language. On the other hand, poetry and folklore should be studied using linguistic methods because they use language as their material.

Unlike the early OPOIaZ concept of poetic language as opposed to practical language, the functionalist approach to the language of poetry considered it a use of language in its aesthetic, or poetic function. The aesthetic function is defined via the concepts of *dominanta* and *ustanovka*.

The concept of the dominant (*dominanta*) was introduced by Ėikhenbaum and Tynianov, who borrowed this concept from the German aesthetician Broder Christiansen and reinterpreted it (see Erlich 1965, 199–200, 212–215; Hansen-Löve 1978, 314–319, 1986; Steiner 1984, 104–106; Gerigk 2007; Sini 2010). Ėikhenbaum was the first to use this term in *The Melodics of Russian Lyrical Verse*, with a direct reference to Christiansen (Ėikhenbaum 1922, 9). The formalists could have read Christiansen's *Philosophie der Kunst* (1909, *Philosophy of Art*) either in the German original or in the Russian translation by the philosopher Georgii Fedotov (1911). For Christiansen, the aesthetic object is created thanks to the perceptual synthesis of various impressions of the artifact. Four factors participate in this synthesis: the *Gegenstand* (subject matter), *Form* (form), *Stoff* (material), and *Methode/Hantierung* (method, technique). Not all the four factors are equal – one of them or a group of them usually predominates, i. e. "advances to the foreground and takes the lead" ("sich in den Vordergrund schiebt und die Führung übernimmt"). It is called '*die Dominante*' (Christiansen 1909, 241–251).

According to Tynianov's *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka* (1924, *The Problem of Verse Language*, 1981), the interplay of all the factors involved in the construction of an artistic work creates not only the form, but also the semantics of poetry. The dominant – also called 'the constructive factor' – subordinates other factors to itself. However, it does not harmonize them, as Christiansen thought, but 'deforms' them. In a work of art, "one feature may be foregrounded at the expense of the others, so that they are deformed and sometimes degraded to the level of neutral props" (Tynianov 1981 [1924], 7). Compare Tynianov's "O literaturnoi ėvoliutsii" (1927, "On Literary Evolution," 2019b): "A system is not the egalitarian cooperation of all its elements, but instead assumes that some groups of elements ('the dominant') will be foregrounded and the others deformed" (Tynianov 2019b [1927], 271) (see Schamma Schahadat's chapter on literary evolution in this volume). This is how Tynianov modified the terminological pair 'factors// the dominant' already found in Christiansen.

In his course of lectures on Russian formalism, which he delivered in Czech at the University of Brno in 1935, Jakobson devoted an entire lecture to 'the dominant' and later published it in English, French and Russian under the eponymous title. Jakobson describes the dominant as "one of the most crucial, elaborated and productive concepts in Russian formalist theory" and gives its definition: "The dominant may be defined as the focusing component of a work of art: it rules, determines, and transforms the remaining components. It is the dominant

which guarantees the integrity of the structure. The dominant specifies the work"
(Jakobson 1971a [1935], 82).

The theory of the dominant was not the sole property of the Petrograd formalists. Iarkho also devoted many pages of his *Methodology* to this concept. However, unlike the OPOIaZ scholars, who interpreted the dominant in a functionalist and axiological key, Iarkho, in his own words, "reinterpreted the concept of the dominant on a *quantitative basis*" (Iarkho 2006, 107). For Iarkho, the aesthetic efficiency of any element at any level of the artistic work is determined by its quantitative particularity. With his admiration of biology, Iarkho also drew on the biological overtones of the term *dominant*, pointing to the dominant and recessive traits of literary genres and works. Yet another version of the theory of the dominant was developed by the Russian physiologist Aleksei Uktomskii, whose studies had a direct influence on the use of this term in the works of Mikhail Bakhtin (Marcialis 1986; Khalizev 1991).

The dominant specifies poetry and prose. According to Tomashevskii, sound dominates in poetry, whereas meaning dominates in prose, or, more precisely: "The difference between prose and poetry consists in the fact that, in poetry, the sound design [*zvukovoe zadanie*] dominates over the semantic design, whereas in prose, the semantic design [*smyslovoe zadanie*] dominates over the sound design" (Tomashevskii 1923b, 8). Tomashevskii's concept somehow differs from Tynianov's. For Tynianov, 'the constructive principle' of poetry (i. e. the particular way in which the dominant deforms the subordinate factors) is verse rhythm, rather than sound in general: there is no verse without rhythm, but there exist verse forms without euphony and rhymes (*vers libre*). The verse rhythm provides for the segmentation of poetic speech into non-syntactical rhythmical groups (i. e. splitting into verse lines), which are responsible for "the unity and density of the verse series" (Tynianov 1981 [1924], 57–63). The additional relationship between linguistic materials, imposed by verse segmentation, transforms – or, as Tynianov put it, deforms – the meanings that the words have in practical language and thus creates specifically poetic semantics. Characteristically, the original title of Tynianov's 1924 book was not *The Problem of Verse Language*, but *Problema stikhovoi semantiki* (*The Problem of Verse Semantics*) (Toddes et al. 1977, 501–502). As regards the concept of 'deformation,' Tynianov expressed self-resentment: "My term 'deformation' is infelicitous; it should have been 'transformation' [...]" (a letter to Vinokur of 7 November 1924, quoted in Toddes et al. 1977, 517; Steiner 1984, 117).

The dominant specifies the aesthetic, or poetic function. As early as in *Noveishaia russkaia poèziia* (1921, *The Latest Russian Poetry*), Jakobson refurbished the early OPOIaZ dichotomy of 'poetic' and 'practical' language as the non-concurrence of language functions and their operation in different functional varieties

of language. He contrasted poetic language not only with 'practical' language, but also with 'emotional' language, elaborating on the discussion of a linguistic sign in Edmund Husserl's *Logische Untersuchungen* (1900–1901, *Logical Investigations*). In "Ausdruck und Bedeutung" ("Expression and Meaning", § 6.2), Husserl introduces the trichotomy of 'showing forth' (of psychic states), 'naming' (of the objects of presentation) and 'meaning' (the sense or content of verbal presentation); accordingly, Jakobson ascribes these faculties to emotional language, practical language, and poetic language (Steiner 1984, 202–204). "To a certain degree, the poetic word is always objectless": it has "verbal form, both outer and inner," but it "lacks what Husserl terms *dinglicher Bezug* [i.e. referentiality]" (Jakobson 1921, 47). Poetry is an "utterance oriented toward expression [*vyskazyvanie s ustanovkoi na vyrazhenie*] [...]; the communicative function, essential to both practical language and emotional language, has only minimal importance in poetry. [...] Poetry is language in its aesthetic function" (Jakobson 1921, 10–11; 1973 [1921], 62, translation modified). In his Brno lectures, Jakobson made an important caveat: "a poetic work is not confined to aesthetic function alone," and "aesthetic function is not limited to the poetic work" (Jakobson 1971a [1935], 83). Therefore, "a poetic work is defined as an utterance whose aesthetic function is its dominant" (Jakobson 1971a [1935], 84). The *dominant* function of any utterance or message is not its 'only' function (Holenstein 1981).

The Russian word *ustanovka* can designate an 'orientation' or 'intention' (Striedter 1989, 59–60), and it is "very resistant to translation or explanation" (Steiner 1984, 124). Even in his seminal later work, "Linguistics and Poetics" (1960), Jakobson proved unable to find a generally accepted English equivalent for the term *ustanovka* and selected the word *set*. An unambiguous understanding of the English term is prevented by a parasitic homonymy with *set*, 'a collection of distinct objects.' Furthermore, the noun *set* that Jakobson used in the phrase '*a set toward*' denotes only one aspect of *ustanovka*, namely: 'willingness or unwillingness to do anything.' This is precisely how the American psychologists used the terminological phrase '*set toward*,' and they primarily use *set* as a passive participle, e. g.: "The 'attitude' is primarily a way of being 'set' toward or against things" (Murphy and Murphy 1931, 615). To avoid misunderstandings of *set*, Jakobson suggested three words to interpret it: two intralingual translations (*orientation* and *focus*) and an interlingual translation (*Einstellung*). In "Linguistics and Poetics," the referential function is defined as "a set (*Einstellung*) toward the referent, an orientation toward the context", whereas the poetic function is defined as "the set (*Einstellung*) toward the message as such, focus on the message for its own sake" (Jakobson 1960, 353, 356; Pilshchikov 2021).

On the one hand, *Einstellung* – an immediate source of both the Russian *ustanovka* and the English *set* – is a part of the terminology of German physiologi-

cal psychology introduced in 1888 by Ludwig Lange, a student of Wilhelm Wundt. On the other hand, this empirical-psychological (phenomenalist) interpretation of *Einstellung* contrasted with a phenomenological one. Gustav Shpet, the main proponent of Husserl's ideas in Russia, translated Husserl's *phänomenologische Einstellung* ('phenomenological apperception') as *ustanovka*; meanwhile, the synonym for *Einstellung* in Husserl's terminology is *Intentionalität*, i. e. intentionality of consciousness ("*Gerichtetsein des Bewußtseins*"), which establishes a correspondence between the content of consciousness and the "'eidetic structures' of the essence of the objects being experienced" (Hansen-Löve 1988, 164–165).

Although the polemics between the followers of Jakobson and the followers of Shpet soon led to a schism in the MLC (see Section 4 below), the interpretation of *Einstellung* in Jakobson's definition of language functions is perfectly compatible with Husserl's (Holenstein 1976, 49–51, 164). Furthermore, Jakobson's eventual rejection of the term 'aesthetic function' in favor of 'poetic function,' universally known from his "Linguistics and Poetics," can be explained by the influence of the Russian Husserlians – Shpet (1922–1923, vol. 2, 66; Tihanov, 2010, 48) and Vinokur (see Shapir 1999, 144–145, 150–152). In a 'methodological essay' titled "Poetics. Linguistics. Sociology", Vinokur stated that

> [...] the parameter of function [...] should help us to delimit the poetic from other stylistic phenomena. The word as a thing performs a function that is not inherent in the word as a sign. Some scholars call this function aesthetic. I prefer to be more careful – let this function be simply called poetic. A word can be poetic without causing any emotions, including aesthetic ones. [...] The poetic function uses the word to tell us what the word itself is, whereas [...] all other functions use the word to tell us about something else. (Vinokur 1923, 110)

In 1929 the term *une fonction poétique* was used in the Theses of the Prague Linguistic Circle, co-authored by several members of the circle, including Jakobson ("Thèses", 14).

At the same time, Jakobson's 1921 definition of the aesthetic function uses the same basic concepts that are used in Tynianov's terminology of the 1920s: 'the dominant,' 'set/orientation,' and 'function' (Toddes et al. 1977, 493). However, Jakobson's and Tynianov's interpretation of these terms differs in their understanding of 'function' – teleological in Jakobson and correlational in Tynianov (Toddes et al. 1977, 521, 528; Steiner 1984, 124; Lovell 2001, 426, fn. 26; Depretto 2012). In both approaches, an artwork is conceptualized not as a sum total of its devices, as in Shklovskii's early work, but as "a system of correlated factors. Correlation of each factor with the others is its *function* in relation to the whole system" (Tynianov 1929, 48, quoted in O'Toole and Shukman 1977, 37). For Tynianov, in the poetic text as a system, every element is defined by its function (Ehlers 1992). If an

element is materially absent, its absence is not an empty space but an 'equivalent' of text. An omitted line or a group of lines, a stanza or a group of stanzas (as in Pushkin's *Eugene Onegin*) are equivalents of text that manifest its duration and implement the same design as the 'full-text' lines and stanzas (Tynianov 1981 [1924], 42–47). A skipped metrical stress creates a longer interval of unstressed syllables, and this series of syllables serves as an equivalent of stress (Tomashevskii 1925, 127).

Tynianov linked the concept of the 'dominant' with the concept of 'dynamics.' According to Tynianov, "the form of the literary work must be recognized as a dynamic phenomenon": 'dynamism' emerges as a result of interaction between the factors and "the foregrounding of one group of factors at the expense of others," so that "the foregrounded factor deforms the subordinate ones" (Tynianov 1981 [1924], 33, translation modified). Therefore: "The unity of the work is not a closed symmetrical whole, but an unfolding, dynamic, integration; between its elements we find not the static sign of equality or addition, but always the dynamic sign of correlation and integration" (Tynianov 1981 [1924], quoted in O'Toole and Shukman 1977, 20).

Tynianov thought of 'dynamics' as a compound characteristic of several fields of literary form:

(i)   Dynamics as the instability of the deformed verbal material in a poetic work, as opposed to the stability of the unaltered (i. e. aesthetically neutral) material.

(ii) Dynamics as the formation of the 'oscillating' components of meaning in poetry, as opposed to the stable meanings of the words in prose (Tynianov 1981 [1924], 70).

(iii) Dynamics as the duration of the text ('successiveness,' in Tynianov's terminology), as opposed to the text's 'simultaneity.' The dichotomy of successiveness and simultaneity manifests itself in the opposition of first reading and rereading. They are opposed to each other as "the orientation toward coming into being and the orientation toward being, toward text as a process and text as a result" (Gasparov 1988b, 19), i. e. as Wilhelm von Humboldt's ἐνέργεια and ἔργον.

(iv) Dynamics as historical variability or literary evolution as opposed to achronic staticity.

The dynamics of the text is not necessarily temporal; it is thought of as a category "outside of time, as pure movement" (Tynianov 1981 [1924], 33), whereas the dynamics of literature is temporal and evolutionary (Toddes et al. 1977, 510–511).

Tynianov consistently distinguished between 'evolution' and 'genesis'. Evolution is intrinsic (to the literary series or the national literary tradition), whereas

genesis is extrinsic (it implies an interaction between literature and other social and cultural practices, or between one national literary tradition and another). Quite often, Tynianov speaks of the genesis of a 'literary work' and the evolution of a 'literary system'. According to Tynianov, evolution is systemic, in contrast to genesis, which is purely accidental: evolution makes use of what it needs choosing from whatever is available at a given moment.

Tynianovian evolution is not gradual, but intermittent and saltatory, leaping from one synchronic state of a system to the next one (Wellek 1956): "Not gradual evolution, but a leap; not development, but shift" (Tynianov 2019a [1924], 151). The principle of literary evolution is "struggle and displacement," Tynianov insists (154, translation modified). Its primary motive is therefore not allegiance but repulsion, that is, "the tendency to react against the dominant literary forms of the century. Romanticism was not the direct heir of Classicism: it was its adversary" (Tomashevskii 2004 [1928], 129). Of course, the new artistic schools do not emerge *ex nihilo* – quite the opposite, nothing is new under the sun. "Undoubtedly each new school has its precursors [...]. But the 'precursors' [...] always appear first as constituting a minor line, as the younger and misunderstood brothers of the dominant school" (Tomashevskii 2004 [1928], 129). Evolution is not succession – or, if it is, it is not direct. An artistic tradition is not 'the son's inheritance from the father,' but 'the nephew's inheritance from the uncle.' Shklovskii described this as a 'knight's move,' meaning the L-shaped move of this figure in chess – a zigzag motion (Shklovskii 2005 [1923]). Literary evolution is not only intermittent – it is nonlinear.

Canonization of the minor lines and the lower genres is described as their motion from the background to the foreground or (to use another metaphor of Tynianov's) from the periphery to the center:

> Instead of one primordial, regular stream of succession flowing and evolving at the center of literature, with new phenomena congregating around its edges, it is these new phenomena that come to occupy the center, while what was previously in the center is in turn relegated to the periphery. (Tynianov 2019a [1924], 153)

Examples of these "successive rehierarchizations" (Margolin 2005) are processes such as the expansion of genres that were previously considered 'popular' and 'low-brow' (e. g. the rise of the novel) and the withdrawal of previously favored genres (e. g. the decline of the solemn ode).

Each work has a particular function within the literary system, and each element has a particular function within the whole of the artwork (which is a system in itself). However, the system changes, and the function of the work may change. In particular, what was considered non-art before (e. g. Russian icons or Old Russian literature) can now be reconsidered as art (so we move the icon from

the church to the museum and include an archbishop's sermon in a university course on literary history). The same applies to the elements of artistic works. Any element with a particular function in one period may change function completely in another period. The grotesque was considered to be a comic technique in Classicism but became a source for the tragic in Romanticism. Compound rhymes were used in Russian satirical poetry of the late nineteenth century to create a comic effect, but after the crisis of the Russian rhyme during the Symbolist period, they became a legitimate means of expression in the avant-garde poetry of Vladimir Maiakovskii. "In the continual change of function, the true life of the components of the literary work reveals itself" (Tomashevskii 2004 [1928], 131).

The factor of change was already important in Shklovskii's initial statements, but now it acquired new significance. In their joint manifesto "Problemy izucheniia literatury i iazyka" (1928, "Problems of the Study of Literature and Language," 2019), written in Prague in December 1928 and published immediately in *Novyi Lef*, Tynianov and Jakobson proclaimed a revision of the Saussurean dichotomy of synchrony and diachrony:

> At present, gains on the part of the synchronic conception are forcing a reappraisal of the principles of diachrony as well. Synchronic studies replaced the notion of a mechanical agglomeration of phenomena with the notion of a system or structure; and diachronic studies has followed suit. The history of a system is, in turn, itself a system. Pure synchronism is now revealed to be an illusion: each synchronic system has its own past and future as integral structural elements of the system. (Tynianov and Jakobson 2019 [1928], 280)

Obvious examples are archaisms and neologisms – the past and the future embodied in the vocabulary of the present time.

Up to this point, the formalists' innovations in the realm of literary history were still grounded in, and carried by, their theoretical assumptions of the supremacy of form and the autonomy of the literary discourse. But Jakobson and Tynianov make the next step. The study of literature as an autonomous 'series' (Russian: *riad*, German: *Reihe*) should, as they claim, be complemented by the complex study of other related 'series,' with which literature interacts. The literary series can be correlated to other series, but cannot be reduced to them. An integral totality of these series (that is, culture) was considered as a systematically and hierarchically organized whole (that is, structure):

> The question […] can only be solved by analyzing the interrelations between the literary series and other historical series. These interrelations (a system of systems) have their own structural laws, also subject to study. (Tynianov and Jakobson 2019 [1928], 281)

The first, work-centered period of Russian formalism left the issue of literary and cultural biography outside the scope of Formalist studies. Moreover, simple-minded 'biographism' and 'petty factualism' was considered a vestige of the earlier epoch. In an article published in *Lef* and titled "T.n. 'formal'nyi method'" (1923, "The So-Called 'Formal Method'," 1977), Brik made fun of the Pushkin scholar Nikolai Lerner's paper "Kuril li Pushkin?" (1913, "Did Pushkin Smoke?"), which contained numerous quotations from Aleksandr Pushkin testifying to the fact that he smoked and described smoking in his writing. A poetic text cannot serve as a biographical document, Brik argued:

> If the poetic work is understood as a 'human document,' as a diary entry, then it is interesting to the author, to his wife, his relatives, friends, and to maniacs such as those passionately seeking the answer to the question 'did Pushkin smoke?' – and to no one else. (Brik 1977 [1923], 90)

Lerner's paper is a vivid sample of *Pushkinism* as a specific phenomenon of Russian cultural and intellectual life similar to Boswellism – "the quest for the smallest characteristic details" of the biography (Lerner 1913, 62). The formalists outlined a new approach to cultural biography. Biography began to be understood as a research problem, rather than a collection of anecdotes or a comprehensive factography. A question was raised about the relationship between biography and literature.

The first attempts to reconsider the issue of a 'writer', who stands behind his/her 'writing', was Tomashevskii's article entitled "Literatura i biografiia" (1923, "Literature and Biography," 1971) and his lesser-known book of 1925, *Pushkin: Sovremennye problemy istoriko-literaturnogo izucheniia* (*Pushkin: Contemporary Problems of Historical-Literary Study*) (see Steiner 1984, 129–132). Tomashevskii distinguished between two types of writers: "writers 'without' a biography" (examples: Shakespeare, Afanasii Fet) and "writers 'with' a biography" (examples: Voltaire, Lev Tolstoi), for whom "their biographies were a constant background for their works" (Tomashevskii 1971 [1923], 49).

There have been "eras during which the personality of the artist was of no interest at all to the audience" – the Middle Ages are an example of this "great tendency toward anonymity" (Tomashevskii 1971 [1923], 47–48). However, an opposing emphasis rose to the surface during the "epoch which cultivated subjectivism in the artistic process" when the "name and personality of the author came to the forefront" (the Enlightenment, and especially Romanticism). At this time, the "reader's interest reached beyond the work to its creator" (Tomashevskii 1971 [1923], 48). The works of a writer like Voltaire or Rousseau were "inseparably linked with his life": those who "admired his writings were worshipers of his personality; the adversaries of his writings were his personal enemies" (Toma-

shevskii 1971 [1923], 48). They were more than just writers: "The biographies of such authors require a Ferney [the estate where Voltaire lived] or a Iasnaia Poliana [Tolstoi's estate]: they require pilgrimages by admirers and condemnations from Sorbonnes [Voltaire's case] or Holy Synods [Tolstoi's case]" (Tomashevskii 1971 [1923], 49). This is the reason why, to quote Tomashevskii,

> [...] the biography that is useful to the literary historian is not the author's curriculum vitae or the investigator's account of his life. What the literary historian really needs is the biographical legend created by the author himself. Only such a legend is a 'literary fact'. (Tomashevskii 1971 [1923], 55)

The 'literary fact' is Tynianov's concept which specifies what, in a certain period, is perceived as belonging to literature, and what is not.

Tomashevskii's ideas about the specificity of literary biography help us to understand Tynianov's notion of the 'literary personality' (*literaturnaia lichnost'*) Tynianov introduced this term for the first time in his article "Literaturnyi fakt" (1924, "Literary Fact", 2019a), in which he opposed 'literary personality' to 'the writer's individuality' (Tynianov 2019a [1924], 155). A 'literary personality' can be consciously and intentionally created by the writer. To describe this phenomenon, the Russian Symbolists used the terms *zhiznetvorchestvo* (life-creation) and *zhiznestroitel'stvo* (life-building). However, the phenomenon itself originated in the pre-Modernist period. The term 'literary personality' appears once again in Tynianov's article "On Literary Evolution". Its renowned eleventh thesis is devoted to "the reverse 'expansion of literature into everyday life'" (Tynianov 2019b [1927], 274):

> At various times, the 'literary personality,' 'authorial personality,' or 'protagonist' constitutes a 'speech' orientation [*rechevaia ustanovka*] on the part of literature, and from there can make its way into everyday life [*byt*]. This is the case with Byron's lyric protagonists, who are interrelated with his 'literary personality'– the personality that came to life for the readers of his poetry and thus transitioned into everyday life. Heine's 'literary personality' was likewise quite removed from the biographical, authentic Heine. (Tynianov 2019b [1927], 274)

"Everyday life" in the English translation of this passage stands for – and is followed by – the notoriously untranslatable *byt*, also rendered as 'daily life,' 'routine life,' or 'everyday environment' (see Zenkin 2004; 2018, chap. 5).

Tynianov's "On Literary Evolution," which poses the problems of literary history and literary biography, is dedicated to Èikhenbaum in the 1929 edition of Tynianov's collected essays, *Arkhaisty i novatory* (*Archaists and Innovators*). The issue of the writer's social and literary milieu becomes a "theoretical quintessence" of Èikhenbaum's own work (Levchenko 2010, 79). In the essays "Liter-

aturnyi byt" (1927, "Literary Environment," 1971b), "Literatura i pisatel'" (1927, "Literature and the Writer") and "Literaturnaia domashnost'" (1929, "Literary Domesticity") – all included in Èikhenbaum's 1929 collection of essays *Moi Vremennik* (*My Journal*) – he turned to a consideration of literature as a social institution, within which the institutional functions of a writer are defined. For the functioning of literature, two questions are important: 'How to write?' and 'How to be a writer?' (Èikhenbaum 1971b [1927], 58). To answer the latter question, Èikhenbaum developed the concept of *literaturnyi byt* (literary environment/surroundings) based on Tynianov's dialectics of 'literature' and *byt*. Literature is at least in part determined by its institutional context, i. e. its relationship "to extra-literary institutions, practices, forms and values" (Lovell 2001, 416) – to the professional or dilettantish character of literary activities, the relations between the author and his/her readership, the forms and genres of literary venues, the conditions of the literary market and publishing, book trade and distribution, the relations between the writer and literary critics – that is, "literary-environmental conditions" or "the forms and potentialities of literary endeavor as a profession [that] change according to the social conditions of an age" (Èikhenbaum 1971b [1927], 62–63; Oushakine 2019). At the same time, to be a writer does not mean to stop being something else (e. g. a social reformer, or a moral philosopher): the function of being a writer is a 'dominant' function of the writer's social being, but not his/her 'sole' social function (Greenfeld 1987; Pilshchikov and Ustinov 2020b).

"Literary Domesticity" was also used as a foreword to a montage of nineteenth-century memoirs about literary coteries and salons edited by the 'junior formalists' – Tynianov's and Èikhenbaum's students Mark Aronson and Solomon Reiser, who wrote in their preface to the same book:

> [A] writer is the result of the interlacing of a number of complex unities. The writer's individuality, in the final analysis, can be seen as a certain interrelation between the forces that participated in the creation of that individuality: literary, literary-environmental, and social. To examine these forces, to understand them, to see how they influence literature, to know the laws and processes of the literary production and consumption [...], and to study living literary evolution in society – these are the tasks that face the contemporary study of literature and will uncover the meaning of the concept of the writer and the work done by a writer. (Aronson and Reiser 1929, 16–17)

In terms of Tynianov's (and Èikhenbaum's) dichotomy of evolution and genesis, 'literary environment' is firmly in the domain of literary genesis. It provides literary evolution with the material with which literariness – i. e., literary function – is endued:

> Since literature [...] cannot be the simple derivative of any other series, there is no reason to believe that all its constituent elements can be genetically conditioned. Literary-historical fact is a complex construct in which the fundamental role belongs to *literariness* – an element of such specificity that its study can be productive only in immanent-evolutionary terms. (Ėikhenbaum 1971b [1927], 62)

Literary environment is the social series which is nearest to the literary series – the immediate social environment in which the production and consumption of literature take place. Iarkho called a study of this domain 'literary ecology' (Gasparov 2016 [1969], 147). Both Ėikhenbaum and Iarkho offered moderate versions of a formalist sociology of literature. An extreme version would have a much broader inclusion of sociology in the study of literature and the creation of a sociological poetics. To conceptualize the leading role of society in individual artistic creations, Brik put forward the concept of *sotsial'nyi zakaz* (social demand/order), which became central to the ideology of the Left Front of Art (Lef) and its eponymous journal. In particular, Brik notoriously claimed that: "Had Pushkin not existed, *Eugene Onegin* would all the same have been written" (Brik 1977, 90), because it was responding to a social demand. Iarkho objected: a writer writes with a reader in mind, but their relations should be described as a 'social market or sale,' rather than a 'social order or demand.' "The reading public is not a client, directly dictating to the master all the characteristics of the requested product, but rather a free consumer, who more often than not is attracted to the shop window exactly by the unexpectedness and unusualness of the goods" (Gasparov 2016 [1969], 147). To 'order' *Eugene Onegin*, the client should be as talented as Pushkin himself. At the same time, the "demand-driven production" ("*Produktion auf Bestellung*") is characteristic of folklore as opposed to literature – the "retail-driven production" ("*Produktion auf Absatz*") (Jakobson and Bogatyrev 1966, 7; Steiner 1984, 227–228).

One result of the development of 'functionalist' formalism was the birth of formalist literary history. Significantly, in 1927 Tomashevskii presented formalism as 'a new school of literary history,' rather than 'a new school of literary theory.' Previous positivist academic approaches to literary history were mostly biographical and psychological or ideological, and considered the history of literature as part of the history of ideas. Symbolist literary criticism was anti-historical. Formalist literary history was

> [...] a study of the historical function of artistic devices. [...] The mechanism of literary evolution became clear [...]: it presented itself not as a succession of forms being substituted for each other but as a continual variation of the aesthetic function of literary devices." (Tomashevskii 2004 [1928], 131, translation modified: *procédé* – Tomashevskii's equivalent for the Russian *priem* – is rendered as *device*)

Besides designing a new approach to literary history, the period of 1923–1929 should be credited for having raised the issue of the "social function of the literary series in different periods" (*Novyi Lef*'s editorial foreword to Tynianov and Jakobson 1928, 36). At this juncture, formalism entered into a complex relationship with Marxism. Despite the celebrated dispute "Marksizm i formal'nyi metod" ("Marxism and the Formal Method") held in Leningrad on 6 March 1927 (Ustinov 2001b; Tihanov 2019, 36–38), their "competition never amounted to true dialogue" because the official version of Marxism soon "became a prescriptive discourse" in the Soviet Union (Tihanov 2012, 1240), and its anti-formalist rhetoric quickly evolved "from polemics to bullying" (Levchenko 2017). The point of no return in the denunciation and condemnation of formalism was Pavel Medvedev's book *Formalizm i formalisty* (1934, *Formalism and the Formalists*); not to be confused with his earlier *Formal'nyi metod v literaturovedenii* (1928, *The Formal Method in Literary Scholarship*).

5 The phenomenological wing of the MLC

In the early 1920s some of the younger members of the MLC (Aleksei Buslaev, Boris Gornung, Maksim Kenigsberg, and Nikolai Zhinkin, among others) were followers of Gustav Shpet, who was the main intermediary between German phenomenology and the formalists (Tihanov 2010, 47–51). Their role in the formation and evolution of the MLC cannot be exaggerated. Thus, Buslaev (Jakobson's fellow student at Moscow University and a great-grandson of the famous Slavist Fedor Buslaev) was one of the co-founders of the MLC and its president in 1920–1922. Gornung – together with Vinokur – was a secretary to the Circle. It was Gornung who, in 1972, handed over the unpublished proceedings of the MLC to the Institute of Russian Language in Moscow, where they are now kept. Shpet was selected a full member of the MLC on 14 March 1920 (MLC Papers, folder 3.6, fol. 84). Very soon his influence on other members increased, and his adherents formed the phenomenological wing of the MLC. Of the former partisans of Jakobson and OPOIaZ in Moscow, Vinokur was more influenced by Shpet than others (Shapir 2000).

The Shpetians are often considered anti-formalist. However, just as other members of the MLC and OPOIaZ, they agreed that "the analysis of [verbal] art is the analysis of forms of expression, i. e. of verbal forms" (Kenigsberg 1922, 113; quoted in Kenigsberg 1994, 186). It can be argued that they shared a common agenda with the empirical wing of the MLC, but often provided the opposite solutions to the same problems, such as Husserlian phenomenology vs. positivism, the generation of poetic semantics, the issue of inner form, or the importance of

semiotics for linguistics and poetics. Having enumerated these problems, Jakobson pointed out that these discrepancies led to a split in the Circle and the consequent dissolution of the MLC:

> In vehement disputes on linguistic essentials – [the] phenomenology of language and the strictly empiricist approach; the place of phonetics and semantics in the science of language; the problem of the Humboldtian internal [i. e. inner] form; [the] criteria for the delimitation of poetic and ordinary language; or, finally, the relation between language and culture – the Moscow team lost its former unity of purpose and principles. New institutions, like for instance the State Academy for the Study of Arts (GAKhN), attracted the most active workers of the MLC, and in the summer of 1924, during the tenth year of its existence, the Moscow *kruzhok* was formally dissolved. (Jakobson 1971b [1965], 532)

Ironically, a peculiar combination of Husserlian phenomenology, structuralism and semiotics became characteristic of Jakobson's literary and cultural theories (Holenstein 1976).

In contrast to the empiricists, who dominated the MLC in 1919–1920, the young phenomenologists wanted to build a system of poetics based not on phonology, but on semasiology (semantics), because they considered language a semiotic phenomenon par excellence; from this point of view they became paradoxically close to Tynianov (Shapir 1994). Shpet's favorite disciple Maksim Kenigsberg developed a semiotic poetics in the article "Ideia filologii i poėtika" (1924, "The Concept of Philology and Poetics"), which still remains unpublished. As a result, the empiricists (e. g. Jakobson and Iarkho) conceived of poetics as part of linguistics, while the phenomenologists regarded poetics as part of semiotics – the term already used in Kenigsberg's "The Concept of Philology and Poetics" (Kenigsberg quoted in Pilshchikov 2015, 337, fn. 17). The transition of the younger members of the MLC to phenomenological positions incurred the displeasure of the empiricist wing of the Circle, and the opposition between the two wings was transferred to State Academy for the Study of Arts (Gosudarstevennaia Akademiia khudozhestvennykh nauk, GAKhN). At the Joint Meeting of the Philosophical Division and the Subsection for Theoretical Poetics of the Literary Section of GAKhN (6 February 1925), devoted to the discussion of Gornung's anti-Jakobsonian paper "K voprosu o predmete i zadachakh poėtiki" ("On the Subject and Goals of Poetics") Iarkho openly inveighed against phenomenological poetics:

> Attempts at a Husserlian construction of poetics have been made, but they have always been a failure: the greatest result that they have produced has been the creation of a fragment. But [they have never produced] any integral systems of poetics. (Boris Iarkho quoted in Pilshchikov 2017a, 53)

At the same time, Iarkho considered his own and Shpet's (1922–1923) views on aesthetic and non-aesthetic verbal objects in their relationship to the issue of form in literature as "almost identical" (Iarkho 2016 [1927], 151 fn. **).

The concept of semiotics as general aesthetics was later proposed by the leading art theorist of the Prague Linguistic Circle, Jan Mukařovský, in the paper "L'art comme fait sémiologique" (1934, "Art as a Semiological Fact") presented at the Eighth International Congress of Philosophers in Prague. Jakobson supported these ideas in his lectures given at the University of Brno in 1935:

> During the first years of the existence of the formalist school, ardent debates took place over whether the problem of poetry [...] can be reduced to a linguistic problem, that is, do we have the right to reduce the scholarly problem of poetry to the problem of language in its aesthetic function [...] In the poetic form [...] there are elements which [...] do not contain anything specifically linguistic, but represent a semiological problem. Thus, an integral understanding of the sign helps to include poetics [...] in semiology, the study of signs. (Jakobson 2005, 80)

Jakobson combined the linguistic approach with the semiotic approach, as if he wanted to resolve the contradictions between the antagonistic methodologies within the MLC (Pilshchikov 2011, 99; 2015, 333).

Another keyword is 'structure' – it immediately brings to mind the meta-term 'structuralism'. Jakobson borrowed it from contemporary psychology and used it as a programmatic self-description in October 1929 in a newspaper piece on the First International Congress of Slavists, written in Czech:

> Were we to comprise the leading idea of present-day science in its most various manifestations, we could hardly find a more appropriate designation than 'structuralism'. Any set of phenomena examined by contemporary science is treated not as a mechanical agglomeration but as a structural whole, as a system, and the basic task is to reveal the inner, whether static or developmental, laws of this system. (Jakobson 1929a, 11; 1971d, 711; see Steiner 1976; Percival 2011)

The opposition of 'structure' to a 'mechanical agglomeration of material' was transplanted here from Jakobson and Tynianov's manifesto of 1928. Jakobson gave a more detailed definition of structuralism in a German-language article (Jakobson 1929b, 634) published in the journal *Slavische Rundschau*, also in October 1929 (Avtonomova and Gasparov 1997).

When Jakobson stated that 'structure' is the core concept of the contemporary humanities, he may have had in mind his Moscow colleagues as well. Shpet introduced this notion as early as in his *Ėsteticheskie fragmenty* (1922–1923, *Aesthetic Fragments*), a book that had a great impact on the MLC (Steiner 1991; Tihanov 2010, 48–49; 2019: 87–88). In this innovatory study, the term 'structure' and its

derivatives occur more than seventy times, and in Shpet's *Vnutrenniaia forma slova: Ètiudy i variatsii na temy Gumbol'dta* (1927, *The Inner Form of the Word: Etudes and Variations on Themes from Humboldt*) they occur more than sixty times. In Vinokur's *Biografiia i kul'tura* (1927, *Biography and Culture*) we find over fifty occurrences of the term under discussion. Vinokur identified the concepts of 'structure' and the 'inner form' and transferred them from the field of linguistics to the field of the semiotics of cultural behavior. An apotheosis of proto-structuralism is Vinokur's statement in *Biography and Culture*: "Biography as a historical phenomenon of high complexity is, of course, not just a structure, but a structure of structures, i. e. a structure in which each individual component has, in its turn, a structural construction" (Vinokur 1927, 41). In 1934, Mukařovský described culture as a "structure of structures," which consists of various ("political, economic, ideological, literary") structures or series: "they are elements of a structure of a higher order and this structure of structures has its hierarchy and its dominant element (the prevailing series)" (Steiner 1984, 264). In his classical *Metapoetics* of Russian formalism, Peter Steiner compares Mukařovský's notion of the 'structure of structures' to Jakobson and Tynianov's 'system of systems' (Steiner 1984, 264). Vinokur's influence can also be suspected here. Tellingly enough, Vinokur visited the Prague Linguistic Circle in November 1928, around the same time as Tynianov. Vinokur, in his turn, was obviously influenced by Shpet, who defined a biological organism as "a system of structures" (Shpet 1922–1923, vol. 2, 13).

Most of the attempts to create 'philosophical formalism' remained unfinished (Dmitriev 2009; Hansen-Löve 2012, 2013). Retrospectively, one of the more important results was the first step they made toward a transition from the poetics of text to the semiotics of culture.

6 Conclusion

My typology and chronology of Russian formalism are somewhat different from, and at the same time complementary to those of Victor Erlich (1965 [1955]), Aage A. Hansen-Löve (1978) and Peter Steiner (1984). Erlich describes formalism as a single conceptual entity that underwent three historical stages: 'the years of struggle and polemics' (1916–1920), the stage of 'turbulent growth' (1921–1926), and, eventually, 'crisis and rout' (1926–1930). These stages consequently represent the formation, consolidation and disintegration of the formalist doctrine. Hansen-Löve opposes his own metododological reconstruction of the evolution of formalism to Erlich's historical reconstruction and speaks of three phases: F1–F3. F1 (1916–1919) presents a reductionist and paradigmatic model of text and its

perception and is focused on the concepts of *ostranenie*, *priem*, *motivirovka* and *ustanovka*. F2 (1919–1924) presents a functional and syntagmatic model. It develops such concepts as *siuzhet*, *skaz* and *dominanta*, and puts forward the formalist theories of plot, narrative, verse, 'dynamic form' in literature and 'montage' in cinema (the latter is not discussed in this article). F3 (1925–1934) presents a diachronic and pragmatic (literary-sociological) model. It elaborates on the concepts of 'evolution,' *literaturnyi byt* and *literaturnaia lichnost'*. Steiner also speaks of several models, but he defines them by the basic trope they exploit to describe a work of literature and literature in general, rather than by their diverse methodological orientations. These tropes are three metaphors ('a working machine,' 'an organism,' and 'a hierarchical system') and one synecdoche (language standing for literature). They are responsible for the four chronologically overlapping trends in Russian formalism: the mechanistic trend, the morphological trend, the systemic-functional trend, and the linguistic trend, respectively.

I hope to have demonstrated that Russian formalism was a multifaceted unity, and its diverse versions often overlap – not only chronologically, but also methodologically –, thus producing a stereoscopic image of Russian formalism. Moreover, the number of formalist 'facets' or 'faces' was perhaps not limited to four (Steiner 1982a). Some other approaches can also be identified as 'formalist' – most importantly, Vladimir Propp's 'generativist' formalism. Propp's *Morphologiia skazki* (1928, *Morphology of the Folktale*) is often assessed as the finest formalist contribution to the analysis of narrative schemes (Erlich 1965, 249–250). However, when Lévi-Strauss (1960) contrasted his own structuralist approach with Propp's and labeled Propp's approach as formalist, Propp (1966) furiously rejected the 'formalist' label and instead presented himself as a structuralist *avant la lettre*.

In 1965 Jakobson published an article titled "An Example of Migratory Terms and Institutional Models," furnished with the subtitle: "On the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Moscow Linguistic Circle". Here he pointed out the fact that the MLC served as an institutional model for both the Prague Linguistic Circle (PLC), of which he became a co-founder in 1926, and another important center of European structuralism, the Linguistic Circle of Copenhagen. Both circles were even named in order to recall their Moscow predecessor. An important feature of the PLC, however, was the combination of the MLC-type organizational structure with regular meetings, and the OPOIaZ-type self-promotion based on the Circle's periodical, *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague* (published from 1929 to 1939). To emphasize the organizational importance of this type of scholarly institution, Jakobson periodically leaves untranslated the Slavic terms for 'the circle' (incidentally, unlike the English *circle* or the French *cercle*, the Russian *kruzhok* and the Czech *kroužek* literally mean 'a small circle,' thus emphasizing the semantics of an affinity group).

For a few years both formalist associations operated as legal entities. The MLC was accepted in the network of the Academic Center of the People's Commissariat for Education (Narkompros) in the autumn 1918 and received grants from the state budget until 1 January 1923 (see Jakobson 1996, 361–363). OPOIaZ was officially registered on 19 December 1919 (Krusanov 2003, 296–297). Jakobson and Shklovskii planned a broad cooperation between the MLC and OPOIaZ which, however, became unattainable after Jakobson's emigration and the breakup of the MLC into opposing factions (Pilshchikov and Ustinov 2018b). By that time, according to the joint statement of the Shpetians (among them Buslaev, Gornung and Kenigsberg), which was presented at the plenary session of the MLC on 21 March 1922:

> [...] the MLC, de facto, [...] ceased to be an organization [...] it was from 1918–1920, when R. O. Jakobson was the president of the Circle and, along with him, O. M. Brik [...] and V. B. Shklovskii played a leading role. They are currently not much involved in the Circle's activities [...] and their views on poetics are not shared by the overwhelming majority of the Circle's members. (Shapir 1994, 75)

Two weeks earlier, Shklovskii had fled abroad across the ice of the Gulf of Finland to escape the arrest that awaited all former SRs – the ex-members of the Socialist Revolutionary Party, a onetime main political rival of the Bolsheviks. OPOIaZ had been officially disbanded even earlier: in December 1921 it did not receive a routine re-registration from the Administration of the Petrograd Soviet (Galushkin 2000, 136). OPOIaZ continued to exist informally and even published books. Ėikhenbaum's *Melodics* was printed in Petrograd as an unnumbered volume of the *Studies on the Theory of Poetic Language*, with OPOIaZ as publisher. Jakobson's *O cheshskom stikhe, preimushchestvenno v sopostavlenii s russkim* (1923, *On Czech Verse; Primarily in Comparison with Russian*) was printed in Berlin as the fifth volume of the same series, with "OPOIaZ – MLC" indicated as 'publishers' in some printed copies.

Despite political hardships, the formalists had almost a decade of active and productive life ahead. The situation drastically changed after Stalin's 'Great Turn' of 1929. After the dissolution of OPOIaZ and the MLC, the activities of their members continued in two colleges. One was the State Academy for the Study of Arts in Moscow, where Shpet was vice-president, and Iarkho was department chair. The other was the State Institute of the History of Arts (Gosudarstvennyi institut istorii iskusstv) in Petrograd/Leningrad, where Tynianov and Ėikhenbaum conducted their seminar and published a yearbook *Poėtika* (1925–1929, *Poetics*, 5 vols.) and a book series *Voprosy poėtiki* (1923–1929, *Questions of Poetics*, 13 vols.) (see also Danuta Ulicka's chapter on the Institute of the History of Art in this volume). Propp's *Morphology of the Folktale* was published as volume 12 of this series. Ėikhenbaum and Tynianov's students (Aronson and Reiser, as well as

Boris Bukhshtab, Lidiia Ginzburg, Nikolai Stepanov, and some others) came to be known under the label of *mladoformalisty* ('junior formalists'; Ustinov 2001a). Both institutions were closed by Decree No. 436 of the Council of People's Commissars of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic of 10 April 1931, at the same time when formalism was officially banned. Jakobson's and Tynianov's attempt to re-create OPOIaZ in 1928–1930 also failed (Galushkin 2000). Maiakovskii's suicide on 14 April 1930, bitterly deplored in Jakobson's essay "O pokolenii, rastrativshem svoikh poėtov" (1930, "On a Generation that Squandered its Poets"), marked the end of the epoch. Symbolically, Maiakovskii was a committed participant in the MLC meetings of the late 1910s and early 1920s.

In a newspaper article entitled "Pamiatnik nauchnoi oshibke" (1930, "A Monument to a Scholarly Error," 2014), Shklovskii renounced formalism as "a road already traversed – traversed and left several stages behind." After *Archaists and Innovators* (1929) Tynianov moved away from theory and history of literature and devoted himself to writing historical novels – he preferred to separate 'science' (research) from 'literature' (fiction), while Shklovskii and Ėikhenbaum merged them, each in his own way (Gasparov 1990). In 1928–1929 Ėikhenbaum published his 'revisionist' essays on 'literary environment' and dedicated himself to a biographical trilogy about Lev Tolstoi in the 1850s, '60s and '70s (1928–1940), which presents a sharp contrast to his earlier formalist book of 1922, *The Young Tolstoi*. Tomashevskii abandoned poetics and focused on Pushkin's biography and textology (a term he coined in the 1920s). Iarkho found temporary refuge in poetic translations before he was convicted in the falsified case of the 'German lexicographers.' He got off with an imprisonment in Moscow and an exile to Omsk in Siberia, whereas his colleague and opponent Shpet, after having been exiled to Tomsk (also in Siberia), was shot there in 1937. In 1940 Iarkho was allowed to come to Kursk in the European part of Russia and become a professor at the local pedagogical institute. After the German invasion he was evacuated to Sarapul in Udmurtia, where he died of hunger and miliary tuberculosis in 1942 (Akimova and Shapir 2006). Those who survived adapted to their circumstances and adopted Marxist or quasi-Marxist mode of thinking (Toddes 2002; Levchenko 2014). Interest in formalism in Russia revived somewhat in the 1960s, after Khrushchev's Thaw.

Both the formalists and their contemporaries were fully aware of the revolutionary nature of their new theories. In the announcement about the creation of OPOIaZ published in the newspaper *Zhizn' Iskusstva* (*The Life of Art*) on 21 October 1919, Shklovskii proclaimed:

> The revolution in art has renewed minds and freed the study of art from the oppression of tradition. The new society for studying the theory of poetic language was born under the sign of revolution. (Shklovskii 1919a)

At the fifth anniversary of the MLC on 29 February 1920, Buslaev stated that "the main task of the Circle was a methodological revolution" (quoted in Jakobson 1996, 380). Lev Trotskii's openly negative article "Formal'naia shkola poèzii i marksizm" ("The Formalist School [in the Study] of Poetry and Marxism", 2005) – published in 1923 in the Bolshevik Party's central newspaper *Pravda* (*Truth*) and reprinted in his book *Literatura i revoliutsiia* (*Literature and Revolution*) in the same year – began with a compliment:

> [T]he formalist school is the first scientific school of art. Owing to the efforts of Shklovskii [...] the theory of art [...] ha[s] at last been raised from a state of alchemy to the position of chemistry. (Trotskii 2005 [1923], 138)

In the same article, Trotskii called Shklovskii "the herald of the formalist school, the first chemist of art" (Trotskii 2005 [1923], 138). Iarkho wanted to advance literary studies in the same way that Johannsen had improved biology, but in the *Methodology* he compared himself with an even more superior scholar, the great eighteenth-century chemist Antoine Laurent de Lavoisier:

> Placing quantitative data and microanalysis at the base of my research, I only suggest that we do for the science of literature what Lavoisier did for chemistry a century and a half ago, and I have no doubt that the results will be imminent. (Iarkho 2006, 7, quoted in Gasparov 2016 [1969], 135)

Although the formalists created the theory of literature as a discipline, they did not formulate "a uniform doctrine, whether theoretical, historical, or methodological": formalism was "more an ongoing process of self-conscious theorizing than a finished theory" (Margolin 2005). "We possess no theory of such a kind as could be developed as a rigid, ready-made system," Èikhenbaum claimed (1971 [1925], 35). But this is not at all necessary: theories come and go, "their validity is always provisional and conditional" (Margolin 2005). Still, there remain facts that are disclosed by these theories, even though the disclosed facts may be reinterpreted in the light of future theories (Èikhenbaum 1971a [1925], 3). The raised questions and formulated agendas are perhaps even more important than the established facts. In a letter to Shklovskii of 12 April 1925, Tomashevskii wrote disdainfully about his own book of 1925, which is usually considered "a summary and textbook of the doctrines of the [OPOIaZ] group" (Wellek 1971, 179):

> My *Theory of Literature* is all outside the Formal method, outside the research work, outside the upcoming tasks. It's just an old – Aristotle's – theory of verbal art [...]. Obviously, I did not address the formalists with this book, because our job is to formulate problems and not to put the facts into prearranged cells. (Fleishman 1978, 385)

In the history of knowledge, periods of nomothetic development, or 'normal science' (as Thomas Kuhn calls it) are opposed to 'scientific revolutions' which generate new epistemological paradigms. The formalist breakthrough of the 1910s and 1920s was precisely such a 'revolution,' i. e. a period of grand conceptual shifts. The Russian formalist school did not possess internal methodological unity and did not manage to create a new scientific paradigm (in Thomas Kuhn's sense of this word). Thus, from the Kuhnian standpoint, formalism "can be termed an 'interparadigmatic stage' in the evolution of Slavic literary scholarship" (Steiner 1984, 269).

The functionalist structuralism of the Prague School can be considered, with all necessary reservations, the next step in the development of the formalist theory and 'paradigmatization' of formalist doctrine (Steiner 1982b). In the course of the methodological discussion held at the PLC on 10 December 1934 (see Glanc 2016, 110–112), Mukařovský demarcated formalism and structuralism:

> The term 'formalism' [...] is the name of the Russian school, which, for the first time in modern literary studies, focused research interests on the issue of the artistic construction of a poetic work and has done a remarkable job. The scholarly trend represented by the Prague Linguistic Circle is based, in the field of literary studies, both on the domestic pre-requisites and on the stimuli that came from formalism, and defines itself as structuralism, its basic concept being that of structure, a dynamic whole. (Mukařovský et al. 1935, 190)

Jakobson resumed at the end of the discussion, quoting the title of Lenin's article "Detskaia bolezn' 'levizny' v kommunizme" (1920, "The Infantile Sickness of 'Leftism' in Communism"):

> Structuralism benefited a lot from formalism, but it cannot adhere to those of its theses that were a mere infantile sickness of the new direction in literary studies. Formalism developed toward a dialectical method, but it was still heavily burdened by a mechanistic hangover. (Mukařovský et al. 1935, 192)

At the same time, the discoveries made by the formalists, as with any scientific revolution, have a methodological value of their own (Dmitriev and Levchenko 2002). The Russian formalist school did not create a paradigm for modern literary studies, but did draft an agenda. From this point of view, Russian formalism "was not simply a transitory and immature preparation phase that was transcended by subsequent, more robust paradigms, but a seminal episode of intense debate and dialogue in its own right, the potential of which was not fully recycled by later traditions" (Glanc 2015, 3). New scientific revolutions often emerge from insights which remained underdeveloped during and after previous scientific revolutions – this is precisely what happened in the 1960s when the neo-structuralists

revamped formalist ideas. Similarly, the recalibration of our contemporary reception of Russian formalism may well give rise to a new revolution in humanitarian knowledge.

References

Akimova, Marina, and Maksim Shapir. "Boris Isaakovich Iarkho i strategiia 'tochnogo litera-turovedeniia'." Boris Iarkho, *Metodologiia tochnogo literaturovedeniia: Izbrannye trudy po teorii literatury*. Eds. Marina Akimova, Igor Pilshchikov, and Maksim Shapir. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kul'tur, 2006. vii–xxxii.

Aronson, Mark, and Solomon Reiser. *Literaturnye kruzhki i salony*. Ed. Boris Ėikhenbaum. Leningrad: Priboi, 1929.

Avtonomova, Natalia, and Mikhail Gasparov. "Jakobson, slavistika i evraziistvo: dve kon"iunktury, 1929–1953." *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* 23 (1997): 87–91.

Bailey, James. "The Russian Linguistic-Statistical Method for Studying Poetic Rhythm: A Review Article." *Slavic and East European Journal* 23.2 (1979): 251–261.

Belyi, Andrei. *Simvolizm: Kniga statei*. Moscow: Musaget, 1910.

Brik, Osip. "Zvukovye povtory (Analiz zvukovoi struktury stikha)." *Sborniki po teorii poėticheskogo iazyka*. Vol. 2. Petrograd: Tipografiia Z. Sokolinskogo, 1917. 24–62.

Brik, Osip. "Contributions to the Study of Verse Language." Trans. by C. H. Severens. *Readings in Russian Poetics: Formalist and Structuralist Views*. Eds. Ladislav Matějka and Krystyna Pomorska. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1971. 117–125.

Brik, Osip. "The So-Called Formal Method." [1923] Trans. by Ann Shukman. *Russian Poetics in Translation*. Vol. 4: *Formalist Theory*. Eds. Lawrence Michael O'Toole and Ann Shukman. Colchester: University of Essex, and Oxford: Holdan Books, 1977. 90–91.

Cassedy, Steven. *Flight from Eden: The Origins of Modern Literary Criticism and Theory*. Berkeley, CA, Los Angeles, CA, and Oxford: University of California Press, 1990.

Christiansen, Broder. *Philosophie der Kunst*. Hanau: Clauss und Feddersen, 1909.

Christiansen, Broder. *Filosofiia iskusstva*. Trans. by Georgii Fedotov. Ed. Evgenii Anichkov. St. Petersburg: Shipovnik, 1911.

Curtis, James. "Bergson and Russian Formalism." *Comparative Literature* 28.2 (1976): 109–121.

Červenka, Miroslav. "Rhythmical Impulse: Notes and Commentaries." *Wiener Slawistischer Almanach* 14 (1984): 23–53.

Depretto, Catherine. "La question du formalisme moscovite." *Revue des études slaves* 79.1/2 (2008): 87–101.

Depretto, Catherine. "La 'Dominante' de Roman Jakobson, ou comment parler du formalisme russe dans la Tchécoslovaquie de 1935." *Fabula-LhT* 10 (2012). http://www.fabula.org/lht/10/depretto.html (14 February 2022).

Depretto, Catherine. "Formalisme et poétique. Boris Tomaševskij, le formaliste oublié." *Communications* 103 (2018): 107–118.

Dmitriev, Aleksandr, and Ian Levchenko. "Nauka kak priem: eshche raz o metodologicheskom nasledii russkogo formalizma." *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* 50 (2002): 195–246.

Dmitriev, Aleksandr. "Kak sdelana 'formal'no-filosofskaia shkola' (ili pochemu ne sostoialsia moskovskii formalizm?)." *Issledovaniia po istorii russkoi mysli: Ezhegodnik za 2006–2007*

god. Vol. 8. Eds. Modest A. Kolerov and Nikolai S. Plotnikov. Moscow: Modest Kolerov, 2009. 71–96.

Èikhenbaum, Boris. *Melodika russkogo liricheskogo stikha*. Petrograd: OPOIaZ, 1922.

Èikhenbaum, Boris. "Illiuziia skaza." [1918] Boris Èikhenbaum, *'Skvoz' literaturu': Sbornik statei*. Leningrad: Academia, 1924. 152–156.

Èikhenbaum, Boris. "Leskov i sovremennaia proza." [1925] Boris Èikhenbaum, *Literatura: Teoriia. Kritika. Polemika*. Leningrad: Priboi, 1927. 210–225.

Èikhenbaum, Boris. *Stat'i o Lermontove*. Moscow and Leningrad: Izdate'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1961.

Èikhenbaum [Èjxenbaum], Boris. "The Theory of the Formal Method." [1925] Trans. by Irwin R. Titunik. *Readings in Russian Poetics: Formalist and Structuralist Views*. Eds. Ladislav Matějka and Krystyna Pomorska. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1971a. 3–37.

Èikhenbaum [Èjxenbaum], Boris. "Literary Environment." [1927] Trans. by Irwin R. Titunik. *Readings in Russian Poetics: Formalist and Structuralist Views*. Eds. Ladislav Matějka and Krystyna Pomorska. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1971b. 56–65.

Èikhenbaum, Boris. *The Young Tolstoi* [1922]. Ed. and trans. by Gary Kern. Ann Arbor, MI: Ardis, 1972.

Èikhenbaum, Boris. "How Gogol's 'Overcoat' Is Made." [1918] *Gogol from the Twentieth Century: Eleven Essays*. Ed. and trans. by Robert A. Maguire. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1974. 269–291.

Ehlers, Klaas-Hinrich. *Das dynamische System: Zur Entwicklung von Begriff und Metaphorik des Systems bei Jurij N. Tynjanov*. Bern et al.: Peter Lang, 1992.

Erlich, Victor. *Russian Formalism: History – Doctrine* [1955]. 2nd edition. The Hague: Mouton, 1965.

Fischer, Frank, Marina Akimova, and Boris Orekhov. "Data-Driven Formalism." *Journal of Literary Theory* 13.1 (2019): 1–12.

Fleishman, Lazar'. "Tomashevskii i Moskovskii lingvisticheskii kruzhok." *Uchenye zapiski Tartuskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta* 422: *Trudy po znakovym sistemam*. Vol. 9. Tartu: University of Tartu, 1977. 113–132.

Fleishman, Lazar'. "B. V. Tomashevskii v polemike vokrug 'formal'nogo metoda'." *Slavica Hierosolymitana* 3 (1978): 384–388.

Galushkin, Aleksandr. "'I tak, stavshi na kostiakh, budem trubit' sbor…': K istorii nesostoi-avshegosia vozrozhdeniia OPOIAZa v 1928–1930 gg." *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* 44 (2000): 136–158.

Gasparov, Mikhail. "Quantitative Methods in Russian Metrics: Achievements and Prospects." [1973] Trans. by G. S. Smith. *Russian Poetics in Translation*. Vol. 7: *Metre, Rhythm, Stanza, Rhyme*. Ed. G. S. Smith. Colchester: University of Essex, and Oxford: Holdan Books, 1980. 1–19.

Gasparov, Mikhail. "Belyi-stikhoved i Belyi-stikhotvorets." *Andrei Belyi: Problemy tvorchestva*. Eds. Stanislav Lesnevskii and Aleksandr Mikhailov. Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1988a. 444–460.

Gasparov, Mikhail. "Pervochtenie i perechtenie: k tynianovskomu ponimaniiu suktsessivnosti stikhotvornoi rechi." *Tynianovskii sbornik: Tret'i Tynianovskie chteniia*. Ed. Marietta Chudakova. Riga: Zinātne, 1988b. 15–23.

Gasparov, Mikhail. "Nauchnost' i khudozhestvennost' v tvorchestve Tynianova." *Tynianovskii sbornik: Chetvertye tynianovskie chteniia*. Ed. Marietta Chudakova. Riga: Zinātne, 1990. 12–20.

Gasparov, Mikhail. "Boris Yarkho's Works on Literary Theory." [1969] Trans. by Michael Lavery and Marina Tarlinskaja. *Studia Metrica et Poetica* 3.2 (2016): 130–150.

Gerigk, Horst-Jürgen. "Wer ist Broder Christiansen? Differenzqualität, Dominante und Objektsynthese: drei Schlüsselbegriffe seiner *Philosophie der Kunst* (1909)." *Figurationen der literarischen Moderne: Helmuth Kiesel zum 60. Geburtstag*. Eds. Carsten Dutt und Roman Luckscheiter. Heidelberg: Winter, 2007. 85–105.

Ginzburg, Lidiia. *Literatura v poiskakh real'nosti*. Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel', 1987.

Glanc, Tomáš. "The Russian Formalists as a Community." *Theoretical Schools and Circles in the 20th-Century Humanities: Literary Theory, History, Philosophy*. Eds. Marina Grishakova and Silvi Salupere. New York, NY, and Abingdon: Routledge, 2015. 1–22.

Glanc, Tomáš. "(Intellektual'nye) revoliutsii Romana Jakobsona, 1910–1930-e gody." *Russkaia intellektual'naia revoliutsiia 1910–1930-kh godov: Materialy mezhdunarodnoi konferentsii (Moskva, RANKhiGS, 30–31 oktiabria 2014 g.)*. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2016. 102–114.

Greenfeld, Liah. "Russian Formalist Sociology of Literature: A Sociologist's Perspective." *Slavic Review* 46.1 (1987): 38–54.

Hansen-Löve, Aage A. *Der russische Formalismus: Methodologische Rekonstruktion seiner Entwicklung aus dem Prinzip der Verfremdung*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1978.

Hansen-Löve, Aage A. "'Motivirovka,' 'motivatsiia'." *Russian Literature* 18.2 (1985): 91–101.

Hansen-Löve, Aage A. "Dominanta." *Russian Literature* 19.1 (1986): 15–25.

Hansen-Löve, Aage A. "'Ustanovka' ('Intention,' 'Einstellung')." *Russian Literature* 24.2 (1988): 161–179.

Hansen-Löve, Aage A. "Die 'formal-philosophische Schule' in der russischen Kunsttheorie der zwanziger Jahre. Ein Überblick." *Zwischen den Lebenswelten: Interkulturelle Profile der Phänomenologie*. Eds. Nikolaj Plotnikov, Meike Siegfried, and Jens Bonnemann. Berlin: Lit, 2012. 205–257.

Hansen-Löve, Aage A. "'Synthetische Avantgarde' – Akmeismus und 'Formal-Philosophische Schule' in Russland." *Form und Wirkung: Phänomenologische und empirische Kunstwissenschaft in der Sowjetunion der 1920er Jahre*. Eds. Aage A. Hansen-Löve, Brigitte Obermayr, and Georg Witte. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 2013. 123–172.

Holenstein, Elmar. *Roman Jakobson's Approach to Language: Phenomenological Structuralism*. Trans. by Catherine Schelbert and Tarcisius Schelbert. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1976.

Holenstein, Elmar. "On the Poetry and the Plurifunctionality of Language." *Structure and Gestalt: Philosophy and Literature in Austria-Hungary and her Successor States*. Ed. Barry Smith. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, 1981. 1–44.

Iakubinskii, Lev. "O zvukakh stikhotvornogo iazyka." *Sborniki po teorii poėticheskogo iazyka*. Vol. 1. Petrograd: Tipografiia Z. Sokolinskogo, 1916. 16–30.

Iarkho, Boris. "Granitsy nauchnogo literaturovedeniia." *Iskusstvo* 1.2 (1925): 45–60; 3.1 (1927): 16–38.

Iarkho, Boris. *Metodologiia tochnogo literaturovedeniia: Izbrannye trudy po teorii literatury*. Eds. Marina Akimova, Igor Pilshchikov, and Maksim Shapir. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kul'tur, 2006.

Iarkho [Yarkho], Boris. "The Elementary Foundations of Formal Analysis." [1927] Trans. by Michael Lavery and Igor Pilshchikov. *Studia Metrica et Poetica* 3.2 (2016): 151–174.

Iarkho [Yarkho], Boris. "Speech Distribution in Five-Act Tragedies (A Question of Classicism and Romanticism)" [1929–1935]. Trans. by Craig Saunders. *Journal of Literary Theory* 13.1 (2019): 13–76.

Jakobson, Roman. *Noveishaia russkaia poèziia: Nabrosok pervyi*. Prague: Politika, 1921.

Jakobson, Roman. *O cheshskom stikhe, preimushchestvenno v sopostavlenii s russkim*. Moscow and Berlin: OPOIaZ – MLC, 1923.

Jakobson, Roman. "Romantické všeslovanství – nová slavistika." *Čin* 1 (31 October 1929a): 10–12.

Jakobson, Roman. "Über die heutigen Voraussetzungen der russischen Slavistik." *Slavische Rundschau* 1.8 (1929b): 629–646.

Jakobson, Roman. "Linguistics and Poetics." *Style in Language*. Ed. Thomas A. Sebeok. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1960. 350–377.

Jakobson, Roman. "Postscript." Osip Brik, *Michigan Slavic Materials*. Vol. 5: *Two Essays on Poetic Language*. Ann Arbor, MI: Slavic Languages Literatures, 1964. 77–81.

Jakobson, Roman. "The Dominant." [1935] Trans. by Herbert Eagle. *Readings in Russian Poetics: Formalist and Structuralist Views*. Eds. Ladislav Matějka and Krystyna Pomorska. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1971a. 82–87.

Jakobson, Roman. "An Example of Migratory Terms and Institutional Models (On the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Moscow Linguistic Circle)." [1965] Roman Jakobson, *Selected Writings*. Vol. 2: *Word and Language*. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1971b. 527–538.

Jakobson, Roman. "Linguistics and Communication Theory." [1960] Roman Jakobson, *Selected Writings*. Vol. 2: *Word and Language*. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1971c. 570–579.

Jakobson, Roman. "Retrospect." Roman Jakobson, *Selected Writings*. Vol. 2: *Word and Language*. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1971d. 711–722.

Jakobson, Roman. "Modern Russian Poetry: Velimir Khlebnikov [Excerpts]." [1921] *Major Soviet Writers: Essays in Criticism*. Ed. Edward J. Brown. Oxford and New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1973. 58–82.

Jakobson, Roman. "Moskovskii Lingvisticheskii Kruzhok." Ed. Maksim Shapir. *Philologica* 3 (1996): 361–380.

Jakobson, Roman. *Formalistická škola a dnešní literární věda ruská Brno 1935*. Ed. Tomáš Glanc. Prague: Academia, 2005.

Jakobson, Roman, and Petr Bogatyrev [Pëtr Bogatyrëv]. "Die Folklore als eine besondere Form des Schaffens." [1929] Roman Jakobson, *Selected Writings*. Vol. 4: *Slavic Epic Studies*. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1966. 1–15.

Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of the power of judgment* [1790]. Trans. by Paul Guyer and Eric Matthews. Ed. Paul Guyer. Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Kenigsberg, Maksim. "Iskusstvo i istina (V zashchitu i protiv realizma)." *Hermes* 2 (1922): 111–140.

Kenigsberg, Maksim. "Iz stikhologicheskikh ètiudov. 1. Analiz poniatiia 'stikh'." Eds. Sergei Mazur and Maksim Shapir. *Philologica* 1 (1994): 149–189.

Khalizev, Valentin. "Uchenie A. A. Ukhtomskogo o dominante i rannie raboty M. M. Bakhtina." *Bakhtinskii sbornik*. Vol. 2: *Bakhtin mezhdu Rossiei i Zapadom*. Moscow, 1991. 70–86.

Kliger, Ilya, and Boris Maslov. "Introducing Historical Poetics: History, Experience, Form." *Persistent Forms: Explorations in Historical Poetics*. Eds. Ilya Kliger and Boris Maslov. Bronx, NY: Fordham University Press, 2016. 1–36.

Krusanov, Andrei. *Russkii avangard 1907–1932 (Istoricheskii obzor)*. Vol. 2: *Futuristicheskaia revoliutsiia (1917–1921)*. Book 1. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2003.

Lerner, Nikolai. "Kuril li Pushkin? (Otvet na vopros)." *Pushkin i ego sovremenniki* 16 (1913): 61–65.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. "La structure et la forme: Réflexions sur un ouvrage de Vladimir Propp." *Cahiers de l'Institut de science économique appliquée* 99 (1960): 3–36. [Reprinted as "L'Analyse morphologique des contes russes." *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 3 (1960): 122–149.]

Levchenko, Ian. *Drugaia nauka: Russkie formalisty v poiskakh biografii*. Moscow: HSE, 2010.

Levchenko, Ian. "Poslevkusie formalizma: Proliferatsiia teorii v tekstakh Viktora Shklovskogo 1930-kh gg." *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* 128 (2014): 125–143.

Levchenko, Ian. "Ot polemiki k travle: ritorika spora vokrug formalistov v 1920-e gody." *Logos* 120 (2017): 25–44.

Levchenko, Ian, and Igor Pilshchikov. "Vmesto predisloviia." *Ėpokha 'ostraneniia': Russkii formalizm i sovremennoe gumanitarnoe znanie*. Eds. Ian Levchenko and Igor Pilshchikov. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2017. 5–10.

Lovell, Stephen. "Tynianov as Sociologist of Literature." *Slavonic and East European Review* 79.3 (2001): 415–433.

Marcialis, Nicoletta. "Michail Bachtin e Aleksej Uchtomskij." *Bachtin: teorico del dialogo*. Ed. Franco Corona. Milan: Franco Angeli, 1986. 79–91.

Margolin, Uri. "B. I. Yarkho's Programme for a Scientifically Valid Study of Literature." *Essays in Poetics* 4.2 (1979): 1–36.

Margolin, Uri. "Russian Formalism." *The Johns Hopkins Guide to Literary Theory and Criticism*. 2nd edition. Eds. Michael Groden, Martin Kreiswirth, and Imre Szeman. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press, 2005. https://litguide.press.jhu.edu/cgi-bin/view.cgi?eid=227 (14 February 2022).

Medvedev, Pavel. *Formalizm i formalisty*. Leningrad: Izdate'stvo pisatelei v Leningrade, 1934.

Merrill, Jessica. "Historical Poetics and Poetic Language: Rethinking the Concept of Autonomy for Modern Literary Theory." *Poetics Today* 38.3 (2017): 519–548.

MLC Papers – The V.V. Vinogradov Russian Language Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Department of Linguistic Information Sources and the History of Russian Literary Language (Otdel lingvisticheskogo istochnikovedeniia i istorii russkogo literaturnogo iazyka Instituta russkogo iazyka imeni V.V. Vinogradova Rossiiskoi akademii nauk), fond 20.

Mukařovský, Jan et al. "Přednášky v Praž. ling. kroužku v listopadu a v prosinci 1934." *Slovo a slovesnost* 1.3 (1935): 189–192.

Murphy, Gardner, and Lois Barclay Murphy. *Experimental Social Psychology*. New York, NY: Harper and Brothers, 1931.

O'Toole, Lawrence Michael, and Ann Shukman. "A Contextual Glossary of Formalist Terminology." *Russian Poetics in Translation*. Vol. 4: *Formalist Theory*. Eds. Lawrence Michael O'Toole and Ann Shukman. Colchester: University of Essex, and Oxford: Holdan Books, 1977. 13–48.

Oushakine, Serguei [Ushakin, Sergei]. "Sotsiologiia literaturnogo dela Borisa Ėikhenbauma." Boris Ėikhenbaum, *Molodoi Tolstoi*. Moscow and Ekaterinburg: Kabinetnyi uchenyi, 2019. 5–24.

Percival, W. Keith. "Roman Jakobson and the birth of linguistic structuralism." *Sign Systems Studies* 39.1 (2011): 236–262.

Pilshchikov, Igor. "Il retaggio scientifico del formalismo russo e le scienze umane moderne." Trans. by Cinzia Cadamagnani. *Enthymema* 5 (2011): 70–102. https://riviste.unimi.it/index.php/enthymema/article/view/1751 (14 February 2022).

Pilshchikov, Igor. "Nasledie russkoi formal'noi shkoly i sovremennaia filologiia." *Antropologiia kul'tury* 5 (2015): 319–350.

Pilshchikov, Igor. "'The Inner Form of the Word' in Russian Formalist Theory." *Theory of Literature as a Theory of the Arts and the Humanities* (*Wiener Slawistischer Almanach*, Sonderband 92). Eds. Michał Mrugalski and Schamma Schahadat. Leipzig and Vienna: Biblion Media, 2017a. 37–64.

Pilshchikov, Igor. "Zasedanie Moskovskogo lingvisticheskogo kruzhka 1 iiunia 1919 goda i zarozhdenie stikhovedcheskikh kontseptsii O. Brika, B. Tomashevskogo i R. Jakobsona." *Revue des études slaves* 88.1/2 (2017b): 151–175.

Pilshchikov, Igor. "Franko Moretti i novyi kvantitativnyi formalizm." *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* 150 (2018): 39–45.

Pilshchikov, Igor. "A poética quantitativa do Formalismo Russo." Trans. by Valteir Vaz. *RUS – Revista de Literatura e Cultura Russa* 16 (2020): 9–41. http://www.revistas.usp.br/rus/article/view/172896 (14 February 2022).

Pilshchikov, Igor. "El esquema comunicativo de Roman Jakobson entre lenguas y continentes: historia cruzada del modelo teórico." Trans. by Anastasia Belousova, Sebastián Páramo. *Revista de Estudios Sociales* 77 (2021): 2–20.

Pilshchikov, Igor, and Andrei Ustinov. "Debiut Viktora Shklovskogo v Moskovskom Lingvisticheskom Kruzhke: Ot 'istorii romana' k 'razvertyvaniiu siuzheta'." *Literaturnyi fakt* 9 (2018a): 314–334.

Pilshchikov, Igor, and Andrei Ustinov. "Viktor Shklovskii v OPOIaZe i Moskovskom Lingvisticheskom Kruzhke (1919–1921 gg.)." *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch: Neue Folge* 6 (2018b): 176–206.

Pilshchikov, Igor, and Andrei Ustinov. "Moskovskii Lingvisticheskii Kruzhok i stanovlenie russkogo stikhovedeniia (1919–1920)." *Stanford Slavic Studies.* Vol. 50: *Unacknowledged Legislators: Studies in Russian Literary History and Poetics in Honor of Michael Wachtel.* Eds. Lazar Fleishman, David M. Bethea, and Ilya Vinitsky. Bern et al.: Peter Lang, 2020a. 389–413.

Pilshchikov, Igor, and Andrei Ustinov. "Poverkhnostnoe napriazhenie: istoriia kul'tury i kontseptsiia 'literaturnogo byta' B. M. Eikhenbauma." *Rhema* 4 (2020b): 9–22.

Polilova, Vera. "Polemika vokrug sbornikov 'Khudozhestvennaia forma' i 'Ars poetica': B. I. Iarkho i OPOIaZ." *Studia slavica*: *Sbornik nauchnykh trudov molodykh filologov.* Vol. 10. Tallinn: Tallinn University. Institute of Slavic Languages and Cultures, 2011. 153–170.

Propp, Vladimir. *Morfologia della fiaba. Con un intervento di Claude Lévi-Strauss e una replica dell'autore.* A cura di Gian Luigi Bravo. Turin: Einaudi, 1966.

Sanmartín Ortí, Pau. *Otra historia del formalismo ruso.* Madrid: Lengua de Trapo, 2008.

Schmid, Wolf. "Skaz." *Russian Literature* 54.1/3 (2003): 267–278.

Shapir, Maksim. "M. M. Kenigsberg i ego fenomenologiia stikha." *Russian Linguistics* 18.1 (1994): 73–113.

Shapir, Maksim. "'Poèziia ne slovo, a kriptogramma': Polemicheskie zametki G. O. Vinokura na poliakh knigi R. O. Jakobsona." *Roman Jakobson: Teksty, dokumenty, issledovaniia.* Eds. Henryk Baran and Sergei Gindin. Moscow: RGGU, 1999. 144–160.

Shapir, Maksim. "'Teper' dlia menia nevozmozhen dazhe kompromiss': Iz istorii otnoshenii G. O. Vinokura s 'Lefom'." *Izvestiia Rossiiskoi Akademii nauk. Seriia literatury i iazyka* 59.1 (2000): 60–66.

Shapir, Maksim. "Moskovskii lingvisticheskii kruzhok." *Literaturnaia èntsiklopediia terminov i poniatii.* Ed. Aleksandr Nikoliukin. Moscow: Intelvak, 2001. 591–594.

Shklovskii, Viktor. "O poèzii i 'zaumnom' iazyke." *Sborniki po teorii poèticheskogo iazyka*. Vol. 1. Petrograd: Tipografiia Z. Sokolinskogo, 1916. 1–15.

Shklovskii, Viktor. "Iskusstvo kak priem." *Sborniki po teorii poèticheskogo iazyka*. Vol. 2. Petrograd: Tipografiia Z. Sokolinskogo, 1917. 3–14.

Shklovskii, Viktor. "Izuchenie teorii poèticheskogo iazyka." *Zhizn' Iskusstva* 273 (21 October 1919a): 2.

Shklovskii, Viktor. "Potebnia." *Sborniki po teorii poèticheskogo iazyka*. Vol. 3: *Poètika*. Petrograd: 18-ia Gosudarstvennaia tipografiia, 1919b. 3–6.

Shklovskii, Viktor. *Razvertyvanie siuzheta*. Petrograd: OPOIaZ, 1921a.

Shklovskii, Viktor. *Rozanov. Iz knigi 'Siuzhet kak iavlenie stilia'*. Petrograd: OPOIaZ, 1921b.

Shklovskii, Viktor. *'Tristram Shendi' Sterna i teoriia romana*. Petrograd: OPOIaZ, 1921c.

Shklovskii, Viktor. *Literatura i kinematograf*. Berlin: Russkoe Universal'noe Izdatel'stvo, 1923.

Shklovskii, Viktor. "O Zoshchenke i bol'shoi literature." *Mastera sovremennoi literatury*. Vol. 1: *Mikhail Zoshchenko: Stat'i i materialy*. Eds. Boris Kazanskii and Iurii Tynianov. Leningrad: Academia, 1928. 13–25.

Shklovskii [Shklovsky], Viktor. "Monument to a Scientific Error [Pamiatnik nauchnoi oshibke]. *Literaturnaia gazeta* no. 4, 27 January 1930, p. 1." Trans. by Maria Belodubrovskaya. March 2014. http://www.davidbordwell.net/essays/shklovsky.php (24 August 2022).

Shklovskii, Viktor [Shklovsky, Victor]. "Art as Technique." [1917] *Russian Formalist Criticism: Four Essays*. Trans. by Lee Y. Lemon and Marion J. Reis. Lincoln, NE, and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1965. 3–24.

Shklovskii [Shklovsky], Viktor. *Theory of Prose*. Trans. by Benjamin Sher. Elmwood Park, IL: Dalkey Archive Press, 1990.

Shklovskii [Shklovsky], Viktor. *Knight's Move*. [1923] Trans. by Richard Sheldon. Normal, IL: Dalkey Archive Press, 2005.

Shpet, Gustav. *Èsteticheskie fragmenty*. Vols. 1–3. Petersburg: Kolos, 1922–1923.

Shubin, Vladimir. *Iurii Tynianov: Biobibliograficheskaia khronika (1894–1943)*. St. Petersburg: Arsis, 1994.

Sini, Stefania. "L'intero irrequieto: sulla poligenesi dell'idea strutturale nel pensiero russo del primo Novecento." *Enthymema* 1 (2010): 190–228. https://riviste.unimi.it/index.php/enthymema/article/view/586 (14 February 2022).

Steiner, Peter. "The Conceptual Basis of Prague Structuralism." *Sound, Sign and Meaning: Quinquagenary of the Prague Linguistic Circle*. Ed. Ladislav Matějka. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications, 1976. 351–385.

Steiner, Peter. "'Formalism' and 'Structuralism': An Exercise in Metahistory." *Russian Literature* 12.3 (1982a): 299–330.

Steiner, Peter. "The Roots of Structuralist Esthetics." *University of Texas Press Slavic Series*. Vol. 6: *The Prague School: Selected Writings, 1929–1946*. Ed. Peter Steiner. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1982b. 174–219.

Steiner, Peter. *Russian Formalism: A Metapoetics*. Ithaca, NY, and London: Cornell University Press, 1984.

Steiner, Peter. "Gustav Shpet and the Prague School: Conceptual Frames for the Study of Language." *Journal of Comparative Literature and Aesthetics* 14.1/2 (1991): 35–44.

Stepanov, Nikolai. "Novella Babelia." M*astera sovremennoi literatury*. Vol. 2: *I. E. Babel': Stat'i i materialy*. Eds. Boris Kazanskii and Iurii Tynianov. Leningrad: Academia, 1928. 11–41.

Striedter, Jurij. *Literary Structure, Evolution, and Value: Russian Formalism and Czech Structuralism Reconsidered*. Cambridge, MA, and London: Harvard University Press, 1989.

Svetlikova, Ilona. *Istoki russkogo formalizma: Traditsiia psikhologizma i formal'naia shkola*. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2005.

"Thèses." *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague*. Vol. 1: *Mélanges linguistiques dédiés au Premier Congrès des philologues slaves*. Prague: Jednota československých matematiků a fysiků, 1929. 5–29.

Tihanov, Galin. "The Politics of Estrangement: The Case of the Early Shklovsky." *Poetics Today* 26.4 (2005): 665–696.

Tihanov, Galin. "Innovation and Regression: Gustav Shpet's Theoretical Concerns in the 1920s." *Critical Theory in Russia and the West*. Eds. Alastair Renfrew and Galin Tihanov. Abingdon and New York, NY: Routledge, 2010. 44–62.

Tihanov, Galin. "Russian Formalism." *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*. 4th edition. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2012. 1239–1242.

Tihanov, Galin. "On the Significance of Historical Poetics: In Lieu of a Foreword." *Poetics Today* 38.3 (2017): 417–428.

Tihanov, Galin. *The Birth and Death of Literary Theory: Regimes of Relevance in Russia and Beyond*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2019.

Titunik, Irwin. "The Problem of 'Skaz': Critique and Theory." *Papers in Slavic Philology*. Vol. 1: *In Honor of James Ferrell*. Ed. Benjamen A. Stolz. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications, 1977. 276–301.

Toddes, Evgenii. "B. M. Ėikhenbaum v 20–50-e gody: K istorii sovetskogo literaturovedeniia i sovetskoi gumanitarnoi intelligentsii." *Tynianovskii sbornik*. Vol. 11: *Deviatye Tynianovskie chteniia: Issledovaniia, materialy*. Ed. Marietta Chudakova. Moscow: OGI, 2002. 563–691.

Toddes, Evgenii, Aleksandr Chudakov, and Marietta Chudakova. "Kommentarii." Iurii Tynianov, *Poėtika. Istoriia literatury. Kino*. Moscow: Nauka, 1977. 397–572.

Todorov, Tzvetan (ed. and trans.). *Théorie de la littérature: Textes des Formalistes russes réunis, présentés et traduits par Tzvetan Todorov*. Paris: Seuil, 1965.

Tomashevskii, Boris. "Piatistopnyi iamb Pushkina." *Ocherki po poėtike Pushkina*. Berlin: Ėpokha, 1923a. 7–143.

Tomashevskii, Boris. *Russkoe stikhoslozhenie: Metrika*. Petrograd: Academia, 1923b.

Tomashevskii, Boris. *Teoriia literatury (Poėtika)*. Moscow and Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo, 1925.

Tomashevskii, Boris. *O stikhe*. Leningrad: Priboi, 1929.

Tomashevskii [Tomaševskij], Boris. "Literature and Biography." Trans. by Herbert Eagle. *Readings in Russian Poetics: Formalist and Structuralist Views*. Eds. Ladislav Matějka and Krystyna Pomorska. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1971. 47–55.

Tomashevskii [Tomashevsky], Boris. "The New School of Literary History in Russia." [1928] Trans. by Gina Fisch. *PMLA* 119.1 (2004): 120–132.

Trotskii, Lev [Trotsky, Leon]. *Literature and Revolution* [1923]. Trans. by Rose Stransky. Ed. William Keach. Chicago, IL: Haymarket Books, 2005.

Tynianov, Iurii. *Arkhaisty i novatory*. Leningrad: Priboi, 1929.

Tynianov, Iurii [Yuri]. *The Problem of Verse Language* [1924]. Ed. and trans. by Michael Sosa and Brent Harvey. Ann Arbor, MI: Ardis, 1981.

Tynianov, Iurii [Yuri]. "Literary Fact." [1924] Yuri Tynianov, *Permanent Evolution: Selected Essays on Literature, Theory and Film*. Ed. and trans. Ainsley Morse and Philip Redko. Boston, MA: Academic Studies Press, 2019a. 149–168.

Tynianov, Iurii [Yuri]. "On Literary Evolution." [1927] Yuri Tynianov, *Permanent Evolution: Selected Essays on Literature, Theory and Film*. Ed. and trans. by Ainsley Morse and Philip Redko. Boston, MA: Academic Studies Press, 2019b. 262–277.

Tynianov, Iurii, and Roman Jakobson. "Problemy izucheniia literatury i iazyka." *Novyi Lef* 12 (1928): 35–37.

Tynianov, Iurii [Yuri], and Roman Jakobson. "Problems of the Study of Literature and Language." [1928] Yuri Tynianov, *Permanent Evolution: Selected Essays on Literature, Theory and Film*. Ed. and trans. by Ainsley Morse and Philip Redko. Boston, MA: Academic Studies Press, 2019. 278–282.

Ustinov, Denis. "Formalizm i mladoformalisty: Postanovka problemy." *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* 50 (2001a): 296–321.

Ustinov, Denis. "Materialy disputa 'Marksizm i formal'nyi metod' 6 marta 1927 g." *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* 50 (2001b): 247–278.

Veselovskii, Aleksandr [Veselovsky, Alexander]. "From the Introduction to Historical Poetics: Questions and Answers." [1894] Trans. by Boris Maslov. *Persistent Forms: Explorations in Historical Poetics*. Eds. Ilya Kliger and Boris Maslov. Bronx, NY: Fordham University Press, 2016. 39–64.

Vinogradov, Viktor. "Problema skaza v stilistike." *Poètika*. Vol. 1. Leningrad: Academia, 1926. 24–40.

Vinogradov, Viktor. "Iazyk Zoshchenki." *Mastera sovremennoi literatury*. Vol. 1: *Mikhail Zoshchenko: Stat'i i materialy*. Eds. Boris Kazanskii and Iurii Tynianov. Leningrad: Academia, 1928. 51–92.

Vinokur, Grigorii. "Poètika. Lingvistika. Sotsiologiia: Metodologicheskaia spravka." *Levyi Front Isskustv* [*LEF*] 3 (1923): 104–113.

Vinokur, Grigorii. *Biografiia i kul'tura*. Moscow: GAKhN, 1927.

Vygotskii, Lev. *The Psychology of Art* [1925]. Eds. A. N. Leontiev and V. V. Ivanov. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1971.

Wellek, René. "The Concept of Evolution in Literary History." *For Roman Jakobson: Essays on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday*. Ed. Morris Halle et al. The Hague: Mouton, 1956. 653–661.

Wellek, René. "The Main Trends of Twentieth-Century Criticism." *The Yale Review* 51.1 (1961): 102–118.

Wellek, René. "Russian Formalism." *Arcadia* 6.1/3 (1971): 175–186.

Wellek, René, and Austin Warren. *Theory of Literature* [1949]. 3rd edition. Harmondsworth: Peregrine Books, 1963.

Zenkin, Sergei. "Otkrytie 'byta' russkimi formalistami." *Lotmanovskii sbornik*. Vol. 3. Eds. Liubov' Kiseleva, Roman Leibov, and Tat'iana Fraiman. Moscow: OGI, 2004. 806–821.

Zenkin, Sergei [Zenkine, Serge]. *La Forme et l'énergie: L'Esthétique du formalisme russe*. Clermont-Ferrand: Presses universitaires Blaise Pascal, 2018.

Zhirmunskii, Viktor. "Zadachi poètiki." *Nachala* 1 (1921): 51–81.

Zhirmunskii, Viktor. "K voprosu o 'formal'nom metode." Oskar Walzel, *Problema formy v poèzii*. Trans. by Maria Gurfinkel'. Ed. Viktor Zhirmunskii. St. Petersburg: Academia, 1923a. 5–23.

Zhirmunskii, Viktor. *Rifma, ee istoriia i teoriia*. St. Petersburg: Academia, 1923b.

Zhirmunskii [Žirmunskij], Viktor. *Introduction to Metrics: The Theory of Verse* [1925]. Trans. by Clarence F. Brown. The Hague: Mouton, 1966.

Michał Mrugalski
Formalism in Poland

In her seminal *Theoretical Poetics* (*Poetyka teoretyczna*), Maria Renata Mayenowa distinguished between two broad types of modern poetics in and outside of Poland, poetics being synonymous with or central to literary theory (Mayenowa 1979, 8–9). The first, 'phenomenological' current described from the first-person-singular perspective how the subject, on the basis of an artistic product, constitutes and experiences aesthetic objects by relating them to aesthetic values. In this chapter, I will illustrate this approach with Juliusz Kleiner's essay of 1914 titled "Analiza dzieła" ("Analysis of the Work", Kleiner 1960). Kleiner equates literary analysis with the identification of all possible experiences on the part of the recipient. The crowning achievement of this approach was, according to Mayenowa, Roman Ingarden's *Das literarische Kunstwerk* (1931, *Literary Work*). Mayenowa includes in this first variety – alongside Kleiner and Ingarden – Zygmunt Łempicki, Stefan Kołaczkowski, and Eugeniusz Kucharski.

The representatives of the second, 'structural' tendency reconstruct the principles of the intricate linguistic organization of utterances, the organization that according to the medium-is-the-message principle equals the significance. The so-called formalists, first and foremost members of the Warsaw Polonist's Circle (Kazimierz Budzyk, Dawid Hopensztand, Franciszek Siedlecki, Stefan Żółkiewski), operating from the mid-1930s onwards, were the first researchers in Poland to pursue the programme of studying the linguistic structure of the literary work. They recognized Kazimierz Wóycicki as their forebear and thus shaped the manifesto of the new generation of researchers as a collective volume *Prace ofiarowane Kazimierzowi Wóycickiemu* (1937, *To Honor Kazimierz Wóycicki*). As a second manifesto of the Structural School, an anthology of Polish translations from the Russian formalists was prepared throughout the 1930s. The prepared anthology was only partly printed and never distributed. Instead, it shared the destiny of the first generation of the Polish formalists: most of the edition burnt in September 1939, the rest vanished together with the Warsaw Ghetto in 1943, and the only surviving copy shared the fate of the entire city razed to the ground by Germans in an act of revenge for the Warsaw Uprising in 1944 (on the history of the movement: Żółkiewski 1989; Mayenowa 1970; Karcz 2002; Ulicka, Adamiak 2008; Kola 2010; Kola and Ulicka 2015).

The first, phenomenological or expressionist tendency took its cues rather from German-speaking countries, especially from Wilhelm Dilthey and Heinrich Wölfflin's art history. The German guidance was sustainable: Manfred Kridl, a generation older than his comrades-in-arms, professor in Vilna, played the role of

the institutional leader of the structural movement (even though he himself was an eclectic trying to combine phenomenology with a structuralist approach, cf. Mrugalski 2017). However, even his 1933 manifesto "Przełom w metodyce badań literackich" ("Breakthrough in the Method of Literary Studies", Kridl 1933) does not mention a single Russian name. It is Croce and above all German speaking philosophers and literary students (Heinrich Rickert, Wilhelm Windelband, Georg Simmel, Herbert Cysarz, Conrad Wandrey and Oskar Walzel) that propose the new 'aesthetic approach' to literature (new in relation to the worn-out positivism reigning in Polish academia, but not to the earlier generation of phenomenological formalists). Kridl's subsequent interest in Russian formalism – of which his *Wstęp do badań nad dziełem literackim* (*Introduction to Literary Studies,* Kridl 1936) is a shining example – was induced by his younger students in Vilna (i.a. Mayenowa) and his Warsaw colleagues. Kridl's *Introduction* was the first in the 'formalist' book series *Z zagadnień poetyki* (*Problems of Poetics*).

Kridl's eclecticism aside, the polarization between phenomenological and structuralist currents was so strong that the Polish scholars projected the division retroactively onto Russian formalism. In constructing the genealogy of the movement to which he belonged, Dawid Hopensztand set apart the methodological (structural) formalism of Vinogradov, Jakobson and Iakubinskii form the naïve (expressionist) formalism of Shklovskii and Ėikhenbaum (Hopensztand 1938; cf. Budzyk 1937). Hopensztand began his reconstruction of Russian formalist theory, which supposedly emerged as an apology for Futurist poetry, by placing the poet Velimir Khlebnikov – the proto-structuralist conventionalist who modelled morphologies in order to achieve inventive semantic effects – in opposition to the Expressionist Aleksei Kruchenykh; their respective theoretical spokesmen were Iakubinskii and Shklovskii.

Structuralist poetics and theory are discussed in the chapter devoted to structuralism and semiotics in Poland (see my chapter on "Structuralism and Semiotics in Poland" in this volume). In the present chapter, I will focus exclusively on the first – phenomenological or expressive – current. I will begin with the reconstruction of Kazimierz Wóycicki's poetics as conveyed by his writings from the years 1912–1914. Not only does Wóycicki's work lie at the common root of phenomenological and structural approaches to the literary work, but also it bears traces of the historical situation in which it emerged – the end of Poland's 123-year partitions and the reconstruction of the state. Its main pathos lies in unification at both the level of method and the object-level of seemingly heterogeneous elements into new holistic structures characterized by stylistic unity. *Restitutio ad integrum* – related to both the state and man – was the great topic of Romanticism, a dominant current in Polish culture. In the second section devoted to Juliusz Kleiner, I show how Polish formalism responded to the catastrophe of Romanticism, which

initially seemed to come into real being but eventually split on the rock of *realpolitik*. In the wake of the dissolution of the Romantic dream that gave the impression of coming true, this personal and generational experience reinforces the methodical doubt regarding the possibility of knowledge of history. Literary science is saved, however, by the creation of genetic fictions (*fikcja genezy*) that revive or bring closer to life the inherently ahistorical systems of art and literary science. To remain scientific, a disappointed science must doubt its results, understand them as necessary fictions. This weak status prompts it to look for reassurance in other disciplines. In the conclusion, I demonstrate literary studies' dependence on art history as another dimension of the former's entangled character.

1 Kazimierz Wóycicki and integral formalism

The differences between the two cultures notwithstanding, Russian and Polish literary theories grew out of the revolutionary underground. Sergei Stepniak-Kravchinskii's *Podpol'naia Rossiia* (1883, *Underground Russia*) also embraced the Privislanskii Krai (the officially preferred name of the Kingdom of Poland) that was peopled by Andrzej Strug's *Ludzie podziemni* (1908, *Underground Men*, the title of his collection of short stories about the Polish Socialist Party fighters) (Stepniak-Kravchinskii 1987 [1884]; Strug 1930 [1908]; Mogil'ner 1999). The Polish revolutionary *inteligencja* (intelligentsia) shared with its Russian *narodniki* (Narodniks, peopleists) counterparts the feelings of guilt towards the people, revolutionary zeal, and the scrutiny of dependence on German revolutionary ideas (Sdvizhkov 2006, 58–59; Cywiński 2010 [1971], 90–91). The underground was a form of dormancy before the final surge. In the Russia of 1905, Tadeusz Zieliński and others preached the third renaissance of antiquity with its tragic attitude and feasts, which were supposed to rise again among the Slavs (Zieliński 1899), while in Poland the chief ideologist of the "neo-irredentist" (Sdvizhkov 2006, 119) Polish Socialist Party, Kazimierz Kelles-Kraus, not only perceived the self-education and home-schooling movement (the hub of Polish literary theory) to be the next Renaissance, but also interpreted Bachofen's work on matriarchy as an auspice of the coming regeneration of culture (Snyder 1997, 215; Kelles-Krauz 1902; Marzec 2012).

A shared experience of the Russian and Polish theoreticians was the revolution of 1905. According to Maciej Adamski's recent study, it created the conditions for the emergence of literary theory on the Polish lands under Russian occupation by bringing Polish language and literature back to schools (Polish was banned in the wake of the January uprising of 1863–1864). Added to this was that schools were expected to pursue the ideal of the Schillerian aesthetic education of integral

man (Adamski 2015a, 26). In his introduction to the first edition of Wóycicki's lectures on stylistics and literary history Adamski focused on the even earlier origins of literary theory in Poland in the years preceding the revolution of 1905, when secret self-educational activity flourished, most of it concerned with the education of women (Adamski 2015b, 7–22). The greenhouse of Wóycicki's (and thus Polish) literary theory was located at the margins of official public life, which were occupied by women – the *pensja*, the all-female school, and the unofficial 'Flying University' sometimes called the '*Babski*' ('Hens' University) because it was originally established by and for women.

In nuce, literary theory was a modernizing effort undertaken by the domestic family man, or, especially in Poland, woman too, in a revolutionary situation or underground. The professors of the flying university were nevertheless men who had studied abroad and combined their social engagement with the writing of lofty poems in prose about the duties of the *inteligent* (Cywiński 2010 [1971], 80–85; Nałkowski 1904; Krzywicki 1958 [1908]). Their lectures – this tradition includes Wóycicki's lectures on stylistics and literary history (Wóycicki 2015) – took place in private salons whose decor, full of patriotic Polish memorabilia (Sdvizhkov 2006, 133), imitated the interiors of the country house in Soplicowo described in the first book of Mickiewicz's national epic *Pan Tadeusz*. Wóycicki's essays and lectures are correspondingly resplendent with examples from Polish Romantic literature. Even a kind of poetry that parallels Russian *zaum*' (transrational language) is illustrated by the works of one Romantic poet – Józef Bohdan Zalewski's Ruthenian-hued verses, so melodic that they are meaningless. Out of this clandestine university developed the Wolna Wszechnica Polska, a university whose graduates included Victor Erlich, the first monographer of the formalist-structural school in Eastern and East-Central Europe (Erlich 2006, 120–130). It is emblematic that on the last page of Wóycicki's *Jedność stylowa utworu poetyckiego* (1914b, *Style Unity of the Poetic Work*), a strong contender for being considered the inaugural text of Polish literary theory, the author placed the date: March 8, 1914.

The genetic link between the emergence of Polish modern literary theory and the condition of underground men and women sheds some light on the strange pause in the development of the intellectual movement. After Wóycicki's pioneering efforts of the years 1913–1922, the formalist movement seems to lose its momentum. It was only after 1935, when the political situation in Poland again became so tense that the country was teetering on the brink of revolution, that the school of 'Polish formalists' emerged. According to the testimony of their leading representative, Stefan Żółkiewski, at their semi-official meetings they discussed both peasant strikes and Rudolf Carnap's *Der logische Aufbau der Welt* (1928, *The Logical Structure of the World*) (Żółkiewski 1989, 5). They may also have discussed the interview given at roughly the same time by the author of *Underground People*,

Andrzej Strug: "Does it mean that the 'underground people', who surfaced [and joined pubic life] after Poland regained independence, should again go underground?" "In their souls they have been there for a long time" (Boyé 1933, 2). Since its inception, Polish literary theory wavered between underground and superstructure, the official and the unofficial, or between circles and schools (cf. Kola and Ulicka 2015).

Wóycicki's two most impactful contributions (alongside his 1912 monograph of Polish prose and Polish verse, written in the spirit of the ear phonology of the time [Wóycicki 1960 [1912]]) appeared in a series curated by a private or civil institution substituting for an academy of sciences in the partitioned and occupied land: the Scientific Society of Warsaw (Towarzystwo Naukowe Warszawskie). The first contribution, entitled *Historia literatury i poetyka* (1914, *Literary History and Poetics*), is a plea for an extension of the purview of Polish literary criticism, which for various reasons, mostly of a political nature, concentrated solely on literary history as a means of conveying national identity. It is necessary that literary studies, Wóycicki claims, include literary theory, or it all amounts to the same thing for him: poetics. Wóycicki sets forth a blueprint of an edifice of literary scholarship. The discipline's main areas of interest should be methodology (here, the stress is placed on discerning between the individual and the general phenomena), the psychology of the creative personality, the limits and the essence of poetry, and the role of the subject in literary studies. All the disparate issues fall within the scope of an idea which then engaged Wóycicki the most and which subsequently occupied a position at the conceptual heart of Polish formalism, namely the idea of the style unity of the literary work. Thanks to the fact that unity in diversity is an axiom of literary studies, the literary work may be subject to both intrinsic and extrinsic literary history (he calls the former 'literary evolution'), dealing with formal and genetic issues, respectively. Wóycicki expands on numerous interdependencies between poetics and both kinds of literary history. Because form is both objective and experiential, Wóycicki allows both psychological poetics ('the poetics of experience' [cf. Nycz 2012]) and objective poetics, the poetics of the artefact. Something amounting to a pre-established harmony reigns between the subjective and the objective approaches to poetics and literary history, as Wóycicki (1914a, 64) seals his argument with Goethe's aphorism or rather Goethe's verse translation of Plotinus' treaty on Beauty (Enneades 1.6.9): "Were not the eye sunlike / It could never see the sun" ("Wär' nicht das Auge sonnenhaft, / Die Sonne könnte es nie erblicken"). In the context of literary studies, Plotinus' or Goethe's *bon mot* suggests that the objective forms and the receptive faculties of the subject are tuned to one another. Juliusz Kleiner, the second pioneer of formalist poetics in Poland, summed up the intervention "Historyczność i pozaczasowość w dziele literackim" (1935, "Historicity and

Timelessness in the Literary Work") with the same quotation from Goethe (1960, 666). Oskar Walzel and Juliusz Kleiner took from Goethe the definition of *Gehalt* or *Gestalt* (*zawartość*) as a dialectical unity of *material* and *form* (Goethe [1827] without date, 1134; Walzel 1923; Kleiner 1960 [1913]), the same unity postulated by Wóycicki; Iurii Tynianov opened and closed the fundamental dissertation *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka* (1923, *The Problem of Verse Language*) with quotations from Goethe's conversations with Eckermann (Tynianov 1965 [1923], 25, 158), which – together with his correspondence with Schiller – are at the heart of the concept of a literary work depicted in Wóycicki's second groundbreaking contribution from 1914, *The Style Unity of Poetic Work* (Wóycicki 1914b). The concept of pre-established harmony elucidates how formalisms – especially OPOIaZ Formalism – could pass as an objectivist approach while dealing mostly with the effects of forms on the perceiver, beginning with the effects of estrangement and making-difficult of form.

In *The Style Unity of Poetic Work*, Wóycicki claims a correspondence between the composition of the literary work and the aesthetic experience:

> Where all the factors of a work are in accordance, condition each other as much as possible, where they have the same mark, the same measure and proportion, where they perfectly match each other and become a whole, there is a style unity of work, a stylish work. From the psychological standpoint, style unity consists in the harmonious combination of the components of the aesthetic experience, the harmonious relationship of impressions in an experience. (Wóycicki 1914b, 33)

The first-person-singular ('psychological' or 'phenomenological' – the border between the two was porous at the time; Theodor Lipps, for instance, went from being a pivotal figure of European psychologism to a co-founder of the Munich Phenomenological Society) approach to form assigns Wóycicki's poetics to the tradition of philosophical aesthetics, which inquires into aesthetic values: "Since the style unity of the work depends on taking into account all the requirements of its stylistic factors, it is the best and the most objective measure of the aesthetic value of works" (Wóycicki 1914b, 33–34). However, one should not conflate the postulate that the work be evaluated according to aesthetic values with pseudo-Classical normativism. Wóycicki repeatedly emphasizes the plurality of the forms of the aesthetic experience; it is impossible to designate in advance the ideal of a work that would be automatically appreciated. Unity is a purely formal feature.

European scholarship of the day largely assumed double – subjective and objective – apprehension of the work of (not only literary) art. The most vibrant and the most extensive grouping of literature and art scholars gathered around the Berlin scholar Max Dessoir, who in 1906 began to publish the *Zeitschrift*

für Ästhetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft (see my chapter on "Journal and Society of Aesthetics and the General Science of Art" in this volume). The subject experiences 'aesthetic' incentives and values, whereas the very construction of the artefact (artisanship, expertise) is dealt with in the science of art. It was in the pages of the journal edited by Dessoir that the first proposals appeared for the application of phenomenology to the study of art and literature. These outlines of phenomenological aesthetics, formulated by Waldemar Conrad (1908) and Moritz Geiger (1913; 1925), were soon followed by a complementary response by Zygmunt Łempicki (1921), who invented 'pure poetics'. A Polish scholar of German literature, Łempicki intended pure poetics to describe the objective artistic side of works of art, which constitutes a stimulus to the subjective aesthetic experience. Roman Ingarden and in a different way Kazimierz Wóycicki tried to include in their theories both aesthetic and artistic values of artworks.

Wóycicki, in the title to his lecture for the Scientific Society of Warsaw, states the dominant, main thought, which all elements of the argument are subordinated to – this is, of course, style unity. The term 'style unity' links the subjective and objective dimensions of poetics. 'Unity' points to aesthetics and a first-person perspective: striving for unity (*Einheit*) is the basic aesthetic law according to the German aesthetician Theodor Lipps, whom Wóycicki cites at strategic junctures of his argument. However, refinement (style) complements unity with multiplicity.

According to Wóycicki and his like-minded contemporaries, style is by nature an individual phenomenon that manifests itself differently in different materials, e. g. in the poetic work. For the reason that it implies materiality and uniqueness, style as an epithet points to the objective dimension of unity, a physical artistic product. The main reference point of Wóycicki's stylistics in this and other works (Wóycicki 1922) is the style of Charles Bally (cf. Maciej Adamski's critical introductions to Wóycicki 2015 and Wóycicki 1922). The Swiss linguist – a pupil and successor of Ferdinand de Saussure at the Geneva Chair of Linguistics as well as co-editor of *Cours de linguistique générale* (1916, *Course in General Linguistics*) – postulated the science of style that, unlike Benedetto Croce, Karl Vossler, and Leo Spitzer's neo-idealist attitudes, was claimed to have an objective character. Although stylistics does examine utterances (*paroles*), not a language system (*langue*), although it does not describe the explicit systemic (dictionary) meanings, but implicit emotional-evaluative connotations related to specific usage contexts, this affective and evaluative language is described as objective (systemic) and social, and not subjective and individual (Mayenowa 1966).

The aesthetic science of unity as a source of aesthetic experiences is by no means incongruent with objective stylistics. The perspective of the first person singular bonds a philosopher who studies sensations and aesthetic values with an objective linguist who describes explicit and implicit meanings. Even Maye-

nowa, an uncompromising opponent of phenomenological poetics (Mayenowa 1989), recognized that "the world of signs cannot be understood without the participation of introspection" (Mayenowa 1979, 9). Although the researcher maintains a wary distance to the science of literature which examines experiences and aesthetic values, she cannot imagine working on the material, objective dimension of poetics, i. e. on language, without taking into account the results of self-observation. The unity of style unity is therefore guaranteed not only by the subject introducing unity to multiplicity, but also by the material of the poetic work, the nature of which cannot be examined other than from the perspective of the first person singular. The nature of the material requires a subjective approach, which comes to the fore exactly when Wóycicki proceeds in the most objective, structural manner, i. e. when he parallels the structure of the narrative with that of the sentence (Wóycicki 1914b, 6). The typical structuralist postulation that (especially narrative) utterances may be studied as global sentences gains its credibility and obviousness not so much in the context of syntax as in that of semantics, of how smaller significant elements subordinate to the whole which encompasses them so as to contribute to an utterance's global message. The process of the meaning formation is, however, describable only from the position of the perceiver obtaining one element at a time and relating it to grand formations which exist more or less synchronically. This affinity of approaches allows Wóycicki to position himself at the crossroads of phenomenological and Structural poetics.

Wóycicki describes style unity as an "almost organic relationship" (Wóycicki 1914b, 6). The whole can be deemed organic when it exhibits features that its elements do not possess. According to Wóycicki, in the organic form, "all parts [...] move toward a collective goal" (Wóycicki 1914b, 5). The teleological and functional approach is emblematic for modern – principally formalist and structuralist – approaches to literature and culture in general. Works of art have an infinite number of specific goals and one general goal thanks to which they may be called works of art. Each work of art seeks to express unprecedented and one-off content, but all pursue one common goal: they want to interact aesthetically with the recipient, or, in the language of the epoch, to give him a specific aesthetic delight. Theodor Lipps considered the source of pleasure (*Lust*) to be the unity (*Einheit*) of form. The soul enjoys what agrees with its nature: "Pleasure accompanies mental processes to the extent in which they are self-active for this soul" (Lipps 1903, 10). In this post-Kantian philosophy, the soul's most unique activity is to impart unity to various phenomena (Lipps 1903, 11), and "pleasure itself expresses the relation between the nature of what is perceived and demands apperception [here: unification] and the nature of the soul that enables apperception" (Lipps 1903, 12). Lipps recognizes unity as the unity of diversity ("Gesetz der Einheit in der Mannigfaltigkeit"; Lipps 1903, 26); thanks to diversity, unity can come into view as an

expression of shaping and active power, that is, it can provide the subject with an increase in energy, a sense of one's own power and activity. "The variety of elements of the whole sustains interest. It has an invigorating effect on a unified whole. [...] 'Interest' [...] is a prerequisite of pleasure" (Lipps 1903, 3). For Lipps, unity and diversity also concern the basic issue of aesthetics – the relationship between form and content, which in his case turn out to be the same thing, only viewed from different angles. Form is what is perceived as an active factor shaping passive content (Wóycicki 1914b, 18; Lipps 1906, 96).

The principle of holism does not allow the artistic product to be an accumulation of mutually indifferent elements. On the contrary: the unity of artistic form is a function of the hierarchy of its parts. One of the elements assumes a "leadership role" (Wóycicki 1914b, 11), becomes the target or "dominant" (Wóycicki 1914b, 11–13, 22) which imposes itself with a special "emotional force", drawing attention to itself and subordinating the other elements so that "they play a more servile role, they intensify, emphasize, give variety" (Wóycicki 1914b, 11). Wóycicki underscores how important for the correct interpretation of the work it is to gain a proper grasp of qualitative dominants and subdominants, while his approach is purely functional. When he claims that the aesthetic form must have a hieratic character, he does not specify which element of the work – character, action, drawing, colour, sound, the tragic – is to occupy the privileged position of the goal of the autotelic structure.

The functional and qualitative dominant occurs on both sides of the aesthetic relationship: in the work and in the subject. The term itself appeared for the first time in the phenomenalist philosophy of Richard Avenarius (1890, 275–277), which deliberately ignores the customary distinction between subjectivity and objectivity, focusing on hierarchical relations between phenomena. Thanks to the German aesthetician Broder Christiansen (1909; Russian translation 1912, Polish 1914), the dominant became part of the apparatus of the Russian formalists, and Roman Jakobson promoted it to the basic term of Central European structuralism (Jakobson 1981 [1935]).

Lipps extensively discusses the "principle of monarchical subordination" ("Prinzip der monarchischen Unterordnung"; Lipps 1903, 53) of various elements in the unity of form. The philosopher emphasizes that the aesthetic principle of the hierarchy is fundamentally different from other forms of perceiving unity, e. g. bringing heterogeneous elements of the whole into a common denominator (Lipps 1903, 53). On the contrary, aesthetic unification intensifies differences and tensions between elements: "the superior element experiences growth. Its importance to me increases. On the other hand, the independent meaning of subordinated elements is diminishing for me. They undergo an attenuation in terms of their own ability to express and exert influence" (Lipps 1903, 55). Lipps postu-

lates a correspondence between the elements of an artistic product and the subject's attention, reacting to the apperceptional centres of gravity in a piece (Lipps 1903, 56–57). As if relying on *gestalt* psychology, he distinguishes loci privileged by nature (frame and canter in the case of visual arts, the beginning and end of creations based on succession of elements), and accents placed *ad libitum* by the artist which enter into various interactions with natural centres of apperception (Lipps 1903, 59–64, 87–89).

Wóycicki draws from this description of the coexistence of the subject and the external form at least two fundamental conclusions for subsequent literary studies. The first concerns the cognitive – or perhaps 'experiential' – value of artistic forms that help us see the world with ever new vision. Although the very term *disautomatization* of the language – and, through the language, perception – does not arise in the text of *The Style Unity*, Wóycicki describes the thing itself and thus joins such important theorists of disautomatization as Jan Baudouin de Courtenay (1974, 228 [1904, 76]) and Jan Rozwadowski (1959 [1922]). Drawing on the French writer Alphonse Daduet, who postulated the "divorce of words" (in fact breaking down phraseologies and collocations, quoted in Wóycicki 1914b, 15), Wóycicki writes: "Strong artistic temperament with impetus breaks associations of images and words, sanctified by poetic tradition or the linguistic habits of his [the poet's] times; he creates new connections, bold appositions, in which words, as someone wittily said, are surprised by their proximity" (Wóycicki 1914b, 15). Estrangement is closely related to disautomatization, if not actually synonymous. The disautomatization of perception is not only a basic operation in modern literature and art, but also a faculty that assigns to the disciplines that examine literature and art a privileged position among the sciences of man – a position contingent on the cognitive power of their object. In view of the imperialism of style, a term encompassing both singular utterances and entire epochs, Wóycicki's theory opens up a vista on a theory of culture which will examine uniform hierarchical systems applicable to different material substances and thus making up the great unity of the human world. Poetics will be the first discipline to reveal the very ambitions that will drive cultural semiotics; the project of the stylistics of culture will resurface, devoid of explicit references to Wóycicki, in Stefan Żółkiewski's Marxist theory of literary production and consumption (discussed in my chapter on Marxism in Poland in this volume).

2 Juliusz Kleiner or History as fiction

Historically, Juliusz Kleiner was one of the most important Polish literary scholars of the twentieth century. He is considered the author of the first essay to advocate modern, anti-positivistic literary studies: "Charakter i przedmiot badań literackich" ("Character and Object of Literary Studies", Kleiner 1960 [1913]; Gorczyński 2009). On the other hand, he pursues the literary history of Romanticism as an epoch of geniuses. His life's work consists of three monographs on the poet-prophets: *Zygmunt Krasiński. Dzieje myśli* (1912, *Zygmunt Krasiński. The History of Thought*), *Juliusz Słowacki. Dzieje twórczości* (1919–1927, *Juliusz Słowacki. The History of Creation*), and *Mickiewicz* (1933 and 1948). These monographs enjoyed great popularity and numerous editions.

The amount of energy invested in penning the great *literary-historical syntheses* is perplexing against the backdrop of Kleiner's theoretical statements. In the pioneering "Character and Object of Literary Studies" from 1913, Kleiner expresses an anti-positivist position, i. e. he endeavours to identify the literary *par excellence* in a gesture parallel to the Russian formalists' literariness (*literaturnost'*). From the irreducible specificity of literature as a phenomenon of culture, Kleiner derives the impossibility of reducing a work of art to the conditions of its creation – be it the psychological or the sociological circumstances. An unbridgeable gap exists between the autonomous and unique work and the environment of its creation. Under this premise, literary history always misses its mark since – as Kleiner claims, drawing on Dilthey (1989 [1883]) – literature and other domains of culture create atemporal arrangements of exceptional achievements. And yet only in their light is human, i. e. historical existence comprehensible.

The literature of Romanticism addresses precisely this disparity and mutual indispensability of poetry and temporal reality. Kleiner's formalism accordingly focused on Romanticism. On the one hand, Romanticism emphasizes the contrast between poetry and reality. On the other hand, poetry must be implemented; the Romantics say it should saturate the reality. Romanticism encompasses pure aestheticism (Novalis's definition of poetry as expression for expression's sake; Aleksandr Pushkin's claim *à propos* of his *Tsygany* (1827, *Gipsies*) that the aim of poetry is poetry itself; Mickiewicz's last Crimean sonnet bracketing all traumatic experiences as material for long-lasting forms; Julisz Słowacki's wish that his *Beniowski* will light up as fireworks and vanish, etc.). Apparently, the translation of Percy Bysshe Shelley's *A Defence of Poetry* contributed to the emergence of Russian formalism (Svetlikova 2005, 74–77; on the relationship between German Romanticism and Russian formalism, see Renate Lachmann's chapter on "The Migration of Concepts" in this volume). And on the other hand: if positivism reduces the literary work of art to the circumstances of its inception, to the particular reality

that generated the artwork together with the artist, then proto-Romanticism and Romanticism bear the embryo of positivism: it suffices to mention Herder, Mme De Staël, A.W. Schlegel's *Über dramatische Kunst und Literatur* (1809–1811, *On Dramatic Art and Literature*), Friedrich Schlegel's *Geschichte der alten und neuen Literatur* (1815, *History of Old and New Literature*) and Mickiewicz's 1922 "Introduction" to *Ballady i romanse* (1822, *Ballads and Romances*).

Kleiner's introduction to his Słowacki monograph (Kleiner 1919) is especially symptomatic of the genesis of post-Romantic aestheticism. Above all, the dream of Polish Romanticism – the restoration of Poland – is correlated with two aesthetic or stylistic principles characteristic of Modernism or even the Avant-garde. Firstly, just as in Freud, Austin or the innumerable studies of aphasia from Broca to Freud and Jakobson and to Derrida and Agamben, the anomalous, the abnormal, reveals the truth about the normal. Or, to put it differently, according to this principle of making difficult (*utrudnienie*), the normal, the ordinary, the accustomed gives joy (anew) thanks to the experience of the abnormal, the alienated (see also Erik Martin's chapter on alienation in this volume): non-normal life, painful patriotism gave birth to Polish Romanticism; its extraordinary role was determined by the absence of state life – and yet Romanticism will endure not only as an aesthetic, universal human value, but also as a national asset (Kleiner 1919, I). Thanks to this anomaly, coming generations can look to Poland with the eyes of a convalescent lest they do not take it for granted. Here, the Modernist aesthetic of new vision gained in the result of experiencing difficulty allegedly participates in actual nation-building.

Another formalist aspect of the Słowacki monograph is Kleiner's assumption that the energetic surplus value (the surplus value of the aesthetic pleasure) depends on the device of making difficult the perception of content (*utrudnienie*). With the help of this economical principle, Kleiner defies and refutes positivism together with its reduction of structure to genesis. While assuming that certain circumstances produce certain works, positivism relies on the principle of least effort. In other words, the reverse engineering of the work of art so that we gain insight into the conditions of its inception demands that one assumes the trajectory of the creative process to be predictable, i.e. unsurprising. This assumption holds only if the creative process takes place along the lines of least effort. This is the positivist principle *par excellence* – since it is supposed to connect the physical and the psychical realities. According to Kleiner, instinct follows the principle of the least effort, while conscious creation is based on making difficult. Consciousness is form – in this post-Kantian paradigm, the mind enjoys in the form its own nature, which consists in uniting parts into a whole (as in apperception discussed in the previous section). In spite of the fact that the social and literary milieu pushed the eighteen-year-old Słowacki towards the simple form of *ukrain-*

ska dumka (Ukrainian narrative and pensive folksong), he favoured difficulty by turning to the form of the sonnet: the sonnet, an international form, proves that European Romanticism is not amorphic hysterics, but a creator of durable forms (Kleiner 1919, 18–20). Just as the Russian formalists projected onto literary history the correlated principles of estrangement and making difficult, which they initially regarded as general, omnipresent features of the literary, so these principles shape Słowacki's development as a poet.

Kleiner regards the difficult time around 1918, full of adversity, as the materialization of Romantic aesthetics in real life. Kleiner describes the moment when the Słowacki monograph was published – concurrent with the formation of the state and its defence against Soviet aggression – as the *parousia* of Romanticism. Romanticism becomes visible in a historical tragedy:

> For us – for a generation that went through a world war and experienced the joy and tragedy of founding a state in terror and danger, among the enemies and rubble of the old world – the great post-partitionist poetry became up to date again. We understood the call of Konrad's despair, which cried to heaven for a miracle, to put an end to the horrors of the earth – we felt the infinity of pain in the heart of Polelum, tragically towering over the enemies in the midst of the destruction of the Weneds [...] and we realized the truth that lay in the Messianic ideas of the transformation of the world and the transformation-related emergence of Poland. (Kleiner 1919, 18–20)

Of course, the world and Poland let down the expectations and history separated itself once again, it seems irretrievably, from the system of literature.

And yet the research practice proved that history is indeed indispensable and necessary. However, taking history into consideration does not constitute an end in itself, as in positivism, but is required with a view to having an aesthetic or emotional effect on the reader as a member of society. This state of affairs becomes conspicuous above all in the introduction to Kridl's Mickiewicz monograph from 1933. Here Kleiner opposes the "faded-away conditions of birth" to the meeting with the "eternally present organism" of poetry. "But on the other hand," he adds, "the world of the spirit (culture) is the world of history. And those who want to understand the spirit in the living truth must reckon with it" (Kleiner 1933, V). The historicity of a work is not a retroactive quality, as positivism assumed when it acknowledged reconstructing genesis as the ultimate aim of literary studies. On the contrary, historicity operates proactively, for the sake of the vivid effect of the work on the perceiver.

The genetic explanation of the work ceases to be the purpose of research and becomes a moment of the aesthetic meeting with the living organism of the work. In the introduction to the Mickiewicz monograph, Kleiner calls the "image of genesis" what he had once daringly labelled the "fiction of genesis" (Kleiner

1956 [1931]). This image is only an aspect, albeit a vital one, of research and public outreach. The historical genesis cannot be a purpose of literary research because of the gap between the genesis and the work itself. A work is never a necessary consequence of its historical motivation (Kleiner 1933, VI). Additionally, after the crisis and catastrophe of Polish Romanticism, smashed in the moment of its materialization, the historicity of the works can no longer be experienced as a hope for their realization. The work's bond with the historical past and the historical future becomes highly problematic and yet indissoluble, lest it lose its ties with human reality. The historicity of the work is anchored in a sensation that is homologous with aesthetic pleasure. To describe works of art as aesthetic phenomena amounts to describing them as historical entities.

Both the historical character and the aesthetic value of an individual work result from the need for unification, synthesis, context, form – so strong is the Kantian 'apperception'. This need activates a unifying, i.e. narrating activity of the mind: "The mind disapproves of hanging important substances in a vacuum. It demands connections – calls for causal chains, be they only partial; it demands series of comparisons that make it possible to determine the individual difference" (Kleiner 1933, VII). And further: "The need to connect phenomena" – which is likewise the basis of aesthetic pleasure – "causes the image of genesis – be it deceptive, be it a false one – to decisively influence the experience of the work. We cannot abstract *Pan Tadeusz* from emigration, we will not experience *Wallenrod* unless we think of the power of the tsarism" (Kleiner 1933, VII).

The task of the researcher is therefore not to dissolute the work into its components corresponding with general abstract patterns making up literary tradition, but to create a cognitive equivalent of the work, "about which one must say that it really is this very work" (Kleiner 1960 [1935], 137). Following Schleiermacher, Kleiner postulates that a quasi-mystical insight (divination) initiates and concludes the cognition of the work; in between, historical comparative research takes place (Kleiner 1960 [1935], 137–138), a linking effort aspiring to create as satiated a cognitive equivalent as possible. Kridl's preoccupation with history is reminiscent of Valentin Voloshinov and Mikhail Bakhtin's philosophy of the utterance, which originated from related neo-Kantian and hermeneutic inspirations. A word in a statement does not resemble an entry in a dictionary: it carries with it the single moment, its "ideal and emotional charge" and the unrepeatable horizon in which it fell (Kleiner 1960 [1935], 138).

Kleiner suggests that in contrast to other kinds of art, the literary work in principle represents the situation of communication, since it always assumes the presence of a narrator and/or speaking heroes and, moreover, often explicitly addresses its own origin; therefore, it carries with it the fragments of its genesis. "The living relationship to works of art is largely determined by what one knows

or assumes about their genesis" (Kleiner 1956 [1931], 158). Thanks to the image or the fiction of genesis, the critic thus creates a cognitive equivalent that makes the innately difficult, strange, undemocratic, aristocratic, isolationist work of great art (Kleiner 1960 [1935], 135) accessible for the general public. The nation can thus form and shape itself after, and for the sake of its poetry. A substitute Romanticism of engaging literary studies emerges after the failure of the real implementation of Romanticism in the years 1918–1920.

Even if the historical interpretation of a work is accurate and truthful, it primarily has the structure of fiction anyway. The cognitive equivalent acts on the reader like a successful fiction. The criterion of truthfulness in this literary science is whether the cognitive equivalent or the work itself – they are after all 'equivalent' – triggers an experience in readers which they can enclose in their respective life contexts: "The sketch [of genesis] can conform with the historical truth, or it may be false, or even fantastic – this does not change its real meaning, this cannot take away the power of the decision as to whether the work – because it is full of inner truth – interconnects with life" (Kleiner 1956 [1931], 159). Aesthetic formalism amounts to existentially charged reception aesthetics.

3 Conclusion: Entanglements

As a result of foregrounding post-Kantian apperception, Polish formalism conforms with (its own) entangled history: it raises anew the problem of the interaction between the cultural context and the intellectual and artistic work, while at the same time highlighting the transcultural nature of art, its world, and its study. Another crucial aspect of Polish formalism as a representative of a Central and Eastern European phenomenon was its interdisciplinarity, in the Polish case especially the cues it took from art history. Wóycicki, for example, illustrates through comparison between a graphic and a poetic work (the former's descriptions) the general formalist principle (Ėikhenbaum 1924 [1919]; Vygotskii 1998 [1925]) according to which form negates the inherent properties of material; how else would it turn out to be energy, the active side of the forming process? Wóycicki demonstrates this by analyzing Maria Konopnicka's ekphrases of Artur Grottger's drawings (depicting, incidentally, what many considered to be the ultimate catastrophe of Polish political Romanticism – the January uprising of 1863). Analogous content is, then, expressed in different materials. In the process of the reception of Maria Konopnicka's poems, language signs attenuate their sequential character and form a *quasi*-simultaneous image, affecting the reader by means different to those in Grottger's drawings, but with quantitatively and qualitatively similar intensity:

> The difference between the image as a lasting moment and the story as the subsequent follow-up of images seemingly diminishes because the fragments that follow one another in time unite in memory, as something existing coincidentally; they fix into a general outline, crystallize in an architectural creation; just as in music, tones are related to motifs, images find their places in rounded sentences and form a voluminous whole. Eventually, in the poem, the details congregate into a scene: a sleeping man, a half-carved, anxious woman, a hand knocking on the window. (Wóycicki 1914b, 25)

The intersemiotic and interdisciplinary analogy of melody was also borrowed from Lipps (1903, 26), even though the most famous description of apprehending temporal phenomena the way one experiences melody is credited to Edmund Husserl; it was contained in the lectures on inner time consciousness edited by Martin Heidegger (Husserl 1964 [1928]). Interdisciplinarity should not be reduced to merely drawing inspiration from various sources. It can also be perceived as a condition of Formalism's emergence. Not only in special cases of the interdisciplinary transfer of concepts, as when Eugeniusz Kucharski (1923), inspired by Oskar Walzel's (1917) conversion of Heinrich Wölfflin's notions so that they fit with the literary, proposes a method of aesthetic analysis of literary works which would apply to them the network of categories developed by the art historian from the Vienna School, Joseph (Józef) Strzygowski. In Walzel und Kucharski, the problem lies in establishing mutual correspondences between potential elements of overreaching rubrics or in finding matching aspects of different kinds of materiality (paint, words, etc.). However, the more general, indeed fundamental reliance of literary studies was expressed by a writer in conflict with literary critics and scholars, Witold Gombrowicz. In the visual arts – Gombrowicz writes in his *Diary* – the generalities (epochs, style, directions) dominate over the individuality of an artist. Painters and sculptors produce objects – and so, under the influence of art history, literary works are treated as objects, catalogued, labelled, inscribed into rubrics. Literary criticism becomes ever more objective as literary critics cease to be artists in favour of research, connoisseurship, and information (Gombrowicz 1988 [1963], 99–100). Providentially, Polish formalism has come up with antidotes to imminent rigidity – Wóycicki's equating form to energy and Kleiner's awareness of literary studies' fictional character.

References

Adamski, Maciej. "Szkoła, polityka i estetyka literacka. O początkach nowoczesnej teorii literatury." *Współczesne dyskursy konfliktu*. Ed. Włodzimierz Bolecki et al. Warsaw: IBL PAN, 2015a. 13–32.

Adamski, Maciej. "Wstęp." Kazimierz Wóycicki, *Wykłady ze stylistyki i historii literatury*. Ed. Maciej Adamski. Warsaw: IBL PAN, 2015b. 7–22.

Avenarius, Richard. *Kritik der reinen Erfahrung*. Vol. 2. Leipzig: Fues, 1890.

Boyé, Edward. "Rozmowa z Andrzejem Strugiem." *Wiadomości Literack*ie 22 (1933): 2.

Budzyk, Kazimierz. "Posłowie." Leo Spitzer, Karl Vossler, Viktor Vinogradov, *Z zagadnień stylistyki*. Ed. Kazimierz Budzyk. Warsaw: KPUW, 1937. 149–159.

Christiansen, Broder. *Philosophie der Kunst*. Hanau: Clauss & Fedderssen, 1909.

Conrad, Waldemar. "Der ästhetische Gegenstand: eine phänomenologische Studie." *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 3.1 (1908): 71–118; 3.4 (1908): 469–511; 4.3 (1909): 400–455.

Courtenay, Jan Baudouin de. *Szkice językoznawcze* [1904]. *Dzieła wybrane*. Vol. 1. Ed. Przemysław Zwoliński. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1974.

Cywiński, Bohdan. *Rodowody niepokornych* [1971]. Warsaw: PWN, 2010.

Dilthey, Wilhelm. *Introduction to the Human Sciences* [1883]. *Selected Works*. Vol. 1. Eds. Rudolf A. Makkreel and Frithjof Rodi. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1989.

Èikhenbaum, Boris. "O tragedii i tragicheskom." [1919] *Skvoz' literaturu. Sbornik statei*. Leningrad: Akademia, 1924. 73–83.

Erlich, Victor. *Child of a Turbulent Century*. Chicago, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2006.

Geiger, Moritz. "Beiträge zur Phänomenologie des ästhetischen Genusses." *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung* (1913): 567–684.

Geiger, Moritz. "Phänomenologische Ästhetik." *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 19.1 (1925): 29–42.

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von. "Moderne Guelfen und Ghibellinen." [1827] Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, *Schriften zu Literatur und Theater*. Ed. Walter Rehm. Stuttgart: Cotta, no date. 1134–1135.

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von. "Zahme Xenien." Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, *Berliner Ausgabe*. Ed. Siegfried Seidel. Berlin: Aufbau. Vol. 1, 1960, 635–715.

Gombrowicz, Witold. *Diary* [1963]. Vol. 3. Trans. by Lillian Vallee. Chicago, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1988.

Gorczyński, Maciej. *Prace u podstaw: polska teoria literatury w latach 1913–1939*. Wroclaw: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 2009.

Hopensztand, Dawid. "Filozofia literatury formalistów wobec poetyki futuryzm." *Życie Literackie* 5.2 (1938): 182–195.

Husserl, Edmund. *The Phenomenology of Internal Time-Consciousness* [1928]. Trans. by James S. Churchill. Ed. Martin Heidegger. The Hague: Marinus Hijhoff, 1964.

Ingarden, Roman. *Das literarische Kunstwerk: Eine Untersuchung aus dem Grenzgebiet der Ontologie, Logik und Literaturwissenschaft*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1931.

Jakobson, Roman. "Dominant." [1935] Roman Jakobson, *Selected Writings*, Vol. 3: *Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry*. Ed. Stephen Rudy. The Hague: Mouton, 1981. 751–756.

Karcz, Andrzej. *The Polish Formalist School and Russian Formalism*. Rochester, NY: Rochester University Press and Krakow: Wydawnictwo UJ, 2002.

Kelles-Krauz, Kazimierz. "J. J. Bachofen (1861–1901): Aus den Studien über die Quellen des Marxismus. Vortrag, gehalten an der Université Nouvelle in Brüssel." *Die neue Zeit: Wochenschrift der deutschen Sozialdemokratie* 17.1 (1902): 517–524.

Kleiner, Juliusz. *Słowacki: dzieje twórczości*. Vol. 1. Warsaw: Gebethner i Wolf, 1919.

Kleiner, Juliusz. *Mickiewicz*. Vol. 1. Lviv: Ossolineum, 1933.

Kleiner, Juliusz. "Krytyk jako twórca fikcji genezy." [1931] Juliusz Kleiner, *Studia z zakresu teorii literatury*. Lublin: TN KUL, 1956. 58–59.

Kleiner, Juliusz. "Charakter i przedmiot badań literackich." [1913] *Teoria badań literackich w Polsce: wypisy*. Vol. 1. Ed. Henryk Markiewicz. Krakow: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1960. 195–214.

Kleiner, Juliusz. "Analiza dzieła." [1914] *Teoria badań literackich w Polsce: wypisy*. Vol. 1. Ed. Henryk Markiewicz. Krakow: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1960. 215–223.

Kleiner, Juliusz. "Historyczność i pozaczasowość w dziele literackim." [1935] *Teoria badań literackich w Polsce: wypisy*. Vol. 2. Ed. Henryk Markiewicz. Krakow: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1960. 135–142.

Kola, Adam. "Zwrot dokonany niedopełniony. Z dziejów nowoczesnego literaturoznawstwa polskiego okresu międzywojennego." *"Zwroty" badawcze w humanistyce. Konteksty poznawcze, kulturowe i społeczno-instytucjonalne*. Eds. Jacek Kowalewski and Wojciech Piasek. Olsztyn: Instytut Filozofii Uniwersytetu Warmińsko-Mazurskiego w Olsztynie, 2010. 237–284.

Kola, Adam, and Danuta Ulicka. "From Circles to the School (and Back Again): The Case of Polish Structuralism." *Theoretical Schools and Circles in the Twentieth-Century Humanities: Literary Theory, History, Philosophy*. Eds. Marina Grishakova and Silvi Salupere. New York, NY, and London: Routledge, 2015. 63–83.

Kridl, Manfred. "Przełom w metodyce badań literackich." *Przegląd Współczesny* 130.12 (1933): 145–162.

Kridl, Manfred. *Wstęp do badań nad dziełem literackim*. Vilnius: Dom Książki Polskiej, 1936.

Krzywicki, Ludwik. *Takimi będą drogi wasze* [1908]. Warsaw: PWN, 1958.

Kucharski, Eugeniusz. "O metodę estetycznego rozbioru dzieł literackich." *Pamiętnik Literacki* 20.1–4 (1923): 1–39.

Lipps, Theodor. *Ästhetik oder Psychologie des Schönen und der Kunst*. Hamburg and Leipzig: Voss, 1903 (vol. 1), 1906 (vol. 2).

Łempicki, Zygmunt. "W *sprawie uzasadnienia* poetyki czystej." *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 23 (1921): 171–188.

Marzec, Wiktor. "Momenty polityczności. Kazimierz Kelles-Kraus – między dialektyką dziejów a stanowieniem polityki demokratycznej." *Internetowy Magazyn Filozoficzny Hybris* 16 (2012). http://cejsh.icm.edu.pl/cejsh/element/bwmeta1.element.hdl_11089_1400 (20 July 2020).

Mayenowa, Maria Renata. "Analiza doktryny stylistycznej Bally'ego." *Stylistyka Bally'ego: wybór tekstów*. Ed. Maria Renata Mayenowa. Warsaw: PWN, 1966. 5–56.

Mayenowa, Maria Renata. "Rosyjskie propozycje teoretyczne w zakresie form poetyckich (1916–1930)." *Rosyjska szkoła stylistyki*. Eds. Maria Renata Mayenowa and Zygmunt Saloni. Warsaw: PWN, 1970. 14–54.

Mayenowa, Maria Renata. *Poetyka teoretyczna: zagadnienia języka*. Wroclaw et al.: Ossolineum, 1979.

Mayenowa, Maria Renata. "Wersologia Franciszka Siedleckiego i jej założenia teoretyczne." Franciszek Siedlecki, *Pisma*. Eds. Stefan Żółkiewski and Maria Renata Mayenowa. Warsaw: PIW, 1989. 45–72.

Mogil'ner, Marina. *Mifologiia podpol'nogo cheloveka: radikal'nyi mikrokosm v Rossii nachala XX veka kak predmet semioticheskogo analiza*. Moscow: NLO, 1999.

Mrugalski, Michał. "The Polish Reception of Reception. The Transfer of *priem* within the Intellectual Morphic Field of Russian and Polish Formalisms." *Ėpokha "ostraneniia". Russkii formalizm i sovremennoe gumanitarnoe znanie*. Eds. Ian Levchenko and Igor Pilshchikov. Moscow: NLO, 2017. 153–164.

Nałkowski, Wacław. *Bojownik: fantazya*. Warsaw: Stefan Demby, 1904.

Nycz, Ryszard. *Poetyka doświadczenia. Teoria – nowoczesność – literatura*. Warsaw: IBL PAN, 2012.

Prace ofiarowane Kazimierzowi Wóycickiemu. Vilnius and Warsaw: Dom Książki Polskiej, 1937.

Rozwadowski, Jan. "Zjawisko dysautomatyzacji i tendencja energii psychicznej." [1922] *Wybór pism*. Vol. 3. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1959. 107–134.

Sdvizhkov, Denis A. *Das Zeitalter der Intelligenz: Zur vergleichenden Geschichte der Gebildeten in Europa bis zum Ersten Weltkrieg*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006.

Snyder, Tymothy. *Nationalism, Marxism, and Modern Central Europe: A Biography of Kazimierz Kelles-Krauz (1872–1905)*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997.

Stepniak-Kravchinskii, Sergei. *Podpol'naia Rossiia* [1884]. *Sobrannye sochineniia v 2-kh tomakh*. Vol. 1. Eds. Natal'ia Pirumova and Mira Perper. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1987. 338–514.

Strug, Andrzej. *Ludzie podziemni* [1908]. Warsaw and Cracow: Mortkowicz, 1930.

Svetlikova, Irina. *Istoki russkogo formalizma. Traditsiia psikhologizma i formal'naia shkola*. Moscow: NLO, 2005.

Tynianov, Iurii. *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka* [1923]. Iurii Tyniavon, *Stat'i*. Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1965.

Ulicka, Danuta, and Marcin Adamiak (eds.). *Tradycje polskiej nauki o literaturze: Warszawskie Koło Polonistów po 70 latach*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo UW, 2008.

Vygotskii, Lev. *Psikhologiia iskusstva* [1925]. Rostov-on-Don: Feniks, 1998.

Walzel, Oskar. *Wechselseitige Erhellung der Künste*. Berlin: Reuther-Richard, 1917.

Walzel, Oskar. *Gehalt und Gestalt im Kunstwerk des Dichters*. Berlin: Athenaion, 1923.

Wóycicki, Kazimierz. *Historia literatury i poetyka*. Warsaw: Towarzystwo Naukowe Warszawskie, 1914a.

Wóycicki, Kazimierz. *Jedność stylowa utworu poetyckiego*. Warsaw: Towarzystwa Naukowe Warszawskie, 1914b.

Wóycicki, Kazimierz. "Z pogranicza gramatyki i stylistyki. Mowa zależna, niezależna i pozornie zależna." *Przegląd Humanistyczny* 1.1 (1922): 75–100.

Wóycicki, Kazimierz. *Forma dźwiękowa prozy polskiej i wiersza polskiego* [1912]. Warsaw: PWN, 1960.

Wóycicki, Kazimierz. *Wykłady ze stylistyki i historii literatury*. Ed. Maciej Adamski. Warsaw: IBL PAN, 2015.

Zieliński, Tadeusz [Zelinskii, Faddei]. "Antichnyi mir v poèzii A.N. Maikova." *Russkii vestnik* 7 (1899), 138–157.

Żółkiewski, Stefan. "O Franciszku Siedleckim." Franciszek Siedlecki, *Pisma*. Eds. Stefan Żółkiewski and Maria Renata Mayenowa. Warsaw: PIW, 1989. 5–44.

Renate Lachmann

Jurij Striedter's Reading of Russian Formalism

1 The beginnings of Russian formalism in Germany

In the 1960s, a rather barren period in German literary theory marked by unclear methodology, texts of Russian formalism created some interest (see also Igor' Pilshchikov's chapter on Russian formalism in this volume). Translations of Shklovskii into German (by Gisela Drohla), Ėikhenbaum and Tynianov (both by Alexander Kaempfe) and Jakobson were published in 1965, 1966, 1967 and 1969. However, a stronger interest was sparked only with a project conceived at the University of Konstanz in the late 1960s and early 1970s: a bilingual edition of formalist texts edited by Jurij Striedter and Wolf Stempel together with a group of young Slavic scholars. The task of translating and editing lay with Karl Eimermacher, Rolf Fieguth, Inge Paulmann, Witold Kośny, Frank Boldt, and Helene Immendörfer. This edition, published in two volumes in 1969 and 1972, allowed a comparison between the original terminology and its German version. Around the same time, Aage Hansen-Löve in Vienna was writing his important book on formalism published in 1978 (Hansen-Löve 1978). Finally, at the University of Bochum, Karl Maurer founded the journal *Poetica* in 1966 in order to revive the theoretical concepts of formalism. He opened with a programmatic statement:

> The revival of the title *Poetica* is a tribute to the Russian critics and writers who founded the Petersburg 'Society for the Analysis of Poetic Language', so long ignored in the West, exactly 50 years ago. At the same time, it is a tribute to the spirit of the great 1920s, the era of Oskar Walzel, Karl Vossler and Leo Spitzer. (Maurer 1967, 1)

In the first year, an essay by Shklovskii from the volume *Khod konja* (*Knight's Move*) appeared in the translation of Karl Maurer. Later on, many studies about formalism were published in this journal – especially by Wolf and Herta Schmid. In 1973 Hans Guenther and Karla Hielscher edited the volume on the 'ideological' debate *Marxismus und Formalismus* (*Marxism and Formalism*), containing texts by Trotskii, Bukharin, Lunacharskii, Ėikhenbaum, Brik, and P. Medvedev. In the following year, Wolfgang Beilenhoff presented texts by the formalists on the theory of film entitled *Poetik des Films* (1974, *The Poetics of Cinema*). This common field of interests created productive contacts between the schools of Slavic Studies at Bochum and Konstanz.

2 The first reactions to the first translations

The Striedter/Stempel edition and its path-breaking and much-cited introductions opened up a theoretical field which was cultivated in multiple ways over the following years. Special interest centered on the concept of estrangement, on literary evolution in the sense of a replacement of systems (*smena sistem*), on the idea of an automatization and disautomatization of forms, the outline of a theory of poeticalness, and narratological concepts of the construction or absence of plot. One should not overlook the fact, however, that Jurij Striedter and Dmitrij Tschižewskij, the other important Slavic scholar, had already introduced formalism and the concept of estrangement to the discussions of the group Poetik und Hermeneutik (Poetics and Hermeneutics), as documented in the collection *Immanente Ästhetik, Ästhetische Reflektion* (*Immanent Esthetics*, *Esthetic Reflection*) in 1966, the year of a renaissance in theoretical interest (see also Schamma Schahadat's chapter on Poetics and Hermeneutics in this volume). Tschižewskij's contribution "Wiedergeburt des Formalismus? In welcher Form?" ("Rebirth of formalism? In which form?") proceeds from Victor Erlich's exposition (1955). In spite of its "shortcomings", he sees the book as "lively and engagingly written", the rediscovery of an "undoubtedly valuable critical and theoretical current of the early revolutionary years" (Tschižewskij 1966, 297). He expressly welcomes the German translation of Erlich (1964) as a contribution to theoretical debate. However, he places even more emphasis on a lecture by Leo Spitzer (1961) at the International Federation for Modern Languages and Literatures (FILLM) congress at Liège in 1960, which emphasized the "methodological importance of Russian formalism (with reference to Erlich's book)" (Tschižewskij 1966, 298). Tschižewskij adds that this lecture by the "figurehead of Romanic philology" had been received as a "testament" because Spitzer died a few days after the congress (Tschižewskij 1966, 297). Tschižewskij writes this with regard to his own contact with formalist concepts, especially during his membership of the Cercle Linguistique in Prague, and he is committed to explaining to his colleagues at Poetics and Hermeneutics the genesis und later development of this new literary theory and critical method. His review is also interesting because of its repudiation of a "pseudo-genealogy of formalism" (Tschižewskij 1966, 299) which includes names like Oskar Walzel, Eduard Sievers (via the communication of Zhirmunskii), A. Potebnia and N. Veselovskii. Instead of this pseudo-genealogy, Tschižewskij emphasizes names like Konstantin Leont'ev (esp. his study on Tolstoi's novels) and Innokentii Annenskii (on Konstantin Bal'mont). Tschižewskij aimed at a change of emphasis which presumably could not be fully grasped by his listeners at the Bad Homburg conference of Poetics and Hermeneutics. But they were probably interested in his historical contextualization of this genesis of theory and the highlighting of some

of its representatives, especially Shklovskii and Jakobson. Even more interest was (or could have been) stimulated by a presentation of the new terminology with its analytical implications: 'estrangement' (*ostranienie*), 'slowing-down' (*zamedlenie*), 'deviation' (*otstuplenie*), and 'disclosure of poetic procedure' (*obnazhenie priema*). It was perhaps the first time these terms had been mentioned in Germany, with the exception of estrangement (*Verfremdung*). Furthermore Tschiževskij touches on the multifarious coalition of formalism and Futurism and presents the later fortunes of formalism: its persecution in the Soviet Union and its survival which was primarily due to Jakobson's research in the USA. And – now as a critic of the formalists – he censures the missing aspects of their research: the content of the literary work, the author's biography, the dominant *Weltanschauung*, the historical context etc. At no point does he mention the tenets of structuralism which relate to formalism in so many points and which he himself helped to develop at Prague.

3 Priem / *Verfahren / Device*

German, English and French attempts to translate the terminology of formalism into their own language simultaneously show the effort to fit them into an existing scholarly context. That already holds for the very general term *priem*, which has been translated as procedure, strategy, *procédé, stratégie, Verfahren* but also *Kunstgriff*. Striedter whose doctoral thesis of 1953 analysed the works of Novalis expands on the term *Verfahren* in the preface he wrote to it in 1985:

> The term *Verfahren* is common in today's criticism of literature and art in German, and most people who use it are aware that it were the Russian formalists who declared *Verfahren* (procedure) to be the real subject and 'hero' of art and literary criticism. Indeed, this translation of *priem,* the programmatic formalist term, has completely vanquished its older and too narrow translation as *Kunstgriff* ever since we decided to use it in the introduction of our bilingual edition of *Texte der russischen Formalisten [Texts of the Russian Formalists].* But only now, after rereading my dissertation, I have realized that I probably borrowed this term directly from Novalis. In his fragments and notes he uses *Kunstgriff* but also – and much more frequently and centrally – *Verfahren*, including the phrase 'the methods of *Verfahren*', which points to the connection between *Verfahren* and the 'formal method.' (Striedter 1985, 7–8)

4 *Ostranenie* / Estrangement

At the same conference of the Poetics und Hermeneutics circle, Striedter presented a paper on formalism centered on the concept of *Verfremdung*: "Transparenz und Verfremdung. Zur Theorie des poetischen Bildes in der russischen Moderne" (1966, "Transparency and Estrangement. On the Theory of the Poetic Image in Russian Modernism"). His analysis of a poem emphasizing the procedure of estrangement – probably the first in this setting – looks at Esenin's poem "Pesn' o khlebe" (1921, "Song of the Bread"). Striedter does not comment on the connection of this term with Brecht's concept of estrangement in his theatrical practice. In defining the poetic image he is interested in the contrast of transparency (*prozrachnost'*), which is central to Russian Symbolist poetry and its theory, and estrangement (*ostranenie*) as a method which he uses for his analysis with reference to Shklovskii. He gives a full exposition of the genesis of this term in Shklovskii's poetological thinking and quotes Shklovskii's famous sentences from his own translation. (It seems to me that the fundamental importance of Striedter's theses on the poetic image – from Symbolism to Futurism and to the poetry of the 1950s and 1960s – has not been fully appreciated by the Poetics and Hermeneutics circle.) The application of *ostranenie* to Esenins "Song of the Bread" is a reversion of the interpretations of Tschiževskij and N. Kravtsov, who refer to the transformation of riddles and themes of popular poetry as pre-texts. Striedter discovers the *Verfremdung* of these themes, especially of some elements of the *Slovo o polku Igoreve* (twelfth century, *Song of Igor*). He concludes: "Esenins estranging poetry is no more 'unpoetic' than Brecht's estranging drama is 'undramatic'" (Striedter 1966, 296). He seeks to adapt a method to poetry which was first applied to epic forms, an adaptation already performed for drama by Brecht. Again, Striedter does not mention the unclear genealogy of the term. This genealogy is the subject of my essay (Lachmann 2010) in a collection of essays that follow the migration of these concepts from East to West and back again (Kohler 2010).

Ostranenie was translated into German as *Verfremdung*, which was better suited to the semantic aura of Shklovskii's term than the French *étrangement* and the English *estrangement* and *foregrounding*. But this brought the term *Entfremdung* – with its plausible French counterpart *aliénation* – into play, opening up a further (Rousseauist-Marxist) field which was echoed by the Russian *otchuzhdenie*. This toing and froing created a tangle of poetological and philosophical terms which allowed reciprocal interpretations. Shklovskii's later renaming of *ostranenie* as *udivlenie* and his reference to Novalis suggest that he had not completely discarded this concept. However, it did nothing to clear up the circulating terms (Lachmann 1970). (See also Erik Martin's chapter on alienation/defamiliarisation/estrangement in this volume.)

5 Brecht's *Verfremdung*

In Germany, the reference to Shklovskii was not taken up in a sustained manner, since Brecht himself had not made it clear. The *V-Effekt* (estrangement effect) attained a special status which concealed Brecht's contact to the Russian cultural scene. A sophisticated history of the term in which the philosophical and the aesthetic side (with reference to Shklovskii) were balanced was provided by Reinhold Grimm (1984 [1961]). The association with methods of Baroque poetics (*far stupir*), i. e. the grounding of the concept in historical poetics as suggested by Grimm and the attempt to illuminate Pop Art which gained prominence in the 1960s but had not been methodically defined – cf. Wissmann (1966) – established *Verfremdung* firmly in German criticism. It remained closely connected to Brecht, not only to his drama but also to his poetry, as shown by Heselhaus (1966), who rooted it in the German poetic tradition.

The term was established poetically and hermeneutically, as it were, and it was used regularly in the interpretation of texts from different periods. The original points of Shklovskii's theory were not of specific interest, nor was the entangled terminological history of the term, which had been complicated by Shklovskii's own revision.

6 The growth of a concept: *ostranenie* / estrangement / *Verfremdung*

The case of Russian formalism provides an insight into the different reactions of intellectual milieus: they may either reject an 'alien' theory or try to incorporate it – erasing its 'alienness' – or they permit contact which allows its further development, sharpening etc. The migration of concepts involves the question which position they may occupy in the receiving system, as categories, paradigms, analytical concepts or hypotheses, and to what degree they are incorporated in or can modify their new theoretical context. Here, estrangement (*Verfremdung*) is the key term whose appearance on the stage of theory – especially in a German context – invokes associations whose consistency cannot be ignored. Thus in a strange way, the theoretical field was ready for the reception of the formalist concept. As a matter of fact, the double function of estrangement – 'disautomatization' and 'complication' of form – is not taken up by critical studies in the 1960s and 1970s. Concepts like the exposing of procedure and the dualism of automatization and disautomatization do not take on an importance of their own – and these two are indeed the constituent moments which lead to a new perception and which

represent the real poetical semantics of the term *Verfremdung* that Striedter foregrounds in his outline of the history and interpretation of formalist theory. They lead to a new perception and represent the poetic semantics of the term *Verfremdung*. Aage Hansen-Löve's comprehensive and still unmatched study *Der russische Formalismus. Methodologische Rekonstruktion seiner Entwicklung aus dem Prinzip der Verfremdung* (1978, *Russian Formalism: Methodological Reconstruction of Its Development Based on the Principle of Alienation*) provides a new opening up of the field of discussion. For Western criticism, this work reconstructs the genesis of a theory, the development of its concepts and terminology on a ground saturated with *Verfremdung*. For its country of origin, it brings to light what had been temporarily banned, almost forgotten and hidden by other critical concepts. Slavic literary studies in the German language have fully made use of this newly presented theory, and with further works on it they have had an impact beyond the boundaries of their subject. But the vital point of the concept of migration here is the return in the light of *Verfremdung,* as it were, of formalist theory to Russia in a clearer, theoretically sharpened form. And one might say that some concepts of literary criticism only gradually develop their theoretical (and methodical) potential in the migration from one context to another.

7 Striedter's reading of Russian formalism

How did Striedter, to whom Hansen-Löve referred in many passages of his book, proceed in his reading of formalism? Striedter highlights fundamental themes of formalist theory and orders them thematically. His starting point is a concept of theory and science which uses Habermas' opposition of nomological-empirical and historical-hermeneutical. From the very outset, Striedter stresses that the formalists are aiming not at a definition of the literary, but at the specific quality of literature as a special form of language, not at a text-based aesthetics but at the describability of forms (Striedter 1969, IX–XXVII). Following the opposition of nomological-empirical and historical-hermeneutical discussed in the social sciences, he sees the formalist concept of theory in the field of the nomological and rejects a reductionist interpretation that reads formalist theorems as fixed results. Such an understanding would create an overly static picture of the theoretical practice of formalism and would ignore that on the contrary, formalism is distinguished by the rapid development and change of its methods and categories, and that its main challenge is the constant reassessment, correction and replacement of its own methods and theses. Striedter reconstructs the dynamics of the theoretical discussions of the formalist circle in the 1910s and 1920s, the

development from pure theory to a literary history that foregrounds the idea of literary evolution. He also examines the theoretical profile of the main protagonists of the circle, Shklovskii, Èikhenbaum, Tynianov and Jakobson:

> It is characteristic for Eichenbaum – in contrast to Shklovskii – to proceed from the interpretation of a single text as a poetic system and to ask for the dominant aspects of the style of an author, and it is significant for the practice of formalism in general that he analyzes the phenomenon of *skaz* in its historical development and its importance for contemporary literature but also uses it as a point of departure for looking at the fundamental tasks and possibilities of a theory of narrative. (Striedter 1969, LI)

Striedter wanted to show the difference to the relevant theoretical schools of the 1960s, e. g. to the New Criticism which did not see the deviation from the norm as the norm itself, as formalism did, but which understood the "aesthetic norm" as a given and absolute yardstick. He points out connections between formalism and structuralism and states that the Prague School adopted some prominent formalist concepts.

In the German context, Oskar Walzel is considered a precursor of formalist thinking because of his interest in form, but his contrasting of content (*Gehalt*) and form (*Gestalt*) was not in line with formalist ideas. This would rather hold true for the "morphological method" of André Jolles, whose 'simple forms' (*Einfache Formen,* [Jolles 1930]) as specific forms of language stressed the autonomy of linguistic procedures. But the idea of *Urformen* (primal forms) and the lack of a concept of rupture or deviation separates this position from the formalists. Certainly there are parallels to critical positions that do not pursue a 'philosophy' of narrative but analyze its construction as in Eberhard Lämmert's *Bauformen des Erzählens* (1955, *Types of Narrative*). The turning away from a work-immanent analysis of literature and the adoption of analytical-functional methods (also applied by Käte Hamburger and Franz Stanzel) seem to evoke the formalist positions of the 1920s. Striedter highlights the parallel between Èikhenbaum and Walter Benjamin, who both wrote about Leskov (Benjamin in 1936 after contact with the USSR) (on Benjamin's reading of Leskov see Michał Mrugalski's chapter on Kracauer and Benjamin and the Frankfurt School in this volume). According to Striedter, Benjamin sees the functional difference between oral and written narrative in accordance with formalist procedure, but since he does not use the concept of automatization/disautomatization of procedures, he cannot appreciate the specific quality of Leskov.

The incorporation of formalist concepts, theoretical approaches and concrete interpretations, especially narrative forms, into the theoretical and analytic studies of mostly German critics practised by Striedter shows a mutual compatibility that can be seen as a response to the problem of integrating migrated concepts.

8 Striedter, Russian formalism and reader-response criticism

In the context of the development of *Rezeptionsästhetik* (reader-response criticism) in the 1960s, Striedter sees a rather critical relation between the approach of Hans-Robert Jauß and certain formalist tenets. However,

> Jauß is not placing himself in direct opposition to formalism, but tries to resume and proceed systematically from the point at which formalism was content with a mere acknowledgement of its own historicity instead of drawing the methodological consequences. These consequences include Habermas' general insight, applied by Jauss to literary criticism, that the 'empirical' or 'nomological' theory and methodology cannot simply be transferred to the social sciences and the humanities because the latter are concerned with the historically conditioned interpretation of historical phenomena, and therefore need their own historical-hermeneutic methodology. (Striedter 1969, LXXII)

According to Striedter, it would have been relevant for reader-response criticism to elaborate on Shklovskii's remark: "It is important for the writer to emphasize the ambiguity [*raznosmyslivanie teksta*] of his work" (Striedter 1969, XXXV). The potential for multiple meanings is contained in the work itself.

Striedter seeks to question specific theoretical positions, for instance, he disagrees with Victor Erlich's criticism of Shklovskii's apodictic statement on the central role of parody and the thesis that *Tristram Shandy* is the most typical novel in world literature. He answers this criticism by referring to Shklovskii's essay on prose without plot (*vne siuzheta*) and arguing that the genre of the novel is designed to disclose hardened or hardening artistic procedures. This is accomplished by parody as well as by the reduction of plot or of the hero in narrative texts. These procedures of deviation from genre conventions may become features of the genre itself. Striedter's method of presentation involves the explication of theorems and the testing of their methodological usefulness:

> The dissolution of traditional plot constructions allows the accommodation of themes and methods which are new or previously regarded as 'unliterary'. In this way it may become an important factor of literary evolution. And this leads to the question whether novels that are 'lacking in plot' or offend against traditional 'methods of plotting' may be of special importance to the genre and its evolution. (Striedter 1969, XLI)

Striedter also examines Tynianov's concept of parody. In its inherently destructive element, which is at the same time constructive, he stresses the general movement of literary evolution. (The intertextual aspect is not important yet.)

9 Wolf-Dieter Stempel and Russian formalism

In following the stages of theoretical development of the formalists, Striedter detects a decline of self-reflection within the group, which he appraises critically:

> Whereas in his early article Jakobson still poses the question of the historical conditionality of his own position in judging artistic works, later formalist statements on the problem of evolution concentrated unambiguously on the 'supersession of systems and schools' and their doctrines, without reflecting on the principally historical character of their own 'school' and their 'system' or making it evident as a part (and foundation) of theory and analysis itself. (Striedter 1969, LXX)

The introduction of the Romance scholar Wolf-Dieter Stempel also looks at the concepts, their argumentative validation and fields of application, in particular the theory of poetic language, the problem of confronting poetic with practical language, the development of a poetic linguistics and the specifics of verse emphasizing the role of rhythm compared to metrics. Stempel highlights a later phase of formalist thinking which takes up a historic approach connected to a specific concept of meaning, stemming from Tynianov's analysis of verse. He shows the interrelation between the concept of poetic language and the practice of Futurist poetry and discusses the opposition between 'poetic' and 'practical' language with reference to the theory of deviation, which he considers imprecise. For him, "the question of the linguistic status of literature has remained controversial even beyond the subsequent Prague structuralism to this day" (Stempel 1972, XVII). He misses the differentiation between the general 'deviation' of the poetic code and the deviating use of linguistic elements. "Neither is the deviation from or breaking of linguistic rules 'poetic' in itself [...], nor is correctness or regularity unpoetic per se" (Stempel 1972, XXII). Stempel sees the definition of poetic language as a statement focussing on expression as the continuative functional aspect. According to him, Jakobson's model of the functions of language which was conceived after the formalist period has begun a new phase in the theoretical discourse about poetic language. In his discussion of the theses of Jakobson, Tynianov and Tomashevskii, Stempel uses a style of argumentative debate by discussing the aporias of many theoretical approaches or their incompleteness in the context of the linguistic poetics of the 1970s. Like Striedter, Stempel presents cross-references to contemporary or later positions which were analogous or oppositional (Benedetto Croce, Paul Valéry, Spitzer, Vossler, linguistic poetics of the 1970s). He also quotes Novalis' characterization of poetic language as "expression for expression's sake" (Novalis 1968, 93).

10 Russian formalism and Poetics and Hermeneutics

The theoretical positions advocated by Striedter and Stempel as members of the research group Poetik und Hermeneutik centered on formalist concepts in connection with theoretical developments in France (Greimas, Todorov, Genette, Kristeva, Riffaterre).

At the conference of the group devoted to "The Comic" (1974) Striedter came up with a little performance one might call a mimed enactment of formalist theory. In a clownish way, he mimed dealing with an obstacle, a hurdle. (It was a wooden lath blocking the path, which had to be surmounted in different ways – deviously, elaborately.) This involved the testing of alternatives, the verification and falsification of solutions. There was neither a clear solution, nor a conclusive approach to the problem, rather a dynamic, undogmatic tackling the obstacle without doctrine and clear options. Striedter's mime was an interpretation of Ėikhenbaum's theory of the formalist method centering on dynamics, transformability, relinquishing of doctrine and self-correction. And he follows Ėikhenbaum:

> We do not have a complete system, a closed doctrine, and we never did. In our scientific work we value theory only as a working hypothesis used for discovering facts and meaning, both in their regularity and as material for research. Therefore we eschew definitions, so necessary for epigones, and general theses, so beloved by eclectics. We formulate concrete principles und stick to them if they are verified by the material. If the material calls for their differentiation or transformation, we change and differentiate the principles. In this sense we are independent of our own theories. There is no finished science – science does not take place in the postulation of truths but in the surmounting of errors. (Striedter 1969, XIV)

In the role of a clown, Striedter enacted, as it were, the opposition between the nomological-empirical and the historical-hermeneutical (though it is not Shklovskii's knight's move that he enacted). Supported by arguments, he turned his performance into a verbal text. In this form it is documented in the proceedings of the conference on "The Comic" (Striedter 1976). The argument for alternative solutions, the self-correction, the positing of principles and their surmounting sound like a disclosure of formalist methods. As a formalist clown, Striedter managed to lead the conference – usually a rather stiff discussion group around an oval table – to a 'new seeing' (*novoe videnie*); he addressed the group as "Esteemed Ladies and Gentlemen" (Striedter 1976, 390) and even managed to make them laugh.

After moving to Harvard, Striedter took part in influential literary debates as a lively and much sought-after participant, consistently presenting formalist positions for discussion.

11 Conclusion

Striedter managed to connect the two aspects of theory in his account: its semantics and its syntax. The semantics is more figurative in the sense of the production of concepts, the syntax is narrative. An interpretation of semantics looks at the forming of concepts, their figurativeness; the syntactic aspect means that a theory about topics like literature is using an argumentative discourse, a theoretical narrative. Striedter analyzed both the discourse and the narrative.

As authors of the introductions to the two volumes on Russian formalism, Striedter and Stempel considered it their task to project the central positions of formalism onto an existing or just evolving field of discussion. They saw themselves as mediators who also intervened retrospectively in the theoretical discussion of the formalists. This is what makes their introductions so challenging. They both were concerned with emphasizing the openness, incompleteness and compatibility of formalist positions. In other words: the anti-doctrinaire quality of a theory.

Translated by Martin Richter

References

Erlich, Victor. *Russian Formalism: History – Doctrine*. The Hague: Mouton, 1955.

Erlich, Victor. *Russischer Formalismus*. Munich: Hanser, 1964.

Grimm, Reinhold. "Verfremdung. Beiträge zu Wesen und Ursprung eines Begriffs." [1961] *Verfremdung in der Literatur*. (*Wege der Forschung* 551). Ed. Hermann Helmers. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1984. 183–215.

Hansen-Löve, Aage. *Der russische Formalismus: Methodologische Rekonstruktion seiner Entwicklung aus dem Prinzip der Verfremdung*. Vienna: Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1978.

Heselhaus, Clemens. "Brechts Verfremdung der Lyrik." *Immanente Ästhetik, ästhetische Reflexion: Lyrik als Paradigma der Moderne*. (*Poetik und Hermeneutik* Vol. II). Ed. Wolfgang Iser. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1966. 307–326.

Jolles, André. *Einfache Formen: Legende, Sage, Mythe, Rätsel, Spruch, Kasus, Memorabile, Märchen, Witz*. Halle: Niemeyer, 1930.

Kohler, Gun-Britt (ed.). *Blickwechsel: Perspektiven der slavischen Moderne. Festschrift für Rainer Grübel*. Munich: Sagner, 2010.

Lachmann, Renate. "Die 'Verfremdung' und das 'Neue Sehen' bei Viktor Šklovskij." *Poetica* 3 (1970): 226–249.

Lachmann, Renate. "Migration der Konzepte." *Blickwechsel: Perspektiven der slavischen Moderne. Festschrift für Rainer Grübel*. Ed. Gun-Britt Kohler. Munich: Sagner, 2010. 19–44.

Lämmert, Eberhard. *Bauformen des Erzählens*. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1955.

Maurer, Karl. "Zu dieser Zeitschrift." *Poetica* 1 (1967): 1.

Novalis. *Schriften*. Vol. III: *Das philosophische Werk* II. Eds. Paul Kluckhohn and Richard Samuel. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1968.

Spitzer, Leo. "Les études de style et les differents pays." *Langue et littérature: Actes du VIIIe Congrès de la Féderation Internationale des Langues et Littératures modernes*. Paris: Les belles lettres, 1961. 23–38.

Stempel, Wolf-Dieter. "Zur formalistischen Theorie der poetischen Sprache." *Texte der russischen Formalisten*. II: *Texte zur Theorie des Verses und der poetischen Sprache*. Eds. Jurij Striedter, Wolf-Dieter Stempel, and Inge Paulmann. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1972. IX–LIII.

Striedter, Jurij. "Transparenz und Verfremdung. Zur Theorie des poetischen Bildes in der russischen Moderne." *Immanente Ästhetik, ästhetische Reflexion: Lyrik als Paradigma der Moderne*. (*Poetik und Hermeneutik* Vol. II). Ed. Wolfgang Iser. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1966. 263–296.

Striedter, Jurij. "Zur formalistischen Theorie der Prosa und der literarischen Evolution." *Texte der russischen Formalisten*. I: *Texte zur allgemeinen Literaturtheorie und zur Theorie der Prosa*. Eds. Jurij Striedter and Wolf-Dieter Stempel. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1969. IX–LXXXIII.

Striedter, Jurij. "Der Clown und die Hürde." *Das Komische*. (*Poetik und Hermeneutik* Vol. VII). Eds. Wolfgang Preisendanz and Rainer Warning. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1976. 389–398.

Striedter, Jurij. *Die Fragmente des Novalis als "Präfigurationen" seiner Dichtung*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1985.

Tschiževskij, Dmitrij. "Wiedergeburt des Formalismus? In welcher Art?" *Immanente Ästhetik, ästhetische Reflexion: Lyrik als Paradigma der Moderne*. (*Poetik und Hermeneutik* 2). Ed. Wolfgang Iser. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1966. 297–305.

Wissmann, Jürgen. "Collagen oder die Integration von Realität im Kunstwerk." *Immanente Ästhetik, ästhetische Reflexion: Lyrik als Paradigma der Moderne*. (*Poetik und Hermeneutik* Vol. II). Ed. Wolfgang Iser. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1966. 327–360.

Jessica Merrill
The North American Reception of Russian Formalism

Russian formalism was a heterogeneous movement, which was initially developed within two separate societies – The Society for the Study of Poetic Language (Obshchestvo po izucheniiu poeticheskogo iazyka, OPOIaZ) and the Moscow Linguistic Circle, MLC (Moskovskii lingvisticheskii kruzhok, MLK) – beginning in the mid-1910s. Although the core formalists (Osip Brik, Boris Ėikhenbaum, Roman Jakobson, Viktor Shklovskii, and Iurii Tynianov) developed their ideas in close collaboration with each other, their writings did not build off of a set of shared presuppositions. In his *Russian Formalism: A Metapoetics* (1984) Peter Steiner concludes that Russian formalism was "not the sum total of its theories [...] but a *polemos*, a struggle among contradictory and incompatible views" (Steiner 1984, 259; see also Steiner 1982). Furthermore, as Ėikhenbaum stressed in his well-known summary and defense of the movement, the formalists were constantly "evolving" in their thinking (Ėikhenbaum 1971 [1927], 3). This heterogeneity is an important factor in assessing the historical reception of the movement. When Russian formalism was introduced to an English-speaking audience after World War II there was an array of possible positions (e. g. Shklovskii's view or Tynianov's), and moments (e. g. writings from the 1910s or 1930s) that could be selected as the center point for constructing a coherent narrative. (See also Igor Pilshchikov's chapter on Russian formalism in this volume.)

This chapter begins with a brief synopsis of what I will call the 'canonical reception narrative' for Russian formalism currently found in English-language textbooks and encyclopedias of literary theory. The second section presents an alternative, summary narrative. This serves to highlight that the canonical narrative is a product of the reception history of Russian formalism, not a given. The third and fourth sections identify the forces that shaped the introduction of Russian formalism to an English-speaking audience in the 1950s and 1960s. I seek to explain why the canonical narrative emerged as it did, and how it was solidified in the 1970s as mainstream North American literary studies began to shift away from literary theory towards cultural studies.

1 The canonical narrative: Literary autonomy as difference

Entries on Russian formalism in encyclopedias or introductions to literary theory often introduce the movement by stressing the concept of "autonomy" and a methodology of contrastive differentiation. For example, we read that: "the Formalists' ambition was to establish an autonomous science of literature," and that they "insisted on the autonomy of literature and, by implication, of literary study" (Thompson 1985, 152). This stress on the autonomy of literature and literary studies is given as the primary goal of the movement. This raises the question: how did the formalists seek to demonstrate this autonomy? An answer routinely provided in these overviews goes as follows, "Formalism emerged as a distinctly independent school in Russian literary scholarship […] by focusing attention on the analysis of distinguishing features of literature"; that is, "on the differences between poetic and practical language" (Kolesnikoff 1993, 53). For the formalists, "literature is a 'special' kind of language, in contrast to the 'ordinary' language we commonly use" (Eagleton 1996, 4). Or, "The specificity of literature […] is embodied in 'special' formal procedures, techniques, and patterns […] These patterns are perceived as different from 'ordinary' forms of textual organization" (Margolin 2005, italics added). To summarize, what one finds persistently foregrounded in English-language overviews of Russian formalism are two interrelated claims: (1) Russian formalism sought to establish the 'autonomy' of literature and literary studies by (2) seeking to identify the features that differentiate literary (also 'poetic', 'special', 'artistic') discourse from non-literary (also 'prosaic', 'ordinary', 'practical') discourse.

2 An alternative narrative: Psychological parallelism

Summaries of formalist theory that stress the importance of isolating and differentiating poetic language often refer to Lev Iakubinskii's contributions to the first OPOIaZ collections. His articles, published in 1916 and 1917, focused on the sounds of poetic language, differentiating them from non-poetic ('practical') language on empirical grounds. For example, he argued that the general tendency towards the dissimilation of similar liquid sounds ('r', 'l') is not observed in poetic language. This allowed him to claim that "the fate of the accumulation of liquid sounds in practical and poetic language shows to what extent these two language

systems are different" (Iakubinskii 1986 [1917], 180). His arguments suggested that poetic language can be thought of as an autonomous language system, empirically differentiated from non-poetic language.

This claim was not universally accepted by the formalists, however. At an April 1919 meeting of the MLC, Roman Jakobson and Osip Brik debated the concept of poetic language. The minutes of the meeting suggest that Jakobson opposed Iakubinskii's approach, arguing that: "in general one must not think of poetic language and practical language as two sharply differentiated spheres. One can speak only of two tendencies, whose endpoints are antipodes" (Institut Russkogo Iazyka 1919). Jakobson (1969 [1923], 16–17) would dispute Iakubinskii's claims in print in 1923. The idea that literary form is autonomous was also not a principle universally accepted by the formalists. In Jakobson's and Petr Bogatyrev's survey, *Slavianskaia filologiia v Rossii za gody voiny i revoliutsii* (1923, *Slavic Philology During the Years of War and Revolution*) they articulate the differences between OPOIaZ and the MLC. The authors report that, while the "one group" – the MLC – "proves the necessity of a sociologically grounded history of the development of artistic forms, the other [OPOIaZ] insists on the complete autonomy of these forms" (Jakobson and Bogatyrev 1923, 31). These disputes indicate that, among the formalists, there was no single orthodox position on the concepts of literary autonomy and poetic language.

How can we summarize Russian formalism in a less restrictive way, so as to accommodate these disagreements? Rather than begin with the claim that Russian formalist theory was motivated by the question: what makes poetry different from non-poetry?, we can substitute this for a broader research question: what is poetry? When answering this question, the formalists relied on arguments derived from the psychology of cognition. At the turn of the twentieth century, the relevant psychological discourse centered on debates about how 'ideas' or 'images' are organized in the mind (today, cognitive psychology is defined as the study of how people perceive, learn, remember, and think about information). In her groundbreaking book *Istoki russkogo formalizma: Traditsiia psikhologizma i formal'naia shkola* (2005, *The Origins of Russian Formalism: The Tradition of Psychologism and the Formal School*), Ilona Svetlikova has demonstrated that nineteenth-century associationist psychology was essential for the emergence Russian formalist theory. Associationism was a movement which argued that mental processes and mental structure result from the ability to associate ideas. Association was understood to follow basic laws; the most universal of which were widely held to be the laws of contiguity and similarity. As Svetlikova has shown, the formalists adhered to the widely held associationist premise that conceptual associations based on similarity were more creative than those made on the basis of contiguity, which were more conservative. The latter were thought to be responsible for habits and

clichés, and the former for inventive mental activity including artistic creativity (Svetlikova 2005, 87–92).

Roman Jakobson, for example, described poetry as a mode of cognition using the terms of associationist psychology. In his "Noveishaia russkaia poeziia" (1921, "The Newest Russian Poetry", 1979), he refers to different modes of "linguistic thought" ("iazykovoe myshlenie") – practical, emotional, and poetic – and suggests that these can be defined by the kinds of associations which are operative in the mind (Jakobson 1979 [1921], 304). In poetic and emotional language, Jakobson stresses, "habitual associations of contiguity [*assotsiatsii po smezhnosti*] retreat into the background"; "in poetry the role of mechanical association [*mekhanicheskaia assotsiatsiia*] is reduced to minimum" (Jakobson 1979, 330). Viktor Shklovskii likewise defined art as a mode of cognition, which he described using the neologism *ostranenie* (defamiliarization) (Shklovskii 1985 [1929], 14). Like Jakobson, he describes this as a process in which mechanical associations are disturbed: "in order to make an object a fact of art, it is necessary [...] to remove (*vyrvat'*) the thing from the series of customary associations (*riad privychnykh assotsiatsii*) in which it is located" (Shklovskii 1985 [1929], 79). How does poetry disrupt these habitual associations? The formalists assumed that verbal art is a product the cognitive process whereby stimuli are associated with each other on the basis of their perceived similarities (the law of similarity). The manifestation of this tendency in verbal form was referred to as parallelism. In this, the formalists were extending (while critiquing) the work of Aleksandr Veselovskii, particularly his study "Psikhologicheskii parallelizm i ego formy v otrazheniiakh poeticheskogo stilia" (1898, "Psychological Parallelism and its Forms in the Reflection of Poetic Style", 2011). Parallelism, for these scholars, was the juxtaposition of two units of language on the basis of perceived similarities between them.

I propose that Russian formalist theory can be summarized as a number of theoretical extensions building off of this idea. I will briefly identify three primary extensions: the identification of 'devices' (*priemy*); the study of poetic production; and the descriptive analysis of individual works. My summary does not purport to account for all of Russian formalist theory, but this framework can be extended to include works and authors not mentioned here. The first extension is that of comparative poetics. This includes efforts to identify a range of 'devices.' For the formalists, these devices all have parallelism as a kind of common denominator. For example, Jakobson writes that:

> Poetic language possesses a certain rather elementary device (*priem*): the device of the convergence (*sblizheniia*) of two units of speech. In the area of semantics, varieties of this device are: parallelism; simile – a particular case of parallelism; metamorphosis, that is, a parallelism developed in time; and metaphor, that is, a parallelism reduced to a single

point. In the area of euphony modifications of the device include: rhyme, assonance, and alliteration (or, more broadly speaking, sound repetition). (Jakobson 1979 [1921], 336)

Here Jakobson describes an array of techniques of verbal art – simile, metaphor, assonance, rhyme – as manifestations of parallelism as 'the' elementary device. Shklovskii makes a similar claim in his seminal study, "Sviaz' priemov siuzhetoslozheniia s obshchimi priemami stilia" (1919, "The Relationship between Devices of Plot Construction and General Devices of Style"). Contrasting "art" with "practical thought" (*prakticheskoe myshlenie*), he writes that

art [...] is based on stepped gradation and the disintegration of even those things which are presented abstract and indivisible. Stepped construction includes: repetition – with its particular case, rhyme, tautology, tautological parallelism, psychological parallelism, deceleration, epic repetitions, the triadic repetition of folktales, peripeteia, and many other devices of plot construction (*siuzhetnost'*). (Shklovskii 1985 [1929], 33)

Shklovskii's conclusion is that: "we see that that which in prose can be designated as 'a', in art is expressed by 'A1 A' (for example, psychological parallelism). This is the soul of all devices" (Shklovskii 1985 [1929], 37). In these passages we find the distinction between 'poetic' and 'practical' that was stressed in the canonical reception narrative. However, by calling attention to the cognitive psychological underpinnings of their arguments, we can frame the opposition between poetic and practical language somewhat differently. This is not an opposition between two fixed corpora; the formalists did not construct arguments by contrasting examples of 'practical' and 'poetic' speech. Instead they started with cognitive tendencies (i. e. the laws of association) and then looked for formal manifestations of the law of similarity by identifying an array of devices derived from parallelism. The Russian formalists found these devices in political rhetoric and in advertising, as well as in verse. The analyses of the 'devices' of Vladimir Lenin's speeches published by Shklovskii, Èikhenbaum, and Tynianov demonstrate that the identification of 'devices' is not equivalent to the contrastive differentiation of poetic versus non-poetic language (Èikhenbaum 1924; Shklovskii 1924; Tynianov 1924).

The second extension of psychological parallelism I want to mention is the study of the production of verbal art. Shklovskii, who was invested in production as a writer and a creative writing instructor, frequently approached the study of narrative structure from this perspective. This is indicated by his theoretical terminology; his goal is to elucidate the laws of "plot construction" (*siuzhetoslozhenie*) (Shklovskii 1985 [1929], 27). Shklovskii repeatedly describes the process of production as placing one "piece" (*kusok*) next to another. For example, he writes that "in an artistic work, in addition to elements which consist of borrowings,

there is also an element of creation (*tvorchestvo*), commonly known as the will of the creator (*volia tvortsa*), who is constructing the work, by taking one piece and placing it next to other pieces" (Shklovskii 1985 [1929], 54). Elsewhere, Shklovskii specified that the juxtaposition of pieces ought to prompt a feeling of "contradiction" (*protivorechie*): "The sense of the unity (*slitnost'*) of a literary work is, for me, replaced by a feeling of the value of the individual piece. Rather than unifying the pieces, I am more interested in their contradictions" (Shklovskii 1990a [1928], 381). Shklovskii's 'pieces' are juxtaposed as parallels, that is, according to perceived similarities. As he explains in "Iskusstvo kak priem" (1917, "Art as Device"), parallelism is not just about similarity, but about similarity in difference: "in parallelism what is important is the feeling of a lack of convergence despite similarity" (Shklovskii 1985 [1929], 20). In sum, in Shklovskii's account of narrative production, this process is driven by the mental process of similarity association. This view is comparable to Jakobson's description of verbal production in the "poetic function" as the projection of "the principle of equivalence from the axis of selection into the axis of combination" (Jakobson 1987 [1960], 71). This is a statement about verbal production; the selection and combination of units of speech.

The third extension of Russian Formalist work on parallelism is the description of individual works or discrete corpora of verbal art. In this kind of study similarity associations are employed as an analytic lens. One of the best-known examples of this kind of analysis is Jakobson's article on Baudelaire's "Les Chats" (1857, "The Cats"), co-authored with Claude Lévi-Strauss in 1962 (Jakobson and Lévi-Strauss 1987 [1962]). In contrast to the first extension described above as the identification of devices, this kind of analysis tended towards minute descriptions of parallelism within a work, rather than the identification of 'devices' (derived from parallelism) found across diverse examples. Jakobson was committed to the study of parallelism throughout his career. As he reported in his dialogs with Krystyna Pomorska, recorded when he was in his 80s, "there has been no other subject during my entire scholarly life that has captured me as persistently as have the questions of parallelism" (Jakobson and Pomorska 1988 [1980], 100). In his 1966 article, "Grammatical Parallelism and its Russian Facet," Jakobson demonstrated how the 'parallelistic texture' of a single work could be analyzed not just on semantic and phonological levels, but also at the level of grammar: syntax; nominal gender, animacy, and case; and verbal tense and aspect. Jakobson described parallelism as: "a system of steady correspondences in composition and order of elements on many different levels; syntactic constructions, grammatical forms and grammatical categories, lexical synonyms and total lexical identities, and finally combinations of sounds and prosodic schemes" (Jakobson and 1988 [1980], 102–103). Some of these levels, such as the repetition of entire lines of

verse ('total lexical identities'), are relatively obvious to any perceiver. Other levels require training in linguistics to perceive. Jakobson's analyses range across these different levels, treating them as equal. This was criticized by Michael Riffaterre, who argued that the perception of equivalences on the order of words or phrases is categorically different from perceived grammatical similarities; the latter are constituents which can be identified by a linguist, but are not perceptible to an ordinary reader (Riffaterre 1980 [1966], 31). This critique highlights the fact that Jakobson's work on grammatical parallelism can be seen as resulting from a particular (linguistic) mode of perception: the use of similarity associations as an analytic lens for describing a discrete text.

In sum, it is possible to summarize Russian formalism as (at least) three extensions of the study of psychological parallelism: as comparative poetics (identification of devices); as poetic production; and as the linguistic description of works (as invariants and variables). In the reception of formalism in the US after World War II these three extensions were not treated as equally valid, but were instead incorporated into a narrative of progress, in which the third extension was seen as the most accurate, surpassing other kinds of Formalist research.

3 The North American reception of Russian formalism

English translations of Russian formalist texts and English-language publications on the movement began to appear in significant numbers only in the early 1970s. David Gorman's bibliography of English-language resources relating to Russian formalism (1992; supplemented 1995), lists twelve anthologies of Russian formalist texts; of these, only one was published before 1970. The English-language publications on or related to Russian formalism available before 1970 included: Victor Erlich's *Russian Formalism: History, Doctrine* (1955, revised 1965); Vladimir Propp's *Morfologiia skazki* (1958, *Morphology of the Folktale*); Lee Lemon and Marion Reis' *Russian Formalist Criticism: Four Essays* (1965); Roman Jakobson's *Selected Writings: Phonological Studies* (1962) and *Selected Writings: Slavic Epic Studies* (1966); Krystyna Pomorska's *Russian Formalist Theory and its Poetic Ambiance* (1968). Other impactful introductions to Russian formalism from this period were found in: René Wellek and Austin Warren's *Theory of Literature* (1949) and Lev Trotskii's critique of the movement in *Literatura i revoliutsiia* (1923, *Literature and Revolution*, 1925, Trans. Rose Strunsky). In this short list one can already see indications of the forces that shaped the reception of Russian formalism in the 1950s and 1960s. I began this chapter by noting that formalism was a protean, difficult-to-synthesize

movement. In its English-language reception it was adapted to two more familiar theoretical movements: New Criticism and structuralism. I will focus first on the influence of New Criticism, and then turn to the influence of Roman Jakobson and the amalgamation of formalism with structuralism. These were two separate developments, yet they converged in shaping the reception of Russian formalism.

The emergence of New Criticism in the US is dated to around 1923. As with Russian formalism, scholars stress the diversity of the movement. Wellek, for example, asserts that "the view that the New Criticism represents a coterie or even a school is mistaken [...] Ransom, Tate, Cleanth Brooks, and R. P. Warren may be grouped together as Southern Critics. Burke and Blackmur stand apart, and Yvor Winters was a complete maverick" (Wellek 1978, 613). New Criticism emerged as an alternative to the methods of philology and literary history, which had dominated academic literary studies in the US since the 1890s. John Crowe Ransom, in his seminal "Criticism, Inc." (1937) proposed, as an alternative, that literary 'criticism' should be "seriously taken in hand by professionals," and that the field should "receive its own charter of rights and function independently" (Ransom 1937, 588, 600). Over the course of the 1930s, the program for an independent and professionalized criticism established itself not only against academic philology, but against other modes of criticism. The New Critics emphatically rejected what they called 'moral' criticism, particularly Marxist or Marxist-informed criticism. Gerald Graff mentions, as examples, R. P. Blackmur's 'attack' on Granville Hicks's *The Great Tradition* in 1935, and Cleanth Brooks' critique of Edmund Wilson's *Modern Poetry and the Tradition* in 1939. As Graff summarizes, by the end of the 1930s, the New Critics came to embrace a position that: "literature had no politics except as an irrelevant extrinsic concern" (Graff 2007 [1987], 150). Simplifying some, the New Critics defended this position by arguing that no statement of a poet's thought can be separated from the total communication of the poem as a complex whole. By the mid–1950s, "the New Criticism was identified with the formalist study of an individual, autonomous text which was displaced from any sense of context" (Jancovich 1993, 5).

The New Critical approach was often referred to as 'intrinsic' criticism, a term which relies on its opposite: 'extrinsic' criticism. This division was widely employed, and organized, for example, Warren and Wellek's *Theory of Literature* (1956 [1948]) – a textbook described as having "exercised a profound influence on the teaching of and research into literature at university level" in the 1950s and 1960s (van Rees 1984, 504). Their book divides the study of literature into an "extrinsic approach," with chapters on literature and biography, psychology, society, ideas, and the "intrinsic study" of literature with chapters on prosody, style, symbolism and myth, and genre (Warren and Wellek 1956 [1948], xi). Wellek's considerable knowledge of Czech structuralism (as a former member of the

Prague Linguistic Circle), and of Russian formalism allowed him to weave references to these movements into the book's arguments throughout. With the onset of the Cold War in the 1950s, the New Critics' opposition to extrinsic, Marxist-informed analyses was foregrounded as an important commonality with Russian formalism. For instance, writing in 1955, Victor Erlich referred to an anti-Soviet political alliance between New Criticism and Russian formalism:

> Russian Formalism is not necessarily a thing of the past. 'Formalist' activities in Russia, and subsequently in other Slavic countries, could be prohibited by bureaucratic fiat. But many Formalist insights outlasted the totalitarian purge as they found new lease on life in kindred movements on the other side of the 'Marxist-Leninist' iron curtain. (Erlich 1955, 241)

This equation of the two movements as political allies ignores the intellectual and political context which informed the emergence of Russian formalism in the late 1910s and early 1920s – a time when some formalist leaders, such as Osip Brik and Viktor Shklovskii, voluntarily and enthusiastically allied themselves with the revolutionary movement. What was more important, in the US after the 1950s, was that Russian formalism had ultimately been repressed by Stalin in the 1930s. The impulse to think in terms of the oppositions 'intrinsic-extrinsic,' and 'formalism-Marxism,' overpowered many important differences between Russian formalism and New Criticism. The most obvious of these is that the movements adhered to incompatible methodologies and rationales for their scholarship (Thompson 1971, 152). The New Critics were primarily interested in literary interpretation and literary criticism, while the Russian Formalists were committed to the study of poetics and literary theory. Simplifying some, this meant that while the New Critics sought to elucidate the meanings created by literary works, the formalists eschewed interpretative questions–focusing instead on identifying poetic devices found in many works (i. e. poetics). Moreover, while the New Critics saw their task as the evaluation of a literary work as better or worse than others (what they called literary or aesthetic judgment), the formalists vehemently rejected this kind of value judgment as unscholarly. Their understanding of literary theory was modeled on the 'value-free' social sciences and linguistics.

Nevertheless, the introductory English-language scholarship on Russian formalism often sought to explain the foreign movement by pointing to possible analogies with New Criticism. The most obvious example is the important anthology *Russian Formalist Criticism: Four Essays* (Lemon and Reis 1965; 2012 [2nd edition]), which for decades was the primary resource for Russian formalism in English. Subsequently published English-language anthologies, although more extensive and compiled by specialists, have still not been cited nearly as often (according to a Google scholar search). The editorial commentary and introductions in the *Four Essays* volume supplied by Lee T. Lemon and Marion J. Reis,

consistently seek to explain Russian formalism through the lens of New Criticism. Their "Introduction" begins by noting that

> an English-speaking reader going through the early works of the Formalists will often feel that, despite differences of names and details of arguments, he is on familiar ground. With the necessary adjustments, he recognizes some of the concepts of the New Critics, their strategies, and 'even their enemies' (Lemon and Reis 1965, xix; emphasis added).

Helping the reader to make these adjustments throughout, the editors suggest a series of analogies: Vissarion Belinskii and Nikolai Chernyshevskii are equivalent to Matthew Arnold and Paul Elmer More; A. A. Potebnia is like I. A. Richards, A. N. Veselovskii like R. S. Crane (Lemon and Reis 1965, xx, xxi, xxii). Commentary on the articles themselves often fuses the voices of the formalists with their New Critical counterparts: Shklovskii makes the same point as Richards; Tomashevskii is like Kenneth Burke and Warren; Jakobson is close to Ransom; Tynianov to Brooks, etc. (Lemon and Reis 1965, 5, 61, 95, 127, 130). The translation of Russian formalism into English is, in effect, the translation of the movement into the language and conceptual framework of New Criticism. Today, the association of the two movements is well established in surveys. For example, a popular textbook edited by David H. Richter, *The Critical Tradition*, issued in three editions (1989, 1998, 2007), introduces Russian formalism along with New Criticism and Chicago Neo-Aristotelianism under the heading of "Formalisms." The rationale for grouping these movements together, is that:

> all three versions of formalism proposed an 'intrinsic' criticism that defined and addressed the specifically literary qualities in the text, and all three began in reaction to various forms of 'extrinsic' criticism that viewed the text as either the product of social and historical forces or a document making an ethical statement (Richter 2006, 699).

In sum, we find in English-language translations, anthologies, and scholarship on Russian formalism an overwhelming tendency to amalgamate the movement with New Criticism. Formalism was received as an ally of the New Critics in their opposition to extrinsic (i. e. socially-minded or Marxist) criticism. This meant that important sociological, conceptual, and methodological differences between the movements were overlooked. Instead, the aspects of the formalist legacy which seemed most compatible with New Criticism were foregrounded: the conceptual center of Russian formalism was located in its proto-Structuralist or even Czech-Structuralist 'phase'.

This second trend in the reception history of Russian formalism is intertwined with the career of Roman Jakobson. Jakobson's influence on this history was considerable, as he was the only member of the original core group of formalists to leave the Soviet Union and establish contacts in Central and Western Europe

and in the United States. Moreover, Jakobson was a masterful institution builder. After co-founding the MLC in the 1910s, Jakobson moved to Czechoslovakia in 1920, where he was influential as a co-founder of the Prague Linguistic Circle, and as a leading theorist of Czech structuralist linguistics and semiotics. In 1941, Jakobson arrived in New York as a refugee from Nazi-occupied Europe. He initially taught at the École Libre des Hautes Études and at Columbia University in the 1940s, but by 1951 Jakobson would take up the teaching and research positions at Harvard University and at MIT that he would hold until his retirement. The two monographs on Russian formalism that appeared in English before 1970 were both written by Jakobson's students. Victor Erlich's book began as a dissertation advised by Jakobson while he was at Columbia, and Krystyna Pomorska's book was begun under Jakobson's supervision at MIT before they were married in 1962. Jakobson's considerable influence on Erlich's understanding of Russian formalism is candidly described in the latter's 2006 memoir. For instance, Erlich includes the following assessment of his dissertation by another faculty member: "few dissertations have an epic hero. This dissertation has got one. His name is Roman Jakobson" (Erlich 2006, 135).

It is impossible to pinpoint one person's role in a complex historical process. Yet, one place we can potentially identify Jakobson's influence is in the reiteration of his discursive formulations in the work of his students. Jakobson presented the history of formalism as a structuralist overcoming of earlier mistakes. For instance, in the 1930s, Jakobson told his students in Brno that:

> in the earlier works of Shklovskii, a poetic work was defined as a mere sum of its artistic devices, while poetic evolution appeared nothing more than a substitution of certain devices. With the further development of Formalism, there arose the 'accurate' (*správný*) conception of a poetic work as a structured system, a regularly ordered hierarchical set of artistic devices. (Jakobson 1978 [1935], 85; emphasis added)

Jakobson creates a narrative in which the 'earlier' theory – associated with Viktor Shklovskii–produced simplistic scholarship which has been surpassed by a more 'accurate,' structuralist, approach. There is arguably a personal factor at play here, in that Shklovskii and Jakobson had once been close friends and collaborators, but by the mid-1920s had become rivals. This rivalry was transposed into Erlich's *Russian Formalism*, where Shklovskii's work is treated in a dismissive tone, something that Erlich later attributed "in part" to his "thesis advisor's slant on his former comrade-in-arms" (Erlich 2006, 133). Even more importantly, the teleological narrative of progress from an 'early' Shklovskian formalism towards a more 'accurate' Jakobsonian structuralism informs Erlich's book throughout; articulated in statements such as: "Russian formalism 'at its best' was or tended to be Structuralism" (Erlich 1980 [1965], 200; emphasis added).

This narrative of progress has remained central to summaries of formalism for decades. For instance, an entry in the *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory* breaks Russian formalism into two "phases" and goes on to state that the "inadequacies of the early formalists' approach to literature were threefold": it was too "mechanistic," "ahistorical," and insisted on "too strict a separation of literature from life" [...] "Most of these inadequacies were eliminated in the second phase of formalism..." (Kolesnikoff 1993, 56). A more recent entry echoes this assessment, without the overt evaluative judgment: "the initial perspective was aestheticist, ahistorical, reductive, and mechanistic and is associated with the early Shklovskii" (Margolin 2005). In this narrative of progress, Shklovskii is firmly associated with the "inadequate," "early" phase, and Jakobson and Tynianov are championed as the authors of the more advanced phase (Margolin 2005).

Privileging the branches of Russian formalist theory that were most compatible with structuralism facilitated the conceptual convergence of Russian formalism with New Criticism. As exemplified by Erlich, this could be done by picking out moments of organicist thinking in the two movements:

> we find that the version of New Criticism which comes closest to the Formalist-Structuralist methodology is the trend represented by Cleanth Brooks and Robert Penn Warren. This approach, which is often described as 'organistic' [...] parallels in many crucial respects the later phase of Slavic Formalist theorizing. The emphasis on the organic unity of a work of literature, with the concomitant warning against the 'heresy of paraphrase', a keen awareness of the 'ambiguity' of poetic idiom [...] all this reminds one of Tynianov and Jakobson in their later phases and of the Prague Linguistic Circle. (Erlich 1980 [1965], 275)

As suggested by Erlich's use of the hyphenated amalgamation 'Formalist-Structuralist', the convergence between formalism and New Criticism went alongside the convergence between formalism and structuralism. The prevalence of organicist thinking for the New Critics – the tendency to describe poems metaphorically as organic bodies, totalities, or wholes – is well-established, and is commonly traced to the influence of the English romantic poet Samuel Coleridge. While Czech structuralist linguistics described language as a system, not as an organism, the popular simplification of structuralism as asserting that "language is a system in which 'tout se tient': in which everything is inextricably related to everything else," has allowed for a perceived convergence between structuralism and organicism (Culler 1975, 13). For instance, in an essay on structuralist linguistics, Ernst Cassirer summarized that "language" is "organic in the sense that [...] it forms a coherent whole in which all parts are interdependent upon each other. In this sense, we may even speak of a poem, a work of art, of a philosophic system as 'organic'" (Cassirer 2007 [1945], 310; for the influence of biological theories on Czech Structuralism see Seriot 2001, 214–231).

To return to my suggestion that Russian formalism can be summarized as three extensions of psychological parallelism, we can see that these extensions were not received as equally valid. Preference was shown for work which was compatible with organicist thinking. Jakobson's descriptive analyses of individual works were perceived as complimentary to a New Critical agenda: both isolated an individual text, treated as an autonomous or organic whole, in order to explicate the intricacies of its structure. In their analysis of "Les Chats," Jakobson and Lévi-Strauss describe the poem as "consist[ing] of systems of equivalences which fit inside one another and which offer in their totality, the appearance of a closed system" (Jakobson and Lévi-Strauss 1987 [1962], 195). This kind of work could be seen as a supplement to the goals of New Critical literary studies. For example, in a favorable review of Jakobson's analysis of grammatical parallelism in Shakespeare's sonnet 129 "Th' expence of Spirit..." (1609), I. A. Richards suggested that Jakobson's "unchallengeable" description can be taken as evidence for the judgment of this sonnet as one of "topmost rank" (Richards 1970, 589). Jakobson's focus on individual works, or corpora, as systems, allowed his extension of parallelism to appear compatible with the expectations for literary scholarship in North America established in the 1930s.

This was not true for Shklovskii's extension of parallelism as the study of poetic/narrative production. An indication of this can be found in the English translation of the sentence in Shklovskii's "Plot Construction" study cited above. In this quote, Shklovskii is describing the process of narrative production as the placement of one 'piece' after another. In his translation of this passage Benjamin Sher added a new clause ("as an integral whole") to the end of the sentence. The Russian reads:

> В художественном произведении, кроме тех элементов, которые состоят из заимствований, существует еще элемент творчества, известной воли творца, строящего произведение, берущего один кусок и ставящего его рядом с другими кусками. (Shklovskii 1985 [1929], 54)

Sher's translation reads:

> Apart from elements which consist of borrowings, a work of art also contains an element of creativity, a force of will driving an artist to create his artifact piece by piece 'as an integral whole'. (Shklovskii 1990b [1929], 41; italics added)

This addition is unmotivated by the text of the original. Moreover, it overrides Shklovskii's rejection of the concept of the literary work as a 'unity' elsewhere in *Theory of Prose*. Shklovskii writes, for example, that "the unity (*edinstvo*) of a literary work is probably a myth" (Shklovskii 1985 [1929], 215). One way of explaining

this addition is that Sher is making Shklovskii's theory more compatible with the New Criticism and/or with structuralism. The apparent need to rewrite Shklovskii in the English translation suggests the extent to which the dominant reception narrative for Russian formalism, which privileged the proto-structuralist work of Tynianov and Jakobson, created expectations which were projected onto the movement as a whole.

4 The poetic language debates

In this last section I will focus on a particular moment in the reception of Russian formalism which served to solidify the amalgamation of formalism to New Criticism and structuralism and to entrench the canonical narrative of autonomy and differentiation found in summary articles. This was a debate in the 1970s over the relationship between linguistics and literary studies, which centered on the question of 'poetic language.' The debate was conducted, in part, on the pages of *New Literary History*, which devoted special issues to the *The Language of Literature* (1972) and to the question: *What Is Literature?* (1973). This debate can be seen as a further step in the synthesis of Russian formalism with New Criticism and with structuralism, motivated by the perception that these movements could all be seen as allied intrinsic approaches in opposition to extrinsic scholarship. In the debate over poetic language a number of broader disagreements were implicitly at stake. An attack on the foundations of an allegiance between literary studies and linguistics (e. g. Jakobsonian linguistic poetics) could be seen as preparatory to advocating a preferred allegiance with the study of culture. The challenge to a linguistic definition of literature could be seen as a challenge to elitist definitions of the literary canon in favor of a broader object of study. In these debates the reception history of Russian formalism became intertwined with the shift in American literary studies away from New Criticism towards a Marxist-informed cultural studies.

In the 1970s debates, the opposition between the intrinsic and extrinsic camps was articulated as positions in favor of, and opposed to, an empirical distinction between 'poetic' and 'ordinary' language. The legacy of Russian formalism came to stand for a defense of this binary opposition, while the anti-formalist camp sought to dissolve it. This is evident from the titles of articles alone: e. g. Stanley Fish's "How Ordinary is Ordinary Language?" (1973) or Manuel Duran's "Inside the Glass Cage: Poetry and 'Normal' Language" (1972). One of the most extended and explicit statements of the anti-formalist position can be found in Mary Louise Pratt's *Towards a Speech Act Theory of Literary Discourse* (1977), which begins with a chapter devoted to a strident critique of Russian formalism and Czech

structuralism titled "The 'Poetic Language' Fallacy". For Pratt, this fallacy is equivalent to the: "belief that literature is linguistically autonomous, that is, possessed of intrinsic linguistic properties which distinguish it from all other kinds of discourse" (Pratt 1977, xii). Pratt sees that this fallacy is the central legacy of Russian formalism and Czech structuralism, movements which she treats as a single entity. Moreover, she stresses that:

> the poetic language doctrine which I am trying to refute constitutes the main area of overlap between structuralist poetics and Anglo-American "New" [...] criticism. Regardless of their differences, there is no question that both structuralist poetics and New Criticism foster essentially the same exclusivist attitude toward the relation between literary discourse and our other verbal activities. This affinity no doubt accounts for the ease and enthusiasm with which structuralist poetics was received on this side of the Atlantic in the 1950s and 1960s. (Pratt 1977, xiv–xv)

Pratt's critique of this poetic language 'doctrine' or 'fallacy', is both ethical and empirical. She argues that the division of poetic from ordinary language is based on elitist prejudices inherited from Romantic and Symbolist poetic movements, and she seeks to show that the devices found by Russian formalists in 'poetic' language are also found in 'ordinary' language, such as in oral narrative (Pratt 1977 xvi–xix, 68). In doing so, she refers for support to William Labov's *Language in the Inner City* (1972) and Labov's and Joshua Waletzky's "Narrative analysis: Oral versions of personal experience" (1997).

It is notable that the critique of formalism which accompanied the rejection of literary theory (e. g. structuralism) in favor of cultural studies (e. g. New Historicism) within mainstream Anglo-American literary studies is reiterated almost verbatim in summaries of Russian formalism found in encyclopedias and textbooks. This apparent consensus around the 'autonomy' and 'differentiation' narrative, as I hope to have shown, is a product of the historical reception of Russian formalism – impacted by a Cold War understanding of intrinsic versus extrinsic criticism, and by the amalgamation of Russian formalism with New Criticism and structuralism along these lines. My alternative summary which suggests that Russian formalism can be seen as a movement departing from the psychology of cognition provides grounds to challenge Pratt's critique (Merrill 2017). More importantly, my understanding of Russian formalism is part of a broader effort to reinterpret the movement in a way that restores its connections with cultural history, biography, and politics (see, for example, Kalinin 2016; Levchenko 2012; Tihanov 2019; Svetlikova 2005). It is to be hoped that this research will eventually reshape the reception narrative for Russian Formalism not only within the field of Slavic Studies, but in the broader domain of Anglo-American literary academic studies.

References

Cassirer, Ernst. "Structuralism in Modern Linguistics." [1945] Ernst Cassirer, *Aufsätze und Kleine Schriften*. Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 2007. 299–320.

Culler, Jonathan. *Structuralist Poetics: Structuralism, Linguistics and the Study of Literature*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975.

Eagleton, Terry. *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. 2nd edition. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.

Ėikhenbaum, Boris. "Osnovnye stilevye tendentsii v rechi Lenina." *LEF* 1.5 (1924): 57–70.

Ėikhenbaum, Boris. "The Theory of the Formal Method." [1927] *Readings in Russian Poetics: Formalist and Structuralist Views*. Eds. Ladislav Matejka and Krystyna Pomorska. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1971. 3–27.

Erlich, Victor. *Russian Formalism: History-Doctrine*. The Hague: Mouton, 1955.

Erlich, Victor. *Russian Formalism: History-Doctrine*. 2nd edition [1965]. The Hague: Mouton, 1980.

Erlich, Victor. *Child of a Turbulent Century*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2006.

Gorman, David. "A Bibliography of Russian Formalism in English." *Style* 26.4 (1992): 554–576.

Gorman, David. "Supplement to a Bibliography of Russian Formalism in English." *Style* 29.4 (1995): 562–567.

Graff, Gerald. *Professing Literature: An Institutional History* [1987]. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2007.

Iakubinskii, Lev. "Skoplenie odinakovykh plavnykh v prakticheskom i poėticheskom iazykakh." [1917] Lev Iakubinskii, *Iazyk i ego funktsionirovanie*. Moscow: Nauka, 1986. 176–182.

Institut Russkogo Iazyka. Arkhiv Moskovskogo lingvisticheskogo kruzhka. Fund 20, item 2, list 62, June 28, 1919.

Jakobson, Roman. "Grammatical Parallelism and Its Russian Facet." *Language* 42.2 (1966): 399–429.

Jakobson, Roman. *O cheshskom stikhe preimushchestvenno v sopostavlenii s russkim* [1923]. Providence, RI: Brown University Press, 1969.

Jakobson, Roman. "The Dominant." [1935] *Readings in Russian Poetics: Formalist and Structuralist Views*. Eds. Ladislav Matejka and Krystyna Pomorska. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1978. 82–87.

Jakobson, Roman. "Noveishaia russkaia poėziia – Nabrosok pervyi: Postupy k Khlebnikovu." [1921] Roman Jakobson, *Selected Writings*. Vol. 5: *On Verse, Its Masters and Explorers*. Ed. Stephen Rudy. The Hague: Mouton, 1979. 299–354.

Jakobson, Roman. "Linguistics and Poetics." [1960] Roman Jakobson, *Language in Literature*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987. 62–94.

Jakobson, Roman, and Petr Bogatyrev. *Slavianskaia filologiia v Rossii za gody voiny i revoliutsii*. Berlin: OPOIaZ, 1923.

Jakobson, Roman, and Krystyna Pomorska. *Dialogues* [1980]. Trans. by Christian Hubert. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1988.

Jakobson, Roman, and Claude Lévi-Strauss. "Baudelaire's 'Les Chats'." [1962] Roman Jakobson, *Language in Literature*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987. 180–197.

Jancovich, Mark. *The Cultural Politics of the New Criticism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Kalinin, Il'ia. "Viktor Shklovskii versus Roman Jakobson: Voina iazykov." *Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta* 9.3 (2016): 55–63.

Kolesnikoff, Nina. "Russian Formalism." *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory: Approaches, Scholars, Terms*. Ed. Irene Makaryk. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993. 53–59.

Lemon, Lee T., and Marion J. Reis (eds.). *Russian Formalist Criticism: Four Essays*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1965.

Levchenko, Ian. *Drugaia nauka: Russkie formalisty v poiskakh biografii*. Moscow: Vysshaia shkola ėkonomiki, 2012.

Margolin, Uri. "Russian Formalism." *The Johns Hopkins Guide to Literary Theory and Criticism*. 2nd edition. Eds. Michael Groden, Martin Kreiswirth, and Imre Szeman. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005. https://litguide.press.jhu.edu (15 February 2022).

Merrill, Jessica. "Historical Poetics and Poetic Language: Rethinking the Concept of Autonomy for Modern Literary Theory." *Poetics Today* 38.3 (2017): 519–548.

Pratt, Mary Louise. *Toward a Speech Act Theory of Literary Discourse*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1977.

Ransom, John Crowe. "Criticism, Inc." *The Virginia Quarterly Review* 13.4 (1937): 586–602.

Richards, I. A. "Jakobson's Shakespeare: The Subliminal Structures of a Sonnet." *Times Literary Supplement* 28.5 (1970): 589–590.

Richter, David H. "Formalisms." *The Critical Tradition: Classic Texts and Contemporary Trends*. Ed. David H. Richter. Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2006. 699–716.

Riffaterre, Michael. "Describing Poetic Structures: Two Approaches to Baudelaire's Les Chats." [1966] *Reader-Response Criticism: From Formalism to Post-Structuralism*. Ed. Jane Tompkins. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980. 26–40.

Seriot, Patrick [Patrik Serio]. *Struktura i tselostnost': ob intellektual'nykh istokakh strukturalizma v Tsentral'noi i Vostochnoi Evrope*. Trans. by N. S. Avtonomova. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskoi kul'tury, 2001.

Shklovskii, Viktor. "Lenin, kak dekanonizator." *LEF* 1.5 (1924): 53–56.

Shklovskii, Viktor. *O teorii prozy* [1929]. Ann Arbor, MI: Ardis, 1985.

Shklovskii, Viktor. "Gamburgskii Shchet." [1928] Viktor Shklovskii, *Gamburgskii schet: Stat'i – vospominaniia – esse (1914–1933)*. Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1990a. 331–446.

Shklovskii [Shklovsky], Viktor. "The Relationship between Devices of Plot Construction and General Devices of Style." [1929] Viktor Shklovskii, *Theory of Prose*. Trans. Benjamin Sher. Elmwood Park, IL: Dalkey Archive Press, 1990b.

Steiner, Peter. "The Roots of Structuralist Aesthetics." *The Prague School: Selected Writings, 1929–1946*. Ed. Peter Steiner. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1982, 174–219.

Steiner, Peter. *Russian Formalism: A Metapoetics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1984.

Svetlikova, Ilona. *Istoki russkogo formalizma: Traditsiia psikhologizma i formal'naia shkola*. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2005.

The Language of Literature. Special Issue of *New Literary History* 4.1 (1972).

Tihanov, Galin. *The Birth and Death of Literary Theory: Regimes of Relevance in Russia and Beyond*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2019.

Thompson, Ewa. *Russian Formalism and Anglo-American New Criticism: A Comparative Study*. The Hague: Mouton, 1971.

Thompson, Ewa. "Formalism." *Handbook of Russian Literature*. Ed. Victor Terras. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1985. 151–154.

Tynianov, Iurii. "Slovar' Lenina-Polemista." *LEF* 1.5 (1924): 81–110.

van Rees, C. J. "'Theory of Literature' Viewed as a Conception of Literature: On the Premises Underlying Wellek and Warren's Handbook." *Poetics* 13 (1984): 501–533.

Veselovskii, Aleksandr. "Psikhologicheskii parallelizm i ego formy v otrazheniiakh poeticheskogo stilia." [1898] *Izbrannoe: Istoricheskaia poetika*. Ed. I. O. Shaitanov. St. Petersburg: Universitetskaia kniga, 2011. 417–508.

Wellek, René. "The New Criticism: Pro and Contra." *Critical Inquiry* 4.4 (1978): 611–624.

Wellek, René and Austen Warren. *Theory of Literature* [1948]. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1956.

What Is Literature? Special Issue of *New Literary History* 5.1 (1973).

II.3 Phenomenology in German-speaking Areas, Russia, Czechoslovakia, and Poland

Patrick Flack
Phenomenology in German-Speaking Areas and in Russia

The contributions of phenomenology to the study and theory of literature are as numerous as they are diverse in their perspectives. For over a century – as long as modern literary theory itself –, phenomenological conceptions of literature have circulated in very different cultural and intellectual contexts, crystallising in highly varied shapes and forms: from the early writings on language and aesthetics of Edmund Husserl to Jacques Derrida's deconstructions of the text or Henri Maldiney's interpretation of the literary work as 'compelling the impossible' (*contrainte à l'impossible*), without forgetting the subtle ontological analyses of Roman Ingarden, the hermeneutic approach of Gustav Shpet, Martin Heidegger's idea of poetry as world disclosure, Jean-Paul Sartre's existential literature or Maurice Merleau-Ponty's fascination for the 'speaking word' (*parole parlante*). This diversity derives of course primarily from the longevity and the dynamic, international nature of the phenomenological movement itself, which spread quickly from its early German epicentre to Russia, Central Europe, France, Italy or North America, and which underwent thereby a constant, radical process of reflexive criticism and deepening of its own methodological assumptions. Because phenomenology constantly evolved and was profoundly transformed by its successive reappraisals and transfers – in particular from pre- and inter-war Germany to post-war France –, it is but to be expected that its approach to literature would mirror this complex development.

Beyond its own internal diversity, phenomenology is also remarkable for the recurrent and essential role it played in the dynamic system of exchanges and transfers that powered both the rise and the evolution of literary theory as a discipline. At various points in time and to varying degrees, phenomenological ideas provided impetuses that were crucial to the development of many of the major traditions of literary theory (Russian and German formalism, structuralism and post-structuralism, materialist dialectics, hermeneutics, reader-response criticism, deconstruction, etc.). To take here but the clearest examples, one can mention the productive confrontation between Russian formalism and Gustav Shpet (Shapir 1994) or Jakobson's evocations of a phenomenological framework to anchor his conception of *poetic language* (Holenstein 1975; Fontaine 1994). Similarly, the conceptual debt owed to phenomenology by the Geneva School, Wolfgang Iser's and Hans-Robert Jauss's reader-response criticism, Hans Blumenberg's metaphorology or Derrida's deconstruction is so obvious that these are more often than not directly categorised as 'phenomenological' (Magliola 1977; Lobsien 2012).

Neither the manifold of phenomenological ideas on literature nor their contributions to the main schools of literary theory, however, can hide the fact that no autonomous, 'specifically' phenomenological literary theory seems to exist. Although there is no doubt that the likes of Husserl, Heidegger, Ingarden, Sartre or Merleau-Ponty can be grouped together under the banner of 'phenomenology', it is not clear that their writings and ideas on literature are connected by more than their common participation to phenomenology as a general philosophical project. This problem is compounded by the often 'peripheral' nature of most phenomenologists' interest in literature and, especially, in its theorisation. Husserl himself did not write on literature and only very sparingly on the topics of art and aesthetics (Sepp and Embree 2010; Steinmetz 2011). Even in the cases of Heidegger, Sartre or Merleau-Ponty, for whom literature played a much greater role, reflexions on this subject are always subsumed to their wider philosophical project. Only Ingarden seems to have pursued the aim of explicitly formulating or contributing to a 'theory of literature'. Within phenomenology, literature thus often appears only as a particular object upon which to direct (specific types of) phenomenological inquiry and to confirm general phenomenological intuitions about existence, perception, expression, the life-world, Being, etc. Even in the rather lax terms in which one can refer to a 'formalist literary theory', it is thus hardly convincing to talk of a 'phenomenological literary theory' – as is also confirmed by the partial nature of the few attempts to provide an overview of phenomenology's ties with literature and literary theory (Konstantinović 1973; Magliola 1977; Vandevelde 2010; Lobsien 2012).

These preliminary remarks are important insofar as they free us both from the utopian requirement of providing an account of phenomenological contributions to literary theory as a coherent, unified tradition and from the need to consider much of the phenomenological thinking *on* or *about* literature that does not clear the threshold of at least aiming towards a 'systematic' literary theory. Given the specific perspective of this volume, we can turn instead to the moments where phenomenology did encroach upon and contribute to literary theory as such, and where the general patterns of trans-cultural, trans-disciplinary exchanges that characterise both their histories are revealed most clearly. We propose to briefly explore here just three examples of such moments in the German-speaking world and in Russia. Interestingly, none of these examples are particularly well-known, suggesting how much of phenomenology's century-long entanglement with literary theory, along with the precise extent of literary theory's methodological and philosophical debt to phenomenology, all still need to be explored and clarified.

1 From phenomenological aesthetics to reader response theory

Our first example revolves around the early attempts to derive or articulate an 'objective' theory of literature directly from the principles of phenomenology. The name most commonly associated with this approach is of course that of Roman Ingarden, thanks in particular to his seminal work, *Das literarische Kunstwerk* (1931, *The Literary Work*). In many anthologies of literary theory, Ingarden's study is presented as the first consequent application of Husserlian phenomenology to the domains of aesthetics and literature – and, as such, both as the most convincing realisation of a phenomenological theory of literature *and* the most obvious, direct phenomenological source of inspiration for the development of new criticism and reader response theory amongst others. This relatively straightforward intellectual genealogy between Husserl, Ingarden and later phenomenological approaches (Iser, Blumenberg, etc.) is still at work in one of the most recent attempts, made by Eckhard Lobsien (2012), to cast light on the conceptual significance of phenomenology for literary theory. While there can be no doubting the operative reality of the theoretical bond linking Husserl to Ingarden and Iser, Jauss or Blumenberg, however, a closer look reveals this single line to be but the best-known thread of a larger network.

First of all, one needs to remember that Ingarden's was not the first attempt to articulate a theory of literature in the terms of Husserlian phenomenology: such an attempt is to be found much earlier, in Waldemar Conrad's "Der ästhetische Gegenstand: eine phänomenologische Studie" ("The Aesthetical Object: A Phenomenological Study"), published in 1908 in the *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* (*Journal for Aesthetics and the General Science of Art*). A student of Husserl in Göttingen just like Ingarden himself, Waldemar Conrad (1878–1915), explicitly sets out in his essay "to apply the so-called 'phenomenological' method to the field of aesthetics" (Conrad 1908, 71). After a short methodological introduction, which he bases largely on Husserl's *Logische Untersuchungen* (1900–1901, *Logical Investigations*), Conrad turns to a more detailed investigation of various arts, namely music, literature (*Wortkunst*), and painting, in order "to establish the essence of the 'aesthetical object' [*ästhetischer Gegenstand*] in general" (Conrad 1908, 80). The entire second part of his study is devoted exclusively to literature and provides an extensive phenomenological discussion of the essential features of the literary object as such.

The interest of Conrad's little-known article lies not so much in the fact that it predates *The Literary Work*, but in the contextualisation it provides to the project of applying Husserlian phenomenology to the study of aesthetics and literature

also pursued by Ingarden. As mentioned, Conrad's article appeared in the pages of the *Journal for Aesthetics and the General Science of Art*, a journal in which many other early phenomenological contributions to 'aesthetics' or 'literary theory' also feature. One can mention here in particular Moritz Geiger and his important study "Phänomenologische Ästhetik" (1925, "Phenomenological Aesthetics"), but also a raft of other figures such as Maximilian Beck, Antonio Banfi, Fritz Kaufmann and, of course, Ingarden himself. Additionally, the *Journal of Aesthetics and General Science of Art* contains numerous reviews both by phenomenologists and of phenomenological texts, which all contribute to firmly bind the budding phenomenological aesthetics to other contemporary schools and traditions.

In this sense, the *Journal of Aesthetics and General Science of Art* provided a 'privileged' forum for the development of a phenomenological aesthetics (Henckmann 1972, Flack 2016), which itself was 'crucial' to Ingarden's phenomenology of the literary work. Indeed, the principles laid out by Conrad – in particular his focus on the essence of the aesthetic object and its definition as 'ideal' and 'intentional' – were taken up by Geiger and Ingarden and used as a basis for their own theories (Henckmann 1972, Krenzlin 1998). To be more precise, while Conrad provided a first impetus marked by a rather crude Platonic interpretation of Husserl's *Logical Investigations*, Geiger and Ingarden sought to improve his definition of the 'intentional aesthetic object', leading them eventually to Ingarden's famous 'stratification model' (*Schichtenmodell*). These improvements, it is important to note, came not from a study of individual literary works, but from reflexions of a philosophical nature on the features of the aesthetic object in general and the phenomenological method itself. In stark contrast to the Russian formalists, for whom philosophical models were only ever but a tool to support their 'specifications' of concrete literary works and traditions, the early phenomenological approach to literature was defined by its focus on clarifying the methodological conditions and principles of an objective study of aesthetic objects in general.

Crucially, in the forum of the *Journal of Aesthetics and General Science of Art*, methodological reflexions on the 'nature of aesthetics' and the 'aesthetic object' were not conducted exclusively in a phenomenological perspective, but in the animating spirit of the two initiators of the journal, Max Dessoir and Emil Utitz. That spirit was defined in turn primarily by two guiding principles: to establish a scientific, objective approach to aesthetics and the general science of art, *and* to do this on the basis of a "disintegration of disciplines" (Henckmann 1972, xv), in which various approaches, ranging from psychological (Volkelt, Hamann) or empirical aesthetics (Lipps) to idealist philosophy (Croce) and of course phenomenology, could be confronted with each other. As such, the development of a phenomenological aesthetics itself was conditioned and strongly influenced by other sources than Husserl. Theodor Lipps and his theory of empathy (*Einfühlung*) is

particularly prominent. But the most interesting figure, the tradition he brings to bear, are Utitz and the School of Brentano.

Like Conrad, Emil Utitz (1883–1956) is an almost forgotten figure. A Jewish-German philosopher and specialist of aesthetics born in Prague, he was a student there of the Brentanians Anton Marty and Christian von Ehrenfels and later became close to the Munich phenomenologist Geiger. In his most important work, the two-volume *Grundlegung der allgemeinen Kunstwissenschaft* (1914–1920, *Foundation of a General Science of Art*), Utitz clarifies one of the fundamental insights of the *Journal of Aesthetics and General Science of Art*, which is to separate the field of 'aesthetics' proper from that of the 'general science of art'. Geiger (1922) provided a positive review of this work in the pages of the *Journal* itself. To a certain extent, although it is inspired primarily by Brentanian psychology, Utitz's aesthetics can even be considered phenomenological (Henckmann 1972) and is on many points hard to distinguish from the theories of Geiger and Ingarden. Indeed – again according to Henckmann – Utitz was among the first to take steps towards an Ingardenian 'stratification model'. In short, Utitz's role in the development of a phenomenological aesthetics confirms that it emerged not solely – and to some extent not even primarily – out of Husserlian phenomenology, but that it also had strong roots in the ideas of Lipps, Munich phenomenology and Brentanian psychology.

All these elements are interesting enough in themselves, revealing as they do both a more intricate and more specifically psychological and realist genesis of Ingarden's literary theory within the phenomenological movement. But the addition of Utitz also allows us to make a further interesting connection. Besides playing an important role for Ingarden, Utitz was indeed also a major influence on the Czech structuralist Jan Mukařovský (Henckmann 1972, xix). This sudden convergence with structuralism is less surprising than it seems when one remembers that Utitz's Brentanian teachers, Marty and Ehrenfels, were also precursors of structuralist thought: Ehrenfels with his contribution to Gestalt psychology, Marty with his distinction between 'categorematic' and 'syncategorematic' terms and concepts of *inner form* (significant also for Shpet). As an aside, Marty's categorematic/syncategorematic distinction – which distinguishes terms that can have a meaning on their own (e. g. nouns), from those who need to be used together with others (e. g. pronouns) – was also important both for Husserl's fourth *Logical Investigation* (itself significant for Jakobson), and for an interesting analysis of the literary notion of 'tension' (*Spannung*) put forward by Gustav Hübener – another Göttingen student of Husserl – which anticipates in many ways Tynianov's conception of *dominant* and *constructive factor*.

Of course, given Utitz's own obscurity and the generally selective interest afforded to Mukařovský – focussing more on his links with the Prague Linguistic

Circle and the Czech Herbartian tradition of aesthetics (Zich, Hostinsky, etc.) – the personal and conceptual ties between Utitz and Mukařovský have not been explored at length. That they share conceptual affinities, however, and that their theoretical efforts converged is borne out in interesting fashion by the fact that, next to Ingarden, they both attracted the interest of none other than the reader response theorists. Mukařovský, as is well-known, was an important influence for Jauss in particular (Striedter 1989, 221–229); as for Utitz, it is worth noting that the only significant re-edition of one of his works, the *Foundation of a General Science of Art*, is to be found in the *Theorie und Geschichte der Literatur und der schönen Künste* (*Theory and History of Literature)* series directed by Jauss, Iser and Max Imdahl. In summary, rather than the bearer of an independent, uniquely phenomenological theory of literature taking its place in a relatively clear sequence of successive, separate schools of literary theory, Ingarden's work thus appears to have constituted a node that was tightly integrated in a complex network of personal and conceptual exchanges that partially collapses our usual distinctions both between disciplines (ontology, aesthetics, psychology, literary theory itself) and intellectual traditions (phenomenology, Brentano School, structuralism, reader response theory).

2 'Formal' phenomenology

Our second example of phenomenology's entanglement with literary theory is its critical encounter with Russian formalism. The main actor of this encounter is the philosopher Gustav Shpet (1879–1937), yet another student of Husserl in Göttingen. As is well documented, Shpet introduced Husserl's thought in Russia (Haardt 1993; Dennes 1998), in particular through his major work, *Iavlenie i smysl* (1914, *Appearance and Sense*, 1991), published in 1914. In this work, Shpet did more than simply present Husserl's philosophy, but already critically engaged with it and developed his own, largely original interpretation. Although nominally focussed on the *Logical Investigations*, Shpet's reading is already markedly influenced by the *Ideas* (1913), a fact that sets him apart from Conrad, Geiger or Ingarden, who remained famously sceptical of Husserl's 'transcendental' turn. Indeed, with its inspirations taken from Hegel, Humboldt, and the tradition of Hermeneutics (Tihanov 2009), the phenomenological theory put forward by Shpet could in many ways not be further apart from the objective and realist project of the *Journal of Aesthetics and the General Science of Art*.

While it set the scene for phenomenology in Russia, moreover, *Appearance and Sense* is not primarily concerned with matters of aesthetics, let alone liter-

ature. It is only in later works, by turning to aesthetics (*Esteticheskie fragmenty*, 1923, *Aesthetics Fragments*) and elaborating on the question of language (*Vnutren-niaia forma slova*,1927, *Inner Form of the Word*), that Shpet put forward a philoso-phy of poetry and provided elements for a literary theory. These later texts are less explicitly phenomenological, drawing rather on sources such as Humboldt, Marty and Alexandr Potebnia. As Maryse Dennes has shown, however, the main features of Shpet's philosophy (in particular his addition of a third type of 'intelligible' intuition [*intelligibel'naia intuitsiia]* to Husserl's binary distinction), remained stable both throughout his forays into linguistics and aesthetics and his turn to other disciplines and intellectual traditions (Dennes 1998). As such, it is correct to interpret Shpet's later contributions on literature as having an essentially phe-nomenological origin. That said, one cannot fail to notice that his path towards a theory of literature is one that led him ever further away both from Husserl and from phenomenology itself. His objective, in contrast to Conrad's project, was not to apply Husserlian ideas to aesthetics and literature, but to cement and deepen his own original understanding of phenomenology and his ideas on the poetic function of language.

In itself, Shpet's approach is quite typical of the way most phenomenologists dealt with the problem of literature, namely as a 'peripheral' object or domain whose analysis could strengthen their own interpretation of phenomenological philosophy. Thanks in particular to his confrontation with Russian formalism, however, Shpet's approach does raise a number of very interesting questions as to the relation between phenomenology and literary theory. In effect, it is well known that Shpet and his formal-philosophical school became increasingly antagonistic towards the Russian formalists, refuting some of their major meth-odological positions – in particular their thrust towards isolating literature or 'lit-erariness' (*literaturnost'*) as an autonomous object of inquiry. There are of course many reasons for this antagonism, which revolves around issues – such as the relation of literature or art to other spheres (social, cultural, political) – that were of particular relevance in the Soviet context of the 1920s. But, as is made clear in a number of articles by Shpet's colleague Rozalija Shor (1894–1939), one of the core disagreements at the heart of the dispute – over the essentially expressive or communicative, social essence of language – could be and was articulated in specifically phenomenological terms.

In a first article, "Vyrazhenie i znachenie: Logisticheskoe napravlenie v sovre-mennoi lingvistike" (1927, "Expression and Signification: The Logicist Trend in Modern Linguistics"), Shor sets out to critically comment Husserl's *Logical Inves-tigations*, interpreting them in a clearly 'Shpetian fashion' and focussing on the inter-subjective foundations of the essential relation – the 'inner form' – between *expression* (or expressive linguistic sign) and *signification*. As her article makes

abundantly clear, because of the relative autonomy of the expressive sign as an arbitrary symbol, the relation between expression and signification needs to be methodologically explained and guaranteed by a stable, collectively shared socio-cultural tradition of mutual understanding. In a second article, published in the same year, "Formal'nyi metod na zapade" (1927, "The Formal Method in the West"), she then attacks Roman Jakobson, condemning the central role he attributes to the 'disruptive', 'autotelic' function of poetic language, which in her eyes renders 'expression' too independent from 'signification' and from its roots in socio-culturally stabilised forms of linguistic meanings.

Shor's opposition to Jakobson – which she formulates in the language of Husserl's phenomenology and which itself implicates the fundamental way in which the Russian formalists decided to define poetical language, namely through its autotelic, defamiliarising properties focussed on linguistic expression itself – are already puzzling in themselves. It is widely acknowledged, indeed, that Jakobson was sympathetic to the teachings of phenomenology, and particularly those of the *Logical Investigations* (Holenstein 1975). It is also thanks to Shpet himself, during his frequentation of the Moscow Linguistic Circle, that Jakobson was acquainted with phenomenology (Haardt 1993). Furthermore, one could add, Jakobson's conception of language does seem to share many of Shpet's concerns. Nonetheless, it is also clear that one of the central planks of his conception of 'poetic language', its autotelic, self-reflexive nature, is diametrically opposed to Shpet's concept of 'expression', which is always intrinsically tied to 'signification' (by contrast, for Jakobson 'expression' and 'signification' are only functionally related). In that sense, Shor is fully justified in emphasising a radical difference between Jakobson's and her own, 'Shpetian' reading of Husserl.

This confusing picture is further muddled when one takes into consideration the work of Maksim Kenigsberg (1900–1924), a scholar who died prematurely and is absent from canonical accounts of both Russian formalism and literary theory. Kenigsberg was a member of the Moscow Linguistic Circle, specialising in poetry and verse studies. A student of Shpet, he put forward a theory of verse of phenomenological inspiration. Indeed, Maksim Shapir goes so far as to speak of Kenigsberg's "Phenomenology of Verse" (Shapir 1994). The most stunning feature of this phenomenology of verse, which certainly warrants its mention here, is that it is eerily similar to the verse theory put forward at about the same time by Iurii Tynianov (Shapir 1994). As Shapir notes, there is no suggestion of mutual influence between the two scholars, only the clear conceptual similarities of their theoretical conclusions. But even this pure convergence – to which one could add the both phenomenological and almost Tynianovian analysis by Gustav Hübener of the concept of *tension* (Hübener 1913) – is enough to put us in front of the following paradox: how could a formalist theory of verse, elaborated well within the

framework set out by the Society for the Study of Poetic Language (Obshchestvo izucheniia poėticheskogo iazyka, OPOIaZ), end up being similar if not identical with verse theories derived from Shpet's or Husserl's phenomenology – which, as we just saw through Shor's polemic with Jakobson, differ from it precisely on the phenomenological question of the 'expressiveness' or 'poeticity' of language?

Such questions will obviously not find a definitive answer here, but they do pinpoint one crucial fact, already visible in the apparently seamless switching between phenomenological, structuralist and Brentanian traditions observable in the context of the *Journal of Aesthetics and General Science of Art*: methodological and philosophical models were not being applied rigorously or dogmatically by figures such as Geiger, Utitz, Shpet or Jakobson, but used to experiment with new approaches and new definitions of aesthetic, literary and linguistic objects. Points of disagreements on specific aspects, for example the exact nature of the link between poetic expression and signification, did not preclude moving sometime closer together (Kenigsberg, Tynianov), or sometime taking explicitly divergent paths (Jakobson, Shor). All this obviously relativises and problematises the role of phenomenology as a 'conceptual source' or 'framework' for literary theory. Indeed, phenomenology can be seen here playing a flexible, filigrane role – providing impetus all while almost divesting itself of its own principles (for example by veering towards Marty and hermeneutics in Shpet's philosophy) or running in parallel to non-phenomenological theories (such as Tynianov's analyses of verse), but then re-emerging (in Kenigberg's work or in Jakobson's later Prague period) as a sort of constant, fixed conceptual orientation point.

3 'Neo-Kantian' phenomenology and structuralism

One can further trace this persistent, yet complex and flexible presence of phenomenology within the field of literary theory in our third example, which is concerned with the relation between phenomenology and structuralism. Much of the exchanges between these two traditions, of course, happened on the terrains of philosophy of language, linguistics and aesthetics, in Prague, both within the Prague Linguistic Circle – which Husserl famously graced with his presence – and through the Prague School linguists' exchanges with the Brentanian and phenomenological *Cercle philosophique de Prague* (Kozák, Kraus, Landgrebe, Patočka, Utitz, etc). On both these geographical and disciplinary counts, these exchanges fall mostly outside the scope of this chapter. Some of the most interesting insights into the convergences and meeting of structural and phenomenological approaches

to the study of literature, however, are provided by another – yet again relatively 'obscure' – figure, the Dutch philosopher and linguist Hendrik Pos (1898–1955).

A student of Husserl and of the neo-Kantian philosopher Heinrich Rickert in Freiburg, Pos was one of the most significant philosophical interlocutors of the Prague School (Fontaine 1994). He published an important article, "Perspectives du structuralisme" (2013 [1939], "Perspectives on Structuralism"), in the volume of the *Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Prague* (*Works of the Linguistic Circle of Prague*) commemorating Trubetskoi, in which he comments favourably on the epistemological and explanatory potential of structural linguistics and phonology. Conversely, both Trubetskoi and Jakobson referred to Pos as an important philosopher of language, whom they saw, alongside Karl Bühler and Marty, as having paved the way for phonology (Trubeckoi 1936; Jakobson 1974). In his dissertation, *Zur Logik der Sprachwissenschaft* (*The Logic of the Language Sciences*), published in 1922, Pos had indeed sought to put linguistics on a philosophical footing and, although he did not do this from an explicitly structuralist point of view (his main inspiration and point of orientation was the transcendental idealism of his master Rickert), his efforts led to a theory of linguistics with striking similarities (and important differences) with Saussure's *Cours de linguistique générale* (1916, *Course in General Linguistics*) (Salverda et al. 1991).

Furthermore, Pos's real claim to being included here derives as much from his relation with the Prague structuralists as from the fact that he is also the author of philological work in which he specifically sought to apply phenomenological methods to the study of literature. In his *Kritische Studien über philologische Methode* (1923, *Critical Studies on Philological Method*), published just one year after his dissertation, he gives a strong phenomenological turn to his neo-Kantian approach, precisely while moving from the study of language in general to the specific investigation of literature and poetic language. In a certain way, Pos's methodological intention in *Critical Studies on Philological Method* seems to match that of Conrad, namely to directly apply the principles of phenomenological philosophy to literary objects. Pos's outlook, however, also differs significantly from Conrad's: most obviously, Pos doesn't rely on aesthetics as an intermediary discipline, starting off instead from the 'linguistic' framework outlined in his dissertation.

The detail of Pos's philologico-phenomenological analyses, which – as far as we can tell – had strictly no impact on the development of literary theory, will only interest us here because of the general framework for applying phenomenology to linguistic and literary objects they formulate and demonstrate. For Pos, linguistic as well as literary or philological inquiry require a double perspective, that of the 'objective scientific fact' on the one hand, and of the 'living, experiencing subject' on the other. Only in their combination, for example by taking into account the objective grammatical description of a language and the subjective experience of

a speaker, is it possible to provide a complete, adequate account of language. This double principle, which imposes a strong neo-Kantian twist to the ideas of phenomenological 'reduction' and 'eidetic description' (Willems 1998), also applies to the analysis of literary facts. In that sense, there is a certain continuity in Pos's approach in *The Logic of the Language Sciences* and *Critical Studies on Philological Method:* which mixes neo-Kantian and phenomenological methodological principles to account both for general linguistic and specifically literary objects.

The strong neo-Kantian element in Pos's phenomenological approach is highly interesting in relation to our two first examples of entanglements between phenomenology and literary theory. On the one hand, the context of the *Journal of Aesthetics and the General Science of Art* was indeed characterised by the almost complete absence in its midst of neo-Kantian approaches, such as for example the philosophy of art of Broder Christiansen, a figure who was of course in turn very important for the Russian formalists. On the other hand, much more than phenomenology or any other philosophical model, neo-Kantianism – and in particular Rickert – seems to have provided the basic methodological framework for Russian formalism, as witnessed either by the indirect influences of Christiansen and Belyi's Rickertian reinterpretation of Potebnia, or by the direct mentions of neo-Kantian epistemology by figures such as Ėikhenbaum or the commentator of Russian Formalism Boris Ėngelgardt. Lest one forget, it is precisely and explicitly to Pos's particular, neo-Kantian brand of phenomenology – even more than to Husserl himself – that Trubetskoi and Jakobson refer in the 1930s, i. e. in the already mature period of Prague structuralism and phonology (Trubeckoi 1936; Jakobson 1974).

All these contrasts and convergences, obviously, cannot lead us here to any kind of strong conclusions on the complex web of relationship between neo-Kantianism, phenomenology and structuralism as competing *or* complementary 'frameworks' of literary theory (or indeed as 'paradigms' for the human sciences). But they do emphasise even more strongly the paradoxical extent to which phenomenology – whether as a general methodological framework or as the provider of punctual insights for example on the expressive structure of language or the nature of the aesthetic object – seems to only have been operative within the field of literary theory through its hybridisation with other perspectives (Brentano, hermeneutics, neo-Kantianism, structuralism, etc.). At the same time, they also highlight how phenomenology accompanied the development of literary theories and approaches much more consistently and persistently than any other epistemological or philosophical traditions. This last observation is only strengthened by looking at the post-war history of literary theory, whose development is even less conceivable without the fundamental inputs of Heidegger, Merleau-Ponty or Derrida.

In conclusion, one might be tempted to simply reiterate our introductory remarks, now confirmed by a few more examples: in Germany and Russia, phenomenology played a constant role in the development of literary theory, without however ever crystallising into a literary theoretical tradition or school in its own right. Because literature or indeed aesthetics and the arts were rarely one of its main concerns, phenomenology seems to have mostly evolved independently of literary theory, providing a renewed source of insights on language, perception or experience on the one hand, but also only managing to apply these insights to literary phenomena by crossing over into other traditions and abandoning some of its own tenets on the other hand. In this interpretation, one obtains a slightly more complex and detailed picture, in which phenomenology remains only marginally relevant to literary theory, as an episodic 'dynamiser' and 'provider' of conceptual insights, but also as a mostly independent, fundamentally philosophical tradition.

The entanglements of phenomenology with literary theory we have detailed here, the fact that these entanglements have been mostly ignored and overlooked, and the productive tensions they have revealed even between the different ways of applying phenomenological methods of analysis to literary phenomena, however, point towards another possible interpretation. All this suggests indeed that a better assessment of the transformations undergone by phenomenology in its moments of entanglement with the Brentano School, structuralism or neo-Kantianism on the specific field of literary theory – coupled in particular with a better contextual and comparative analysis of the relation of these moments to each other – would perhaps allow us to inscribe them in a 'coherent historiographical narrative'. This in turn could modify our understanding of what phenomenology itself owes not only to its encounters with literature or poetry, but to its recurrent, if hybrid attempts to theorise literary and poetic phenomena.

References

Conrad, Waldemar. "Der ästhetische Gegenstand 1: Eine phänomenologische Studie." *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 3 (1908): 71–118.

Dennes, Maryse. *Husserl – Heidegger: Influence de leur oeuvre en Russie*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 1998.

Flack, Patrick. "Phänomenologische Ästhetik und die allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft." *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft (Neue Serie)* 61.2 (2016): 329–344.

Fontaine, Jacqueline. "Le Cercle linguistique de Prague au carrefour des cultures." *Revue germanique internationale–ancienne série* 1 (1994): 183–192.

Geiger, Moritz. "Review of *E. Utitz, Grundlegung der allgemeinen Kunstwissenschaft*." *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 16 (1922): 399–406.

Geiger, Moritz. "Phänomenologische Ästhetik." *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 19 (1925): 29–42.

Haardt, Alexander. *Husserl in Rußland: Phänomenologie der Sprache und Kunst bei Gustav Špet und Aleksej Losev*. Munich: Fink, 1993.

Henckmann, Wolfhart. "Vorwort." *Grundlegung der allgemeinen Kunstwissenschaft*. Ed. Emil Utitz. Munich: Fink, 1972. vii–xlvii.

Holenstein, Elmar. *Roman Jakobsons phänomenologischer Strukturalismus*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1975.

Husserl, Edmund. *Logische Untersuchungen*. Vols. 1 & 2. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1901–1902.

Hübener, Gustav. *Die stilistische Spannung in Miltons 'Paradise Lost'*. Göttingen: Kaestner, 1913.

Ingarden, Roman. *Das literarische Kunstwerk: eine Untersuchung aus dem Grenzgebiet der Ontologie, Logik und Literaturwissenschaft*. Halle/S.: Niemeyer, 1931.

Jakobson, Roman. *Main trends in the science of language*. New York, NY: Harper, 1974.

Konstantinović, Zoran. *Phänomenologie und Literaturwissenschaft*. Munich: List, 1973.

Krenzlin, Norbert. "Die 'Seinsweise' des literarischen Kunstwerks: Differenzen zwischen den Auffassungen Roman Ingardens, Edmund Husserls und Waldemar Conrads." *Axiomathes* 9.1–2 (1998): 49–60.

Lobsien, Eckhard. *Schematisierte Ansichten: Literaturtheorie mit Husserl, Ingarden, Blumenberg*. Munich: Fink, 2012.

Magliola, Robert. *Phenomenology and Literature: An Introduction*. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 1977.

Pos, Hendrik. *Zur Logik der Sprachwissenschaft*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1922.

Pos, Hendrik. *Kritische Studien über philologische Methode*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1923.

Pos, Hendrik. "Perspectives du structuralisme." [1939] Hendrik Pos, *Ecrits sur le langage*. Geneva-Lausanne: sdvig press, 2013. 183–192.

Salverda, R., J. Fenoulhet, and T. Hermans. "The contribution of H. J. Pos (1898–1955) to early structural linguistics." *Standing Clear: A Festschrift for Reinder P. Meijer*. Eds. J. Fenoulhet and T. Hermans. London: University College London, 1991. 220–237.

Shapir, Maksim Il'ich. "M. M. Kenigsberg i ego fenomenologiia stikha." *Russian Linguistics* 18.1 (1994): 73–113.

Sepp, Hans Rainer, and Lester Embree (eds.). *Handbook of Phenomenological Aesthetics*. Cham, Heidelberg, New York, NY, Dordrecht, and London: Springer, 2010.

Shor, Rozaliia. "Formal'nyi metod na zapade: Shkola Seufferta i 'retoricheskoe' napravlenie." *Ars Poetica* 1 (1927): 127–143.

Shor [Šor], Rozaliia. "Expression and signification: The logicist trend in modern linguistics." *Metodo. International Studies in Phenomenology and Philosophy* 4.2 (2016): 15–44.

Shpet, Gustav. *Esteticheskie fragmenty*. Petrograd: Kolos, 1923.

Shpet, Gustav. *Appearance and Sense: Phenomenology as the Fundamental Science and Its Problems*. Kluwer, Dordrecht, Boston, MA, and London: Kluwer, 1991.

Shpet, Gustav. *Vnutrenniaia forma slova: et'iudy i variatsii na temy Gumbol'dta*. 2nd edition. Ivanovo: Ivanovskij Gosudarstvennyj Universitet, 1999.

Steinmetz, Rudy. *L'esthétique phénoménologique de Husserl*. Paris: Kimé, 2011.

Striedter, Jurij. *Literary Structure, Evolution, and Value: Russian Formalism and Czech Structuralism Reconsidered*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989.

Tihanov, Galin. *Gustav Shpet's Contribution to Philosophy and Cultural Theory*. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 2009.

Trubetskoi, Nikolai [Trubeckoi, Nikolai]. "Essai d'une théorie des oppositions phonologiques." *Journal de Psychologie* 33 (1936): 5–18.

Utitz, Emil. *Grundlegung der allgemeinen Kunstwissenschaft*. Vols. 1 & 2. Stuttgart: Enke, 1914–1920.

Vandevelde, Pol (ed.). *Phenomenology and Literature: Historical Perspectives and Systematic Accounts*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2010.

Willems, Klaas. "Edmund Husserl und Hendrik J. Pos: Phänomenologie, Sprache und Linguistik." *Phänomenologische Forschungen – Neue Folge* 3.2 (1998): 211–244.

Josef Vojvodík

Phenomenology in Czechoslovakia
(Jan Patočka, Přemysl Blažíček)

Phenomenological incursions into Czech literary scholarship are associated with the structuralism of the Prague Linguistic Circle in the second half of the 1930s. It is owing to Jan Patočka, who had inspired the 1934 foundation of the Cercle philosophique de Prague pour les recherches sur l'entendement humain (Pražského filozofického kroužku) with its focus on phenomenological enquiry, that a visit to Prague was undertaken, between 11 and 25 November 1935, by Edmund Husserl. Husserl's indecision over the substance and title of the lecture he was to give is clear from the correspondence between him and his Prague hosts, but he finally opted for "The Crisis of European Sciences and Psychology" (Husserl 1970, 193). Besides giving his lecture at the German university in Prague and at Charles University, he also spoke at a seminar run by the aestheticist Emil Utitz. Husserl's Austrian disciple Alfred Schütz, who was present at the lecture, writes that Husserl originally intended to speak about the relationship between phenomenology and ethics, but instead switched to speak of his fascination with the ancient Greek idea, or, rather, philosophical stance vis-à-vis the phenomenon of the world from a perspective of universal wonder (θαυμάζειν):

> Only once did I have the opportunity to listen to a talk given by Husserl to students. This was in Prague in November 1935, when I accompanied him to the seminar of Professor Utitz, who had invited him to address his students. Sweeping aside the topics suggested by Utitz – characterology and aesthetics in the light of phenomenology – in a talk lasting ninety minutes, Husserl improvised without any notes on the great event in occidental culture when a few Greek thinkers started to wonder why things are as they are. (Schutz 1959, 87)

Jan Patočka returned to Husserl's lecture in 1937 in a comprehensive review of an expanded version, which had been published in a special issue of the Belgrade journal *Philosophia I* under the title "Die Krisis der europäischen Wissenschaften und die transzendentale Phänomenologie. Eine Einleitung in die phänomenologische Philosophie" (1936, "The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology: An Introduction to Phenomenological Philosophy"). In the tense and dramatic conditions of the second half of the 1930s, in the atmosphere of the looming external and "internal danger" (Patočka 2004a, 378) of the loss of freedom, Patočka, in the conclusion to his review, interprets Husserl's conception of crisis existentially as a major "contribution to the human liberation process, as a piece of human freedom" (Patočka 2004a, 378).

1 Phenomenology, structuralism and 'the enigma of knowledge'

However, there is another remarkable link between Husserl's phenomenology and Prague: surviving among Husserl's posthumous papers are handwritten copies of lectures on genetic psychology by Brentano's follower Anton Marty, delivered in Prague in the summer term of 1889. Marty deals in detail with fantasy images, in part following on literally from Brentano's lectures of 1885–1886 (Marbach 1980, XLV). Marty, and above all Brentano before him, believed one of the main matters demanding resolution was the analytical elucidation of fantasy images as compared to sensory images, an idea that also counts for much in Husserl's phenomenology of fantasies and image-consciousness (*Bildbewußtsein*). In his *Erfahrung und Urteil* (*Experience and Judgement,* Husserl 1939), which was published from his posthumous papers in 1939 by his assistant Ludwig Landgrebe – coincidentally, to add to the tally of Surrealist 'objective chances', also in Prague (this printing was pulped by the Germans at the start of the occupation of Bohemia and Moravia) – Husserl arrives at the view that objects have the status of reality (in the sense of being objectively identifiable) only in objective time and on the basis of being anchored in time. The world is a universe of things while, in contrast, fantasy objects only exist in fantasy time: their status of reality is neutralised as they are merely 'apparent objects' (*Schein-Gegenstände*). For Husserl the world of fantasy is a quasi-world. Its time is merely fantasy time. Husserl believes that this world, too, does have its reality, but it is no more than a fantasy reality. Another reason for his mentioning the phenomenological conception of image-consciousness and fantasy reality at this point is the fact that, six months before Husserl, André Breton had also visited Prague (27 March – 10 April 1935) and spoken of the crisis of the Surrealist object.

Miroslav Petříček has studied this 1935 meeting of Surrealism and phenomenology in Prague, drawing attention to the coincidences and differences in Breton and Husserl's conception of crisis and to the fact that, despite the fundamental disparity between them, both men take the crisis in and criticism of objectivism as their point of departure (Petříček 1996, 108): "The object is in crisis because it has become dispersed in objectivity". Husserl realized the basic paradox vis-à-vis the matter of knowledge through awareness, that is, that 'objective' knowledge is possible solely on the basis of 'subjective' experience. For Husserl, consciousness and sense find themselves in crisis; he meant the loss of a solid faith in the sciences that create sense. In the early pages of *Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology*, Husserl (1970, 18) speaks of the "tragic failure of modern psychology" as a consequence of the naturalism of the natural sciences,

his specific concern being the "transformation of scientific objectivism [...] into a transcendental subjectivism" (Husserl 1970, 68). This world is, as Husserl insisted, one single universe of foregone givens in which we yield to common sense. This naive and disinterested attitude needed to be overcome. Only a "counter-natural attitude" (*widernatürliche Einstellung*, Husserl 1984, 14) could help us cast off the bondage of a practical empirical way of thinking and attitude to the world in favour of an aesthetic attitude and a return to the depths of our innermost selves. What is particularly remarkable, however, is the fact that *The Crisis of European Sciences* contains, along with the postulate of reason, which alone can provide a way out of crisis, reason and existence being one, countless repetitions of the terms enigma (*Rätsel*) and wonder (*Wunder*). Husserl had already written about the enigma in his famous letter to Hugo von Hofmannsthal (12 January 1907):

> As soon as the sphinx of knowledge has posed its question, as soon as we have looked into the abyssal depths of the possibility of a knowledge that would be enacted in subjective experiences and yet contain an in-itself existing objectivity, our attitude to all pre-given knowledge and all pre-given being – to all of science and all assumed reality – has become a radically different one. *Everything* questionable, everything incomprehensible, everything enigmatic! The enigma can only be solved if we place ourselves on its own ground and treat *all knowledge* as questionable, and accept no existence as pre-given. This means that all science and all reality (including the reality of one's own I) have become mere 'phenomena'. (Husserl 2009, 2)

Husserl wrote about "the enigma of knowledge" (Husserl 1970, 117), which is simultaneously objective *and* subjective, rather as the cognitive subject is a paradoxical subjective being *for* this world and an objective being *in* this world. Ultimately, in *The Crisis of European Sciences* the greatest mystery and paradox is the human ego – "the greatest of all enigmas" (Husserl 1970, 80). The idea of the "world-enigmas" (*Welträtsel*, Husserl 1970, 68) in Husserl's works is examined by Käte Meyer-Drawe (1996, 194–221). Phrases such as "wonder of all wonders is pure Ego and pure consciousness" (Husserl 1980, 64) or "the wonder here is the rationality" come as something of a surprise in a thinker who views the absolute rationality of reason as the sole possible solution to the crisis of mankind in Europe, or of philosophy, and as a defence against the danger of irrationality. The terms *miracle* and *mystery* are more an unwitting allusion to the Surrealist concept of the *miraculous* ("l'appel au merveilleux", Breton 1988, 321) than to the idea of "absolutely rational philosophy" (Husserl 1970, 77).

Four decades later and in a commemorative work, Jan Patočka commented on Husserl's lecture at the Arts (Philosophical) Faculty of Charles University:

> It was another huge success, the impression arising from Husserl's person and the solitary energy of his thinking was spectacular. Never before or since has our Auditorium Maximum witnessed an event like it, never had we heard such words here, never had we been stirred so immediately by the spirit of philosophy. (Patočka 1976a, XVI)

On 18 November 1935 Husserl also addressed the Prague Linguistic Circle. A brief report on the lecture appeared in *Slovo a slovesnost* from the pen of Roman Jakobson:

> E. Husserl: On the phenomenology of language. On behalf of the Prg. Ling. Circle, R. Jakobson welcomed E. Husserl and stressed the pivotal importance of his research on logic to contemporary developments in general linguistics, especially syntax, semantics and noetics, and to the break with the burden of psychologism; he pointed to the far-reaching influence of Husserl's teaching, especially on modern Slavonic linguistics, pinpointing those elements of his teaching that are particularly thought-provoking for structuralist enquiry across the fields of linguistics and semiotics and the necessity of maintaining constant close contact between logic and the science of language. Husserl discussed the relationship between phenomenology and the humanities. It is to Dilthey that he owes the conception of the humanities as a unity based on a common philosophical foundation, though unlike Dilthey he does not recognise individual psychology as an undifferentiated foundation, given that all psychology to date has missed the problem of intersubjectivity. Only within such a framework can the phenomenon of language acquire the standing that befits it. A phenomenological account of linguistics must set out from the constitutive importance of language vis-à-vis any issue regarding the world and being. A phenomenology of linguistics immediately takes on a higher level of both awareness of itself and of its critique of linguistic methods. (Jakobson 1936, 64)

Later, in a wide-ranging review of Elmar Holenstein's *Roman Jakobsons phänomenologischer Strukturalismus* (1975, *Roman Jakobson's Approach to Language: Phenomenological Structuralism*), Patočka (1976b) highlighted the particular significance of phenomenology to structural linguistics and, conversely, he saw in structuralism a major driver in the further development of phenomenology. Patočka holds that Jakobson, like Husserl, was seeking a new direction for science, defined in specific opposition both to naturalistic objectivism and to irrationalism and psychologism. Although Patočka is repeatedly at pains to stress Jakobson's rejection of the transcendentalism of Husserl's phenomenology, he considers him a phenomenologist on the simple grounds that his theory of the poetic function is an intentional outlook (*Einstellung*) on poetic language even outside poetry proper. Structuralism, too, which Patočka takes to be pursuing a Husserlian programme of reforming scholarship, could also be considered from the perspective of Husserl's conception of the lifeworld (*Lebenswelt*), given that the lifeworld also exists as interpersonal communication, whence the way ahead leads via biological communication to objectivity (Patočka 1976b, 135).

Holenstein (1975) treats Jakobson's structuralism as nothing short of Husserlianism. He seeks to demonstrate that the two strands in Jakobson's formalist-structuralist reasoning – phenomenology and structuralism – are productively entwined: such basic structuralist oppositions as diachrony and synchrony, history and structure or dynamic and static are, Holenstein believes, missing in Jakobson's structuralism. Structuralism has at its disposal the means and material to allow transcendental issues to be apprehended semiotically.

It is fitting at this point to mention one striking attempt at a reflexion of phenomenological aesthetics, specifically of Ingarden's phenomenology of the work of literature, namely Felix Vodička's Czech structuralist essay "Literárně historické studium ohlasu literárních děl: Problematika ohlasu Nerudova díla" (1941, "The Concretization of the Literary Work: Problems of the Reception of Neruda's Works", 1982). Vodička takes the term *concretisation* from Ingarden's *Das literarische Kunstwerk* (1931, *The Literary Work of Art*, 1973), but gives it a different meaning, based on the aesthetic system of the structuralism of Jan Mukařovský. Vodička turned his attention away from phenomenological enquiry into the constitution of an aesthetic object to the matter of aesthetic reception and the conditions that enable it. As Hans Robert Jauss has noted:

> The methodological problem of the step from the impact to the reception of a work is shown most sharply by F. Vodička in 'The Concretization of the Literary Work: Problems of the Reception of Neruda's Works' (1941, now in *Struktura vývoje*, Prague, 1969), where he discusses the changes of the work which are realized in its successive aesthetic perceptions. (Jauss 1970, 19)

The conception of aesthetic concretisation in Czech structuralism is examined in detail by Herta Schmid (1970, 290–318).

If we are to characterise Patočka's works dealing with works of literature and art, we might say that he takes art, too, to be part of the phenomenology of the natural world (lifeworld). Art is not merely part of our reality, as Patočka writes in the introduction to *Umění a čas* (1966, *Art and time*), it is

> an irrefutable manifestation of human freedom [...] The profound sense of freedom evinced by modern art comes through precisely in the formal devices that it employs: focussing on the basic *signifying* level of meaning, it certainly sacrifices the metaphysical layer of what is being signified, narrated, but only in order to concentrate not on the level that the work is narrating, but on the one that it *is*. (Patočka 2004 f, 316)

In several essays Patočka goes into the phenomenology of Roman Ingarden. In *Roman Ingarden: Pokus charakteristiky filosofické osobnosti a díla* (1967, *Roman Ingarden: An Attempt to Characterise his Philosophical Personality and Work*) he also looks at Ingarden's phenomenological conception of the work of literature as

set out in *The Literary Work of Art*. Patočka sees the burden of Ingarden's "extraordinarily delicate and superbly executed analyses" in his striving to prove beyond doubt "that in ontology it is not possible to get by with just the concepts of the real and the ideal object but also special 'intensional objects' have to be taken into account that differ from the foregoing in the entire nature of their being" (Patočka 2004d, 407). Patočka holds that *The Literary Work of Art* constitutes a 'grand anti-psychological rerun' of semantics as developed by the aforementioned Anton Marty, following on from the phenomenology of Husserl's second book, *Logische Untersuchungen* (1901, *Logical Investigations*). It is, then, an examination of meanings in language (*Sprachbedeutungen*) and their quasi-real correlates that make a work of literature an intensional object. The analytical side of Ingarden's phenomenology of the work of literature is treated by Patočka as crucial to any understanding of a literary work in its "polyphony", within which each layer matters as "a voice carried independently and brought constantly into play within the overall intension" (Patočka 2004d, 409). He believes that this emphasis on the polyphonic aspect of a work of literature is one of the most essential, formally aesthetic concepts in Ingarden's phenomenology and that it reveals how each of his successive analyses of works of literature brings with it more new insights and trains of thought. Anyone wishing, as Patočka stresses, "to discover the way phenomenology works, its self-renouncing objectivity, its strict adherence to the ideal of scholarship, will find no better example than in the works of Ingarden" (Patočka 2004d, 409). He also goes into why it is that Ingarden's book received relatively less recognition than the other great philosophies of the twentieth century despite striking a chord early on, in the German-speaking world, with literary theorists and philosophers (Emil Staiger, Käte Hamburger, Nicolai Hartmann, Günther Müller, René Wellek, Wolfgang Kayser and others). There were, the Czech phenomenonologist believes, two chief reasons: at the time Ingarden's book came out, he was, being in Poland, isolated from the dominant positivist-naturalist tendency; and in the Germany of the day, as opposed to the 1920s, the focus of phenomenological enquiry had shifted away from real ontology (*Realontologie*) and theory of objects (*Gegenstandstheorie*), as represented by Husserl's disciples in Göttingen and Munich (Alexander Pfänder, Hedwig Conrad-Martius, Hans Lipps, Theodor Conrad and Moritz Geiger, among others) towards historicising. The choice of historical topics by such younger phenomenologists as Ludwig Landgrebe (*Wilhelm Diltheys Theorie der Geisteswissenschaften*, 1928, *Wilhelm Dilthey's Theory of the Human Sciences*) or Fritz Kaufmann (*Die Philosophie des Grafen Paul Yorck von Wartenburg*, 1928, *The Philosophy of Count Paul Yorck von Wartenburg*) in Freiburg is quite striking. According to Patočka, this shift, which followed the publication of Heidegger's *Sein und Zeit* (1927, *Being and Time*) with its linkage between existence and ontology, meant "a thrusting aside of Husserl's

transcendental idealism" (Patočka 2004d, 410) and created an entirely new situation. However, Ingarden

> is neither one of those thinkers who descend to the foundations of metaphysics and thereby get the better of it, nor to those returnees to the sobriety of pure gnoseology. He is one of those tireless toilers in the open fields of subsections of philosophy [...]. With the purity of his persona, dedicated to his cause, he represents the first surge of phenomenology to which he remained true in his remarkable output to the end of his days. He is beyond all doubt the most important living Slav philosopher. (Patočka 2004d, 415)

2 Aesthetic experience as a borderline experience: Jan Patočka's conception of art

In Patočka's first essays on literature and art, he is already concerned with the movement of existence as one of the key problems of art and artistic creativity, which he interprets as a mode of the practice of living. Although art is connected with social context and the reality from which it emerges and is "powerless against the social forces that take possession of it, its *sense*, its inner meaning remains unaffected" (Patočka 2004 f, 314). Art is

> proof of our spiritual freedom, authentic evidence *ex definitione* [...] so long as it is the creation of works whose perspective *contains its own sense within it as in a kind of experiencing that does not point to something else, something different outside of it*. [...] it is an assertion of the inner self, and so too of freedom. (Patočka 2004 f, 314)

However, art is imbued, Patočka believes, with a force capable of causing an 'existential shock' to the humdrum. This existential disturbance wrought by means of art is a core motif in Patočka's phenomenology (and not just of art) from the essay "Životní rovnováha a životní amplituda" (1939, "The Equilibrium and Amplitude of Life") to "Války 20. století a 20. století jako válka" (1975, "Twentieth-Century Wars and the Twentieth Century as a War"; Patočka 2002, 117–131) from the collection *Kacířské eseje* (*Heretical Essays*; Patočka 2002a, 13–146), or the lecture "Duchovní člověk a intelektuál" (1975, "The Spiritual Man and the Intellectual", Patočka 2002a, 355–371). Here, a 'spiritual man' is one who is "on the way" (Patočka 2002b, 358). This means one who has accepted life as a problem to be solved, that is, "a problematising of the ordinary, a creation of a new *possibility* of life [...]. Living not at all on terra firma, but within something that is in motion; living *unanchored*" (Patočka 2002b, 359). The whole of philosophy, and likewise art, is no more than expansion on this problematic and anchorless condition, the problematic condition not only of life, but of reality in general. So Patočka believes that intrinsic to

art – and to the aesthetic experiencing of it – is that matter of the existential shock and the making way for a new possibility in life, but how does this come across in his interpretations of literature? We shall take three examples.

Patočka's first literary-philosophical study is his *Symbol země u K. H. Máchy* (1944, *The Symbol of the Earth in K. H. Mácha*), on the most important poet of Czech Romanticism, Karel Hynek Mácha (1806–1836). He sets out from the 'antithesis' of temporality and eternity and shows that Mácha was well acquainted with the philosophy of the German Romantics (Ritter, Steffens, Schelling, Novalis, Hufeland), on the basis of which he developed his own Romantic-Symbolic poetic mythology. At the heart of this lies the symbol of the mother-earth, which is also the essence of temporality. But Patočka shows that Mácha's mythopoeia of the earth is not trapped in archaic myth and the 'Great Mother' cult of the spirit-less dark ages, but arrives at an admission of the "Platonic-Christian ideal, a privately matter-of-fact ideal pole of divinity", and this, as Patočka stresses, is "vastly more manful and hazardous" than the Romantic retreat into the depths of a remote age free of conflict and tension "at the cost of conscious individuality" (Patočka 2004e, 123). Hence Mácha's metaphysical *idée* in no way overlaps with the "dream-worlds of the Romantics", and it is "something majestic", Patočka writes, in that "here at the beginnings of Czech poetry we have someone capable of great compass and of immersion into some of the most profound questions still alive today, in an original, quite matchless way" (Patočka 2004e, 123). Hence, too, Patočka's rejection of the Surrealist image of Mácha put across by the Czech Surrealists in their anthology to mark the centenary of Mácha's death, *Ani labuť ani Lůna* (*Neither Swan nor Moon*, Nezval 1936; the title is a line taken from one of Mácha's sonnets), as a poet of irrational passions and simultaneously one of revolutionary Romantic revolt. However, he also takes issue with Roman Jakobson, who, against the background of the activities of the Prague Surrealists, constructed a model of "two contrary faces of romanticism": a revolutionary Romanticism of "proud and destructive rebellion", represented by Mácha as the type of youthful, supposedly socially and revolutionarily minded poet, and on the other hand a "romanticism of resignation, one of the most distinctive and extreme representatives of which is [...] Erben" as, by contrast, the upstanding type of constitutionally conservative poet (Jakobson 1935, 158). For his part, Patočka elevates Mácha as a poet consciously and manfully accepting "the pain of the individual self", since inasmuch as "it befell him to express his country's pain as the truth of the individual, it befell him to express the pain of *his* land as a truth of the life of the people" (Patočka 2004e, 124). In 1936, the various interpretations of the Czech Romantic poet by the Czech Surrealists, published in the anthology *Neither Swan nor Moon*, included one crafted from a psychoanalytical perspective and another seeing him as a forerunner of the Surrealist imagination. And the existence of the poet was

an existence 'in amplitude' – as Patočka described this mode of existence in the essay "The Equilibrium and Amplitude of Life" (1939) – faced with "adversity and pain", coping with that which "goes against the spontaneous tendency of our cowering nature, against our illusions, against the beloved fears behind which lurk our secret wishes, against our superstitions" (Patočka 2004g, 61).

The second example relates to a modern adaptation of Sophocles' Antigone, "Ještě jedna Antigona a Antigoné ještě jednou" (1967, "One More Antigone and Antigoné Once More"). Patočka discusses the tragic, which he interprets as a self-reflexive, liminal experience and a transgression:

> Man stands at a borderline, on a surface, and he constantly relates himself to that border-line. This means his 'allocation' is in direct contact with another. How he treats it – and he has to treat it somehow, precisely as a being of borderline and surface –, governs the most vital thing in his life, the difference that no inner-world being knows: Evil and Good, *κακόν – ἐσθλόν*. [...] The borderline is the *dual sense* that things have. In this respect it may be said that everything falls under both one allocation and the next. And therein lies the abysmal peril of being human: man is a creature who both *sees* and *knows*; seeing – knowing – savoir-faire is his sphere, and so it may easily escape him that this sphere is not everything: it contains all that can be seen, named, clearly understood and taken hold of. And this is where man's 'abyss-boundedness' is, his dwelling in an abyss, his living above an abyss: not only in light of his certain end, but given the incessant ambiguity of each and every act, which is in consequence a permanent *krisis* – a division, the choice between *κακόν* and *ἐσθλόν*! (Patočka 2004b, 392–393)

Patočka relates 'allotment' etymologically to the Greek *νόμος* (law), which, as he adds, "is derived from *νέμω*, 'I quarter', I divide and give to each his due, his allotment" (Patočka 2004b, 391). He sees Antigone's tragedy as a tragedy of hopelessness, the predicament of human existence at a borderline, the situation in which night-death enters life and which far exceeds human capacity. However, even 'night' in Patočka's interpretation is "relative night" (Patočka 2004b, 399), a component of the polis, of the moral world. Antigone's tragedy is not merely the tragedy of a clash between laws. Patočka does not concern himself with the moral-ethical connotations, being interested in the constantly recurring existential motif of relating oneself to the borderline, acceptance of the finite and abysmal nature of human existence, of the "right to night", in the fact "that man is not his own" (Patočka 2004b, 393–394), that we can only get to the sense of day if we prop it up with the deeper sense of night. For Patočka tragedy is – notwithstanding the inevitability of fate – the tragedy of freedom, for

> it draws all its pathos from freedom's depths and manoeuvrings, and is only possible by freedom's making itself apparent precisely at the point where the empirical, earthly, all too human existence of man ends. [...] Tragic actions, tragic life is played out entirely in an atmosphere of suffering: even if a hero is still far removed from it, he is already standing

> within range of it, in its shadow. [...] We must not forget that the vital question, the question of the purpose of life, has already been asked in tragedy: Socrates, for all his questioning, the ultimate object of which is the point of life, has in tragic man his first, if non-explicit model. (Patočka 1990, 116–117)

But the issue has to be that the personal 'shock of the everyday', which Patočka had already made the topic of his phenomenological writings of the 1940s up to the *Heretical Essays* (1975), is redeployed as something socio-political.

The third example concerns art – the paintings of Mikuláš Medek (1926–1974). During one of his trips to Prague, a philosopher and friend of Patočka's, Walter Biemel, accompanied Patočka to visit the painter's studio. Later, Biemel wrote: "Here in Prague Jan Patočka and I paid several visits to the studio of the painter Medek, whose work gave me quite a shock" (Biemel 1998, 14). In the early 1970s Patočka told Biemel about Medek's ill health, his death in November 1974 and the posthumous private exhibition of his last works held in the painter's studio. He describes one of the paintings – his *Velký žíznivý anděl* (1973, *A Great Thirsty Angel*):

> The largest, and, I think, the most beautiful, represents some kind of thirsty angel. He is gazing through a garland of rubies and his horizontal body is made up of fiery blades, pinions, beaks and other things capable of causing acute pain. In the most exalted manner, Rilke's 'every angel is terrifying' has become an event here. The background is done in old gold, like some gateway to Heaven. (Patočka 2004h, 413)

The quotation from Rilke's *Duineser Elegien* (1912/1923, *Duino Elegies*), with which Patočka seeks to intensify the effect of Medek's painting, points to the problem and question of the (self-)justification of art in the modern age, the "age of technology" (Patočka 2004h, 413) as Patočka notes, that is of concern to the philosopher – to Patočka no less than Biemel. Both men's graphic accounts of the intense effect of Medek's paintings – art that "gave me quite a shock" (Biemel), paintings that cause "acute pain" (Patočka) – can be read as paraphrases of Rilke's poetic image. When Patočka, in said letter to Biemel, comments on Medek's cycle *Pohyblivé hroby* (1972–1974, *Graves in motion*), he adds:

> I thought it was going to be something ironic-sarcastic, but no. The tombstones shift about and swap their ashlar segments in space on ball bearings, so revealing their insides, which consist of fiery, tortured and torturing eyes in rhythmical succession. All about it is matter-of-fact, no symbolism or allegorising, and yet this idea, that of setting gravestones in motion, is resurrection in the age of technology. (Patočka 2004h, 413)

3 Poetry as a 'presentification of freedom': Přemysl Blažíček's existential-phenomenological approach

Patočka's idea of art as a space of freedom, albeit precisely through "the jarring of our secure anchorage in the mundanely self-evident structure of sense" (Patočka 2004c, 530), as he wrote in the foreword to the German edition of Jaroslav Durych's novel *Boží duha* (1955/1969, *God's Rainbow*; Durych 1999, 2016), one of his last texts on a literary theme, was picked up by his follower, the literary historian and critic Přemysl Blažíček (1932–2002). Asking after the character and point of poetry, Blažíček sets out from the idea of the presentification (*Vergegenwärtigung*) of freedom, giving it a visualisable presence:

> the point of poetry as a means to making freedom visualisable, bringing the tension between what is given and freedom to the fore. [...] Making freedom visualisable does not mean merely escalating it, but requires us to re-direct our interest with a principled, radical volte-face, wheeling round to face that to which we have had our backs turned: we must break free from the objective conditions in which we are held, stepping forth from what is to meet that which is not. (Blažíček 2011, 164)

The sense of a poem is not something that is "being communicated" and that we can take possession of as some new piece of knowledge, but is, on the contrary, more something that "draws us in and takes possession of us" (Blažíček 2011, 89):

> A poem's mission is, then, not its actual sense, i. e. the aggregate accumulated at the end of a process of image- and meaning-creation, but that creative process itself, which drags us out of our present condition and is, accordingly, a realisation, a revitalisation of our ability to step out of it, a revitalisation of our freedom. (Blažíček 2011, 89)

Přemysl Blažíček wrote wide-ranging interpretations of the verse of two major Czech twentieth-century poets, Karel Toman (1877–1946) and Vladimír Holan (1905–1980), of Hašek's *Švejk* and of Josef Škvorecký's novel *Zbabělci* (1948/1958, *The Cowards*; Blažíček 2014). Although he was part of the generation of disciples of Jan Mukařovský, he maintained a critical distance from structuralism, seeking his own pathway and approach to works of literature. This does not mean, however, that Blažíček's approach was not driven in part by Mukařovský's structural aesthetics. In his interpretations of verse works he returns to Mukařovský's conception of poetic ways of naming things and the aesthetic function of language. Back in the 1960s, and chiefly through the mediation of Jan Patočka and his disciples (such as Ladislav Hejdánek, Pavel Kouba, Jan Němec), he had been interested in Husserl's phenomenology, Heidegger's ideas on art and philosophy and his expo-

sitions of verse, the phenomenology of Maurice Merleau-Ponty and Eugen Fink, Ludwig Binswanger's Daseinsanalysis (*Daseinsanalyse*), Hans Lipps' philosophy of speech and others. By the end of the 1960s, when Czech scholarship had become dominated by structuralism, Blažíček wrote his phenomenology-centred interpretation of Holan's verse (it had to wait until 1991 to be published), developing it further in the 1970s, when he withdrew completely from his academic career and stopped publishing in 'official' journals. He called his interpretation of Holan's verse "Sebeuvědomění poezie" ("Poetry Becoming Self-Aware"), a title also pointing to the core of his phenomenological conception of poetry (Blažíček 2011, 10–187). Blažíček's basic thesis is that the evolution of modern Czech verse, as a process of 'becoming self-aware', tends towards the suppression of the communicative function as a statement on a given reality and towards the realisation of sense, seen by Blažíček in an intensification of factuality:

> Making sense real demands a quite definite factuality [...]. Making a widely valid sense of art real requires conceptual knowledge to be cast aside. Phenomenology shows that such knowledge is the outcome of conventionalised objectivising, amounting to mental constructs that inhibit our direct contact with things as they emerge in the world as actually lived by us, and that it is therefore necessary to go beyond such constructs in order to gain access to the objects themselves. [...] Poetry is intrinsically object-centred, matter-of-fact; as opposed to phenomenology poetry achieves this matter-of-factness by excluding, to the maximum possible extent, whatever it itself is not. Hence the purgative self-awareness of poetry may be described as its escalated matter-of-factness. (Blažíček 2011, 107)

Matter-of-factness means that the poet creates a view of the reality of phenomena out of telling images, but without any authorial evaluations or judgements. "Direct contact with objects", as Blažíček (2011, 107) speaks of it, applies to a thing or things that have been experienced, lived through, objects with which he is at home, whose essence, the *eidos* of a thing, but also the specific qualities of this direct contact with things are what the poet seeks to express.

Blažíček holds that the sense and originality of Holan's metaphors reside in part in how "in them, man's spiritual world and the material world are brought face to face in a quite particular way" (Blažíček 2011, 27) and how the planes of both "outer" and "inner" worlds draw strikingly on the outer material reality (Blažíček 2011, 28). It might be said that any abstract thought, image or experience, but also any sensory perception or phenomenon are 'materialised' into an artefact by the author's plastic imagination. These peculiarities include the breakdown of the symmetry between *res* and *verbum*, between content and its verbalisation, in favour of *verbum*. Connected with this is Holan's fondness for periphrasis, hyperbaton and various defamiliarising distortions of syntax (Blažíček 2011, 12, 19–20), when the reader is nudged away from a 'fluid' syntagmatic reading of

the lines towards a paradigmatic reading and, with that, towards his own creative process of discovering their sense.

The knowledge at stake in a poetic text is neither a communication, nor a moulding of empirical reality, but a capturing of the general within the unique in the sense that the action condensed into lines by the poet's imagination loses the character of an event to become a one-off quirk exemplifying a general meaning (Blažíček 2011, 73). Gottfried Gabriel describes this process as a semantic shift from referential to symbolic meaning (Gabriel 2015, 131). The peculiarity of poetry is that it contains a distinctive alternative to normal cognition, to wit emotive cognition, though without any form of emotive theory of literature behind it. The 're-presentation' of emotions, feelings or moods in a literary text is no causal evocation of them, but an imaginative way of making them visualisable that should lead to, or facilitate reflection.

At the end of the 1970s, Blažíček turned his attention to the poetry of Karel Toman, a poet of the post-Symbolist generation, who, at first sight, represents the opposite type of poet and a model of the world contrary to that typified by the abstractly hermetic poetics of Vladimír Holan. But it is this antithesis that presents a challenge to Blažíček's phenomenology-based interpretation. Unlike Holan's, the poetry of Karel Toman is, Blažíček maintains, a type of non-metaphorical verse rooted in the non-metaphorical nature of everyday language, a language which, of course, can 'wax lyrical'. Language that, as Mukařovský says in his lecture "Jazyk, který básní" ("Language that Waxes Lyrical"),

> accompanies and facilitates action, also weaves and underpins thinking, imagining and the entire world of the mind, even the part customarily said to defy being put into words. And yet, living a life of its own, language is always ready to extricate itself, however briefly, from the power of the individual who happens to be in control, and to enjoy at will the freedom so seized, whether to wondrous or witty effect. Language is not only the helpmate of poets; it is also a poet itself. (Mukařovský 1947, 17)

Blažíček also sees the particular quality of Toman's verse in how metaphysical values (faith, hope, morality etc., as in his poems written during World War I) are 'revealed' by means of everyday phenomena and things, (apparently) ordinary reality and the reality of phenomena.

> Toman's poetry became a type of non-metaphorical verse, being based precisely on the unrecognised metaphorical richness of everyday language. [...] However, Toman employs words that in one meaning point to the mostly natural reality of time and space, the other pointing to the realm of the spiritual and psychological. A poem will clearly distinguish these two meanings by developing both of them in their mutually 'incommensurable' contexts. Yet it does so while sustaining the one word as just that, unique unto itself in its *linguistic* meaning, so that the two spheres permeate each other: each contains cross-references to the other and they open up to each other in any concrete situation. (Blažíček 2011, 318–319)

During the 1970s and 1980s, various followers of Mukařovský, above all Milan Jankovič, Květoslav Chvatík and Oleg Sus, but also Zdeněk Mathauser, looked at the interference between phenomenology and structuralism. Zdeněk Mathauser stressed, for example, the transcendentally phenomenological hinterland of the structuralist approach and the problem of time: "Husserl's schema of the passage of time including things retained in the consciousness, where the whole progression of perception is mirrored, is at risk of contamination with Mukařovský's theory of the accumulation of meaning" (Mathauser 2006a, 260). Elsewhere he writes:

> I often repeat the apt formula with which, almost ten years ago, M. Jankovič on the one hand took a step forward beyond interwar Structuralism, relaxing its severity somewhat, while on the other rightly demonstrating his continued insistence on that which constitutes the terra firma of the Prague School: 'Today it has become quite clear that an analogous unifying gesture is expected time and again, this time from the addressee, and its fleeting proto-image in time is the birth of a work'. (Mathauser 2006b, 62)

For adherents of literary structuralism, being faced with phenomenology as a theory of aesthetics seems to have been a powerful driver described by Mathauser as "[taking] a step forward beyond interwar Structuralism" (Mathauser 2006b, 62). This "step forward" – whether in the direction of the Konstanz School's aesthetics of reception and Iser's aesthetic response theory, the anthropology/phenomenology-based theory of the work of art, or of its ontological perspectives – can also be viewed as an amplification of the structuralist aesthetics, poetics and ontology of the work of literature as art upheld by the Prague School in its dialogue with phenomenology, a dialogue begun inspiringly in the mid-1930s and then interrupted for years to come at the end of the 1940s.

Translated by David Short

References

Biemel, Walter. "Schein und Erscheinung in der Kunst." *Internationale Zeitschrift für Philosophie* 7.1 (1998): 5–14.

Blažíček, Přemysl. *Knihy o poezii: Holan / Toman*. Ed. Michael Špirit. Prague: Triáda, 2011.

Blažíček, Přemysl. *Knihy o epice. Naši / Švejk / Zbabělci*. Ed. Michael Špirit. Prague: Triáda, 2014.

Breton, André. "Manifeste du surréalisme." André Breton, *Œuvres complètes*. Vol. I. Ed. Marguerite Bonnet. Paris: Gallimard, 1988. 309–346.

Durych, Jaroslav. *Gottes Regenbogen*. Trans. by Jan Patočka and Frank Boldt. Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1999.

Durych, Jaroslav. *God's Rainbow*. Trans. by David Short. Prague: Charles University in Prague, Karolinum Press, 2016.

Gabriel, Gottfried. *Erkenntnis*. Berlin and Boston, MA: De Gruyter, 2015.

Hagedorn, Ludger and Hans Rainer Sepp (eds.). *Jan Patočka*: *Texte, Dokumente, Bibliographie*. Freiburg and Munich: Verlag Karl Alber, 1999.

Heidegger, Martin. *Sein und Zeit. Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung*. Vol. 7. Halle: Niemeyer, 1927.

Holenstein, Elmar. *Roman Jakobsons phänomenologischer Strukturalismus*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1975.

Husserl, Edmund. *Erfahrung und Urteil: Untersuchungen zur Genealogie der Logik*. Ed. Ludwig Landgrebe. Prague: Academia, 1939.

Husserl, Edmund. *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology: An Introduction to Phenomenological Philosophy*. Trans. by David Carr. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1970.

Husserl, Edmund. *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy. Third Book: Phenomenology and the Foundations of the Sciences. Husserliana 5: Edmund Husserl – Collected Works*. Ed. and trans. by Ted E. Klein and William E. Pohl. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1980.

Husserl, Edmund. *Logische Untersuchungen*. Vol. 2: *Untersuchungen zur Phänomenologie und Theorie der Erkenntnis. Husserliana 19: Edmund Husserl – Gesammelte Werke*. Vol. 1. Ed. Ursula Panzer. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1984.

Husserl, Edmund. "Letter to Hofmannsthal." Trans. by Sven-Olov Wallenstein. *Site Magazine* 26–27 (2009): 2.

Ingarden, Roman. *The Literary Work of Art*: *An Investigation on the Borderlines of Ontology, Logic, and Theory of Literature, with an Appendix on the Functions of Language in the Theater* [1931]. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973.

Jakobson, Roman. "Poznámky k dílu Erbenovu. I. O mythu." *Slovo a slovesnost* 1 (1935): 152–164.

Jakobson, Roman. "E. Husserl: O fenomenologii iazyka." *Slovo a slovesnost* 2 (1936): 62–64.

Jauss, Hans Robert. "Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory." *New Literary History* 2.1 (1970): 7–37.

Kaufmann, Fritz. "Die Philosophie des Grafen Paul Yorck von Wartenburg." *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung* 9 (1928): 1–235.

Landgrebe, Ludwig. "Wilhelm Diltheys Theorie der Geisteswissenschaften." *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung* 9 (1928): 237–366.

Marbach, Eduard. "Einleitung des Herausgebers." Edmund Husserl, *Phantasie, Bildbewusstsein, Erinnerung: Zur Phänomenologie der anschaulichen Vergegenwärtigungen. Husserliana 23: Edmund Husserl – Collected Works*. Ed. Eduard Marbach. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1980. XXV–LXXXII.

Mathauser, Zdeněk. "Pražská škola – avantgarda – fenomenologie." *Otázky českého kánonu*. Ed. Stanislava Fedrová. Prague: Ústav pro českou literaturu AV ČR, 2006a. 257–264.

Mathauser, Zdeněk. "Umění zrající svými přesahy." *Česká literatura* 54.2/3 (2006b): 59–73.

Meyer-Drawe, Käte. "Merleau-Pontys Kritik an Husserls Konzeption des Bewußtseins." *Die Freiburger Phänomenologie*. Ed. Ernst Wolfgang Orth. Freiburg and Munich: Verlag Karl Alber, 1996. 194–221.

Mukařovský, Jan. "Jazyk, který básní." *O básnickém jazyce*. Eds. Bohuslav Havránek et al. Prague: Svoboda, 1947. 7–17.

Nezval, Vítězslav (ed.). *Ani labuť ani Lůna: Sborník k stému výročí smrti Karla Hynka Máchy*. Prague: Nakl. Otto Jirsák, 1936.

Patočka, Jan. "Erinnerungen an Husserl." *Die Welt des Menschen – Die Welt der Philosophie: Festschrift für Jan Patočka*. Ed. Walter Biemel. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1976a. VII–XIX.

Patočka, Jan. "Roman Jakobsons phänomenologischer Strukturalismus." *Tijdschrift voor filosofie* 38.1 (1976b): 129–135.

Patočka, Jan. "Exkurs o attické tragédii." *Svět a divadlo* 1 (1990): 116–118.

Patočka, Jan. "Války 20. století a 20. století jako válka." Jan Patočka, *Sebrané spisy Jana Patočky: Péče o duši*. Vol. 3. Eds. Ivan Chvatík and Pavel Kouba. Prague: Oikúmené, 2002a. 117–131.

Patočka, Jan. "Duchovní člověk a intelektuál." Jan Patočka, *Sebrané spisy Jana Patočky: Péče o duši*. Vol. 3. Eds. Ivan Chvatík and Pavel Kouba. Prague: Oikúmené, 2002b. 355–371.

Patočka, Jan. "Edmund Husserl: Die Krisis der europäischen Wissenschaften und die transzendentale Phänomenologie. Eine Einleitung in die phänomenologische Philosophie." Jan Patočka, *Sebrané spisy Jana Patočky: Umění a čas*. Vol. 1. Eds. Daniel Vojtěch and Ivan Chvatík. Prague: Oikúmené, 2004a. 366–378.

Patočka, Jan. "Ještě jedna Antigona a Antigoné ještě jednou." Jan Patočka, *Sebrané spisy Jana Patočky: Umění a čas*. Vol. 1. Eds. Daniel Vojtěch and Ivan Chvatík. Prague: Oikúmené, 2004b. 389–400.

Patočka, Jan. "Předmluva k *Boží duze* Jaroslava Durycha." Jan Patočka, *Sebrané spisy Jana Patočky: Umění a čas*. Vol. 1. Eds. Daniel Vojtěch and Ivan Chvatík. Prague: Oikúmené, 2004c. 526–535.

Patočka, Jan. "Roman Ingarden: Pokus charakteristiky filosofické osobnosti a díla." Jan Patočka, *Sebrané spisy Jana Patočky: Umění a čas*. Vol. 1. Eds. Daniel Vojtěch and Ivan Chvatík. Prague: Oikúmené, 2004d. 401–415.

Patočka, Jan. "Symbol země u K. H. Máchy." Jan Patočka, *Sebrané spisy Jana Patočky: Umění a čas*. Vol. 1. Eds. Daniel Vojtěch and Ivan Chvatík. Prague: Oikúmené, 2004e. 104–124.

Patočka, Jan. "Umění a čas." Jan Patočka, *Sebrané spisy Jana Patočky: Umění a čas*. Vol. 1. Eds. Daniel Vojtěch and Ivan Chvatík. Prague: Oikúmené, 2004 f. 303–318.

Patočka, Jan. "Životní rovnováha a životní amplitude." Jan Patočka, *Sebrané spisy Jana Patočky: Umění a čas*. Vol. 1. Eds. Daniel Vojtěch and Ivan Chvatík. Prague: Oikúmené, 2004g. 53–61.

Patočka, Jan. *Sebrané spisy Jana Patočky: Umění a čas*. Vol. 2. Eds. Daniel Vojtěch and Ivan Chvatík. Prague: Oikúmené, 2004h.

Petříček, Miroslav. "Setkání surrealismu s fenomenologií v magické Praze." *Český surrealismus 1929–1953: Skupina surrealistů v ČSR. Události, vztahy inspirace*. Eds. Lenka Bydžovská and Karel Srp. Prague: Argo – Galerie hlavního města Prahy, 1996. 106–111.

Schmid, Herta. "Zum Begriff der ästhetischen Konkretisation im tschechischen Strukturalismus." *Sprache im technischen Zeitalter* 36 (1970): 290–318.

Schutz, Alfred. "Husserl's Importance for the Social Sciences." *Edmund Husserl 1859–1959: Recueil commémoratif publié à l'occasion du centenaire de la naissance du philosophe*. Eds. Herman Leo van Breda and Jacques Taminiaux. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1959. 86–98.

Vodička, Felix. "The Concretization of the Literary Work: Problems of the Reception of Neruda's Works." [1941] *The Prague School: Selected Writings 1929–1946*. Ed. Peter Steiner. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1982. 103–134.

Piotr Sadzik
Phenomenology in Poland

1 From the beginnings to 1945

Although phenomenology in Poland is most often linked with the works of Roman Ingarden, its history is much richer and more complex. The initial presence of phenomenological thought in the Polish context can be observed as early as the late nineteenth century. Władysław Heinrich's review of Husserl's *Philosophie der Arithmetik* (1891, *Philosophy of Arithmetic*), published in the Leipzig *Vierteljahrsschrift für wissenschaftliche Philosophie* (*Scholarly Philosophy Quarterly*) in 1895, must be considered the initial sign of this phenomenon. Between 1905 and 1914, Husserl's students included many inspired Polish scholars. Notably, the framework created by the author of *Logische Untersuchungen* (1900–1901, *Logical Investigations*) was first considered useful in Poland in the field of psychology. Apart from a few studies by Heinrich, some books written by Tadeusz Witwicki were particularly influential, e. g. *Analiza psychologiczna ambicji* (1900, *The Psychological Analysis of Ambition*). Phenomenology-inspired psychology in Poland produced many pioneering works, such as Stefan Błachowski's studies of memory *Pamięć a świadomość* (1913, *Memory and Consciousness*) or Stefan Szuman's revelatory research on child psychology *Sztuka dziecka. Psychologia twórczości rysunkowej dziecka i postrzeganie dziecięce* (1926, *Children's Art: The Psychology of Children's Drawings and Perception*). Thus it was clearly evident in this period that phenomenology in Poland already served as a set of notions inspiring a wide range of disciplines rather than as a unified philosophical school. It aided the development of some fields of research, legitimizing their autonomous status while at the same time allowing them to transgress the limits of traditional academic domains. A significant example of this phenomenon was Polish psychology, which usually combined its tools with ideas borrowed from the phenomenological theory of literature, as mentioned above (cf. influence of Ingarden's ontology of literary work on Szuman's *O kunszcie i istocie poezji lirycznej* [1948, *On Art and the Essence of Lyrical Poetry*]). Polish phenomenology developed its language in a constant dialogue with other methodologies and philosophical schools. Hence it should be seen as a continued crossing of boundaries, existing entirely 'betwin' (at once *between* the various currents which support it with their conceptual frameworks and *in* the midst of their notions, as well as like a *twin* which admittedly resembles them but simultaneously transcends their borders).

One facet of the Polish reception of phenomenology was a striking absence of translations of Husserl's writings (the first appeared many years after his death).

In consequence, Polish phenomenology distanced itself from any Husserlian orthodoxy or methodological homogeneity from the very outset, contaminating and mixing phenomenological ideas with notions taken from other vocabularies. A characteristic feature of the Polish interwar humanities was the permanent intertwining of phenomenology with intellectual formations that seemed to run counter to the legacy of Husserl and his disciples, primarily analytical philosophy and neo-idealism. Such intersections should be considered an entirely unprecedented phenomenon, probably absent from European thought of the time.

The members of the analytical Lviv-Warsaw School that introduced phenomenology to the Polish humanities were Jan Łukasiewicz, who wrote the first Polish scientific text on the influence of Husserl's method *Teza Husserla o stosunku logiki do psychologii* (1904, *Husserl's Thesis on the Relationship of Logic and Psychology*), and Władysław Tatarkiewicz, whose "Szkoła fenomenologów" (1913, "The School of Phenomenologists") should be seen as the first Polish article devoted entirely to phenomenology. The possibility of connecting these two intellectual trends was also expressed in the works of other major members of this milieu: Kazimierz Ajdukiewicz (one of Husserl's many Polish disciples) and Tadeusz Kotarbiński. Undoubtedly, the most important role in the constitution of the phenomenological movement in Poland was played by one of the founders of the Lviv-Warsaw School of logic, Kazimierz Twardowski.

Some of the first Polish phenomenologically-oriented scholars claimed that it was Twardowski who stood at the roots of phenomenology (Łempicki 1932, 2). Indeed, Twardowski invented strictly pre-phenomenological lexis, distinguishing between the 'concepts of act', 'content' and 'object of representation', as well as formulating the proposition that every act of consciousness has its intentional dimension. He was the first scholar to conduct research on the functions of speech and to attempt to overcome psychologism. Ingarden's notion of 'language', which is usually seen as a direct response to the works of Husserl, is certainly much closer to Twardowski's position, and it seems that it is due to the latter's ongoing influence that Ingarden could not but reject Husserl's apparent turn to idealism in *Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie* (1913, *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy*). Although Twardowski remained skeptical of phenomenology, he found proximity with the Husserlians on the basis of their shared legacy of Brentano (Twardowski had studied under his guidance, as had the young Husserl), similar views on the theory of consciousness, the idea of philosophy as a non-empirical science, and their criticism of psychologism and positivist inductionism. Twardowski also played an important role in Poland when it came to organizing its academia. On his initiative, an institution devoted to psychological research (the Psychological Laboratory, *Pracownia Psychologiczna*) was founded in 1901 in Lviv – the first of its

kind in the historical territories of Poland. It was strongly influenced by the achievements of phenomenology. Twardowski's role in these developments should not be underestimated – for one thing, the overwhelming majority of the first Polish phenomenologists were initially his students. Furthermore, it was Twardowski who persuaded them to attend the Husserl seminars in Göttingen. Notably, these transfers of theories and ideas were not just a 'one-way street'. For example, such reverse transmission is evidenced by Husserl's review of Twardowski's *Zur Lehre vom Inhalt und Gegenstand der Vorstellungen* (*On the Content and Object of Presentations*), written as early as 1896, but published after the philosopher's death. In the first Polish monograph devoted entirely to phenomenology *Husserlowska nauka o akcie, treści i przedmiocie przedstawienia* (1928, *Husserl's Teachings on the Act, Content and Object of Representation*), Leopold Blaustein, a former student of both Husserl and Twardowski, dared to say that Twardowski's work had strongly influenced Husserl when he wrote *Logical Investigations*, where he adopted and developed some of Twardowski's statements and notions.

Even such a short outline of the connections between phenomenology and analytical philosophy allows us to say that despite the powerful influence of the former, which is discernible in Poland in almost every field of the humanities (philosophy, psychology, pedagogy, linguistics, art and literary theory, etc.), phenomenology has never existed here in its pure form, but has always been intertwined with – and haunted by – the legacy of other intellectual currents. Phenomenology and analytical philosophy did not compete here, but rather supplemented each other in constant dialogue. These intersections with other schools of thought were highly visible, above all in the nascent literary criticism. Furthermore, phenomenological literary theory was never a simple application of Husserl's notions, but developed its proper and fairly original tools in a (frequently polemical) dialogue with Husserl's ideas. It should be emphasized that, in this case, phenomenology was not one of many methodologies, but the very foundation and the most powerful impulse for the creation of literary theory – or rather the philosophy of literature – as a separate field of the humanities examining literary works as autonomous areas of artistic reality.

Apart from psychologists, crucial roles in the process of introducing Husserl's ideas to the Polish humanities were played by several scholars who focused on the question of aesthetics. Ada Werner-Silberstein's *Wstęp do estetyki nowoczesnej* (1911, *Introduction to Modern Aesthetics*) inquired, in a manner predating many achievements of the Polish phenomenology, not into the work itself, but the perceiving subject's relation to the object during the process of cognition. In consequence, according to Werner-Silberstein, it is the attitude of a perceiver rather than the object's inherent properties that determines the qualification of the object. While Werner-Silberstein was describing the work of art, she did not use

the concept of the *intentional object*, but came close to this idea when she focused on the way in which the object appeared in the field of subjective seeing. Such a 'receiver-centered' approach contributed to the radical revision of the criteria of distinguishing literature from other arts and became one of the hallmarks of the Polish version of phenomenology.

The first scholar whose works were foundational for the phenomenological movement in Poland was Juliusz Kleiner (*Charakter i przedmiot badań literackich*, 1913, *The Nature and Object of Literary Criticism*). This Lviv-based philosopher and philologist, interested in German and Polish literature, asserted that the content of literary texts creates a separate sphere of human reality and therefore literary studies too should be considered autonomous and separate from other branches of the humanities. He thus called for a transformation of literary studies into a coherent philosophy of literature. Combining phenomenological inspirations with the neo-idealistic belief in the connection between art and life (derived from Henri Bergson and Benedetto Croce), Kleiner considers the literary text as a space for certain elements of reality separated from the fluid chaos of the world. For this reason too, it is literature, as a separate, symbolic system, that allows for a 'partial ordering' of the 'chaotic' reality. Perhaps it was this clear legacy of other intellectual currents that led him to make statements which could be considered quite dubious if examined from the perspective of phenomenology (the psychologization of literary theory and a tendency to treat the empirical model of cognition liberally).

Nevertheless, this contamination of the neo-idealistic framework with phenomenological concepts could be seen as another typical pattern of the emerging literary studies in Poland. (Even Ingarden's doctoral dissertation was devoted to the idea of intuition and intellect in Bergson). It was also clearly visible in the books of Zygmunt Łempicki, whom Ingarden considered the first in Poland to view the literary work directly from a phenomenological standpoint. In his 1921 work *W sprawie uzasadnienia poetyki czystej* (*On the Justification of Pure Poetics*), Łempicki proposed the concept of "pure poetics", which was directly inspired by Husserl's "pure grammar" and "pure phenomenology" (Łempicki 1966, 125). Łempicki's study reshaped the Husserlian framework to include literary expression, which had been largely neglected by the German philosopher. If Husserl saw phenomenology as a kind of meta-thought directed at the very possibilities and forms of thought itself, Łempicki sought a literary criticism founded on the philosophical (ontological) theory of a work of art and thus not belonging to any particular methodology or doctrine. He thought of poetics as an 'autonomous' philosophical discipline, as a part of art theory and aesthetics. Such attempts to differentiate literary studies from other kinds of humanities were highly esteemed by Ingarden, who even considered his own *Das literarische Kunstwerk: Eine Unter-*

suchung aus dem Grenzgebiet der Ontologie, Logik und Literaturwissenschaft (1931, *The Literary Work of Art: An Investigation of the Borderlines of Ontology, Logic, and Theory of Language*) a realization of Łempicki's idea of research. Nevertheless, the fact that Łempicki's works are symptomatic of the 'ambiguity' of the Polish phenomenology of that time cannot be neglected. In fact, like Kleiner, he reconciled phenomenological inspirations with a philosophy of life, derived in turn from Croce's work and Dilthey's version of *Lebensphilosophie* (such tendencies were visible in Łempicki's strong psychological attitude and in his definition of a work of art as an "ideal being", Łempicki 1966, 125). On the other hand, probably due to these neo-idealistic inspirations, Łempicki and Kleiner called on others to overcome the distinction between literature and life as well as to erase the border that separated literature from non-literary forms of writing (but not totally dismantle it yet). Łempicki's conviction that poetics was a discipline which should grasp a whole range of linguistic expression rather than just canonical masterpieces returned in subsequent strictly phenomenological works.

The year 1931 marks a distinct turning point for the Polish phenomenological reflection on literature. It was a moment when three groundbreaking studies were published simultaneously: Kazimierz Troczyński's *Rozprawa o krytyce literackiej* (*A Thesis on Literary Criticism*), Roman Ingarden's *The Literary Work of Art* and Stefania Skwarczyńska's *O pojęcie literatury stosowanej* (*Towards a Notion of Applied Literature*).

Troczyński had pointed to the necessity of forming literary theory as an autonomous field of research with an autonomous object of study even earlier, in his *Przedmiot i podział nauki o literaturze* (1930, *The Object and Classification of Literary Studies*). There, he described literary work in a rather phenomenological manner as a "world of fiction created intentionally in the written word" (Troczyński 1930, 193). His subsequent 1931 attempt to create a morphology of the literary work and redefine the key concepts of literary studies were strongly indebted to Ingarden. Such inspiration could also be seen in his other works, such as *Zagadnienia dynamiki poezji* (1934, *Questions on the Dynamics of Poetry*), where one of the first examples of the application of Ingarden's idea of the stratified structure of literary work could be found, or *Artysta i dzieło: Studium o "Próchnie" Wacława Berenta* (1938, *The Artist and the Work: A Study of Wacław Berent's "Próchno"*), where he returned to the notion of the "intentional object", developed in *A Thesis on Literary Criticism* (Troczyński 1931, 185, 190–192). In the latter work, Troczyński showed that the phenomenological background could not only help to pose the question on the general conditions of the cognition in a literary work, but also serve as a tool for examining particular narratives. Thus Troczyński was among the first scholars to demonstrate the potential of the phenomenological lexicon for the field of literary history.

Troczyński did not limit himself to discussing Ingarden's views. He also developed an original concept of the aesthetic experience of the work of art. In his *A Thesis on Literary Criticism*, Troczyński formulated the notion of the "contemplative attitude" (Troczyński 1931, 83), based on some features of phenomenological reduction, which he outlined in a rather peculiar way compared to Husserl's original thought. The "initial cognitive situation" (Troczyński 1931, 83) of the subject facing the infinitely chaotic elements of the concrete and living reality was of the utmost interest to scholars. Troczyński described the level of material factuality as an objectively existing chaos, which in the next step is organized and classified with the help of concepts, constructions and structures, as arranged by the cognitive subject. He defined the 'living reality' as a constant and pre-discursive flux preceding all forms of culture. Unlike in Husserl, for whom *epoché* was the method of helping the self-presentation of the 'phenomenal reality' in its clear perceptibility, in Troczyński the idiopathic and pre-linguistic materiality transcended every construction which could serve to neutralize it. In *Od formizmu do moralizmu: Szkice literackie* (1935, *From Formism to Moralism: Literary Essays*), he developed the idea of the "state of phenomenological reduction" (Troczyński 1935, 321–323) as the attitude which suspends the significance and correctness of any judgment confronted with the vast multitudes of living phenomena. Troczyński did not reject the cognitive and scientific matrix, but rather expressed its fragility towards the frightful and inexorable flow of material instability. He proposed that the genre which should be privileged in this context was non-fiction literature, since it deals with such 'instability'. In his pioneering *Estetyka literackiego reportażu* (1935, *The Aesthetic of the Literary Reportage*), Troczyński defined reporting as a narrative which is subordinate not to any symbolic rules, but only to the effective contingency of reality. In such statements, it is easy to find not only explicit phenomenological ideas, but also many terms taken directly from the philosophy of life (Bergson) and even culturalism (Florian Znaniecki), combined with concepts of Ingarden and Łempicki in original fashion.

The most important member of the phenomenological movement in Poland was Roman Ingarden. Although it is hard to imagine modern literary studies without his influence, no unified school of his thought ever existed. In some ways, his work is typical of Polish phenomenology, as a fusion of tendencies existing on the dynamic border between Twardowski's school and the dialogue with Husserl's legacy. After studying under Twardowski in Lviv, Ingarden travelled to see Husserl in Göttingen (where he took courses on mathematics, physics, psychology, and philosophy), and thereafter, following his teacher, to Vienna and Freiburg. He identified himself with the Göttingen Circle of phenomenologists, composed of scholars such as Alexander Koyré, Max Scheler and Edith Stein (who became his close and longtime friend).

Ingarden, 'unfulfilled' as a poet, returned to literature in the late 1920s. He developed a strictly original version of the philosophy of literature, conceived as an equivalent to Husserl's project of phenomenology as a 'first philosophy', superior to other disciplines and determining the very conditions of cognition. Obviously, such a measure amounted to the 'autonomization' of literary theory as a separate and legitimate kind of research, but was still inscribed into a wider project of a new understanding of aesthetics. From Husserl's works, Ingarden drew a conclusion for literary studies, which he proposed should focus on analyzing the way in which the object appears in the field of subjective perception. Evidently, Ingarden inherited the basic phenomenological discovery: the conviction that the way of perceiving the work of art corresponded to the object which is perceived.

However, despite this connection, Ingarden's entire project could be seen as a 'polemic' against the concepts Husserl elaborated in *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy* (1913). Such a divergence can already be seen in Ingarden's first works, in which he expresses conviction about the necessity of such a suspension or neutralization of cognitive theories that could open the very possibility of the direct contact with reality. If the world for Husserl was an 'intentional being', depending merely on 'acts of consciousness' (transcendental idealism), Ingarden attempted to develop the idea of 'purely intentional objects' in order to prove that the real world does not have an intentional dimension (ontological realism). According to Ingarden, the literary work is the best example of such 'pure intentionality' as a new category of ontological distinctions. The literary work belongs neither to the field of 'real beings' (as a product of the consciousness of the author), nor to the field of 'ideal objects' (as non-autonomous and changeable). The literary work which comes into being in the author's acts of subjective consciousness is never a finished and completed product, but rather an object which exists only in particular acts of reading. At the same time, it is not a simple effect of the reader's consciousness alone, because in a way it contains a skeleton, the schematic frame for his/her reading. In consequence, one should distinguish between the literary work and its concretizations formed in every particular act of reading as well as between an artistic object as a material medium and an aesthetic object depending on the perceiver's activity. Ingarden defined the literary work of art as an effect of purely intentional activity rooted in the creative acts of the author's consciousness. Simultaneously, it also becomes an 'intersubjective object' due to the reader's activity. Although some aspects of Ingarden's theory (an emphasis on the significance of the perceiver's role in the forming of the work of art) have influenced many important currents of research on literature (the Polish School of Literary Communication, German reader-response criticism), his work went beyond the scope of literary

theory. Rather, he developed a unique kind of philosophy of literature as part of his theory of cognition and aesthetics. Within such a paradigm, research on literary works was part of a new phenomenological interest in ontological and epistemological problems.

One of Ingarden's main achievements was his creation of a 'set of tools' which may be used in the thorough analysis of literary works. He developed a unique concept of the structure of the aesthetic object, composed of four heterogeneous strata: (1) the sounds of words and phonetic formations of higher order, (2) units of meaning (phrases and sentences), (3) schematized aspects (visual, auditory, or other elements via which the objects represented are visible), and (4) represented objects (figures and events). The crucial assumption of ontological realism is that the sentences which constitute a literary work of art are not logical propositions in the proper sense, but rather 'quasi-propositions' which are not intended to form and fix knowledge in concepts as in the case of the 'pure' propositions of scientific research. Consequently, the work of art always forms merely a schematic skeleton in which some aspects of the work are not given in a determinate way ("places of indeterminacy", Ingarden 1960, 316–326) and it is the task of the reader/perceiver to remove its gaps and blanks or to fill them in, that is, to concretize some potential aspects of the work. The literary work of art in particular, or works of art in general (as Ingarden also examined the perception of images, pieces of architecture, and music), should be seen, then, as necessarily incomplete objects. Ingarden emphasized that we should distinguish between a schematic work of art as an 'artistic' object and an 'aesthetic' object which is constructed during the process of concretization, when the perceiver assumes his or her aesthetic attitude.

The first consistent presentation of Ingarden's method was *The Literary Work of Art*, which existed only in its German version for many years, and influenced many leading currents of regional literary studies. In turn, the philosopher's second fundamental work, *O poznawaniu dzieła literackiego* (1937, *The Cognition of the Literary Work of Art*), did not exist outside of Poland, and only its translations into German (1968) and English (1960; first American edition in 1973) helped to spread Ingarden's thought among the international academic community. Postwar studies of the philosopher's works have demonstrated unequivocally that his research on literature is a part of the broader aesthetic project in which the cognition of the literary work of art should be seen as a chapter of epistemological research belonging to the field of aesthetics (*Studia z estetyki*, 1957–1970, *Studies on Aesthetics*). The idea of ontological realism found its conclusion in the monumental *Spór o istnienie świata* (*The Controversy over the Existence of the World*), written between the 1940s and 1970. In this book, Ingarden summed up his polemic with the Aristotelian distinction between 'form' and 'matter' and its reinterpretation elaborated by Husserl. According to Ingarden, 'matter' loses its

passive character and becomes the active subject of some determined properties. For Ingarden, a crucial part of the process of cognition was not only the perceiver, but also the materiality or even corporeality which determines the knowledge that is perceived. Stefania Skwarczyńska was the first Polish woman to become a literary theorist and the first Polish scholar with an academic title gained thanks to a dissertation devoted entirely to literary theory. She should be considered the most intriguing follower of Ingarden's research, someone who enriched and developed the phenomenological theory of literature in an exceptional way. Although Skwarczyńska based her method on inspirations derived directly from Ingarden, she constantly challenged his legacy.

In *Przedmiot, metoda i zadania teorii literatury* (1938, *The Object, Method and Tasks of Literary Theory*) she praised phenomenology as a tool with which to "emancipate literary theory and transform it into a separate discipline" with a "philosophically definite scope" (Skwarczyńska 1938, 9). Skwarczyńska even claimed there that the birth of literary theory as an autonomous scientific discipline would not have been possible without phenomenological tools. She warmly welcomed some other premises of the phenomenological method too: the overcoming not only of positivist poetics but also of psychologism and empiricism. Simultaneously, the notion of a 'dynamic' and 'asemantic' life, taken from the works of Dilthey, resided at the very core of her work. This idea led her to examine the forms of literature that were most directly connected with life itself.

Skwarczyńska's main achievement was the development of the concept of *applied literature* (*literatura stosowana*, Skwarczyńska 1931). Thanks to this term, she was able to introduce to literary studies texts which had previously been ignored and considered 'non-literary' (but only applied literature), such as letters and conversations (*Próba teorii rozmowy*, 1932, *An Attempt at a Theory of Conversation* and *Teoria listu*, 1937, *The Theory of the Letter*). Her research culminated in her thesis on the necessity of a total suspension of the border separating literature from non-literary use of language. It thus led her to reject the term *belles lettres* and, in consequence, to focus on all kinds of linguistic utterances. In such an extended and 'democratized' field of literature, all genres and literary works, both masterpieces and trivial art, were of 'equal value'. Skwarczyńska proposed that the doubtful divisions between literature and non-literature, as well as the very notion of literature, should be replaced by research on the 'totality of utterances', which as a result became proper objects of literary criticism. If the term 'literary work' includes all linguistic statements capable of triggering an aesthetic experience, then 'fictionality' is not its determinant or necessary component. This paradigm of the receiver-centered vision of literature permitted Skwarczyńska to formulate one of the most original literary theories, which sought to grasp the non-literary dimensions of the use of language.

Phenomenological inspirations also strongly influenced Skwarczyńska's revision of genological research (*O istotności i istocie rodzajów literackich*, 1937, *On the Relevance and Essence of Literary Genres*). Between extreme idealism and radical realism, she found the phenomenological attitude to be a tool for examining the existence of literary genres, considered a 'general essence' of the work rather than a 'convention' or a 'set of ideas'. Thus, according to Skwarczyńska, genological reflection should be seen as the essential task of poetics, which in turn plays a privileged role as the most appropriate field of literary research.

In order to complete this short history of Polish interwar phenomenology, one should add that the radical revision of Husserl's notions made it possible to leave his idealistic perspective behind and turn his attention to some aspects of everyday reality and modern phenomena. The works of Leopold Blaustein are the product of such experimental research. In the 1930s, he focused on the problem of psychology and aesthetics, which resulted in pioneering studies on the perception of film and radio plays (*O percepcji słuchowiska radiowego*, 1938, *On the Perception of the Radio Play*). In addition, Zofia Lissa, a former student of Twardowski and Ingarden, devoted some of her papers to the psychology of film music (*Muzyka i film. Studium z pogranicza ontologii, estetyki i psychologii muzyki filmowej*, 1937, *Music and Film. A Study* on the *Ontology, Aesthetics and Psychology of Film Music*). Here, phenomenology revealed its other capacity: to exceed the limits not only of disciplines, but also of various media and other forms of artistic activity.

If we wanted to create a map of transfers and migrations of the period, we would first have to analyze important connections between the two most powerful centers: Jan Kazimierz University in Lviv and the University of Göttingen. Almost all Polish scholars who formed the broad phenomenological movement studied and published their works there. Twardowski was also professor of philosophy in Lviv from 1895 onwards (his successor at the Faculty of Philosophy was Ingarden) and his students included all the founders of Polish literary theory. Some of them had also studied under Husserl in Göttingen (i. e. Błachowski, Łempicki, Ingarden), and later in Freiburg (Ingarden, Blaustein), or Berlin (Blaustein, Łempicki). Individual scholars were based or worked in Zurich, Munich, Vienna, Leipzig, Basel, Leuven, and Hamburg, the major universities in the German-speaking areas of the period. On the Polish side, the influence of the Lviv-Warsaw School of analytical philosophy was so strong that beyond Lviv there were only isolated initiatives (in Warsaw and Cracow), foremost Poznan (Błachowski, Szuman, Troczyński).

2 From 1945 to the present

World War II was a traumatic interruption to the Polish phenomenological movement. Along with other representatives, Blaustein, Łempicki, and Troczyński were killed in Nazi death camps. The end of the war saw the beginning of a new migration of people and ideas caused by a deep geopolitical transformation. Lviv, the capital of Polish phenomenology, became part of the Soviet Union. In consequence, the entire Lvivian community was destroyed and some scholars were forced into exile. After the displacement, Skwarczyńska found a new place to work in Lodz, where she continued her research until the 1980s (for example, she developed an original modification of the notion of the 'places of indeterminacy', expressed in the figure of "concealment" [*przemilczenie,* Skwarczyńska 1947]). Ingarden, in turn, quickly formed a new movement in Cracow in the 1940s and the 1950s (despite an involuntary long break in the Stalinist period, when he was banned from teaching from 1949 to 1957). A strong phenomenological attitude is clearly visible in the works of his students, in which many mutations of the original method can be observed. This is especially true of Maria Gołaszewska's writings (the idea of the 'aesthetic situation' expressed in her *Świadomość piękna. Problematyka genezy, funkcji, struktury i wartości w estetyce*, 1970, *The Consciousness of Beauty: The Problems of Genesis, Function, Structure and Value in Aesthetics*) and Anna-Maria Tymieniecka, who became one of the most important postwar followers of Husserl's method. Tymieniecka was not only an active philosopher but also an animator of the international phenomenological community. She founded many initiatives, for example the International Husserl and Phenomenological Research Society (1969), and was the editor of *Analecta Husserliana: The Yearbook of Phenomenological Research* (1968), which helped to spread the phenomenological approach throughout the academic world.

The particular tendency of Polish phenomenology to be in a state of constant transformation resurfaced as a new phenomenon developed in the postwar situation from the fact that Ingarden's phenomenology crossed paths with Catholic theology. Such a tendency manifested itself among Ingarden's students: Andrzej Półtawski or Józef Tischner (*Ja transcendentalne w filozofii Edmunda Husserla*, 1964, *The Transcendental "I" in the Philosophy of Edmund Husserl*), who created an original philosophical concept directed simultaneously against Husserl's idea of a subject and against the tradition of Thomism. Although such affinities could seem quite confusing given Ingarden's skepticism towards religion, it is also easy to find some reasons for such an alliance. The common ground of Ingarden's phenomenology and Christian anthropology is the specific meaning of *humanism* and the question of the nature of a human being. Crucial achievements of the Catholic section of the movement included a translation of Ingarden's concepts into the

language of theology, and the introduction of the legacy of previously neglected versions of phenomenology to the Polish humanities, such as the branch of the philosophy of dialogue (Emmanuel Levinas).

One of the most important trends in Polish postwar literary theory was a dialogue and some proximity between phenomenology and structuralism. Polish structuralism found an important source of inspiration especially in Ingarden's version of phenomenology. However, initially, in the interwar era, some affinity was mixed with explicit hostility. The evidence of such confrontations could already be found in a collective volume, *Prace ofiarowane Kazimierzowi Wóycickiemu* (*Works dedicated to Kazimierz Wóycicki*), published in Vilnius in 1937. Although Ingarden was not invited to take part in the book, which aimed to present some tools of the nascent structuralism, sometimes in a manner overtly critical of phenomenology, it did include essays influenced by Ingarden's and Łempicki's approach (e. g. Skwarczyńska's article on *macaronisms* ["Estetyka makaronizmu", 1937c] and Manfred Kridl's on the "fictional element in poetry" ["O elemencie fikcyjnym w liryce", 1937]). In Poland, beginning in the mid-1960s, structuralism in literary criticism found its original articulation in the works of the Polish School of Literary Communication, undoubtedly the most dynamic current in Polish postwar research on literature. Far from adhering to structuralist orthodoxy, scholars such as Edward Balcerzan, Kazimierz Bartoszyński, Michał Głowiński, Henryk Markiewicz, Aleksandra Okopień-Sławińska and Janusz Sławiński sought to analyze the general conditions of the literary work understood as a structure principally inscribed in the network of social communication. Their respect for Ingarden, sometimes expressed quite explicitly, was the result of the conviction that his idea of the philosophy of literature supplied literary criticism with tools which also had hermeneutic potential beyond the phenomenological context. When Polish structuralists focused on the relationship between the sender and the receiver of the linguistic message, they followed Ingarden's concept of the literary work to a certain extent (usually in combination with the phenomenological ontology of Jean-Paul Sartre). Some of their key concepts, such as the *subject of creative actions* and the *virtual receiver* (communicative figures inscribed in the structure of the work), obviously could not exist without the phenomenological concept of 'receiver-centered' literary theory and the processual paradigm of a literary work (Głowiński, *Style odbioru. Szkice o komunikacji literackiej*, 1970, *Styles of Reception. Essays on Literary Communication*). Polish structuralists were also heavily influenced by Ingarden's conviction that concretization is a phenomenon determined by various qualities proper to a particular historical moment (as asserted in the chapter on the "concretization of the literary work", Głowiński et al. 1962, 66–73). Ingarden's rejection of Husserl's transcendental idealism contributed to the basic achievements of Polish structuralism, which in turn evolved

into a version of reader response criticism. The possibility of an alliance between structuralism and Ingarden's approach was also clearly visible in the latter's definition of poetics as a discipline exploring the internal order of the literary work and serves as a general theory of its significant structures, relations and properties. Similar to structuralists, Ingarden called for research which could grasp an immanent hierarchy of components and layers of a literary work, that is, some determined (structured) order of a work.

Such evident kinship enabled some scholars to define this phenomenon as "Polish phenomenological structuralism" (Raimondi 1987, 314). Endre Bojtár has even claimed that Ingarden should be seen as the precursor of Slavic structuralism (distinct from its French and American versions) with the idea of ontological structuralism (Bojtár 1985). Bojtár sought to prove the validity of such an assertion primarily on the basis of alleged proximities between Ingarden's and Jan Mukařovský's works.

Nonetheless, despite these comparisons and similar metatheoretical assumptions, one should not overlook some impassable ambivalence and differences which were actually emphasized by Ingarden himself. In *Krytyczne uwagi o poglądach fonologów* (1972, *Critical Remarks on Phonologists' Views*), he sought to defend the notion of a "meaning" as a "set of intentions" (Ingarden 1972, 15–28) and attempted to emphasize the insufficiency of Saussure's phonological *langue-parole* axis. Ingarden criticized Saussure for the obscurity of the main concepts of his model of linguistics and the remains of an anachronistic psychologist paradigm (ascribing 'psychic' qualities to 'non-psychic' objects) which are highly evident in the very foundations of his work.

Ingarden confronted both the 'proper' structuralism and its Polish variant (communicationism) because of its idea of a work as a mere communicate. Additionally, structuralism rejected the entire phenomenological framework (intentional objects, appearances and properties) in order to acknowledge semantic, intratextual structures as the only proper dimension of a literary work. Although Ingarden's poetics was focused on the immanent order of the work, he asserted that any order actually emerges only due to the necessary participation of the external 'I' (as a figure of intentionality), which structuralism ignored. However, in communicationists' works, Ingarden's ideas were sometimes used to support statements that do not reflect his own views. For example, social and historical contexts were an issue of the utmost importance for the members of the Polish structuralist movement. In the notion of 'concretization', Głowiński even saw the opportunity to overcome the distinction between poetics and the sociology of literature, which would aid in the analysis of the ways in which the literary text functions in various social situations or, in the broader sense, in the entire society determined by the particular historical moment. From Głowiński's perspective,

Ingarden's view was too narrow and highly idealistic, neglecting social factors which form the process of receiving. An important polemic with Ingarden's view of the stratified literary work was also expressed in various texts by Markiewicz (e. g. *Roman Ingarden o dziele literackim*, 1961, *Roman Ingarden on the Literary Work* and *Jeszcze o budowie dzieła literackiego*, 1964, *More on the Construction of the Literary Work*), which drew violent protests from Polish phenomenologists who, in turn, accused structuralists of a simple reduction of the complexity of the literary work to two layers only: the layer of 'sound' and the layer of 'meaning'.

Since Ingarden's death in 1970, the influence of his ideas on literary theory in Poland has clearly faded. Meanwhile, the international humanities have shown the opposite tendency. After his first publications, Ingarden's thought was almost completely invisible beyond the German-speaking world, but even there his influence was limited to *The Literary Work of Art*. In the first years after World War II, his work gradually became one of the most important points of reference for the main currents of research on the literary text in Germany, where scholars developed their lexis in a constant dialogue with Ingarden's views. It is evident in studies by Nicolaï Hartman (the reinterpretation of Ingarden's idea of a stratified structure of the literary work), Emil Staiger (*Grundbegriffe der Poetik*, 1946, *Basic Concepts of Poetics*; highly valued by Ingarden himself), Wolfgang Kayser (*Das sprachliche Kunstwerk*, 1948, *The Verbal Work of Art*), Franz Stanzel (*Die typischen Erzählsituationen im Roman*, 1957, *The Typical Narrative Situations in the Novel*), and Käte Hamburger (*Die Logik der Dichtung*, 1957, *The Logic of Literature*). Ingarden's influence can also be observed beyond the German-speaking world. Mikel Dufrenne's *Phénoménologie de l'expérience esthétique* (1953, *The Phenomenology of Aesthetic Experience*) is heavily indebted to Ingarden's theory of aesthetics. Markedly, Ingarden's ideas appeared in English-speaking academia relatively early, but only in isolated works (e. g. Gilbert Ryle's 1927 review of Ingarden's postdoctoral thesis *Essentiale Fragen. Ein Beitrag zum Problem des Wesens*, 1925, *Essential Questions. Preliminaries to the Problem of Beings*). This was possible mostly due to René Wellek's emigration to the USA. This literary critic, yet to achieve his later renown, was probably one of the first foreign scholars outside of Poland to devote his attention to Ingarden (1936). Ingarden's influence is clearly evident in an important text of Wellek published in 1942 (*The Mode of Existence of a Literary Work of Art*) and reprinted in *Theory of Literature*, written by Wellek and Austin Warren, in 1949. In 1981, Wellek's *Four Critics: Croce, Valery, Lukacs, and Ingarden* defined the latter as one of the key figures of twentieth-century literary theory, a thinker whose works mark the turning point of modern reflection on literature. The studies by Wellek (and the works of Felix Vodička [1942], who discussed Ingarden's idea of concretization as early as the 1940s) can be seen as the potential bridge between Ingarden's theory *and* the Prague School of structuralism.

Once phenomenological philosophy's time had passed, according to the famous claim by Martin Heidegger, Ingarden's work delivered the entire conceptual framework for one of the most important currents of contemporary literary theory: the Constance School of reception theory, which was the main current of wider reader response theory. The basic vocabulary of this intellectual movement ('the appellative structure of the text' or 'the implied reader') should be considered a development of Ingarden's key concepts such as 'concretization' and 'indeterminacy' (Ingarden 1960, 316–326). What was taken directly from the Polish philosopher's thought was Wolfgang Iser's premise that research on literary works could not be merely restricted to the text defined as a finite object, but should also focus on acts of reader activity. Nonetheless, Iser's works are not limited to explicit praise for Ingarden's idea, and express some contention. Iser's polemic against the Polish philosopher is evident in the different meaning he gives to 'places of indeterminacy', which, Iser asserted, should be investigated in their historical context, arguing that in some ways context had been neglected by Ingarden himself, who was rather focused on the general conditions in which the work of art exists. The main modification of the idea of indeterminacy expressed in Iser's and Jauss's works served to stress that 'indeterminacy' is variable and undergoes changes as history progresses. The intensity of indeterminacy rises with the evolution of literary styles and genres (modern narratives are more undetermined). Although Iser's theory was clearly an extension of Ingarden's project beyond its original context of the ontology and epistemology of the work of art, it was simultaneously much narrower due to its exclusive focus on the literary work.

After 1989, a new wave of interest in phenomenology emerged in Poland. However, this time was linked with the reception of the French humanities (Emmanuel Levinas, Maurice Merleau-Ponty) rather than with Ingarden's legacy (Jacek Migasiński and Iwona Lorenc). Thus, in its characteristic gesture, phenomenology in Poland was once again paired with concepts apparently unrelated if not opposite to it, with which it created an original intellectual fusion.

References

Bęben, Dariusz, and Marta Ples-Bęben (eds.). *Polska fenomenologia przedwojenna: antologia tekstów*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 2013.

Bojtár, Endre. *Slavic Structuralism*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1985.

Blaustein, Leopold. *Husserlowska nauka o akcie, treści i przedmiocie przedstawienia*. Lviv: Towarzystwo Naukowe, 1928.

Głowiński, Michał, Aleksandra Okopień-Sławińska, and Janusz Sławiński (eds.). *Zarys teorii literatury*. Warsaw: Państwowe Zakłady Wydawnictw Szkolnych, 1962.

Głowiński, Michał. *Style odbioru. Szkice o komunikacji literackiej*. Cracow: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1977.

Ingarden, Roman. *Das literarische Kunstwerk: Eine Untersuchung aus dem Grenzgebiet der Ontologie, Logik und Literaturwissenschaft*. Halle: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1931.

Ingarden, Roman. *O poznawaniu dzieła literackiego*. Lviv: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1937.

Ingarden, Roman. *Szkice z filozofii literatury*. Lodz: Spółdzielnia Wydawnicza "Polonista", 1947.

Ingarden, Roman. *Spór o istnienie świata*. Cracow: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 1947–1948.

Ingarden, Roman. *O dziele literackim: Badania z pogranicza ontologii, teorii języka i filozofii literatury*. Trans. by M. Turowicz. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1960.

Ingarden, Roman. *Krytyczne uwagi o poogląda fonologów: Z teorii języka i filozoficznych podstaw logiki*. Ed. Danuta Gierulanka. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1972. 15–28.

Kayser, Wolfgang. *Das sprachliche Kunstwerk: Eine Einführung in die Literaturwissenschaft*. Bern: Francke Verlag, 1954.

Kleiner, Juliusz. "Charakter i przedmiot badań literackich." *Biblioteka Warszawska* 1.290 (1913): 447–465.

Kridl, Manfred. "O elemencie fikcyjnym w liryce." *Prace ofiarowane Kazimierzowi Wóycickiemu*. Ed. Zygmunt Łempicki. Vilnius: Dom Książki Polskiej, 1937. 57–70.

Łempicki, Zygmunt. "W sprawie uzasadnienia poetyki czystej." Zygmunt Łempicki, *Wybór pism. Studia z teorii literatury*. Vol. 2. Ed. Henryk Markiewicz. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1966.

Łempicki, Zygmunt. "Dzieło literackie: struktura i wygląd." *Wiadomości Literackie* 9 (1932): 2.

Migasiński, Jacek and Iwona Lorenc (eds.). *Fenomenologia francuska: rozpoznania, interpretacje, rozwinięcia*. Warsaw: Wydział Filozofii i Socjologii UW, 2006.

Raimondi, Ezio. "Od formalizmu do pragmatyki." Trans. by Joanna Ugniewska. *Pamiętnik Literacki* 78.3 (1987): 307–318.

Skwarczyńska, Stefania. "O pojęcie literatury stosowanej." *Pamiętnik Literacki* 28.1/4 (1931): 1–24.

Skwarczyńska, Stefania. "Próba teorii rozmowy." *Pamiętnik Literacki* 29.1/4 (1932): 1–51.

Skwarczyńska, Stefania. *O istotności i istocie rodzajów literackich*. Lviv: Drukarnia Zakładu im. Ossolińskich, 1937a.

Skwarczyńska, Stefania. *Teoria listu*. Lviv: Towarzystwo Naukowe, 1937b.

Skwarczyńska, Stefania. "Estetyka makaronizmu." *Prace ofiarowane Kazimierzowi Wóycickiemu*. Ed. Zygmunt Łempicki. Vilnius: Dom Książki Polskiej, 1937c. 337–370.

Skwarczyńska, Stefania. "Przedmiot, metoda i zadania teorii literatury." *Pamiętnik Literacki* 35.1/4 (1938): 6–27.

Skwarczyńska, Stefania. "Przemilczenie jako element strukturalny dzieła literackiej." Stefania Skwarczyńska, *Z teorii literatury: cztery rozprawy*. Lodz: Poligrafika, 1947. 9–45.

Troczyński, Kazimierz. "Przedmiot i podział nauki o literaturze." *Księga pamiątkowa wydana na dziesięciolecie istnienia Koła Polonistów Uniwersytetu Poznańskiego*. Poznan: Nakładem własnym Koła Polonistów UP, 1930. 171–197.

Troczyński, Kazimierz. *Rozprawa o krytyce literackiej*. Poznan: J. Jachowski, 1931.

Troczyński, Kazimierz. "Estetyka literackiego reportażu." Kazimierz Troczyński, *Od formizmu do moralizmu: Szkice literackie*. Poznan: J. Jachowski, 1935. 33–41.

Troczyński, Kazimierz. *Artysta i dzieło: Studium o "Próchnie" Wacława Berenta*. Poznan: Drukarnia Katolicka, 1938.

Ulicka, Danuta. *Ingardenowska filozofia literatury: konteksty*. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1992.

Ulicka, Danuta. *Granice literatury i pogranicza literaturoznawstwa: fenomenologia Romana Ingardena w świetle filozofii lingwistycznej*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Wydziału Polonistyki Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 1999.

Vodička, Felix. "Literárni historie. Jeji problémy a úkoly." Felix Vodička, *Čtêni o jazyce a poezii*. Eds. Bohuslav Havrânek and Jan Mukařovský. Prague: Družstevni práce, 1942. 307–400.

Werner-Silberstein, Ada. *Wstęp do estetyki nowoczesnej*. Warsaw: Drukarnia Naukowa, 1911.

Wróbel, Łukasz. *Hylé i noesis: trzy międzywojenne koncepcje literatury stosowanej*. Torun: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika, 2013.

II.4 Hermeneutics

Robert Bird
Hermeneutics in Russia

Hermeneutics theorizes the interpretation of verbal or visual documents. In its broader conception, it denotes philosophical approaches that prioritize the problem of interpretation and understanding. Originating in eighteenth-century German philology, especially the work of Friedrich Schleiermacher, in the early nineteenth century hermeneutics became a central feature of German idealism, from G. W. F. Hegel and F. W. J. Schelling to Wilhelm Dilthey, all of whom saw historical and aesthetic sources as crucial evidence of the human spirit. With Martin Heidegger hermeneutics became a fully-fledged metaphysics, informing Hans-Georg Gadamer's and Paul Ricoeur's systematic attempts to reconcile a radical historicism with metaphysical horizons. All of these developments have found enthusiastic responses from Russian philosophers and theorists of culture, despite a virtual ban on metaphysics during the Soviet period. Viewed retrospectively, parallels to the hermeneutics of Gadamer and Ricoeur help to clarify the stakes of major Russian cultural theories and to highlight their distinctive contributions to critical theory in a global context.

1 The beginnings of hermeneutics in Russia: Gustav Shpet

As a humanistic methodology, hermeneutics arose in Russia together with modern philology in the late eighteenth century, largely at the hands of German ex-patriots like August Ludwig von Schlözer (1735–1809). The preeminence of criticism as a mode of discourse, particularly literary criticism, kept the problem of interpretation at the center of Russian intellectual life throughout the nineteenth century. From Nikolai Karamzin (1766–1826) and Aleksandr Pushkin (1799–1837) to Vissarion Belinskii (1811–1848) and Fedor Dostoevskii (1821–1881), Russian thinkers developed a historicist approach to metaphysical questions based on the interpretation of historical documents and aesthetic creations.

As a properly philosophical paradigm, hermeneutics was introduced to Russia by philosopher Gustav Shpet (1879–1937) in his manuscripts *Istoriia kak problema logiki* (1916, *History as a Problem of Logic*) and, especially, *Germenevtika i ee problemy* (1918, *Hermeneutics and Its Problems;* first published 1989–1993). Shpet's *Hermeneutics and Its Problems* consists largely of a critical overview of approaches to historical understanding by numerous (mainly German) histori-

ans, philologists and philosophers. In its main genealogy and taxonomy, Shpet's history of hermeneutics matches quite closely the standard story told in more recent Western scholarship (see for example Palmer 1969, Grondin 1994). But Shpet's account was not only precocious; it remains distinctive among histories of hermeneutics (see Ghidini 1992; Kalinichenko 1992; Haardt 1993; Fritjof 1997; Chubarov 1997; Kuznetsov 1999; Bird 2009).

Like Heidegger, Shpet was a student of Husserl who sought a new ontology that would "achieve its tasks in this, the immanent world" (Shpet 1996, 388). Considering Wilhelm Dilthey's hermeneutics to be "the point from which we must now proceed" (Shpet 1993 [1918], 261; 1999, 61), Shpet followed Dilthey in defining "understanding" as "a process in which we receive from sensual data psychical experience, of which sensual data are the manifestation" (Shpet 2002, 880). Understanding is knowledge which "from sensual data in human history turns to what is inaccessible to the senses, but what is nonetheless embodied and expressed in outer being" (Shpet 1993 [1918], 256). As George Kline noted, Shpet effectively supplemented Husserl with "a characteristically Hegelian stress on history, tradition, community, culture, and the network of interrelated social institutions and practices that constitute what Hegel called *objektiver Geist*" (Kline 1999, 182). With its historical grounding, understanding also has a political aspect, insofar as "mutual understanding ensures community (*Gemeinsamkeit*) existing amongst individuals, and on the other hand community represents the precondition for understanding" (Shpet 1993 [1918], 259).

Reality that has been understood in a particular way is for Shpet "concrete reality", which is the life no longer of individuals in society, but also of conscious personalities in the realm of the human spirit. With this link to spirit, the historical act of interpretation opens up onto metaphysical horizons, as does Heidegger's analogous concept of "world". In Shpet's view, the emphasis on sensual experience distinguished his hermeneutics from Dilthey's "psychologism", Husserl's "static" and "arid" phenomenology, and Hegel's "dialectic of the objectivized concept" (Shpet 1991 [1918], 253; 1993 [1918], 277–278). Shpet presented his own approach as "a real dialectic, a dialectic of realized cultural sense", in which concept and materiality always go in tandem (Shpet 1927, 116). (These critical passages demonstrate that it is also an oversimplification to see Shpet as merely a "precursor" of Soviet semiotics, as has sometimes been argued [Ivanov 1976, 1998].) Mediating between concept and materiality, understanding provides the only sure foothold of knowledge in the "constant motion" of reality (Shpet 1993 [1918], 279). Understanding thus resolves the problem of eternal regression by providing a basic beginning point for reliable knowledge that relies on no auxiliary means and requires no further derivation (Shpet 1996, 406; 2002, 860–862;

cf. Bowie 1997). The need and ability to understand are the basic facts of human existence, from which all philosophical inquiry must begin.

With understanding at its center, Shpet's philosophy places particular stress on the mechanism of interpretation, which Shpet defines via Dilthey's conceptual triad "experience, expression, understanding": psychical *experience* finds outer *expression* in signs, which are then *understood* by being read back to their origin in inner experience (Shpet 1993 [1918], 256–257). Concrete reality which has been so expressed, and has therefore been made available for understanding, is categorically separate from instrumental reality. Shpet calls it 'detached reality' or, simply, culture. Understanding is knowledge which detaches or suspends (in the sense of *Aufhebung*) a material phenomenon in the realm of pure meaning. This link between understanding and detachment constitutes Shpet's most distinctive contribution to hermeneutic theory.

Shpet's historicizing phenomenology has several notable counterparts in such later hermeneutic theorists as Hans-Georg Gadamer and Paul Ricoeur. Like Gadamer, Shpet described the process of knowledge in terms of a "'dialogue' with truth": "the realized process of the dialectic in its hermeneutic unfolding can yield only *a single truth*, but as long as the process remains unfinished, the prediction of possibilities remains absolutely free" (Shpet 1992, 37–38). Like Ricoeur, Shpet emphasized the need to include within the hermeneutic process its applied result – exposition and action – which raise raw experience to rational expression in a "verbal-logical form" and complete the "realization of reality" as "culture" (Shpet 1927, 113, 116). Since the knowledge gained from understanding is completed only when it is applied in new acts of expression, thus initiating a new cycle of interpretation, Shpet discounted the possibility of deriving dogmatic truths from past history: "The only lesson we can extract from this is that one must move and complete what has not yet been completed" (Shpet 1993 [1918], 280). For Shpet, as for Ricoeur, the emphasis on application gives understanding an ethical hue; in addition to being, it impinges on the sphere of "duty" (Shpet 2002, 857): "A proposition that we use as a norm [...] becomes such only in the process of *application*", Shpet wrote (Shpet 1996, 381). Finally, Shpet's concept of detachment can be compared to Ricoeur's concept of distanciation. In particular, in his three-volume *Time and Narrative*, Ricoeur defined narrative as "the distanciation of fable or *mythos*", which renders the world intelligible in human terms (Ricoeur 1991, 86). Theorizing this detached or distantiated realm of meaning leads both Ricoeur and Shpet to original analyses of categories of aesthetic expression, like narrative, myth, symbol and genre. Therefore the influence of Shpet's philosophy has been especially notable in philosophical aesthetics.

2 Symbolist hermeneutics

While Shpet was the first Russian philosopher to deploy the term hermeneutics, he was not the first to place understanding at the center of a metaphysical theory. As early as 1886 Vasilii Rozanov (1856–1919) completed a massive philosophical study (his debut work) entitled *O ponimanii* (1886, *On Understanding*), which investigated interpretive activity as a constitutive element in human being. Although Rozanov proceeded to become a visible writer on philosophical issues, *On Understanding* was condemned to obscurity; Shpet, for instance, never mentions it. However, Rozanov's philosophical writings display many points of contact with later hermeneutic philosophy; his 1902 essay "Paestum," for instance, deserves to be read alongside Heidegger's *Der Ursprung des Kunstwerkes* (1935/1936, *The Origin of the Artwork*).

Shpet's most influential predecessors were the theorists of Russian Symbolism who developed aesthetic theories, largely in response to Nietzsche's critique of German idealism and philology. Best known as an indefatigable advocate of Dionysian frenzy in art, poet Viacheslav Ivanov (1866–1949) analyzed the acts of interpretation and understanding in ways congruous with hermeneutics, despite writing with disdain of the Apollonian aesthetics of "purely-epic detachment" (Ivanov 1971–1987, Vol. 2, 201; cf. Szilard 1993, 2002; Bird 1999). The key concept in Ivanov's negotiation of this distance was the symbol, which both Shpet and Aleksei Losev later adopted to denote material reality that is detached into the realm of understanding and made available for interpretation (Shpet 1989, 358, 411). In 1909 Ivanov directly anticipated Ricoeur's threefold analysis of mimesis in *Time and Narrative* by proposing the "mystical" triad catharsis-mathesis-praxis as the basis not only of aesthetic cognition, but also of an existential philosophy (Bird 2003). In his 1920 dialogue with Mikhail Gershenzon *Perepiska iz dvukh uglov* (*Correspondence from Two Corners*), Ivanov argued for "continuity" as a cornerstone even of revolutionary proletarian culture (Ivanov and Gershenzon, 2006).

For all their differences, Ivanov and Shpet both exerted shaping influence on the religious metaphysics of Aleksei Losev (1893–1988), who placed the concept of detachment at the center of his philosophical masterpiece *Dialektika mifa* (1930, *The Dialectics of Myth*). Instead of Shpet's equation of concrete reality with culture, Losev drew a sharp distinction between myth and art, which for him represented two different types of detachment from everyday reality. Aesthetic detachment corresponds to Kant's concept of aesthetic disinterestedness. For Losev, in aesthetic detachment the meaning of reality is telescoped by being detached from factual being and set off as abstract fiction. By contrast, "Mythical detachment is detachment from the meaning and idea of everyday facts, but not from their fac-

ticity", i. e. their material incarnation (2003 [1930], 62). "Myth", Losev declared, "is poetic detachment given as a thing" (2003 [1930], 177). Losev follows Shpet in linking the detachment of art and myth to the concept of expression. Detached reality is not internal or external; rather it is reality which manifests an interchange between the two: "Expression is always dynamic and mobile [...]. Expression is the arena where two energies meet, from within and from without, and their mutual communication in some whole and indivisible image that is at once the one and the other" (2003 [1930], 55). Understanding is the mode by which humans detach from the material world and express it as myth.

The major contrast to Shpet's treatment comes in Losev's hierarchical axiology of detachment. For Losev, as for Viacheslav Ivanov, myth is an unquestionably *truer* illumination of reality than art or normal experience. "Myth," Losev once asserted, "is the fullest perception [of reality]" (RGALI 941.12.49, 20). Moreover, mythical detachment is distinguished precisely by its illumination of hierarchies within reality. When faced with the need to define myth positively, Losev averred that it is marked by "some *detachment* and some *hierarchic character*" (2003 [1930], 33). While he did not specify the origin of this hierarchy, it appears to stem from the human subject's interaction with reality. After all, myth exists only because there are people to perceive reality mythically, and the hierarchic quality of myth must refer primarily to the gradation of its human subjects, who are elevated either in the cognitive or in the ontological sense. Losev was especially critical of Neo-Kantian approaches to myth, particularly Ernst Cassirer's *Philosophie der symbolischen Formen* (1923–1929, *Philosophy of Symbolic Forms*), writing that "Cassirer has not introduced a new concept of 'understanding' [...] He has introduced only a description of understanding" (RGALI 941.14.25, 5; cf. Dunaev 1991, 216–218). In the context of Orthodox spirituality, Losev would seem to be implicating the kind of spiritual detachment one finds in ascetic authors such as St. John of the Ladder (John Climacus), in whose *Ladder of Divine Ascent* detachment appears as *memento mori*, exile, poverty, pure prayer (i. e., free of images), and "the vision of things spiritual" (Climacus 1982, 256; cf. Bird 2004). In this way Losev opened the way for integrating patristic sources into the genealogy of hermeneutics. For Losev, understanding is not only a cognitive and ontological category; it is also an ethical position. As mythical detachment, understanding is a mode of living in truth and participating actively in its historical unfolding.

3 Marxist hermeneutics

Although Shpet and Losev mostly confirm the alliance between hermeneutics and metaphysics, even religion, hermeneutic ideas can also be traced in the work of Russian Marxist theorists, particularly those of the so-called Bakhtin Circle. While Shpet and Losev represent a Right Neo-symbolism, then the Bakhtin Circle produced a Left Neo-symbolism that remains a potent influence within critical theory today. In particular, in *Formal'nyi metod v literaturovedenii* (1928, *The Formal Method in the Literary Scholarship*) Pavel Medvedev (1891–1938) laid the groundwork for a Marxist hermeneutics by reconciling the primacy of the economic base with limited autonomy for the cultural superstructure, which Medvedev theorizes as ideology. On the one hand, individual expressions occur only in forms dictated by the dominant ideology:

> The ideological environment is the realized, material, outwardly-expressed social consciousness of the given collective. It is determined by its economic being and, in its turn, determines the consciousness of every member of the collective. Properly individual consciousness can only become consciousness when realized in these forms of ideological environment which are given to it: in language, in conventionalized gesture, in artistic image, in myth, etc. (Medvedev 1928, 24)

On the other hand, the ideological environment exists only as an abstract potential, and becomes real only when made material in discrete forms and utterances:

> All products of ideological creativity – art works, scientific works, religious symbols and rites, etc. – are material things, parts of reality surrounding man. True, these are a special kind of things, and they possess denotations, meanings, and inner values. But all these meanings and values are given only in material things and acts. They do not submit to actual realization outside of some processed material. (Medvedev 1928, 15)

Each material realization of hitherto abstract "meaning and value" shifts the parameters within the ideological environment. Working directly on material form, seeking expression within available ideological denotations, the understanding and expressing subject produces new ideological meanings and new potentials for everyone else.

For Medvedev each shift in the ideological field occurs as an act of 'social evaluation', which is encoded in material form and unpacked in acts of interpretation by the multitude of addressees. Medvedev traces the concept of social evaluation to the Symbolists' concept of symbol. The entire ideological field, by extension, is comprised of the sum of socially-evaluative acts. Therefore "it is impossible to understand a concrete utterance without participating in its evaluative atmosphere, without understanding its evaluative orientation in the ideologi-

cal environment" (Medvedev 1928, 165). All social communication is the exchange of material evaluations about material evaluations, mediated by the immaterial sphere of ideology: "It is not works that interact, but people; however they interact through the medium of works and thus bring them also into reflected interactions" (Medvedev 1928, 204). An analogous system was developed by Valentin Voloshinov (1895–1936), who in his *Marksizm i filosofiia iazyka* (1929, *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*) deftly contrasts his own emphasis on understanding to the Russian formalists' notion of knowledge as recognition (Voloshinov 1973 [1929], 60). Voloshinov's book was avidly embraced by Raymond Williams and Terry Eagleton in their accounts of Marxist theories of culture (Williams 1977; Eagleton 1983, 116–118). As Williams summarizes Voloshinov,

> The real communicative 'products' which are usable signs are [...] living evidence of a continuing social process, into which individuals are born and within which they are shaped, but to which they then also actively contribute, in a continuing process (Williams 1977, 37).

Though he was a close collaborator of Medvedev (some even attribute Medvedev's and Voloshinov's books wholly to his authorship), Mikhail Bakhtin (1895–1975) mostly stayed much further from the hermeneutic tradition. However Bakhtin's central concepts of unfinalizability and dialogue show him working on parallel lines to those of Gadamer and Ricouer in the West. In particular, a posthumously published text with the Dilthey-esque title "K filosofskim osnovam gumanitarnykh nauk" ("Towards the Philosophical Grounds of the Humanitarian Sciences") shows how Bakhtin's major ideas might be profitably re-read within a hermeneutic framework:

> You can't change the factual, *thingly* aspect of the past, but the meaning, expressive and speaking aspect can be changed, since it is unfinalizable and does not coincide with itself (it is free). The role of memory in this eternal transfiguration of the past. Knowledge is understanding of the past in its unfinalizability (in its non-coincidence with itself). [...]
> The problem of understanding. Understanding as a seeing of *meaning*, but not a phenomenal seeing, but a seeing of the living meaning of experience and expression, the vision of what is inwardly meaningful, so to speak, of a self-meaningful phenomenon. (Bakhtin 1996, 9)

This admittedly cryptic passage seems indebted to Shpet's emphasis on the deep meaning of phenomena, which lies beyond the purely functional signification of the surfaces of things. Bakhtin's application of "unfinalizability" to the past is reminiscent of Hans-Georg Gadamer's 'effective history', according to which the past is seen as fluid and productive, insofar as it is constantly subjected to reinterpretation in the present context. Lastly, Bakhtin relates these insights to the 'human sciences', which, by constantly reinterpreting past expressions of

human experience, achieve access to the deep meaning of phenomena and form the present. For all these reasons Bakhtin attracted enthusiastic followers as someone capable of enriching Soviet Marxism with a broader, more historicist engagement with the cultural past.

4 Conclusion

Although only Gustav Shpet fully adopted the language of hermeneutics, the philosophical systems of Gadamer and Ricoeur help to formulate a major theme within Russian cultural theory from Vasilii Rozanov all the way through to the late Mikhail Bakhtin, including also major voices in Marxist aesthetics like Pavel Medvedev. These examples could easily be extended to include more philosophers and theologians of the early twentieth century, such as Pavel Florensky (1882–1937), and later thinkers working already with knowledge of Heideggerian tradition, like Aleksandr Mikhailov (1938–1995), Vladimir Bibikhin (1938–2004) and Sergei Khoruzhii (b. 1941). In all these cases the resources of hermeneutics have provided Russian thinkers a mechanism for constructing a historicist metaphysics, in which documentary and aesthetic texts mediate between material and psychic dimensions of reality. Therefore hermeneutic methods have played a particularly important role in Russian aesthetic theory, especially via such categories as symbol and myth. Although since the millennium hermeneutics has experienced a sharp downturn in interest and vitality, it remains an inalienable dimension in the history of critical theory and a resource for its future development, particularly for teleological accounts of artistic and intellectual culture, such as those informed by Christian theology and by Marxism.

References

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "K filosofskim osnovam gumanitarnykh nauk." Mikhail Bachtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 5. Eds. S. G. Bocharov and L. A. Gogotishvili. Moscow: Russkie slovari, 1996. 7–10.

Bird, Robert. "Martin Heidegger and Russian Symbolist Philosophy." *Studies in East European Thought* 51 (1999): 85–108.

Bird, Robert. "Obriad i mif v pozdnei lirike Viach. Ivanova." *Viacheslav Ivanov – Peterburg – mirovaia kul'tura: Materialy mezhdunarodnoi nauchnoi konferentsii 9–11 sentiabria 2002 g*. Eds. Vsevolod E. Bagno et al. Tomsk and Moscow: Vodolei Publishers, 2003. 179–193.

Bird, Robert. "Minding the Gap: The Concept of Detachment in Aleksej Losev's The Dialectic of Myth." *Studies in East European Thought* 56.2–3 (2004): 143–160.

Bird, Robert. "The Hermeneutic Triangle: Gustav Shpet's Aesthetics in Context." *Shpet's Contribution to Philosophy and Cultural Theory*. Ed. Galin Tihanov. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 2009. 28–44.

Bowie, Andrew. *From Romanticism to Critical Theory: The Philosophy of German Literary Theory*. London and New York, NY: Routledge, 1997.

Chubarov, Igor' M. "Modifikatsiia fenomenologicheskoi paradigmy ponimaniia soznaniia v proekte germenevticheskoi dialektiki G.G. Shpeta." *G.G. Shpet/Comprehensio. Vtorye shpetovskie chteniia*. Ed. Ol'ga G. Mazaeva. Tomsk: Vodolei, 1997. 27–33.

Climacus, John. *The Ladder of Divine Ascent*. Trans. by Colm Luibheid and Norman Russell. Introduction by Kallistos Ware. Preface by Colm Luibheid. New York, NY: Paulist Press, 1982.

Dunaev, A. G. "Losev i GAKhN (issledovanie arkhivnykh materialov i publikatsiia dokladov 20-kh godov)." *A. F. Losev i kul'tura XX veka: Losevskie chteniia*. Ed. Iurii F. Panasenko. Moscow: Nauka, 1991. 197–220.

Eagleton, Terry. *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1983.

Frithjof, Rodi. "Programma 'germenevticheskoi logiki.' Sravnitel'nyi analiz podkhodov Gustava Shpeta i Georga Misha." *G.G. Shpet/Comprehensio. Vtorye shpetovskie chteniia*. Ed. Ol'ga G. Mazaeva. Tomsk: Vodolei, 1997. 36–50.

Ghidini, Candida [Kandida Gidini]. "Osobennosti germenevtiki G.G. Shpeta." *Nachala* 2 (1992): 13–18.

Grondin, Jean. *Introduction to Philosophical Hermeneutics*. Foreword by Hans-Georg Gadamer. Trans. by Joel Weinsheimer. New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 1994.

Haardt, Alexander. *Husserl in Russland: Phaenomologie der Sprache und Kunst bei Gustav Spet und Aleksej Losev*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1993.

Ivanov, Viacheslav I. *Sobranie sochinenii*. 4 Vols. Brussels: Foyer oriental chrétien, 1971–1987.

Ivanov, Viacheslav V. *Ocherki po istorii semiotiki v SSSR*. Moscow: Nauka, 1976.

Ivanov, Viacheslav V. *Izbrannye trudy po semiotike i istorii kul'tury*. Vol. 1. Moscow: Jazyki Russkoj Kul'tury, 1998.

Ivanov, Viacheslav, and Mikhail Gershenzon. *Perepiska iz dvukh uglov*. Ed. Robert Bird. Moscow: Vodolei Publishers, Progress-Pleiada, 2006.

Kalinichenko, Vladimir V. "Gustav Shpet: ot fenomenologii k germenevtike." *Logos* 3 (1992): 37–61.

Kline, George L. "Gustav G. Shpet as Interpreter of Hegel." *Archiwum historii, filozofii I mysli spolecznej* 44 (1999): 181–190.

Kuznetsov, V.G. "The Role of Hermeneutic Phenomenology in Grounding the Affirmative Philosophy of Gustav Gustavovich Shpet." *Russian Studies in Philosophy* 37.4 (Spring 1999): 53–61.

Losev, A. F. *The Dialectics of Myth* [1930]. Trans. by Vladimir Marchenkov. New York, NY, and London: Routledge, 2003.

Medvedev, P. N. *Formal'nyi metod v literaturovedenii: kriticheskoe vvedenie v sotsiologicheskuiu poetiku*. Leningrad: Priboi, 1928.

Palmer, Richard E. *Hermeneutics: Interpretation Theory in Schleiermacher, Dilthey, Heidegger and Gadamer*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1969.

RGALI: Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv literatury i iskusstva. Moscow, Russian Federation.

Ricoeur, Paul. "The Hermeneutical Function of Distanciation." *From Text to Action*. *Essays on Hermeneutics, II*. Trans. by Kathleen Blamey and John B. Thompson. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1991. 75–88.

Shpet, Gustav G. *Vnutrenniaia forma slova (Ėtiudy i variatsii na temy Gumbol'dta)*. Moscow: Gosudarstvennaia akademiia khudozhestvennykh nauk, 1927.

Shpet, Gustav G. *Sochineniia*. Moscow: Pravda, 1989.

Shpet, Gustav G. "Germenevtika i ee problemy." [1918] *Kontekst-1991. Literaturno-teoreticheskie issledovaniia*. Ed. E. V. Pasternak. Moscow: Nauka, 1991. 215–255.

Shpet, Gustav G. "Rabota po filosofii." *Nachala* 1 (1992): 31–49.

Shpet, Gustav G. "Germenevtika i ee problemy." [1918] *Kontekst-1992. Literaturno-teoreticheskie issledovaniia*. Ed. E. V. Pasternak. Moscow: Nauka, 1993. 251–284.

Shpet, Gustav G. *Psikhologiia sotsial'nogo bytiia: Izbrannye sotsiologicheskie trudy*. Ed. Tat'jana D. Martsinkovskaia. Moscow: Insititut prakticheskoi psikhologii; Voronezh: MODEK, 1996.

Shpet, Gustav G. "On Wilhelm Dilthey's Concept of the Human Sciences: Excerpts from Hermeneutics and Its Problems." *Russian Studies in Philosophy* 37.4 (Spring 1999): 53–61.

Shpet, Gustav G. *Istoriia kak problema logiki: Kriticheskie i metodologicheskie issledovaniia. Materialy. V dvukh chastiakh*. Ed. V. S. Miasnikov. Moscow: Pamiatniki istoricheskoi mysli, 2002.

Szilard, Lena. "Problemy germenevtiki v slavianskom literaturovedenii XX v. (fragment)." *Studia Slavica* 38.1–2 (1993): 173–83.

Szilard, Lena. *Germetizm i germenevtika*. St. Petersburg: Ivan Limbakh, 2002.

Voloshinov, Valentin. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* [1929]. Trans. by Ladislav Matejka and I. R. Titunik. Cambridge, MA, and London: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Williams, Raymond. *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford and New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Josef Vojvodík

Hermeneutics in the Czech Context (F. X. Šalda, Václav Černý, and Dimitrij Tschižewskij [Dmytro Chyzhevsky])

There are several reasons that suggest the position of literary critic and literary historian Frantisek Xaver Šalda as the most important exponent of the hermeneutical method in Czech literary history in the first third of the twentieth century. Firstly, in his critical essays of 1904 he already overcame the strict separation of content and form in favor of the idea of a reciprocity between the two components within the charged relationship of material and creative act. Secondly, and most importantly, he designed his hermeneutics of 'poetic individuality' in an emphatic connection with Nietzsche's notion of tragedy and Wilhelm Dilthey's hermeneutics of life and experience. Oleg Sus expressly points to the meaning of Dilthey's psychology and his life-philosophical structuralism – along with Friedrich Theodor Vischer's and Johannes Volkelt's theory of symbols – for Šalda's concept of aesthetic experience (Sus 1968, 43–45). Reconstructing the genesis of Šalda's 'prestructural aesthetics', Oleg Sus, a student of Mukařovský's, closely analyses the references of Šalda's 'structuralism *sui generis*' to the aesthetic concepts of German art philosophy of the 1880s and 1890s (Sus 1968, 37–66) and stresses the importance of Dilthey's "life-philosophically founded structural semantics" for structural art studies in general and for Czech aesthetics in particular (Sus 1968, 50). In the second half of the nineteenth century the universities of Prague and Vienna evolved into two centres of Austro-Bohemian Herbartism. In Prague, Robert Zimmermann, a student of Bolzano's, became the main exponent of Herbartian aesthetics; his Czech student Josef Durdík became the official vernacular exponent of Herbartian aesthetics at Prague University, yet undivided between German and Czech speakers. Along with the line of action leading from Herbartian aesthetic formalism (concerning the Herbartian genealogy of Prague structuralism, see the introduction to Vodička by Jurij Striedter 1976, XII) via the Prague acknowledgement and reception of the Russian formalist school to the development of the Prague school of literary structuralism there is another parallel hermeneutical line, which began with Šalda's comprehensive essay "Synthetismus v novém umění" (1891–1892, "Synthetism in the New Art"), and which was modified and continued later by some of his students, especially by Václav Černý (1905–1987). The Germanist and Bohemist Vojtěch Jirát (1902–1945) may also be mentioned here.

1 The 'pathic' hermeneutics of poetic individuality (F. X. Šalda)

With "Synthetism in the New Art", Šalda, in a parallel to Dilthey's idea of poetry as an 'expression of life', already attempted to demonstrate artistic work as a synthetic and synthesising process whose ideal goal lay in unifying art and life, expression and character (i.e., form and content), and in deducing a holistic worldview (Šalda 1952, 52–54).

However, Šalda's path to Dilthey's hermeneutics of an 'inner life-nexus' was informed by the idea of 'tragic art' and artistic work as "Kritika patosem a inspirací" (1973d [1905], "Criticism as Pathos and Inspiration"), the title of his essay of 1904/1905. Šalda's 'pathic' idea of art, which he developed in his literary- and art-critical essays from the volume *Boje o zítřek* (1973a [1905], *Fight for Tomorrow*), shows surprising points of contact with the simultaneously formulated thesis of 'pathos formulas' developed by art historian Aby Warburg. Like Warburg, Šalda understands artistic work as an archaic-libidinal and unconscious 'psycho-energetics' that externalises itself in the work of art, as it were. The work of art, whose potency expresses itself as "artistic and dramatic pathos", thus becomes the medium of "discharge" ("vybití") of these "energetics" (Šalda 1973b [1905], 160–163). In the essay "Umělecký paradox" (1973b [1905], "The Artistic Paradox") Šalda foregrounds the category of life as the actual "fabric" ("látka") and the actual substance of art, since artistic work is "a dramatic and pathetic, but not an ethical state. A poet or any other artist indeed creates a new ethos – but only through a new pathos" (Šalda 1973b [1905], 163–164). In the essays of his *Fight for Tomorrow* the literary critic develops an almost psycho*patho*logical symptomatology of psychic conditions which, according to Šalda, accompany the creative process and the genesis of the work of art as extreme conditions and inner, affectively charged reactions to outside events. This "criticism through pathos and inspiration" (Šalda 1973d, 183) clearly finds its expression in Šalda's famous essay on Edvard Munch, "Násilník snu" (1973c [1905], "Rapist of the Dream", on the occasion of the extensive Munch exhibition in Prague in the spring of 1905). As a "man of dramatic pathos and spasm", Munch is seen as a "rapist of the dream" because, as an "artist of unreal colour pathos [...], he forcefully realises dramatic affects artistically – passion, jealousy, anxiousness, or revolt" (Šalda 1973c, 175). As the title of the Munch essay suggests, Šalda connected the violent creative energy of Edvard Munch's art with the notion of an inner, unconscious, and latent energy which may enable the eruption of "dark formative powers" leaving a trace of a "passionately violent gesture" (Šalda 1973c, 173–174), which is supposed to be deciphered by the spectator-critic. Yet not only the artist, but also the art critic

(or art interpreter) is supposed to be a "rapist of his dream"; for both of them, art remains tied up with passion and pain, and "criticism has to become painful for the critic" (Šalda 1973d [1905], 193).

In the essay collection *Duše a dílo: Podobizny a medailony* (published between 1903 and 1912, and as a book in 1913, *Soul and Opus: Portraits and Medaillons*) containing studies on individual Czech (Mácha, Neruda, Němcová, Vrchlický, Sova, Březina, etc.) and foreign authors (Rousseau, Flaubert, Zola, Huysmans, Ibsen), Šalda takes the main points of his *Fight for Tomorrow* a step further, yet the focus shifts from the logics of the paradoxon (*logika paradoxu*) as the basic creative principle of 'pathic' and passionate artistic work to the principle of integration and "wholeness of life" (*životní celistvost*); from the idea of a dramatic-passionate "creative action"(*tvůrčí čin*) to the idea of the "singularity of the literary-historical event" (*jedinečnost zjevu literárně-dějinného*) (Šalda 1937, 6–7). In the preface to *Soul and Opus* Šalda emphasises as the main goal of his essay collection the endeavour to "descend to the psychic primordial experiences of my poet-creators" and to demonstrate these as the foundation of the "inner workings of their soul, their dramatic tension" (Šalda 1937, 6). With his idea of the work of art as an expression of the inwardness of the individual, Šalda comes close to the hermeneutics of poetic individuality developed by Wilhelm Dilthey in the four essays of his volume *Das Erlebnis und die Dichtung* (1910 [1906], *Poetry and Experience*). As Šalda would later, Dilthey assumes a close connection between life and the poetic creative process. Dilthey defines this connection in his Goethe essay from *Poetry and Experience*: "Poetry is the representation and the expression of life. It expresses an experience and it represents the outer reality of life" (Dilthey 1910 [1906], 177). The experience represents the concrete unity of the 'history of life', which Šalda calls "the history of the poet's own soul", i. e., his "outer life" (Šalda 1937, 6). Yet Šalda is not only interested in the knowledge of the 'inner workings of the soul' and the outer 'history of the soul', but mainly in the reconstruction and understanding of the *integration* of these two components of the creative personality. "Integration" Šalda sees as "spiritual typicality" concentrating the outer surface and condensing it to a construct of personal objectivity (Šalda 1937, 7). The principle of integration conceptualised by Šalda as an alternative to the "deductions and descriptions of [literary] evolutionism" (Šalda 1987 [1931], 463) is, as the essence of creative singularity (*jedinečnost*), one of the central terms of Šalda's literary hermeneutics. As an energetic process and as a certain form of "inner tension and exertion" (Šalda 1937, 39) integration aims at the achievement of dynamic wholeness – or, in Dilthey's terminology, of the "spiritual nexus" ("Zusammenhang des Seelenlebens", Dilthey 1994 [1887], 169), whose highest expression is poetry. Therefore, for Dilthey, not only poetry, but art in general becomes knowledge: knowledge about the meaning of life. At the beginning of

the 1930s Šalda still emphasised the great importance of Dilthey's philosophy of the humanities as studies of creative life that objectifies itself through the intellect (Dilthey 1992 [1910], 177–178), and his life-philosophically founded hermeneutics of art from the wholeness of life:

> Germany was lucky that Wilhelm Dilthey was active at the same time as positivism but worked against it. Throughout his youth he was a part of the Romantic movement, and he carried the message of romanticism into the new positivist era like a fertile seed of future transformations. *Poetry and Experience* was the first, albeit not the perfect attempt to liberate literary history from the prison of blandness and 'literariness' and to show certain personalities as cultural-vital forces. [...] Dilthey was the first to make a collective literary history possible, namely, the dramatic interaction of life forces driven by the inner will to crystallisation typicality. (Šalda 1987 [1931], 463)

2 The creative process as aesthetic-artistic 'self-liberation' (Václav Černý's personalism)

The romanicist and comparatist Václav Černý (1905–1987), a student of Šalda's and his successor at Prague's Charles University, took Šalda's critical method as a constant endeavour to discover the creative personality "at the moment of creative uplift, the greatest effort of self-realisation"; according to Černý (1992b [1938], 131), this is also where Šalda's "heroic personalism" was founded. The relation of personality and creative process as aesthetic-artistic self-creation and self-liberation, as breakthrough of personality in self-representation is at the centre of Černý's critical and literary-historical personalism.

Černý interprets the shaping of (creative) life based on the conscience of personality as an "intellectual liberation" ("duchovní liberace", Černý 1992d [1939], 40). Like Šalda and the hermeneutics of the Dilthey school (such as Georg Misch (1878–1965), a Goettingen philosopher and Dilthey's son-in-law), he sees this as the actual core of occidental-European self-determination: "Like every creative opus, personality means liberation" (Černý 1992d [1939], 40). For Černý, 'creative self-liberation' appears unthinkable without the ethical dimension. With reference to the idea of poetic creation formulated by Paul Valéry (for Černý, the paradigm of 'self-creative' artist-man), Černý emphasises: "The ethics of artistic form simultaneously and most of all stand for the ethics of the individual, a moral discipline of life as such" (Černý 1992d [1939], 38).

Even though Černý starts from Bergson's theory of intuition, Ortega y Gasset's philosophy of art, and Emmanuel Mounier's existential personalism, one can also detect relevant parallels to (German) life-philosophical hermeneutics in

his concept of personalism. In his large-scale treatise *Ideové kořeny současného umění: Bergson a ideologie současného romantismu* (Černý 1992a [1929], *Intellectual Roots of Contemporary Art: Bergson and the Ideology of Contemporary Romanticism*), in which Černý reconstructs the meaning of Bergson's theory of poetic intuition for the development of modern poetry (of Italian futurism and French surrealism), he refers to the idea of self-transcendence of life from Georg Simmel's posthumously published *Lebensanschauung*: *Vier metaphysische Kapitel* (1918, *The View of Life: Four Metaphysical Chapters*) right at the beginning and extensively discusses Bergson's aesthetics, e. g., with reference to Schelling's aesthetics (Černý 1992a [1929], 303–310).

In this early treatise there is already a hint of the keynote of Černý's hermeneutics of creative personality and artistic work: The idea of free creative vigour which integrates the past as development and growth and is permanently directed at the increase of freedom. The compatibility of freedom with (artistic) creation and personal moral responsibility is also the main theme of Černý's last essays from the 1970s. At the end of the treatise *Nástin básnické osobnosti Jiřího Koláře: Pokus o genetiku básníka abstraktního* (Černý 1992c [1974], *A Sketch of Jiří Kolář's Poetic Personality. Essay on the Genesis of the Abstract Poet*) he emphasizes:

> As a poet of the insurrection of the moral conscience Kolář evolved under the pressure of the times from the position of the poet of patriotic and social protest to the ontological feeling of the problem of humanity and freedom, and all contradictions and inconsistencies of this development are compensated and covered by the excellent unity of his will and by the moral integrity of his endeavour [...] His works represent an uninterrupted apotheosis of human freedom in all its shapes and forms. At the very moment when he felt the problem of freedom in its ontological scope, Kolář reached the highest level of Czech poetry and its most famous achievement: Even though he was unmusical and unmelodic, he followed in the glorious tradition of Mácha. (Černý 1992c [1974], 895)

Václav Černý is not only regarded as the key figure of modern Czech comparative literary studies, but also as one of the most significant representatives of Czech culture from the 1930s to the 1970s. Among other things, Černý was an internationally acknowledged expert on the Baroque period. During the Prague Spring of 1968 he was allowed to return to Charles University for a brief time, but was forbidden any public activity for the second time in 1970. In 1976/1977 Václav Černý, together with Václav Havel and Jan Patočka, initiated the opposition civil rights movement Charta 77. Černý's 1967 essay "Dostojevskij a jeho Běsi" was published in English translation, "Dostoevsky and his Devils", in 1975.

3 Antinormative style and an antithetical image of the world (Dmitrij Tschizewskij's studies of Czech literature)

Václav Černý shared the hermeneutical research interest for the intellectual structures of the Baroque period and Romanticism with Dmitrij Tschižewskij (1894–1977), slavicist, historian of ideas, and longtime fellow member of the research group *Poetics and Hermeneutics*. During his years of exile in Prague (1924–1931) Tschižewskij developed singular literary and culture-philosophical hermeneutics, whose originality was based on the sophisticated combination of (religio-)philosophical as well as psychologic-'ideological' and phenomenologic-anthropological approaches (e. g., in the treatise "Zum Doppelgängerproblem bei Dostojevskij", "On the Doppelganger Problem in Dostoevsky"; Tschižewskij 1931, 19–50). Tschižewskij's hermeneutical approach can be demonstrated with three terms or figures of thought that take over an idea-historically as well as literary-aesthetically outstanding position in his treatises on Czech literature of the Baroque and the Romantic period: worldview, negative theology, and antithetics.

The collection *Torso a tajemství Máchova díla* (*The Torso and the Secret of Mácha's Works*) was published in 1938 under the editorship of Jan Mukařovský; Tschižewskij contributed the long treatise "K Máchovu světovému názoru" (1938, "On Mácha's Worldview"), originally written in German. The publication of Tschižewskij's essay on Mácha in the collection of the Prague linguistic circle may appear a bit astonishing: Tschižewskij, who lived in Prague from 1924 to 1931, was a member of that circle, but his Mácha interpretations had nothing to do with structuralism. Its title rather suggested its proximity to the philosophical hermeneutics of the Dilthey school, yet, most of all, to Jaspers' hermeneutics of Weltanschauung (worldview).

Tschižewskij interprets Weltanschauung as a specific intellectual position chosen within the world by artistic man and confronting it – on the other hand – as a kind of general term for the world views constituted by the poet in his work. According to Tschižewskij, the essence of Mácha's worldview is founded on the manifestation of the plurality of contrasting life forms; in his works the Czech romantic Mácha strove for their unification (in the sense of plurality in singularity), albeit in vain. Yet this endeavour simultaneously appears as the momentum of a dynamic process representing an essential component of the dialectic of life; a process that produces contrasts, paradoxes, and bold antitheses that lie at the base of Macha's worldview and can "by no means be explained within this poetic context as a simple coexistence of heterogenic elements" (Tschižewskij 1972b, 283–284). According to Tschižewskij, "antithetics to us are an essen-

tial trait of Machá's thinking and not a testimony of the various influences on him" (Tschižewskij 1972b, 284). Tschižewskij connects the dynamic character of Máchas's worldview (Weltbild), his perception of being, and his worldview (Weltanschauung) directly with the Baroque tradition of the paradoxical 'veiling' of being in non-being (Tschižewskij 1972b, 261). Much like Jaspers, Tschižewskij understands worldview as a dialectic-dynamic attitude towards the world in which the life of the intellect realizes itself (Jaspers 1925 [1919], 230). Yet, according to Tschižewskij, for Mácha the dynamic had quite another meaning than for Hegel, even though "Hegelianism perhaps helped Mácha to perceive the general dynamic of being" (Tschižewskij 1972b, 257). This is because "Mácha does not see general movement as the rational self-development of the intellect" (Tschižewskij 1972b, 258); to him, as to some Baroque thinkers, the world rather looked like an aimless, senseless process.

With his Mácha interpretation Tschižewskij deconstructed the Mácha reading of Roman Jakobson which had been totally adopted by the Czech surrealists: namely, Mácha as a poet "of romanticism of the proud and destructive revolt, of revolutionary romanticism", as Jakobson (1935, 158) asserted in his treatise on the poet of the Czech Biedermeier period and Mácha's antipode Karel Jaromír Erben (1811–1870), "Poznámky k dílu Erbenovu: I. O mythu" (1935, "Notes on Erben's Work: I. On Myth"). Tschižewskij shows that, on the contrary, for Mácha's literary figures a conflict-evading, passively-resigned attitude is characteristic, adding:

> With this we have stepped out of the circle of romantic Byronism; a wanderer turning his back on the world and trying to distance himself physically from it leads us back to early romanticism, in part to its religiously tinted aspects – because "wanderer", "pilgrim" and "hermit" are among their favourite characters – and back from early romanticism to the poetry of Baroque, which in many respects shares an inner relationship to it. (Tschižewskij 1972b, 249)

Holt Meyer (2000, 51–62) discusses Tschižewskij's remarks about the relationship between (negative-theological) Baroque mysticism (Angelus Silesius), Mácha's poetry, and the debatable aspects of his methodological approach in his important treatise on the apophatics of Mácha's narrative "Pouť krkonošská" (1836, "Pilgrimage to the Krkonoše Mountains").

The idea of 'physical distance', which Tschižewskij emphasises as one of the main features of Mácha's relation to the world, seems to be especially revealing with regard to Jaspers' thoughts on the freedom of the mind. According to Jaspers, the freedom of the mind is closely intertwined with the idea of the infinity of life, of the world, and of one's own character. In Jaspers' philosophical hermeneutics of worldviews, the infinity of the world and the infinite process of understanding form the basis of the world of ideas, of contrasts, and of dialectics (Jaspers

1925 [1919], 328–331). It is an intellectual attitude stemming from the sphere of emotional life and emotional knowledge, of feeling and instinct. This intellectual attitude, which, according to Jaspers, finds its anchor in infinity (Jaspers 1925 [1919], 149–150), is characteristic for the romantic type of man and creator. It is not universality and the objective that work as driving forces of the emotional sphere's infinite extension, but individual fate, self-fulfilment, self-affection, and the acknowledging self-experience.

The antithetics Tschižewskij names as the essential trait of Mácha's worldview at the same time appear as one of the main terms of his hermeneutic examinations of Czech literature in general and as a link between the terms of antithetics and world image. Antithetics permeate the looking-glass world of the allegorical novel *Labyrint světa a ráj srdce (1622–1623, Labyrinth of the World and Paradise of the Heart)* by Jan Amos Komenský [Comenius], and an "ever-faster hurrying chain of antithetics" (Tschižewskij 1972c [1944], 235) also structures the hymnic poem "Co Bůh? Člověk?" (1659, "*What God? Man?*") by Baroque poet Friedrich (or Bedřich) Bridel, in which Tschižewskij sees a "great expression of the antithetical world-view of Bridel and his era" (Tschižewskij 1972c [1944], 232). One might say that Tschižewskij consciously sets antithetics, asymmetry, anti-classicism, the irregular, the break with conventions, and the transgression and questioning of conventional ways of thinking in stark contrast to all manifestations of 'classicism', normativity, and ideologies. Tschižewskij's fascination with oxymoronic-paradoxical thought appears to be one of the characteristic traits of his critical approach. At the high times of pseudo-classicism and artistically retrograde academism, the disconcerting aestheticisation of traditionalism in 1930s art (one need only think of the World's Fair in Paris in 1937 with its downright pompously celebrated alliance of technocratic enthusiasm and totalising return to sanctioned-normative pseudo-classicism), paired with boundless belief in progress, Tschižewskij, through the prism of modernism, rehabilitated the antithetics of the Baroque era, antinormativity, the anticanonic, the principle of ambivalence and of disconcerting dichotomies, which he detected in Baroque and also in modern literature and thinking. The antithetics Tschižewskij discovered and reconstructed as the meaningful element in the works of the Czech Baroque poets and of the romantic poet Mácha seem to have had an antitotalising implication for his own thinking: Not only does life itself have deeply inherent antitheses, but thinking in antitheses is directed against a totalisation of meaning of any kind. At the end of his short treatise "Eine kulturpessimistische Utopie" (1972a [1937], "A Cultural-Pessimistic Utopia") on the satirical-dystopian novel Válka s mloky (1936, War with the Newts) by Karel Čapek, Tschižewskij writes:

> The author's cultural scepticism apparently goes far beyond the usual boundaries of pessimistic utopias: Most of all he doubts that which is common to all economic, political, and social ideologies of the present – the belief that man can master history, and that mankind by its own efforts can determine at least single stages, however small. (Tschižewskij 1972a [1937], 312)

In his analysis of Bridel's poem *"What God? Man?"* Tschižewskij assumes a close relationship between the antithetics typical of Bridel and the tradition of so-called 'negative theology', in which the hyperexistence of God that transcends man's capacity for knowledge can only be expressed by negative statements, antitheses, oxymoronic constructions, paradoxical inexpressibility, and 'namelessness' of God's majesty. It is the paradoxical rhetoric of the unspeakable that defines the apopathic mysticism of negative theology:

> Bridel obviously follows the theological direction coming mainly from the so-called 'areopagitica' [...]. It shows that every part of the poem is based very methodically on antitheses, and that not only the linguistic devices, but also the composition of the entire poem clearly express the antithetical basic idea of inner contrariness of human and godly being and their mutual relationship. (Tschižewskij 1972c, 229, 232)

God remains the 'unspeakable', the 'unfathomable', for whom man has no name and whom he can only define with negative terms – "a sheer nothing", "nowhere", "night", "darkness" (Tschižewskij 1972c, 229). In the tradition of negative theology the godly being has a "super-material" character, and thus can have no 'shape' or 'form'.

Tschižewskij similarly interprets the model of the labyrinth in Comenius' *Labyrinth of the World and Paradise of the Heart* as an allegory of a "negative encyclopaedia", a "world turned upside down" (Tschižewskij 1972e [1957], 141–142). Renate Lachmann notes that the labyrinth itself is this negative encyclopaedia (Lachmann 2007, 48). As one of the few authors of his time, Comenius used an original stylistic device that Tschižewskij termed "negative allegory" (Tschižewskij 1972e, 140) and whose function lay in negating any meaning and value of things. The demiurgic 'bad world' fallen from order is seen as a 'world turned upside down' from an 'inadequate perspective'. Interestingly, Tschižewskij interprets this device in relation to modern literature in the sense of dystopia as in H.G. Wells, Evgenii Zamiatin, George Orwell, Karel Čapek, and others: "Their characteristic trait is the purposeful suppression of any meanings one may normally see in images emptied by allegorese" (Tschižewskij 1972e [1957], 142). According to Tschižewskij, with his world-labyrinth Comenius builds on the utopia of ideal societies (such as Thomas More's [Morus] *Utopia*, or Tommaso Campanella's *City of the Sun*), albeit only on the negative aspects of these utopias, which he presents as a wrong, negative world:

> In Comenius, the allegory of the world as the 'labyrinth', or rather, of its single spheres (classes, professions, life forms) is, however, evaluated negatively, and in a special way, as it is known, e. g., from the world of antiquity seen through the eyes of a barbarian (the legendary Scyth Anacharsis). To these negatively-evaluating allegories belong the images of the meaninglessness of world affairs in the cynic, stoic, then Christian diatribe, and then also various allegories by poets of newer periods [...]. (Tschižewskij 1972e [1957], 141–142)

According to Tschižewskij, the confrontation of the 'true' and the 'wrong' world in Comenius' novel lay in the great antithesis of labyrinth and paradise.

However, Tschižewskij goes one step further: In his essay "Bemerkungen zur 'Verfremdung' und zur 'Negativen Allegorie'" (1972e [1957], 140, "Notes on 'Alienation' and 'Negative Allegory'") he brings this device together with the key concept of Russian formalism, with ostranenie. In his eyes it was the high artistic poeticity of literary language in Comenius' novel from which emanated the 'new view' of the world and things. Things appear in a new, unexpected context, or they are combined as unusual montages rich in contrast. Tschižewskij asserts that Baroque artists are characterised by a very distinct premodern consciousness of the artistic in the sense of a radical questioning and alienation of the sensually perceptible reality through peculiar stylistic devices. From this perspective the Baroque era as a period of art was already a stilo moderno, as Tschižewskij has also shown in the literary works of Czech Baroque.

His reading of this period of Czech literature, of Bridel's poetic 'negative theology', of Comenius' labyrinth allegory, or of Mácha's world feeling and worldview could pointedly be characterized as 'lateral', as opposed to the 'frontal' look (and interpretation), with its aspiration to see and discover the alleged 'rightness'. The 'lateral' look allows seeing the deep structures, something that so far was believed to be concealed and 'invisible', like, e. g., deviating hyperbolic theological, moral, and aesthetic ideas and ways of thinking. According to Renate Lachmann (2009, 46–47), Tschižewskij developed a subtle attention for these ideas, an attention that he used for identifying and revealing them in literary texts. What appears under the surface are also unsettling deviations, caesura, rifts, antinomies, and paradoxes, whose perception and disclosure was always Tschižewskij's main endeavour.

On the occasion of his seventieth birthday celebration in 1966 Tschižewskij noted in his reply to the toast:

> When I look back on my achievements I believe that my works will most likely be estimated by Czechs: first, the discovery of the Comenius manuscripts, then the works on Church Slavonic literature on Czech soil, perhaps the interpretations of medieval Czech songs, and the works on Baroque poetry. (Tschižewskij 1966, 26)

Translated by Ernst-Georg Richter

References

Černý, Václav. *Dostoevsky and his Devils* [1967]. Trans. by F. W. Galan. New York, NY: The Overlook Press, 1975.

Černý, Václav. "Ideové kořeny současného umění: Bergson a ideologie současného romantismu." [1929] Václav Černý, *Tvorba a osobnost*. Vol. 1. Ed. Jaroslav Kabíček. Prague: Odeon, 1992a. 303–355.

Černý, Václav. "Myšlenka hrdinské osobnosti u F. X. Šaldy a otázka jeho duchovní podstaty." [1938] Václav Černý, *Tvorba a osobnost*. Vol. 1. Ed. Jaroslav Kabíček. Prague: Odeon, 1992b. 127–135.

Černý, Václav. "Nástin básnické osobnosti Jiřího Koláře: Pokus o genetiku básníka abstraktního." [1974] Václav Černý, *Tvorba a osobnost*. Vol. 1. Ed. Jaroslav Kabíček. Prague: Odeon, 1992c. 871–895.

Černý, Václav. "Osobnost a dílo." Václav Černý, *Tvorba a osobnost*. Vol. 1. Ed. Jaroslav Kabíček. Prague: Odeon, 1992d [1939]. 30–40.

Dilthey, Wilhelm. *Das Erlebnis und die Dichtung: Lessing, Goethe, Novalis, Hölderlin* [1906]. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1910.

Dilthey, Wilhelm. "Der Aufbau der Geschichtlichen Welt in den Geisteswissenschaften." [1910] *Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol. 7: *Der Aufbau der geschichtlichen Welt in den Geisteswissenschaften*. Ed. Bernhard Groethuysen. Göttingen: Vandenbrock & Ruprecht, 1992. 79–188.

Dilthey, Wilhelm. "Die Einbildungskraft des Dichters. Bausteine für eine Poetik." [1887] *Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol. 6: *Die geistige Welt: Einleitung in die Philosophie des Lebens. Abhandlungen zur Poetik, Ethik und Pädagogik*. Ed. Georg Misch. Göttingen: Vandenbrock & Ruprecht, 1994. 103–241.

Jakobson, Roman. "Poznámky k dílu Erbenovu: I. O mythu." *Slovo a slovesnost* 1.3 (1935): 152–164.

Jaspers, Karl. *Psychologie der Weltanschauungen* [1919]. Berlin: Julius Springer, 1925.

Lachmann, Renate. "Rhetorische Instrumentierung in Comenius' Seelenbildungsroman 'Labyrinth der Welt und Paradies des Herzens'." *Religion und Rhetorik*. Ed. Holt Meyer and Dirk Uffelmann. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 2007. 48–64.

Lachmann, Renate. "Dmitrij I. Tschižewskij als Barockforscher." *Dmitrij I. Tschižewskij: Impulse eines Philologen und Philosophen für eine komparative Geistesgeschichte*. Eds. Angela Richter and Brigitte Klosterberg. Berlin, Münster, Vienna, Zurich, and London: LIT, 2009. 43–60.

Meyer, Holt. "Nikdy víc mně neporozumíte: Die Apophatik von K. H. Máchas 'Pouť krkonošská' oder Wie nicht verstehen." *Kapitel zur Poetik Karel Hynek Máchas: Die tschechische Romantik im europäischen Kontext*. Ed. Herta Schmid. Munich: Otto Sagner, 2000. 29–73.

Šalda, František Xaver. *Duše a dílo: Podobizny a medailony*. Prague: Melantrich, 1937.

Šalda, František Xaver. "Synthetism v novém umění." František Xaver Šalda, *Boje o zítřek*. Ed. Jan Mukařovský. Prague: Melantrich, 1952. 11–54.

Šalda, František Xaver. *Boje o zítřek: Duše a dílo*. Vol. 4 of *České myšlení*. Prague: Melantrich, 1973a.

Šalda, František Xaver. "Umělecký paradox." [1905] František Xaver Šalda, *Boje o zítřek: Duše a dílo*. Vol. 4 of *České myšlení*. Prague: Melantrich, 1973b. 149–164.

Šalda, František Xaver. "Násilník snu." [1905] František Xaver Šalda, *Boje o zítřek: Duše a dílo*. Vol. 4 of *České myšlení*. Prague: Melantrich, 1973c. 173–182.

Šalda, František Xaver. "Kritika pathosem a inspirací." [1905] František Xaver Šalda, *Boje o zítřek: Duše a dílo*. Vol. 4 of *České myšlení*. Prague: Melantrich, 1973d. 183–197.

Šalda, František Xaver. "Nynější rozpaky literárního dějepisectví." *Z období Zápisníku I*. Ed. Emanuel Macek. Prague: Odeon, 1987. 460–467.

Striedter, Jurij. "Einleitung." Felix Vodička, *Die Struktur der literarischen Entwicklung*. Munich: Fink, 1976. VII–CIII.

Sus, Oleg. "Založení Šaldova symbolismu ve vztahu k německým duchovědným teoriím. Z prehistorie strukturalismu." *F. X. Šalda 1867 – 1937 – 1967*. Ed. Felix Vodička. Prague: Academia, 1968. 37–66.

Tschižewskij, Dmitrij. "Zum Doppelgängerproblem bei Dostojevskij." *Dostojevskij-Studien*. Ed. Dmitrij Tschižewskij. Reichenberg: Gebr. Stiepel, 1931. 19–50.

Tschižewskij, Dmitrij. "K Máchovu světovému názoru." *Torso a tajemství Máchova díla. Sborník prací Pražského linguistického kroužku*. Ed. Jan Mukařovský. Prague: Fr. Borový, 1938. 111–180.

Tschižewskij, Dmitrij. "Antwort des Jubilars auf die Tischrede Prof. Dr. Fedor Stepuns." *Orbis scriptus: Dmitrij Tschižewskij zum 70. Geburtstag*. Eds. Dietrich Gerhardt, Wiktor Weintraub, and Hans-Jürgen zum Winkel. Munich: Fink, 1966. 25–26.

Tschižewskij, Dmitrij. "Eine kulturpessimistische Utopie." [1937] Dmitrij Tschižewskij, *Kleinere Schriften*. Vol. 2: *Bohemica*. Munich: Fink, 1972a, 308–312.

Tschižewskij, *Dmitrij*. "Zu Máchas Weltanschauung." Dmitrij Tschižewskij, *Kleinere Schriften*. Vol. 2: *Bohemica*. Munich: Fink, 1972b. 240–286.

Tschižewskij, Dmitrij. "Zur Komposition des Gedichts Bridels 'Co Bůh? Člověk?'." Dmitrij Tschižewskij, *Kleinere Schriften*. Vol. 2: *Bohemica*. Munich: Fink, 1972c. 224–239.

Tschižewskij, Dmitrij. "Das 'Labyrinth der Welt und Paradies des Herzens' des J.A.Comenius: Die Thematik und die Quellen des Werkes." Dmitrij Tschižewskij, *Kleinere Schriften*. Vol. 2: *Bohemica*. Munich: Fink, 1972d. 92–139.

Tschižewskij, Dmitrij. "Nachtrag: Bemerkungen zur 'Verfremdung' und zur 'negativen Allegorie'." [1957] Dmitrij Tschižewskij, *Kleinere Schriften*. Vol. 2: *Bohemica*. Munich: Fink, 1972e. 140–144.

Schamma Schahadat
Poetics and Hermeneutics

"After theory" (see, e. g., Eagleton 2004) is a catchphrase describing a fatigue that has overwhelmed literary scholars since the millennium after a century in which they produced a great number of exciting theories in the field of literature, culture and the media: formalism, structuralism, poststructuralism, gender studies, cultural studies and so on. Theoreticians, literary and cultural scholars look back on the twentieth century and ask: "what was theory?" (Lepper 2012). Marcel Lepper cites Brian Boyd: "Many now feel that the 'theory' that has dominated academic literary studies over the last thirty years or so is dead, and that it is time for a return to texts" (Boyd 2005, 1; quoted in Lepper 2012). Theory and literary theory / literary studies are two discursive fields that have interacted for much longer than the "last thirty years or so", as Boyd (2005) states; Galin Tihanov traces the prehistory of modern literary theory back to Romanticism, when for the first time an "intimate link" (Jakobson and Pomorska 1983, 10; quoted in Tihanov 2021, 19) was established between literature and linguistics and when "literature's relevance [was] located in the special way in which language is deployed in literature" (Tihanov 2021, 20).

We can safely call the entire twentieth century a century of literary theory if we take into account that literary theory has more or less been in close contact with other discourses – linguistics, philosophy, history, cultural theory – from the very outset and has interacted with them in different chronotopic constellations: in Russian formalism and in structuralism (interacting with linguistics), in poststructuralism (interacting with history [Foucault] and philosophy [Derrida]) and in cultural studies (interacting with ethnography and cultural theory as well as with history). With regard to theory, the twentieth century was cut in half: the exciting beginnings in the 1910s and 1920s were interrupted by fascism, Stalinism and World War II. In the 1950s and 1960s, a new start was initiated which either took up the structuralist origins from the early twentieth century (as we can see in France, Russia and Poland, for instance), turned to the critique of ideology (the Frankfurt School), demanded a social and historical turn in the humanities (the generation of '68), or built a bridge from a postwar perspective to prewar modernism, as did the group *Poetics and Hermeneutics* (P*oetik und Hermeneutik*), which held its founding colloquium in June 1963 in Gießen (Boden and Zill 2017, 7). Those postwar theories are, in one way or another, reactions to a traumatizing past.

The history of the German group Poetics and Hermeneutics provides researchers of intellectual history with a test case for how the production of knowledge

works in a certain chronotope, in certain constellations of literary scholars in postwar Germany who wanted to revolutionize thinking about literature with the help of an interdisciplinary hermeneutic approach that transcended national philological studies. Social, epistemic and institutional aspects have been examined in order to observe how knowledge is produced (see Erhart 2010, 79).

Poetics and Hermeneutics was decidedly a postwar enterprise that sought to erase the past and envisioned itself as an explicitly new theoretical foundation of literary studies in its historical dimension (Amslinger 2017, 17). The three male founding members (the Romance studies scholar Hans Robert Jauß, the philosopher Hans Blumenberg, and the German studies scholar Clemens Heselhaus) had had different experiences during the war; while Jauß and Heselhaus participated in the system, Blumenberg was its victim, but none of them were interested in reconstructing the past of the discipline – instead they intended to shape the future (Amslinger 2017, 25; Assman 2017, 446). This future was supposed to be interdisciplinary as well as a science that – belatedly – turned to Modernism and the avantgarde as its object of specific literary and cultural interest (Amslinger 2017, 62–63). It was this group that later developed the theory of *Rezeptionsästhetik* (*reception theory*), the only literary theory designed in postwar Germany that spread beyond its borders (Rosenberg 2003, 248). Wolfgang Iser, professor of American Studies at Würzburg University since 1957, soon joined the founding members.

The years after World War II were understood as a new start in many areas of German culture, which connected the 1950s to the 1920s and pretended that the years of the Third Reich had never happened. "It was as if the 1920s ended only in the 1950s, after disturbing background noise had been eliminated", writes Anselm Haverkamp (Haverkamp et al. 2003, 47). Poetics and Hermeneutics was part of this redesign of German intellectual history, covering up the past (like, for instance, Hans Robert Jauß, one of the founders, who never talked about his career in the *Waffen-SS*) and participating in the myth of the 'zero hour'. Or, as Aleida Assman put it:

> All the members of Poetics and Hermeneutics had their Nazi past (as victims or as perpetrators); they knew what had happened, and hence they had 'a fundamenal interest in remaining silent about it' (Assmann 2017, 446).

In order to describe Poetics and Hermeneutics as one typical incident in the postwar entangled history of theory, I will first turn to the intellectual scene of the 1950s, 60s and 70s in Germany before outlining the beginnings and the further development of the group and finally elucidating their entanglement in the scene of theory in Central and Eastern Europe. Hence this chapter deals with two different topics which are, nevertheless, closely intertwined: with the

scene of theory in postwar Germany and with the entanglement of one specific example of this scene – Poetics and Hermeneutics – with theories from Central and Eastern European philosophers and literary scholars (Roman Ingarden, Jan Mukařovský, Roman Jakobson, Mikhail Bakhtin, Iurii Lotman, for example) which further determined the development of literary scholarship in the German-speaking context.

1 The scene of theory in postwar Germany

Before turning to the restorative or innovative activities in the humanities after the war, we should take a look at the humanities in the Third Reich: Frank-Rutger Hausmann, who wrote a comprehensive history with many documents on this topic, speaks about a "scientific catastrophe" that the humanities in Germany underwent during and after the war (Hausmann 2011, 15). This catastrophe was – at least in part – based on the uncritical perspective taken up by those who were part of the academic system under the Nazis (Hausmann 2011, 15). Other reasons that can be mentioned are the brain drain that followed the enforced conformity (*Gleichschaltung*) in the universities, since after the Nuremberg Laws in 1935 a large number of scientists had to leave Germany; many of them went to the United States and accumulated knowledge in American academia which, at the same time, was lost to the German system. Others went to war, where they were killed or imprisoned (Hausmann 2011, 12). Hausmann sees the "international marginalization" of the German humanities in the fact that even after the war their history was not reflected upon, instead it was neglected and ignored (Hausmann 2011, 12).

Against this background, various movements in the German scene of literary and cultural theory can be observed, Poetics and Hermeneutics being only one of them. While Poetics and Hermeneutics was deeply rooted in academia and created a kind of ivory tower, with a decisive rejection of reality, society or politics, and thus can be understood as a reaction to Nazi ideology in the humanities, somewhat later other groups turned to social issues and a politicization of the humanities. The year 1968 marks the climax of this movement. While most of these groups can be called theory-obsessed (Philipp Felsch [2015, 16] writes of "the generation of 68's obsession with theory"; Ulrich Raulff [2014] calls the 1970s the "wild years of reading"), the theories they turned to were very different: Poetics and Hermeneutics was – in its first three meetings – concerned with European Modernity on the basis of a formal, aesthetic, 'text-immanent' approach to literature (see, e. g., Erhart 2010, 84, 90). Even though they understood themselves to be a completely innovative academic enterprise whose innovation lay in

the fact that they formed an interdisciplinary group (Meier 2017, 210; Amslinger [2017, 64] speaks of "interdisciplinarity as a narrative of coping with regard to their experiences in the war"), in terms of content, they took up an approach that focused exclusively on the poeticity of the text like that of Emil Staiger or Wolfgang Kayser in the 1940s (or the Russian formalists in the 1910s) – or at least initially. The goal was a professionalization and a "belated modernization" of *Literaturwissenschaft* (literary studies) (Erhart 2010, 90). While Poetics and Hermeneutics focused, as the name suggests, on understanding the literary text, other literary scholars turned to linguistic and literary structuralism, itself based on Russian formalism and the Prague Linguistic Circle (see Rosenberg 2003, 246).

But let us turn away from Poetics and Hermeneutics and take a look at the other theories that fascinated intellectuals around and after 1968: critical theory, poststructuralism, discourse theory and system theory are but a few of them, and more often than not they were intimately linked with political positions, mostly with the New Left. Even though in retrospect it is hard to understand how Marxism "for a long decade could become the dominant school of thinking for the Western world", as Ulrich Raulff, historian and philosopher, writes looking back on his university years in the 1970s, it seemed natural at the time – it was "the air that we breathed" (Raulff 2014, 22–23). Besides the German universities – such as "red Marburg", where Raulff studied (Raulff 2014, 14) – Merve publishers in Berlin were a central intellectual chronotope of the 1960s, 70s, and 80s, taking up all these intellectual threads (see Felsch 2015). Literary studies was part of a criticism of ideology, and students demanded a restructuring of academic institutions and a reform of what they were taught at university (Rosenberg 2003, 252).

In sum, in literary studies, theoretical trends questioning power relations in German postwar society and integrating sociological and ideology critical approaches stood side by side with structuralist approaches. And even though Poetics and Hermeneutics was not a structuralist school, its focus on the literary text and its poetological implications distanced it from the political positions that were more or less radical. This, however, does not mean that Poetics and Hermeneutics did pursue its ideals with less fervor – Raulff quotes the philosopher Manfred Frank, one of the later members of the group, on the discussions of certain concepts: "Without having decided the meaning of this concept, we cannot go on living" – "these people earnestly believed in the value of concepts and their meaning for life", Raulff concludes (2014, 26–27). Many decades later, he wonders about the "sacred earnestness" (Raulff 2014, 26–27) that accompanied all discussions, political, philosophical or literary. And even if the members of Poetics and Hermeneutics were neither radical nor politicized, they initiated a change in the German academic landscape by becoming leading personalities when new universities were founded in Bielefeld, Bochum and Constance (Assmann 2015,

123) and academia was restructured. Because the founding generation of Poetics and Hermeneutics had been "thoroughly politicized and thus experienced, after 1945, the chance for freedom", Aleida Assmann (2015, 123) argues, they turned to the autonomy of the literary text and not to politics.

2 The beginnings and development of Poetics and Hermeneutics

Poetics and Hermeneutics, Jan Assmann states, was a circle comparable to the George circle (here Assmann refers to Raulff 2009), guided by the "principle of affect", by friendship as the common denominator (Assmann 2017, 448). Its pre-history began in the 1950s in Heidelberg, where Hans Robert Jauß, Wolf-Dieter Stempel and Wolfgang Iser, then students of literature, and Reinhard Koselleck, then a student of history (Amslinger 2017, 57), formed learned circles of friendship. But it was in Gießen and only in 1963 that the first meeting ("colloquium") of Poetics and Hermeneutics took place, inspired by the desire to cooperate with colleagues who were interested in literature, theoretical concepts, aestheticism and Modernist authors (such as Proust, Valéry or Jean Paul); the topic was "Imitation and Illusion" ("Nachahmung und Illusion") (Amslinger 2017, 135). At the time, Hans Blumenberg, who participated in the group until 1967 (Amslinger 2017, 214), and Hans Robert Jauß both held professorships in Gießen, the one German university that needed an intellectual reboot more than any other, since the Nazi ideology had been established there in its most extreme forms (Amslinger 2017, 66). It was in Gießen that the group Poetics and Hermeneutics was established under the title Lessing Institut für Hermeneutik und Literaturkritik (Lessing Institute for Hermeneutics and Literary Criticism) (Amslinger 2017, 66); the name was changed at a later stage.

In the years that followed, individual members of the group gained positions in other universities and the circle was reorganized. In 1966, as the *spiritus rector* of Poetics and Hermeneutics, Jauß took the group with him to Constance (Boden and Zill 2017, 8), one of the newly founded universities of the 1960s. He managed to attract kindred spirits who went to Constance and, if they had not yet participated in the group, like, e. g., Wolfgang Iser, they later joined it: Wolfgang Preisendanz (German Department), Wolf-Dieter Stempel (Department of Romance Studies, linguistics) and Jurij Striedter (Department of Slavic Studies) (on Striedter's role in the group see Renate Lachmann's chapter on Jurij Striedter's reading of Russian formalism in this volume). Poetics and Hermeneutics was thus so closely connected to Constance University that it acquired the alternative label

'Konstanzer Schule' (the Constance School) which later was also connected to the *Rezeptionsästhetik* (reception theory) developed by Iser and Jauß. And the longer the circle existed, the more it changed its perspective; while in the beginning it had been a group of friends and colleagues, it later turned into a circle of teachers and disciples – or fathers and sons. The younger generation that joined the group were introduced either by Hans Robert Jauß or by Wolfgang Iser; Renate Lachmann, the first and for a long time the only woman in the group, had no such 'father' (Lachmann 2017, 291) but had to start her own genealogy outside of the male-dominated Poetics and Hermeneutics, which today consists of an impressive number of Slavists holding academic chairs at Slavic departments all over Germany, Austria and Switzerland.

Petra Boden, one of the researchers working on the history of Poetics and Hermeneutics, subdivides the group's history into three phases: the "beginnings" from 1957 to 1970, "interdisciplinary enlargement" from 1970 to 1980/1981, and "crises in orientation" from 1981 on (Boden 2010, 110–112). While interdisciplinarity was the inspiration and the starting point for the group, it seems it was also this plurality of approaches that led to its ending, when younger members (Renate Lachmann and Anselm Haverkamp, for example) no longer believed in the hermeneutics of sense (Boden 2010, 112). From the very outset, the meetings were strongly formalized, since the thinking about literature and literary theory was a "constant dialogue" ("Dauergespräch"), as Julia Amslinger calls it (2017, 135): the meetings were prepared via intensive correspondence before written texts were distributed among the participants and then discussed when they met in person, and included oral statements which were preserved in minutes which were then transformed into published texts (Amslinger 2017, 138, 146–147). The dialogue thus underwent a constant reinterpretation or re-writing between the spoken word and the written text. The amount of time that the literary hermeneuts invested was enormous (see Boden and Zill 2017, 8–9).

In the 30 years or so of the group's existence, it underwent various transformations: time became scarcer when its members acquired more importance and fame (Boden and Zill 2017, 9), the participants belonged to younger generations and thus had different interests (see Warning 2017, 196), and alternative intellectual groups were established who met in Dubrovnik and Jerusalem (Assmann 2017, 443). The ending was staged in the seventeenth volume of the group on the topic of "Contingency" (Marquard et al., 1998). It contained an "Epilogue on the Research Group 'Poetics and Hermeneutics'" by Hans Robert Jauß (Jauß 1998) and was part of the myth-making concerning the group's achievements: the formation of a special academic tradition, the dialogue between the disciplines, the recognition of the "hour of departure" for a reformation of the German universities, a special form of discussion that avoided "monological papers", and the

preservation of its initial ideas, although to the group's critics, poetics, which in those years was closely linked to structural linguistics, seemed to be incompatible with hermeneutics, which appeared to be an "esoteric theological doctrine" (Jauß 1998, 525–527). The group, Jauss summarizes, attempted to understand a (literary) object of research by understanding its terminology, its history, and its form (Jauß 1998, 528). They approached literary texts and literary terms dialogically, each new voice forming a new constellation in this dialogue (Jauß 1998, 529).

However, two aspects went unmentioned in Jauß's "Epilogue": first, the fact that the concept of dialogue had its foundation not only in the Platonic tradition or in Freud's psychoanalytic talking cure, but also in the theories of Mikhail Bakhtin – volume 11 of the book series with the same name as the group, *Poetik und Hermeneutik*, was dedicated to the topic of dialogue (*Das Gespräch*, Stierle and Warning 1996) and contained three articles by Renate Lachmann, where she introduced Bakhtin's concept of dialogue as a "multiplicity of languages" (Lachmann 1996a, 493) which is very close to Jauß's idealiziation of the dialogic culture of Poetics and Hermeneutics. And second, even though Jauß wrote his text in 1998, he does not reflect on the fact that the group is (or was) predominantly male; from the perspective of 2021, this is a *skandalon*, not to mention the fact that not only did Jauß not notice the gender inequality, but he also failed to mention Renate Lachmann or Aleida Assmann as the only female participants to have played an important role in the group in its later years. In 2017, Helga Jauß-Meyer, Jauß's widow, who herself had obtained a Ph.D. in literary studies, remarked that Renate Lachmann was the "great exception" among the otherwise male members of Poetics and Hermeneutics (Jauß-Meyer 2017, 44). Not to mention the fact that Lachmann was the only woman to hold a full professorship at the reformed University of Constance for nearly 10 years; it was not until 1987 that a second female professor acquired the position of full professor in Constance, the psychologist Gisela Tromsdorff (Lachmann 2017, 288). Aleida Assmann followed only in 1993, when, as she herself writes, a generational change had already taken place within the group (Assmann 2015, 121).

In the 2010s, when Poetics and Hermeneutics was already a historical phenomenon and was widely reconstructed with the help of archival material, Jauß's past during the Second World War was rediscovered – for a second time. Aleida Assmann speaks of the "two lives of Hans Robert Jauß", of a divide between his early life during the war when he was an SS *Hauptsturmführer* (Assmann 2015, 121) and his second life as a scholar who married a Jewish woman (Assmann 2015, 123). Assmann argues that Jauß is no singular case in German intellectual history, but that he stands for a whole generation that experienced a "burdensome past" – however, the result of such a biography was also, she concludes, "the unprecedented success story of Poetics and Hermeneutics" (Assmann 2015, 124).

3 The Slavic subtext of Poetics and Hermeneutics

What knowledge was produced in the meetings and publications of Poetics and Hermeneutics? And to what extent can Poetics and Hermeneutic's history of success also be read as part of an entangled history of theories that originated in different cultural contexts? While the potential for conflict between the participating disciplines has been widely discussed – see for instance Siegfried Kracauer's and Jacob Taubes' objections that the "'text-immanent' interpretation of aesthetic contexts" narrows the group's discussions (Taubes, quoted in Erhart 2010, 85) – hardly any attention has been paid to the fact that the group mainly focused on the Western canon. In an interview with Renate Lachmann, Petra Boden asked her about the impact of Russian theories and literature in a context that mainly dealt with English and French material. Lachmann's answer was that the Russian theories were received via Jurij Striedter and Wolf Dieter Stempel, who also knew Russian, and that Rolf Fieguth's work on Polish theory led to the reception of Roman Ingarden, especially by Wolfgang Iser.

> There were theories which were received and then transformed and thus moved, of course, into another context, so that they lost their original form – we, the Slavists, knew that. There were concepts that were, so to speak, harvested and then were a bit changed. (Lachmann 2017, 293)

It was as if Constance was its own space of theory (Lachmann 2017, 294). What becomes obvious is the fact that, first, Poetics and Hermeneutics formed its own chronotope of literary theory and absorbed traveling theories and circulating ideas, making them their own – Aleida Assman writes that Wolfgang Iser usually summarized the discussions he took part in and "in the end the outcome was always Iser" (Assmann 2017, 444). And, second, Poetics and Hermeneutics thought about theory in a very abstract way, without questioning what they themselves were doing: they were concerned with the dialogue in their eleventh colloquium and did not apply the ideas they reflected upon to their own culture of dialogue; they chose the topic *Memoria* (Haverkamp et al. 1993), but they did not reflect on their own strategies of remembering and forgetting, as the case of Jauß demonstrates (Lachmann 2017, 301).

Renate Lachmann, in her recollection of the history of Poetics and Hermeneutics, traces the entangled history of the Russian formalists and Poetics and Hermeneutics: an important landmark was Jurij Striedter's and Wolf-Dieter Stempel's bilingual edition of the texts of the Russian formalists (Striedter and Stempel 1969, 1972). It resulted in certain formalist concepts – defamiliarization, the device, literary evolution, literature as verbal art, poeticity, the dichotomy between practical and poetic language – entering the discourse of Poetics and Hermeneutics

as well as Jauß's *Literaturgeschichte als Provokation der Literaturwissenschaft* of 1967 (*Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory*; the English translation [Jauß 1970] is an abridged version) (Lachmann 2015, 217). Jauß assigns the reader a central place in the triangle of author, work and reader (Jauß 1970, 8) and thus points to the newly evolving field of intertextuality, which sees the author as a reader, and to reception theory, which is connected mainly with Jauß and Iser. "A literary work", Jauß argues (1970, 10), "must be understood as creating a dialogue, and philological scholarship has to be founded on a continuous re-reading of texts, not of mere facts". When he uses the term "literary event" with reference to a text that can become such an event for one reader and not for another ("Perceval becomes a literary event only for the reader who reads this work of Chrétien in light of his earlier works", Jauß 1970, 11), this formula recalls Iurii Tynianov's (2019 [1927]) "*literaturnyi fakt*" (*literary fact*), which, however, is transformed from a historical perspective of literary evolution (see my chapter on literary evolution in this volume) into a central aspect of the reader's historical perception of a book, or, as Jauß calls it, of "literary experience" (Jauß 1970, 11). Like the formalists, Jauß wants to move away from a psychological reading perspective to a more objective one, referring explicitly to Jan Mukařovský, Roman Jakobson and Boris Tomashevskii (Jauß 1970, 11, 12, 15).

Another line of thought that originated in Central Europe leads to Iser's phenomenological approach of reception theory, which has been related to Roman Ingarden, among others (see, e. g., Sneis 2018, 134–168; Zima 2020, 258–284). While Renate Lachmann establishes a connection between Ingarden's *Schichtenmodell* (stratification model) and Wolfgangs Iser's "implied reader" (Lachmann 2015, 217–218), Peter Zima pays attention to the interrelatedness of Ingarden's *Unbestimmtheitsstellen* (places of indeterminacy) and Wolfgang Iser's *Leerstellen* (gaps) which the implied reader has to fill. However, Iser further develops Ingarden's theory (which in turn is related to Husserl's phenomenology; see Zima 2020, 258–269):

> Iser is concerned not only with the question of the semantic potential of the text and its reconstruction and the complementary question of the reader who can subject the text to an appropriate reading, but also with the historical dimension of places of indeterminacy and their growth. (Zima 2020, 266)

Lachmann identifies Umberto Eco as a messenger of theory from yet another culture; he made the works of the Moscow and Tartu semioticians known in the West. While in the 1970s Slavists in Bochum (Karl Eimermacher) and Constance (Renate Lachmann) translated Iurii Lotman into German and/or quoted from his untranslated Russian originals so that his theories could be read by those who didn't speak Russian, Karlheinz Stierle and Rainer Warning introduced French

theories (Foucault, Greimas, Todorov and others) to Constance and to the discussions of Poetics and Hermeneutics (Lachmann 2015, 218).

The volume arising from the colloquium on dialogue (Stierle and Warning 1996) is of special interest from a Slavist perspective. There are, as already mentioned, three contributions by Renate Lachmann: "Ebenen des Intertextualitätsbegriffs" (Lachmann 1996b, "Levels of the Term of Intertextuality"), "Bachtins Dialogizität und die akmeistische Mytho-Poetik als Paradigma dialogisierter Lyrik" (Lachmann 1996a, "Bakhtin's Dialogicity and Acmeist Mytho-Poetics as a Paradigm of Poetry as Dialogue") and "Zur Semantik metonymischer Dialogizität" (Lachmann 1996c, "On the Semantics of Metonymic Dialogicity"). Two of these articles, the one on the levels of the term of intertextuality and the one on metonymic intertextuality, are marked with an asterisk denoting that they are shorter articles including the discussions of the meeting. In these three articles, Lachmann develops the notion of intertextuality that was first introduced by Kristeva's famous, productive misreading of Bakhtin (see Valentin Peschanskyi's chapter on intertextuality in this volume) and applies it to the poetry of Akhmatova and Mandel'shtam, thus contesting Bakhtin's genre definition that prose is dialogical and poetry monological. By quoting from Russian texts in her own translation where no translations are available, Lachmann makes Bakhtin – and other Russian scholars – available for German readers. The Romanist Karlheinz Stierle takes up the thread Lachmann spun, referring to Bakhtin in his essay on "Werk und Intertextualität" (Stierle 1996, "The Work and Intertextuality"): here, Stierle argues against Bakhtin's idea that authority (of the monological word) and freedom (of the dialogical word) are opponents; instead, he argues, they are both integral parts of the aesthetic work. Here Stierle returns to Bakhtin via Rainer Grübel's German translation (Bakhtin 1979) and Tzvetan Todorov's book on Bakhtin's dialogicity (Todorov 1981) – that is, he follows the German and the French transformations (see Stierle 1996, 146, note 17). Wolfgang Iser, in his "Zur Phänomenologie der Dialogregel" (Iser 1996, "On the Phenomenology of the Rule of Dialogue"), also takes up Bakhtin and sets his dialogical word of the novel against the word of everyday life, which is marked by a closedness and finality, and the therapeutic word, which focuses on closing the gap between what is said and what is meant. Bakhtin's dialogic word, Iser argues, is linked to *carnival* and is "representation in the state of being flooded by the imaginary" (Iser 1996, 188) – here Iser moves Bakhtin's ideas into the dimension of psychoanalysis, a movement that was not intended in Bakhtin's original and is thus already a transformation. Both Stierle's and Iser's texts, incidentally, are marked by an asterisk indicating that the discussions had already been taken up and that Lachmann's contributions were – probably – used for their own lines of thought.

These examples of wandering theories show that Poetics and Hermeneutics was a chronotope in which theories were taken up from the outside and transformed in order to fit into new contexts. And whenever Slavists – such as Dmitri Tschižewski, Jurij Striedter, Renate Lachmann or, once, Aage Hansen-Löve (Lachmann 2017, 304) – were part of the group, Slavic theories entered the discussions and were adapted to and transformed.

References

Amslinger, Julia. *Eine neue Form der Akademie: Poetik und Hermeneutik – die Anfänge*. Paderborn: Fink, 2017.

Assmann, Aleida. "Krieg in den Knochen. Die zwei Leben des Hans Robert Jauß." *Zeitschrift für Ideengeschichte* 9.4 (2015): 121–124.

Assmann, Aleida, and Jan Assmann. "Ein Generationenprojekt." *Poetik und Hermeneutik im Rückblick: Interviews mit Beteiligten*. Eds. Petra Boden and Rüdiger Zill. Munich: Fink, 2017. 425–458.

Bakhtin, Mikhail [Bachtin, Michail]. *Die Ästhetik des Wortes*. Ed. Rainer Grübel. Trans. by Rainer Grübel and Sabine Reese. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1979.

Boden, Petra. "Arbeit an Begriffen. Zur Geschichte von Kontroversen in der Forschungsgruppe 'Poetik und Hermeneutik'." *Internationales Archiv für Sozialgeschichte der deutschen Literatur* 35. 1 (2010): 103–121. https://doi.org/10.1515/iasl.2010.007 (27 December 2021).

Boden, Petra, and Rüdiger Zill. "Einleitung." *Poetik und Hermeneutik im Rückblick: Interviews mit Beteiligten*. Eds. Petra Boden and Rüdiger Zill. Munich: Fink, 2017. 7–17.

Boyd, Brian: "Literature and Evolution: A Bio-Cultural Approach." *Philosophy and Literature* 29. 1 (April 2005): 1–23.

Eagleton, Terry. *After Theory*. London: Penguin, 2004.

Erhart, Walter: "'Wahrscheinlich haben wir beide recht'. Diskussion und Dissens unter 'Laboratoriumsbedingungen'. Beobachtungen zu 'Poetik und Hermeneutik' 1963–1966." *Internationales Archiv für Sozialgeschichte der deutschen Literatur* 35. 1 (2010): 77–102. https://doi.org/10.1515/iasl.2010.006 (23 June 2021).

Felsch, Philipp. *Der lange Sommer der Theorie: Geschichte einer Revolte, 1960–1990*. Frankfurt/M.: S. Fischer, 2015.

Haverkamp, Anselm, Renate Lachmann, and Rainer Herzog (eds.). *Memoria: Vergessen und Erinnern*. Paderborn: Fink, 1993.

Hausmann, Frank-Rutger. *Die Geisteswissenschaften im 'Dritten Reich'*. Frankfurt/M.: Vittorio Klostermann, 2011.

Haverkamp, Anselm, Juliane Rebentisch, and Susanne Leeb. "Latenzzeit. Die Leere der fünfziger Jahre. Ein Interview mit Anselm Haverkamp." *Texte zur Kunst* 50: *Die fünfziger Jahre* (June 2003): 44–53.

Iser, Wolfgang. "Zur Phänomenologie der Dialogregel." *Das Gespräch*. Eds. Karlheinz Stierle and Rainer Warning. Paderborn: Fink, 1996. 183–190.

Jakobson, Roman, and Krystyna Pomorska. *Dialogues*. Trans. by Christian Huber. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1983.

Jauß, Hans Robert. "Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory." Trans. by Elizabeth Benzinger. *New Literary History* 2. 1 (Autumn 1970): 7–37.

Jauß, Hans Robert. "Epilog auf die Forschungsgruppe 'Poetik und Hermeneutik'." *Kontingenz*. Eds. Edeltraut Luise Marquard, Matthias Christen, Gerhart von Graevenitz, and Odo Marquart. Paderborn: Fink, 1998. 525–533.

Jauß-Meyer, Helga. "Alle einte die Erkenntnis, dass auch die Wissenschaften und die Universitäten nicht im alten Stil weitermachen konnten." *Poetik und Hermeneutik im Rückblick: Interviews mit Beteiligten*. Eds. Petra Boden and Rüdiger Zill. Munich: Fink, 2017. 41–52.

Lachmann, Renate. "Bachtins Dialogizität und die akmeistische Mytho-Poetik als Paradigma dialogisierter Lyrik." *Das Gespräch*. Eds. Karlheinz Stierle and Rainer Warning. Paderborn: Fink, 1996a. 492–501.

Lachmann, Renate. "Ebenen des Intertextualitätsbegriffs." *Das Gespräch*. Eds. Karlheinz Stierle and Rainer Warning. Paderborn: Fink, 1996b. 133–138.

Lachmann, Renate. "Zur Semantik metonymischer Dialogizität." *Das Gespräch*. Eds. Karlheinz Stierle and Rainer Warning. Paderborn: Fink, 1996c. 517–524.

Lachmann, Renate. "Poetics and Hermeneutics (*Poetik und Hermeneutik*)." *Theoretical Schools and Circles in the Twentieth-Century Humanities: Literary Theory, History, Philosophy*. Eds. Marina Grishakova and Silvi Salupere. New York, NY, and London: Routledge, 2015. 216–234.

Lachmann, Renate. "… steif, aber zugleich aufregend und ungemeine spannend." *Poetik und Hermeneutik im Rückblick: Interviews mit Beteiligten*. Eds. Petra Boden and Rüdiger Zill. Munich: Fink, 2017. 285–312.

Lepper, Marcel. "Was war Theorie?" Review of *Klassiker der modernen Literaturtheorie: Von Sigmund Freud bis Judith Butler* by Matías Martínez and Michael Scheffel (eds.). *JLTonline* (04.01.2012). http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0222-001946 (16 June 2021).

Marquard, Edeltraut Luise, Matthias Christen, Gerhart von Graevenitz, and Odo Marquard (eds.). *Kontingenz*. Paderborn: Wilhelm Fink, 1998.

Meier, Christian. "Temperament, Leidenschaft und kräftige Persönlichkeiten." *Poetik und Hermeneutik im Rückblick: Interviews mit Beteiligten*. Eds. Petra Boden and Rüdiger Zill. Munich: Fink, 2017. 203–228.

Raulff, Ulrich. *Kreis ohne Meister: Stefan Georges Nachleben*. Munich: C.H. Beck, 2009.

Raulff, Ulrich. *Wiedersehen mit den Siebzigern: Die wilden Jahre des Lesens*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 2014.

Rosenberg, Rainer. "Die sechziger Jahre als Zäsur in der deutschen Literaturwissenschaft: Theoriegeschichtlich." *Verhandlungen des Literaturbegriffs: Studien zu Geschichte und Theorie der Literaturwissenschaft*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2003. 243–268.

Sneis, Jørgen. *Phänomenologie und Textinterpretation: Studien zur Theoriegeschichte und Methodik der Literaturwissenschaft*. Berlin and Boston, MA: De Gruyter, 2018.

Stierle, Karlheinz. "Werk und Intertextualität." *Das Gespräch*. Eds. Karlheinz Stierle and Rainer Warning. Paderborn: Fink, 1996. 139–150.

Stierle, Karlheinz, and Rainer Warning (eds.). *Das Gespräch*. Paderborn: Fink, 1996.

Striedter, Jurij, and Wolf-Dieter Stempel (eds.). *Texte der russischen Formalisten I: Texte zur allgemeinen Literaturtheorie und zur Theorie der Prosa*. Munich: Fink, 1969.

Striedter, Jurij, and Wolf-Dieter Stempel (eds.) *Texte der russischen Formalisten II: Texte zur Theorie des Verses und zur poetischen Sprache*. Munich: Fink, 1972.

Tihanov, Galin. *The Birth and Death of Literary Theory: Regimes of Relevance in Russia and Beyond*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2021.

Tynianov, Iurii [Yuri]. "Literary Fact." [1924] *Permanent Evolution: Selected Essays on Literature, Theory and Film*. Eds. Ainsley Morse and Philip Redko. Boston, MA: Academic Studies Press, 2019. 153–172.

Todorov, Tzvetan. *Mikhail Bakhtine – Le principe dialogique suivi d'Écrits du cercle de Bakhtine*. Paris: Seuil, 1981.

Warning, Rainer. "… ein harmonisches Gespräch." *Poetik und Hermeneutik im Rückblick: Interviews mit Beteiligten*. Eds. Petra Boden and Rüdiger Zill. Munich: Fink, 2017. 183–202.

Zima, Peter. *Literarische Ästhetik*. 3rd edition. Tübingen: Narr Franke Attempto, 2020.

II.5 Psychoanalysis and Literature and the Psychology of Art

Serge Tchougounnikov

The Psychologisation of the Central and Eastern European Humanities: Mechanisms and Consequences of the Psychological Turn

The psychologisation of the humanities and sciences began in the 1850s and extended much further into the twentieth century than is usually assumed. This tendency can be observed particularly for European linguistics, literary studies, and aesthetics. The concept of "the psychologisation of the humanities" (cf. Romand and Tchougounnikov 2009, 2010) must be distinguished from the well-known notion of psychologism, the largely criticized view according to which the problems of epistemology can be solved satisfactorily by the psychological study of mental processes. Indeed, while the latter is negatively connoted, the concept of psychologisation accentuates the positive effect of the psychological turn within European humanities to the extent it largely anticipated the development of a modern epistemological frame and has signficantly contributed to its creation. The period's psychology of language subsequently morphed into modern neurosciences, cognitive psychology and cognitive linguistics (Romand and Tchougounnikov 2008, 2013).

To understand the attractiveness of nineteenth-century psychology for the humanities of the time, one should take into consideration the following point: the scientific psychology of the nineteenth century (and particularly the German-speaking psychological tradition) represents a systematically and clearly defined research program. The works of psychologists of this period shared a common epistemological and methodological framework, namely the psychophysical thesis of the non-reducibility of mental states to the neuronal substratum (Herbart, Weber, Fechner, Lotze, Wundt, Lipps et al.). The principle of localisation implying the possible identification of the neuronal substratum with respect to any mental phenomena does not contradict this point concerning the respective autonomy of these two dimensions – the mental and the corporeal – and is clearly formulated within the framework of the abovementioned psychophysical thesis.

Indeed, despite the heavily discussed impact of the anti-psychological turn (Frege, Husserl et al.) on the modern humanities (usually illustrated with the case of formalism and structuralism), it would be naive to believe in its complete emancipation from the previous psychological component. Even if phenomenology was extremely significant as a source of conceptual inspiration (cf. Holenstein 1974), both psychological and anti-psychological trends co-existed for a long time, simultaneously shaping the basis of the humanities.

Initially emanating from psychological linguistics, this kind of research has profoundly influenced literary studies and literary theory: its influence has penetrated major concepts (especially those of poetic language defined, since formalism, sometimes via the notion of *emotivity* or *transrational language*, sometimes via the concepts of *verbal gesture*, *expressive movement* or *pure motricity*, and sometimes via the concept of *construction* and *paradigm-syntagm relation* [cf. Romand and Tchougounnikov 2010, 531–539]).

1 The scientific psychology of the nineteenth century, a cognitive paradigm

The humanities – linguistics, literary scholarship, aesthetics, etc. – have adapted some basic assumptions of nineteenth-century psychology. These are: the use (and probably misuse) of the notion of *representation*; the analytical approach to the states of consciousness or mental facts conceived as being potentially objectified; the assimilation of consciousness to language via the notion of *verbal thought*, etc. Moreover, psycho-physical parallelism conveys the idea that the description of reality can be accomplished on two levels, depending on the point of view from which this reality is apprehended: the external point of view gives access to the objective world, and the internal point of view gives access to the subjective world. Although correlated within the living organism, both these dimensions should follow their intrinsic inner laws and reveal themselves as quite independent of each other. The notion of *mentalism* expresses this irreducibility of the psychological to its neural substratum, even though these two 'substances' are correlated. Mental phenomena are representations, double entities, semantic and experiential at the same time. These entities are further divided into those which can be objectified (representations or *Vorstellungen*) and those which cannot be objectified (feelings or *Gefühle*). The latter function consists in coloring and connoting representations which are fundemantally open to introspection as a research method (cf. Romand and Tchougounnikov 2009, 2010). These commonly shared positions of German psychology of the nineteenth century justify the term *cognitive* that we apply to it.

2 From psychological linguistics to psychological poetics

Since Rasmus Rask (1787–1832) and Franz Bopp (1791–1867), historical and comparative linguistics has accentuated phonic or morphological (flexional) aspects of language. The notion of form elaborated within the first comparative linguistics was conceived in its materiality: the substantial or physical affinities were analysed as the evidence of genealogical relationships. In contrast, the emerging psychological linguistics sought to desubstantiate the notion of form inherited from comparative and historical linguistics. Language is conceived, according to Wilhelm von Humboldt's vision, not as *ergon* – a result or finished product – but as *energia*, activity or pure dynamics. This interpretation of the morphological classification of languages in terms of mental states constituted a significant stage of the emergence of the psychological trend in linguistics.

Both psychology and linguistics become theories of the representation. In this respect, Johann Friedrich Herbart's (1776–1841) contribution is essential (see Peter Steiner's chapter on Herbartian aesthetics in this volume). This is also the approach of Wilhelm von Humboldt and Heymann Steinthal (1823–1899), the founder of psychological linguistics and a fervent adherent of Herbart's psychology. His psychological classification of morphological forms aims to systematize language as a concept or idea. This classification adheres entirely to the inner form of language, the modality of which is purely energetic, since it deals with the energetic characteristic of speech and thought (cf. Steinthal 1858; 1860, 317–318, 127–130; 1881, 396–431). In this context, the representational definition of the phrase formulated by Hermann Paul (1846–1921) (*Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*, 1880, *Principles of the History of Language*) is symptomatic: it confirms representation (*Vorstellung*) as the basis of the new psychological linguistics and attests to the definite assimilation of the mentalist and psychological paradigm by the linguistics of the 1880s: "The sentence is a linguistic expression or symbol, denoting the combination of several ideas (*Vorstellungen*) or groups of ideas, that has been effected in the mind of the speaker; and it is at the same time the means of reproducing the same combination of the same ideas in the mind of the hearer" (Paul 1891, 111).

The psychologist Wilhelm Wundt (1832–1920) proposes a psychological interpretation of the great morphological types of language established by historical and comparative linguistics. The three types of language – isolating, affixing, and inflecting – correspond to the three qualitatively different forms of thought correlated with three periods of the evolution of the human psyche or essentially different forms of thought. Thus, for Wundt, these morphological stages reflect the history of consciousness and, in particular, the fact that consciousness tends

to become ever more analytical. The activity of the consciousness consists in analysing or decomposing representations (cf. Wundt 1863, 364–368, 369–376; 1900, 559–563). The gesture – and particularly a verbal gesture – is perceived within this approach as a kind of psycho-physical syntax binding the mental levels of representation and feeling.

German psychological linguistics soon influenced researchers in the Russian Empire. Aleksandr Potebnia's (1835–1891) treaty *Language and Thought* (1862) laid the foundations for the Kharkov School of Linguistics (see Igor' Pilshchikov's chapter on Russian formalism and Jessica Merrill's chapter on the North American reception of Russian formalism in this volume). Later, there were two more Russian schools of psychological linguistics: the Kazan School of Linguistics, founded by Jan Baudouin de Courtenay (1845–1929) and Filip Fortunatov's (1848–1914) Moscow School. This approach was largely diffused by a lot of influential scholars such as Dmitrii Ovsianiko-Kulikovskii (1853–1920, Kharkov School), Jan Baudouin de Courtenay's disciple Mikołaj Kruszewski (Kazan School), Nikolaj Troubetzkoy (1890–1938), and Roman Jakobson (1896–1982).

Some formalists, such as Evgenii Polivanov (1891–1938) and Lev Iakubinskii (1892–1945), were direct students of Baudouin de Courtenay. Roman Jakobson was formed in the department of linguistics of the University of Moscow, in the atmosphere of Fortunatov's psychological doctrine. The formalist method in literary scholarship borrowed the conceptual tools of this very branch of linguistics (cf. Tchougounnikov 2009b; 2012).

3 Sound philology and living word studies

Sound philology (*Ohrenphilologie*, literally 'philology of the ear' or 'ear philology') and research on the *living word* in Europe emerged from a combination of the late-nineteenth-century theoretical (mostly psychological) sources and elements of a personal declamatory experience elaborated by Joseph Rutz (1834–1895), Ottmar Rutz (1881–1952), and Eduard Sievers (1850–1932) (cf. Tchougounnikov 2007). The oral dominant of the renewed program of humanities was opposed to the classical 'silent' or 'written' philology, and the abovementioned 'ear philology' or *auditory philology* is the most famous example of this trend. The living word phenomenon appears in Russia at the turn of the century as a verbal-semantic-articulated-gestural-emotive unity (on the phenomenon of sound philology and the living word within the Russian-Soviet context, cf. Postoutenko et al. 2016).

The prominent role of the new German philology in Russia is evident from the fact that in 1928 Eduard Sievers (University of Leipzig) and Franz Saran

(1866–1931, University of Erlangen) are designated as members of honour of the Department of Verbal Art at the State Institute of Art History. One of the sections of the Department of Verbal Arts was the Section of Artistic Speech headed by Sergei Bernshtein (1892–1970) until 1925 and later by Viktor Vinogradov (1895–1969) who – together with their disciples such as Nikolai Kovarskii and Sof'ia Vysheslavtseva – made a significant contribution to the specifically Russian part of the development of the sound philology project. Alongside the German influence, one finds profound roots of the 'sound-word' tradition within the Russian cultural field: the attitude of Russian poets towards the oral form of poetical text, the role of sounds in the process of verbal creation, and the quality test of finished texts via their oral realisation. This 'sound-word' attitude concerns the major Russian authors of the Silver Age: Blok, Maiakovskii, Severianin; it is also reflected in various socio-linguistic aspects of declamatory art such as the role of the *chtets-deklamator* (reader-reciter) collection, the culture of public and family reading; phenomena of political, religious, scientific and scenic speech; the study of the history and pragmatics of some major related concepts such as *declamation*, *expressive reading*, the living word (*zhivoe slovo*), and the sound word (*zvuchashchaia rech*) in the Russian context; or the experience of collective declamation in Russia realised by professor Vasilii Serezhnikov (1885–1952) (cf. Tchougounnikov 2016c).

4 Scientific psychology within literary scholarship and aesthetics: the formalist method in Germany and in Russia

In German literary studies, one can easily follow the transformation of comparative historical (Th. Danzel, H. Hettner) and positivist (W. Scherer, E. Schmidt, G. Roethe) approaches towards the vision proper into idealist philology (W. Dilthey, K. Vossler), and, further, into the German branch of psychological formalism (O. Walzel, R. Petsch, E. Staiger; W. Kayser; see Alexander Nebrig's chapter on formalism in Germany in this volume). The Russian counterpoint to this process was the mutation from the comparative historical perspective (A. Vesselovskij) into psychological morphology (A. Potebnia and the Kharkov School) and the formalist orientation.

In particular, the notion of the *sound gesture* unmasks the psychological genealogy of both German and Russian formalism. German psychologists such as Johann Friedrich Herbart, Johannes Müller (1801–1858), Rudolf Hermann Lotze

(1817–1881), Heyman Steinthal, Hermann Paul, Wilhelm Wundt, Georg von der Gabelentz (1840–1893), and Karl Bühler (1879–1963) describe language as a supplementary formation of a reflex movement originally born in a purely mechanical way: in this sense, language is an involuntary product of physical behaviour. For Wundt, the "language of gestures" (*Gebärdensprache*; Wundt 1900, 143) "sound gestures" (*Lautgebärde*; Wundt 1900, 343, 344), "sound images" (*Lautbilder*; Wundt 1900, 330), and "sound metaphors" (*Lautmetaphern*; Wundt 1900, 344) are the most explicit manifestations of what he calls "expressive movements" (*Ausdrucksbewegungen*; Wundt 1900, 43). This kind of movements is understood as instinctive motions accompanying affects. They are as physiologically determined as the acceleration and slowing down of the heart's rhythm or respiration, the instinctive contraction of the facial muscles, etc. For Wundt, these "expressive movements" illustrate the principle of the psycho-physical parallelism elaborated by German psychology since the 1860s: according to this rule, every change of the psychical state is accompanied by the equivalent change of the physical state, although both states are governed by some particular laws unrelated to each other. For Wundt, a phonic language is but a part of this system of expressive movements natural for human organisms (Wundt 1900, 43–142, 231–257).

This idea of corporeal engagement in language production is particularly characteristic of the sound analysis (*Schallanalyse*) of Eduard Sievers (1850–1932), which was largely inspired by the German psychophysics of the second half of the nineteenth century. According to Sievers, emotion, as an original phenomenon, generates a gesture accompanied by a sound; together they form a simultaneous phenomenon. The realisation of sound through language means that it is intrinsically semantically charged; it is a physiognomic expression in the same way as a gesture is an expression of the "movement of the soul" (Sievers 1924, 72–74).

The formalists' interest in the corporeal corposant of the lingual and literary production has led to a particular, linguo-somatic orientation. The concept of sound gesture seems to be fundamental for formalism both in linguistics and in poetics. In his article "On Poetry and Trans-rational Language" (1916), Viktor Shklovskii explains the phenomenon of *zaum'* (transrational poetry) through Wundt's notion of sound images (*Lautbilder*). For Shklovskii, the articulation of these sound images triggers the same facial expressions which naturally accompanies the expression of feelings of joy, sadness, etc.. According to Shklovski, the existence of these sound images confirms the fact that the phonic and the articulating aspects of a word can provoke different emotions (Shklovskii 1990, 48). The formalists Evgenii Polivanov, Lev Iakubinskii, Osip Brik (1888–1945), Boris Èikhenbaum (1886–1959), and Iurii Tynianov (1894–1943) frequently use the notions *iazykovoi zhest* (lingual gestures) and *zvukovoi zhest* (sound gesture) (cf. Tchougounnikov 2009a, 231–248; 2014).

Polivanov seems to be the first formalist scholar to use this concept, in his article "Apropos Sound Gestures in Japanese" (1916), published in the first OPOIAZ collective volume on the theory of poetic language (*Sborniki po teorii poeticheskogo iazyka*, I; Polivanov 1974 [1916]). One should stress that both Polivanov and Shklovski refer explicitly to the ethno-psychology of Wundt. It is a very rare case of an explicit psychological reference within Russian formalism. For the contemporaries of Russian formalism, the link between the transrational *zaum'* language of futurism and the expressive gesture in Wundt's sense is very evident. For example, one could quote an important remark Mikhail Bakhtin (1895–1975) made in his lectures on the Russian literature of 1920s. Directly connecting the *zaum'* language to gestures, Bakhtin observes that the verbal gesture replaces the *theme* in the experimental poetry of Velimir Khlebnikov (1885–1922). Bakhtin refers to Wundt, for whom the original sound is naturally accompanied by gesture, which in turn results from the imitative capacity of the articulating organs. Much later, the sound becomes self-sufficient, turning into a goal in itself (Bakhtin 2000, 368).

Lev Iakubinskii, in his 1923 essay "O dialogicheskoi rechi" ("On Dialogical Speech"), defines gesture as a kind of mimicry, a sort of motoric reaction typical of non-linguistic communicative systems: this reaction, according to Iakubinskii, stems from the partial reduction of the linguistic message and forms part of "dialogical speech" (Iakubinskii 1986 [1923], 122–128, 183–193). Osip Brik, in his essay "Ritm i Sintaksis" (1927, "Rhythm and Syntax"), relegates any gesticulation (mimicry, motor reactions) to the domain of signal systems, which accompany the "verbal orientation" ("rechevaia ustanovka"; Brik 1972 [1927], 167). Brik compares this secondary signal system to a rhythmic impulse which seeks to increase a material or palpable character of the poetic language (Brik 1972 [1927], 167). Iurii Tynianov defines the sound gesture as a *deformation*, a particular mechanism serving to produce semantic change within a poetic line; for Tynianov, this very phenomenon constitutes the "semantics of poetry" (Tynianov 1977 [1924], 140). It is on this notion of expressive gesture that Boris Ėikhenbaum bases his conception of narrative (*skaz*), a particular narrative style imitating an immediate oral telling of a fictive character, where a systematically applied system of deformations has a particular semantic effect (for example, the 'grotesque body' of Gogol's character, Akakii Akakievich, is a pure articulated effect produced by the articulation of this name) (Ėikhenbaum [1919] 1969, 128; on this subject, cf. also Tchougounnikov 2009a, 231–248; Romand and Tchougounnikov 2010, 521–546; 2013, 83–121).

This concept of expressive movements profoundly influenced the German aesthetics of the last half of the nineteenth century, in particular Konrad Fiedler's (1841–1895) sensorial aesthetics developed in his treatise *Über den Ursprung der*

künstlerischen Tätigkeit (1887, *On the Origin of Artistic Activity)*. Fiedler defines art and artistic production as a set of expressive movements derived from the productivity of the human psyche: they contribute to the formation of the works of art. These expressive movements extract forms from the consciousness (which is amorphous by nature). For Fiedler, 'expressive' means morphogenetic; it pertains to the generation of forms whose content does not precede this process. The essence of expressive movements is not the fact that mental content finds external expression through the movement of physical organs. Fiedler sees these expressive movements as a particular stage of development of the psychophysical process. In expressive movements, the mental process as an immediately conscious object undergoes a development which would be impossible without these 'movements': here we see the same phenomenon as in every corporeal process which begins with nervous excitement and reaches, in an immediate external movement, the phase of development it would not reach any other way (Fiedler 1971 [1887], 193–194; cf. also Tchougounnikov 2017).

5 Conclusion: The topicality of the suppressed

We can now formulate a more general hypothesis concerning the epistemological method of Russian formalism and its place within the general epistemology of the humanities:

Russian formalism is dependent on two great lines within nineteenth-century psychological tradition: a) the theory of representation understood as a unity characterized by double determination – qualitative and quantitative; and b) the localisation of lingual and semiotic mechanisms with respect to some basic neuroanatomical centers. This trend continued within the formalist circle and has survived in a particular branch of structuralism represented by Jakobson's linguistics and Russian Moscow–Tartu semiotics. The formalist program takes up some essential elements of physiological psychology (particularly, those of W. Wundt), specifically the idea of the affective and expressive nature of language. Certain Formalist concepts – such as *skaz* (oral narration), poetic language, *ostranenie*, or deformation – allow us to apprehend the expressive movements in language. The quest for this expressive or mimetic dominant in language and literature allows formalism to be connected to both the psychological trend in linguistics and the Romantic theory of expression. The anatomo-physiological approach of German psychology provides a missing link for understanding the functionalist turn as a transition between late formalism and the Prague Linguistic Circle, which finds its continuation in the Soviet Russian structuralism of the 1960s–1980s. Thus Jakob-

son's idea of the localisation of paradigmatic and syntagmatic axes and the idea of the functional dichotomy of the brain were elaborated by the semiotics of Moscow and Tartu in terms of the brain's functional asymmetry (which was developed in a collection of articles discussing brain asymmetry as a semiotic mechanism).

In other words, the intrinsically cognitivist dimension to the formalist programme explains its late success during the period from 1950s–1960s, a time often and erroneously referred to as the period of the cognitivist revolution. In reality, this process amounts to a reemergence of the research programme of the cognitivist sciences, rather exhaustively formulated by the German psychological tradition (cf. Tchougounnikov 2016a, 2016b).

The turn of the twenty-first century has seen an extreme proliferation of studies dealing with such traditional objects of this kind of psychology as representations and feelings or emotions. Principal axes of interpretation of theses mental phenomena are found in matrices formulated by the theorists of the nineteenth century. This vision has also resulted in the physiological theory of emotions advanced by W. James (1884) and C. Lange (1885), which has basically been reaffirmed since the 1960s (Damasio 1995, 2000 [1999], 2003; Golleman 2003).

Another characteristic example is the concept of empathy *(Einfühlung)*, elaborated within the psychological aesthetics of the nineteenth century (Friedrich Theodor Vischer, Robert Vischer, Johannes Volkelt, Théodor Lipps): today, its extreme popularity is a tributary of new discoveries of neurosciences exemplified by the famous 'mirror neurons' (cf. Forest 1999; Berthor and Petit 2006; Curtis and Koch 2009; Agosta 2010).

One can also mention the emergency of research since the 1990s dealing with expressive movements and gestures, conceptual unities referred to within the German-speaking psychological tradition by the terms expressive movements (*Ausdrucksbewegungen)* and sound gestures (*Lautgebärde*), both traditional objects of the psychological age of the humanities (Armstrong et al. 1995; McNeil 2000; Kita 2003; Kendon 2004; Gfrereis and Lepper 2007; Bråten 2007; Bejarano 2011; Donald 1991; Corballis 2001).

Numerous studies within the field of sound philology and the living word testify to the relevance of the current version of speech technologies (*Sprechkunde*) (Brang 1988; Brang 2010; Geissner 1997; Krech 1999, 2007, 31–46; Meyer-Kalkus 2001; Pabst-Weinschenk 1993a; Pabst-Weinschenk 1993b).

Following the research program of the psychology of the nineteenth century, the psychologisation of the humanities (*Geisteswissenschaften*) has made a significant contribution to the creation of a modern epistemological framework. Its conceptual heritage constitutes solid epistemological data, the study of which is extremely useful for the general history of the cognitive sciences. It deals with the basic tendency prevailing during the second half of the nineteenth century,

a tendency which has ultimately transformed the situation within the European humanities. The experience of the psychologisation of knowledge and the models of the humanities invites us to rethink the history and the genealogy of cognitive thought. Thus the psychological age of the humanities has contributed to the reemergence of the research programme initially elaborated by nineteenth-century German-speaking psychology which – due to the oblivion of this powerful and genuinely revolutionary tradition – is currently known as the 'cognitive revolution' of the 1950s (cf. Baars 1986; Gardiner 1986; Pinker 2002).

References

Agosta, Lou. *Empathy in the Context of Philosophy*. New York, NY: Palgrave & Macmillian, 2010.

Armstrong, David, William Stokoe, and Sherman Wilcox. *Gesture and the Nature of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Baars, Bernard. *The Cognitive Revolution in Psychology*. New York, NY: Guilford Press, 1986.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. S*obranie sochinenii*. Vol. 2. Eds. S. Bocharov and L. Melihova. Moscow: Russkiie slovari, 2000.

Bejarano, Teresa. *Becoming Human: From Pointing Gestures to Syntax*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 2011.

Berthor, Alain, and Jean-Luc Petit. *Phénoménologie et physiologie de l'action*. Paris: Odile Jacob, 2006.

Brang, Peter. *Das klingelnde Wort: Zu Theorie und Geschichte der Deklamationskunst in Russland*. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaft, 1988.

Brang, Peter. *Zvuchashchee slovo*. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskoi kul'tury, 2010.

Bråten, Stein (ed.). *On Being Moved: From Mirror Neurons to Empathy*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2007.

Brik, Ossip. "Ritm i sintaksis." [1927] *Texte des russischen Formalismus*. Vol. 2. Ed. Wolf-Dieter Stempel. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1972. 162–221.

Corballis, Michael. "L'origine gestuelle du langage." *La Recherche* 341 (2001): 35–39.

Curtis, Robin, and Gertrud Koch (eds.). *Einfühlung: zu Geschichte und Gegenwart eines ästhetischen Konzepts*. Munich: Fink Verlag, 2009.

Damasio, Antonio. *L'erreur de Descartes*. Paris: Odile Jakob, 1995.

Damasio, Antonio. *The Feeling of What Happens: Body, Emotion and the Making of Consciousness* [1999]. New York, NY: Vintage, 2000.

Damasio, Antonio. *Spinoza avait raison: Joie et tristesse, le cerveau des émotions*. Paris: Odile Jacob, 2003.

Donald, Merlin. *Origins of Modern Mind: Three Stages in the Evolution of Culture and Cognition*. Cambridge, MA, and London: Harvard University Press, 1991.

Êikhenbaum, Boris. "Kak sdelana Shinel' Gogol'a." [1919] *Texte der russischen Formalisten*. Vol. 1. Ed. Jurij Striedter. Munich: W. Fink Verlag, 1969. 122–159.

Fiedler, Konrad. *Schriften zur Kunst* [1887]. Vol. 1. Ed. Gottfried Boehm. Munich: W. Fink Verlag, 1971.

Forest, Robert. *Empathie et linguistique*. Paris: PUF, 1999.

Gardiner, Howard. *The Mind's New Science: A History of the Cognitive Revolution*. New York, NY: Basic Books, 1986.

Geissner, Hellmut. *Wege und Irrwege der Sprecherziehung*. St. Ingbert: Röhrig Universitätsverlag, 1997.

Gfrereis, Heike and Marcel Lepper. *Deixis: Vom Denken mit dem Zeigefinger*. Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2007.

Golleman, Daniel. *L'intelligence émotionnelle*. Paris: Ed. J'ai lu, 2003.

Holenstein, Elmar. *Jakobson ou le structuralisme phénoménologique*. Paris: Seghers, 1974.

Iakubinskii, Lev. *Iazyk i ego funktsionirovanie: Izbrannye raboty* [1923]. Moscow: Nauka, 1986.

Kendon, Adam. *Gesture: Visible Action as Utterance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Kita, Sotaro (ed.). *Pointing: Where Language, Culture, and Cognition Meet*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers, 2003.

Krech, Eva-Maria. "Sprechwissenschaft an der Universität Halle – Entwicklung und Perspektiven." *Sprechwissenschaft – zu Geschichte und Gegenwart: Festschrift zum 90järigen Bestehen von Sprechwissenschaft / Sprecherziehung an der Universität Halle*. Eds. Eva-Maria Krech and Eberhard Stock. Frankfurt/M., Berlin, Bern, New York, NY, Paris, and Vienna: Peter Lang, 1999. 21–39.

Krech, Eva-Maria. "Sprechwissenschaft in Halle – zum Werden einer universitären, wissenschaftlichen Disziplin." *Sprechwissenschaft: 100 Jahre Fachgeschichte an der Universität Halle*. Ed. Ines Bose. Frankfurt/M., Berlin, Bern, New York, NY, Paris, and Vienna: Peter Lang, 2007. 31–46.

McNeill, David (ed.). *Language and Gesture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Meyer-Kalkus, Reinhart. *Stimme und Sprechkünste im 20. Jahrhundert*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2001.

Pabst-Weinschenk, Marita. *Die Konstitution der Sprechkunde und Sprecherziehung durch Erich Drach: Faktengeschichte von 1900 bis 1935*. Magdeburg: Westarp Wissenschaften, 1993a.

Pabst-Weinschenk, Marita. *Erich Drachs Konzept der Sprechkunde und Sprecherziehung: Ein Beitrag zur Theorie und Geschichte der Sprechwissenschaft*. Magdeburg: Westarp Wissenschaften, 1993b.

Paul, Hermann. *Principles of the History of Language*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1891.

Pinker, Steven. *The Blank Slate*. New York, NY: Viking, 2002.

Polivanov, Evgeni. "Apropos Sound Gestures in Japanese." [1916] *Selected Works: Articles on General Linguistics*. Eds. F. D. Ashnin, V. P. Grigor'ev, V. V. Ivanov, A. A. Leont'ev, and A. A. Reformatskii. Trans. by Daniel Armstrong. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1974. 275–284.

Postoutenko, Kirill, Jasmine Jacq, Serge Tchougounnikov, and Dmitri Zakharin (eds.). "Secondary Orality in Modern Russian Culture: Language, Cinema and Politics." Special Issue of the *Russian Journal of Communication (RJC)* 8.2 (2016): 119–121.

Romand, David, and Serge [Serguei] Tchougounnikov. "Quelques sources psychologiques allemandes du formalisme russe : le cas des théories de la conscience." *Langage et pensée: Union soviétique années 1920–1930*. *Cahiers de l'ILSL* 24 (2008): 223–236.

Romand, David, and Serge [Serguei] Tchougounnikov. "Aux origines allemandes du cognitivisme, introduction." *Psychologie allemande et sciences humaines en Russie: Anatomie d'un transfert culturel (1860–1930)*. *Revue d'Histoire des Sciences Humaines* 21 (2009): 3–27.

Romand, David, and Serguei Tchougounnikov. "Le formalisme russe, une séduction cognitiviste." *Sciences humaines et sociales en Russie à l'Âge d'argent: quelques figures de transferts. Cahiers du Monde russe* 51.4 (2010): 521–546.

Romand, David, and Serge [Serguei] Tchougounnikov. "Polivanov, psycholinguiste: Psychologie et formalisme en Russie dans les années 1910–1930." *Evgenij Polivanov (1891–1938): Penser le langage aux temps de Staline*. Eds. S. Archaimbault and S. Tchougounnikov. Paris: Institut d'études slaves, 2013. 83–121.

Sievers, Eduard. *Ziele und Wege der Schallanalyse: Zwei Vorträge von E. S.* Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1924.

Shklovskii, Viktor. *Gamburgskii shchet*. Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1990.

Steinthal, Heymann. *Der Ursprung der Sprache: Im Zusammenhange mit den letzten Fragen alles Wissens. Eine Darstellung, Kritik und Fortentwicklung der vorzüglichsten Ansichten*. Berlin: Ferd. Dümmlers Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1858.

Steinthal, Heymann. *Charakteristik der hauptsächlichsten Typen des Sprachbaues*. Berlin: Ferd. Dümmlers Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1860.

Steinthal, Heymann. *Abriss der Sprachwissenschaft: Einleitung in die Psychologie und Sprachwissenschaft. Erster Teil. Die Sprache im Allgemeinen*. Berlin: Ferd. Dümmlers Verlagsbuchhandlung, Harrwitz und Gossmann, 1881.

Tchougounnikov, Serge [Serguei]. "Eduard Sievers et la phonétique allemande du début du XXème siècle: Les sources allemandes des théorisations russes de la charpente sonore du langage." *Histoire. Epistémologie. Langage* XXIX.2 (2007): 145–162.

Tchougounnikov, Serge [Serguei]. "La psychologie allemande dans la généalogie du formalisme russe." *Formalismes esthétiques et héritage herbartien*. Eds. Céline Trautmann-Waller and Carole Magné. Vienna, Prague, Moscow, Hildesheim, Zurich, and New York, NY: Georg Olms Verlag, 2009a. 231–248.

Tchougounnikov, Serge [Serguei]. "Quelques éléments ethnopsychologiques et psycho-physiques dans les sciences du langage russes de l'entre-deux-guerres." *Psychologie allemande et sciences humaines en Russie: Anatomie d'un transfert culturel (1860–1930). RHSH (Revue d'histoire des sciences humaines)* 21 (2009b): 83–102.

Tchougounnikov, Serge [Serguei]. *Du "psychologisme" au "cognitivisme": La "linguistique psychologique" entre Allemagne et Russie (1850–1930). L'émergence d'une psycho-linguistique européenne. Mémoire d'Habilitation à diriger des recherches.* Paris: Université Paris-7, 2012.

Tchougounnikov, Serge [Serguei]. "Ritmicheskaia kontseptsiia O. Brika v kontekste issledovanii v oblasti vyrazitel'nykh dvizhenii." *Metodologiia i praktika russkogo formalizma: Brikovskii sbornik. Vypusk II: Materialy mezhdunarodnoi nauchnoi konferentsii*. Ed. G. Vekšin. Moscow: Azbukovnik, 2014. 370–377.

Tchougounnikov, Serge [Serguei]. "De la visibilité à la littérarité : l'atelier des formalismes européens." *Revue des Etudes Slaves* 86 (2016a): 353–357.

Tchougounnikov, Serge [Serguei]. "L'espace comme procédé: formalisme russe vs formalisme germanique." *Cinquante nuances du temps et de l'espace dans les théories linguistiques. Cahiers de l'ILSL* 49 (2016b): 27–51.

Tchougounnikov, Serge [Serguei]. "Speech technology as an experimental science: towards the comparative dynamics of *Sprechkunde* in Germany and Russia in the late nineteenth to early twentieth century." *Russian Journal of Communication* 8.2 (2016c): 153–167.

Tchougounnikov, Serge [Serguei]. "Prolegomeny k sravnitel'nomu analizu russkogo i nemetskoiazychnogo formalizmov." *Russkii formalizm i sovremennoe gumanitarnoe*

znanie. Eds. J. Levchenko and I. Pilshchikov. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2017. 103–114.

Tynianov, Iurii [Jurij]. *Le vers lui-même: Les problèmes du vers* [1924]. Paris: Union générale d'éditions, 1977.

Wundt, Wilhelm. *Vorlesungen über die Menschen und Thierseele*. Vol. 2. Leipzig: Leopold Voss, 1863.

Wundt, Wilhelm. *Völkerpsychologie: Die Sprache*. Vol. 1. Leipzig: Engelmann, 1900.

Aleksei Zherebin

Psychoanalysis and Literature and the Psychology of Art (C. G. Jung's Archaic Images and the Russian Jungians)

1 Introduction

Psychoanalysis and literary modernity encountered each other in Russia in a cul-turo-historical constellation in which, to simplify somewhat, Russian literary and cultural theory developed under the strong influence of Symbolism and Marxism. Accordingly, the discussion took two basic forms: Symbolist and Marxist. These two core groups of Russian readers saw great ideological and production-aesthetic potential in psychoanalysis and endeavoured to translate psychoanalytic concepts into their own language and corresponding discourses.

Between about 1908 and the late 1920s, i. e. for about two decades, Freud's psychoanalysis and Jung's analytical psychology were widely discussed. Both Symbolism and avantgardist Marxism considered literature to be a sign system that, in a constructivist sense, had to create a new world and a new human being. Freud's pessimistic 'metaphysics' (claiming that the primitive forces driving us are dark, blind, barbaric, violent and insatiable), his conviction that there is irra-tionality and chaos at the root of all things, his therapy aiming to come to terms with an "uneasiness in culture" (Freud 1969, IX, 191–270) and with the fact that the human being is not the "master in his own house" (Freud 1969, I, 283), and his understanding of art as a generator of comforting illusions – from a Russian perspective, all this was considered positivist, bourgeois and restitutive. To his Russian contemporaries, Freud appeared to be too austere and too cautious; he did not dare to create a utopia one could actually believe could come true in Russia. Thus his theory needed to be radicalized by its symbiosis, on the one hand with Symbolism, and on the other with Marxism.

The Russian discussion on depth psychology was based on a worldly monism. In the Symbolist variation, which was influenced by Vladimir Solov'ev's meta-physics of all-encompassing unity (*metafizika vseedinstva*) (e. g., Solov'ev 1995 [1878]), the human intellect was mystically involved in the totality of the world as a whole, in which sensually perceptible and spiritual reality is connected by symbols. The material chronotopical world is therefore a hitherto incomplete and provisional existence whose true original form (*realia in rebus*) lies unexplored. The revelation of this relationship between the two worlds in symbolic images was understood as the task of a magical art which was supposed to unbound

and recreate the world. Symbolist theurgy referred to the same process of creating the world and the self that Carl Gustav Jung (1875–1961) had described using slightly different terminology: the activation of unconscious archetypal pictorial fields with the aim of individuation in the realm of myth. Jung himself defined his archetype theory as a kind of explication of the Platonic theory of ideas and compared the awareness of archetypes with redemptive *rites de passage* in the Gnostic-hermetic tradition (Jung 1983, IX/1, 91). In addition to the common recourse on Goethe, which also included the dialogue Symbolists conducted with Rudolph Steiner, this mystical tradition formed the basis of their affinity towards Jung. Its approach seemed more familiar than the one chosen by Freud, whose ironic-naturalistic insight into the difficult relationship between spirit and nature had a disconcerting effect. The path of the Symbolists led "forward to Plato" (Ėtkind 1996, 90), to the revaluation of the idealistic tradition, the path of the Marxists to the transformation of the individual on the basis of dialectical materialism. Both positions will be outlined using the example of psychoanalysis as practiced by Lou Andreas Salomé, Lev Trotskii, Ėmilii Metner (Emil Medtner), Boris Vysheslavtsev and Viacheslav Ivanov.

2 Lou Andreas-Salomé

Lou (actually Louise) Andreas-Salomé (1861–1937) also dared to take the path forward 'to Plato'. After a turbulent youth spent in intellectual contact with Russian culture, she found her way to psychoanalysis and, without renouncing her mentor Freud, was able to shift his narcissism theory towards the monistic art and cultural philosophy of Russian origin. Her article "Narzissmus als Doppelrichtung" (1921, "The Dual Orientation of Narcissism") published in the prominent psychoanalytical journal *Imago* is proof of this; she shows a side of narcissism neglected by Freud, "that of captured emotional identification with everything, of re-amalgamating with everything as a positive goal of libido", using the example of "narcissistic implementation in artistic creation" (Andreas-Salomé 1921, 363).

For Lou Andreas-Salomé, the myth of Narcissus reveals the deepest meaning of the poetic imagination. Because the distance between reality and an idea, between appearance and being cannot be overcome, one eternally finds oneself in a borderline situation and can therefore never be completely at one with oneself; one can only recognize oneself – as one moves towards the self – as a mirror in the imagination. In order to come closer to this image, one must repeatedly give up one's ego, renounce one's possessions, turn around, transform oneself and be born again – one must die in order to live, as Goethe puts it in "Selige Sehnsucht"

(1817, "Blissful Yearning"), interpreted several times by the Russian Symbolists (Zhirmunskii 1981, 457–459). Narcissus, the man of the frontier and of the mirror, strives for the absolute state in which the human psyche represents a microcosm, reflects the totality of the divine world and is taken up by it (Assmann 2015, 132).

The perverse antisocial autoeroticism discussed in Freud's text "Zur Einführung des Narzissmus" (1914, "On Narcissism") as well as the decadent *culte de moi,* with which the term corresponded, were reinterpreted by Lou Andreas-Salomé in terms of metaphysical longing or the *unio mystica*. The scientific concept of 'primary narcissism' turned into a phenomenon of aesthetic modernity, a kind of religiously charged utopia, as it were, which sets the idea of love against the rationalist thinking of domination, reconciliation with nature against its overcoming, the ideal of a universal unity in which the subject is embedded against egocentrism instead of wanting to dominate the world from a rationalist point of view.

Andreas-Salomé's positive reinterpretation of narcissism is broadly anchored in the international hypertext that Igor' Smirnov (1983) called the 'narcissistic hypertext' of world literature. These include texts by Rainer Maria Rilke, whose poem *Narcissus* she cites "from the manuscript" (Andreas-Salomé 1921, 367); Rudolf Kassner, whose conversation *Narziss oder Mythos und Einbildungskraft* (1928, *Narcissus or Myth and Imagination*) shows clear parallels with her essay on narcissism; the "Dionysian Narcissism" of the poets of Viennese Modernism (Leopold Andrian, Richard Beer-Hofmann, Hugo von Hofmannsthal); Art Nouveau artists such as Gustav Klimt and Hans Makart (Le Rider 1990, 82–105); and works by French (André Gide, Paul Valéry), English (from Oscar Wilde to Thomas Stearns Eliot) and Russian (from Konstantin Bal'mont and Viacheslav Ivanov to Anna Akhmatova and Iosif Brodskii) poets. What they all have in common is that they all perceive the phenomenon as positive, not in terms of alienation, but rather as an underlying world relationship – which is why Jacques Lacan, with his famous 'mirror stage' (*Spiegelstadium*), does not fit this context. In contrast to Lacan, another 'prophet' of the 1960s, Herbert Marcuse, created a comparable model of the ego narcissus in *Eros and Civilization: A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud* (1996 [1955]), in which narcissism appears as the subversive gesture of 'the Great Refusal' to accept the capitalist system and an alternative concept to a repressive society characterized by the pleasure principle. Chapter 8 in *Eros and Civilization* is called "The Images of Orpheus and Narcissus" and – without mentioning Andreas-Salomé – claims something very similar: "The striking paradox that narcissism, usually understood as egoistic withdrawal from reality, is connected with oneness with the universe, revealing a new depth of the conception" (Marcuse 1996 [1955], 169).

3 Lev Trotskii

Another materialist variation of ideological monism formed the basis of the Marxist reception of psychoanalysis, which developed at the same time under the patronage of Lev Trotskii (Lev Davidovich Bronstein, 1879–1940), the most important ideologist and organizer of the October Revolution alongside Lenin. In this case, too, it was assumed that the human mind was an organic part of the world as a whole. As a product and instrument of the self-organization of matter, it is not a generator of inconsequential illusions, but rather able and destined to achieve the total transformation, purification and mastery of the socio-cultural sphere, including the individual psyche. According to Trotskii, the area of the unconscious should be dominated and placed under the control of collective reason just as much as the chaos of the capitalist market economy. In his work *Literatura i revolutsiia* (1923, *Literature and Revolution*), which includes his literary criticism and cultural policy essays from 1907–1923, Trotskii describes the role of literature and art in this process.

On several occasions he refers to Freud and his school, with which he had become acquainted during his stay in Vienna, the then capital of psychoanalysis. By his own account, he attended meetings of the Psychoanalytical Society, maintained close contact with the Freudians and studied their works (Trotskii 1927, 260). Trotskii's reception of Freud is an integral part of aesthetic modernism around 1900 in Russia and the later avant-garde discourse with its de-differentiation of art and life and the programme of a life-creating art.

The essay "Novogodnii razgovor ob iskusstve" (1991 [1908], "A New Year's Conversation about Art") begins with an indication of time and place: Vienna, Herrengasse, Café Central, New Year's Eve. In this atmosphere, the text purports, an international conversation takes place about the modern art of the present-day and synthetic art of the future, which should not remain locked up in museums and libraries but should permeate and reshape our whole life. The elderly Russian emigrant – presumably Trotskii's alter ego – voices the hope that as soon as technological progress frees humans from the burden and hardship of work, they will have the volition to master the unpredictable element of the unconscious in their own psyche and concentrate their innermost powers on creatively shaping the beautiful forms of life: "Gentlemen! Let us drink to this carefree, happy, brilliant idler of the future, Happy New Year!" (Trotskii 1991 [1908], 223). Here, Freud's therapeutic practice is radicalized as the dialectic of the alienation and reconstitution of a secularized subject. Beyond the anthropology of Marx and Nietzsche, Trotskii draws on the humanist tradition, as expressed above all in Schiller's *Über die ästhetische Erziehung des Menschen* (1795, *On the Aesthetic Education of Man*). Revolution is defined as an aesthetic activity whose task is to abolish the division

and distortion of man caused by the capitalist division of labour and to restore the whole, versatile and fully developed human personality beyond menial labour, in the free space of idle play.

An even clearer and more emphatic expression of the concept of the new 'experimental human being' (*ėksperimental'nyi chelovek*) can be found at the end of the essay "Iskusstvo revolutsii i sotsialisticheskoe iskusstvo" (1923, "The Art of Revolution and Socialist Art"), in which a "radical psycho-physical re-melting of the petrified Homo sapiens" is held in prospect (Trotskii 1923, 2). For Freud, art was the fantasy and playground of an unhappy neurotic who seeks to obtain in the realm of his imagination that which he has been denied in life. In the lecture "Der Dichter und das Phantasieren" (1906, "Creative Writers and Day-Dreaming"), the artist is equated with the playing child; like the latter, the artist daydreams, creates protected zones for the imagination, artificial paradises, in order to provide a vehicle for the pleasure principle which is under the control of the reality principle (Freud 1969, X, 173). In *Vorlesungen zur Einführung in die Psychoanalyse* (1917, *Lectures Introducing Psychoanalysis*), Freud uses suggestive formulations to compare fantasizing with creating a nature reserve, in which the id, the jungle of our desires, reclaims terrain lost to the superego for the ego (Freud 1969, I, 363). Trotskii, "a dreamer in the role of the People's Commissar" (Ėtkind 1996, 292), interprets Freudian anthropology as a guide to the transformation of humans of the past into the superhuman and artistic human of the future. According to Trotskii, a revolutionary is a transitional and experimental figure of modernity, an artistic individual whose material is the artist him- or herself and all the life forms of his or her time, which he or she has to repeal in an aesthetic form and shape into a total work of art. In subsequent years, numerous popular scientists and publicists further developed these views, for instance Georgii J. Malis, the author of *Psikhoanaliz kommunizma* (1924, *Psychoanalysis of Communism*).

As an institution for the practical implementation of the theory of the art of living, pedology, a science of human modification and transformation, came into being in the 1920s. It sought to create a perfect, harmonious, full human being as a kind of malleable work of art (Ėtkind 1996, 326–351). In a public letter addressed to the physiologist and behavioural scientist Ivan Pavlov (1849–1936) in 1923, Trotskii hinted at the possibility of considering the sublimation of sexual energy as the basis for forming conditional reflexes, asserted the fundamental complementarity between psychoanalysis and Pavlov's behavioural science, and called for their synthesis under the sign of dialectical materialism (Trotskii 1927). The discussion Trotskii initiated on the compatibility of 'Freudism' and Marxism remained topical until the end of the 1920s. Important texts on art theory, including *Psikhologiia iskusstva* (*Psychology of Art*) by Lev Vygotskii (written in 1925 and first published in 1965), the critical study *Freidizm* (1927, *Freudism*) by Valentin

Voloshinov, written in close collaboration with Mikhail Bakhtin, and psychoanalytical notes by Sergei Eisenstein and many others, have become important monuments to this discourse in Russia. It was only after the banishment of Trotskii in 1929 that the Russian reception of depth psychology passed almost exclusively into the hands of emigrants and thus again mainly into the tracks of Symbolism.

4 Jung's Archaic Images and the Russia Jungians

4.1 Ėmilii Metner

The Russian reception of Jung is essentially linked to the cultural activities of Ėmilii Karlovich Metner (1872–1936) (Ljunggren 1994), who was an art and music critic affiliated with Russian Symbolism. In 1909 Metner founded the publishing house Musagetes in Moscow, and as its director he found himself at the centre of the so-called Symbolist dispute, which had divided the movement since 1910. The subject of the theoretical controversy was the pan-aesthetic demand of the 'younger' Symbolists (Viacheslav Ivanov, Andrei Belyi, Aleksandr Blok and others) to substantiate their poetics ideologically in order to transfer the creative freedom that humans experience as possible in art to the totality of spiritual life. In this context, there was an increased interest in social, ethical, religious and anthropological matters, and thus in analytical psychology, which was partly fed by the same sources as the younger Symbolism (Schelling and German Romanticism, Goethe and Nietzsche, Jakob Böhme and Meister Eckhart, Plato and Neo-Platonism, ancient systems and the mystical-occult heresy of the Middle Ages). While Andrei Belyi went to Dornach to be initiated into anthroposophy, Metner – leaving behind the heated debate with Belyi about Steiner's interpretation of Goethe – moved to Zurich to develop his publishing house into a centre for the consolidation of the Symbolist movement on the basis of Jung's ideas.

As a patient, friend and follower of Jung, from 1914 on he dedicated himself to communicating the ideas of analytical psychology to the Symbolists in Russia. Just how close the relationship between Metner and Jung was can be seen in their extensive correspondence (Ėtkind 1996, 77) and in Metner's edited commemorative publication *Die kulturelle Bedeutung der komplexen Psychologie* (1935, *The Cultural Meaning of Complex Psychology*) on Jung's sixtieth birthday with his text entitled "Bildnis der Persönlichkeit im Rahmen des gegenseitigen Sich Kennenlernens" ("Portrait of Personality within the Framework of Getting to Know Each Other"). Jung praised his friend in a thank-you letter for inadvertently considering his personality in the light of his ideas (Ėtkind 1996, 80). It was important to him that his

life and work formed an inseparable unity – a premise that also underlies Symbolist poetics and is expressed in the Symbolists' tendency to create autobiographical myths. One of Jung's statements about Metner reads: "His psychology is that of a German of the 18th century and a modern man, and he also has the archaic quality of the Russian psyche" (Jung quoted in Sapov 1994, 159). The most important result of Metner's mediation activities was the three-volume edition on Jung in Russian entitled *Izbrannye trudy po analiticheskoii psikhologii* (1929–1939, *Selected Writings on Analytical Psychology*), the first volume of which, *Psikhologicheskie tipy* (1929, *Psychological Types*), was published by Musagetes, and the others by the Psychological Club in Zurich. In the preface to the first volume, Metner developed the idea of the close relationship between analytical psychology and the aesthetics of Symbolism by emphasizing the fundamental difference between the Zurich School and its Viennese counterpart: Jung extended the meaning of the term *libido* beyond the sphere of sexuality and discovered his own theme (Metner 1929, 8). The same motif of the rebellious son's resistance to his despotic father was also suggested by the motto that Metner had adopted from Viacheslav Ivanov's treatise *Dionis i Pradionisiistvo* (1923, *Dionysus and the Pre-Dionysian Cults*, 2012): "Asclepius, having detached himself from the Apollonian deity, attains complete independence" (Metner 1929, 5). Metner plays with Nietzsche's famous dichotomy: Freud is implied to be Apollo, the god of the world of appearances, and Jung is implied to be Asclepius, the mythological patron saint of the art of healing, disciple and friend of Hermes Trismegistos, who attains divine dignity against his father's will.

Metner regarded the psychological function of the symbol as a central theme for Jung, which not only signifies but also triggers the individuation process as a liberating harmonization of psychological opposites and facilitates the centration of the personality. Metner thus addressed precisely that key concept which both Jung and the Russian Symbolists used with great emphasis – the "living [...] symbol" (Jung 1960, VI, 522; Belyi 1994, 353). For Jung, it is the archetypal image of the self that gives the conscious elements of the unconscious, delimits the conscious ego and, by crystallizing in the psyche, creates the integral personality as "Coincidentia oppositorum" (Jung 1960, VI, 522). Andrei Belyi meant a similar process when he described "the culmination of creative symbolization" with the theological term "epiphany" (Belyi 1994, 353).

In the Russian symbol theory of Andrei Belyi and Viacheslav Ivanov, the "living symbol" or "the living word" is considered an innovative trademark of mythopoetic Symbolism (Hansen-Löve 1998, 19). The symbol is alive, because through it and in it the dualistic world view with its separation of logos and chaos, subject and object, immanence and transcendence is overcome and the divided reality, which in its dissociation has been degraded to dead appearance, is revived in its original organic and living wholeness. Schelling's philosophy of

identity and the Romantic conception of the word as *poiesis* can be assumed to be a common prerequisite for this concept of Symbolism, which Metner recognizes in Jung, rightly asserting its link to Symbolism (Schahadat 2004, 334–335).

4.2 Boris Vysheslavtsev

Following Metner's death, the religious philosopher Boris P. Vysheslavtsev (1877–1954) took on the editorial work for the Russian-language edition of Jung. As early as 1930, he presented the first volume in his Parisian magazine *Put'* and a year later, in his work *Ėtika preobrazhennogo ėrosa* (1994 [1931], *Ethics of Transformed Eros*), pitted Jung, whom he also knew personally (Sapov 1994, 154–161), against Freud and his concept of sublimation. Vysheslavtsev demonstrates a clear affinity towards Jung by using fragments that connect the problem of sublimation to the function of imagination. Freud understood sublimation as a psychological defence mechanism that "shifts [the libido] to a higher level" and redirects "it to a cultural goal that is no longer sexual but related to it psychologically" (Freud 1974, IX, 20). The sex drive camouflages itself by appearing in socially acceptable alternate forms, disguising and encoding itself in art with images such as selfless favours, ascetic renunciation or social commitment. The poetic world created from these images is indeed deduced from the empirical, hormone-driven reality, but is not equivalent to this ontic reality. For Freud, the world of art is an idealistic superstructure, a kind of false consciousness. Jung, who polemicizes with this view in his article "Psychologie und Dichtung" (1930, "Psychology and Poetry"), says on the contrary that a poet is more than a "deceptive, deceiving person" and that "the shocking view into otherworldly abysses" that opens up in art is not an illusion, insofar as this view can be confirmed by the psychological experience of the collective unconscious (Jung 1971, XV, 103). Vysheslavtsev agrees with Jung and specifies: the effective is that which affects, i. e. the truth of the image lies in its efficacy and is contingent on the authenticity of the sublimation it brings about, because that which transforms and ennobles the soul of the artist and his audience can no longer be described as deception – it is an "axiological truth" (Vysheslavtsev 1994 [1931], 108).

According to Vysheslavtsev, there are two sides to sublimation: the highest idealistic values and the lowest subconscious affects. The imagination is the bridge between them. By imagining the higher spiritual reality, those involved in the act of creation imprint it in themselves and transform themselves into the image they have created. Therein lies the magic of art. It condenses the image into reality, to the point of complete identity with the real world: the word becomes flesh, "the world becomes that which we have imagined" (Vysheslavtsev 1994 [1931], 62).

It is precisely this revision of Freud's "speculation à baisse" (Vysheslavtsev 1994 [1931], 110) which, according to Vysheslavtsev, determines the cultural achievement of analytical psychology; the collective unconscious contains more than a kind of *a priori* form of perception for the organization of sensual experience. In the archetype of the self, the Jungian 'thing in itself', he senses the departure into transcendence, the will to dissolve boundaries. He points to the fact that the process of symbol formation, as depicted by Jung, implies the opposite of sublimating Freudian influence. Whereas the latter only veils and re-codes the sex drive, the former is the genuinely human instrument with which human beings emancipate themselves from the dependence on their natural state by embodying the archetype of the divine in their humanity.

However emphatic Vysheslavtsev's recognition of analytical psychology may be, Jung is not his absolutely likeminded ally, but merely a valuable precursor to the transition from the psychoanalytic 'profanation' of art to a religiously substantiated aesthetic. Individuation in Jung's work is not yet transfiguration and a second birth in God, self-discovery is not theosis. Vysheslavtsev accuses Jung's method of cognition of being transcendental, but not transcendent. He excludes all ideological justifications from his theory, abstains from a clear metaphysical statement, psychologises the numinous object and exclusively deals with the immanent phenomenon of *esse in anima*.

Vysheslavtsev had already formulated the decisive conclusion from the accusation of immanentism and psychologism in his 1930 review:

> The transition from experimental science to metaphysical judgement and to an act of faith, however, is completely indispensable: a religious symbol can only liberate when taken absolutely seriously. Its scientific disenchantment as an immanent phenomenon implies the reduction of religion to a phantasm. But the illusion loses its suggestive, sublimating power. Jung is the philosopher who can least wish for this. (Vysheslavtsev 1930, 112)

4.3 Viacheslav Ivanov

Vysheslavtsev interprets the Damascus experience as an example of "genuine sublimation" (Vysheslavtsev 1994, 67), something that Viacheslav Ivanov (1866–1949) addresses in his poem "Ty na puti k vratam Damaska" ("You are on your way to the gates of Damascus") from the poetic cycle *Rimskii dnevnik* (1946, *Roman Diary*) (Ivanov 1979, III, 631). According to Averintsev, Ivanov decodes the biblical episode of Saul's conversion as a process of individuation through the confrontation of the false "persona" with the archetype of the "self" (Averintsev 1972, 133). Especially the late work of Viacheslav Ivanov seems to be the best evidence

of the fact that Metner's efforts to introduce analytical psychology to the circle of Russian Symbolists were worthwhile. Ever since Metner called his attention to the Jung School in 1929 (Ivanova 1992, 217–218), psychological studies had been an integral part of his reading list and were incorporated into his literary work. For example, he knew of Jung's *Wandlungen und Symbole der Libido* (1912, *Psychology of the Unconscious*, 1916) and *Psychologische Typen* (1922, *Psychological Types*), as can be seen from his statements in correspondence with Metner (Ivanov and Metner 1994, III, 306) and from his exemplar of Joan Corrie's *Elements de la Psychologie de Jung* (1929, *Elements of the Psychology of Jung*), which is accompanied by his notes and drawings (Titarenko 2006, 272).

In the article "Razmyshleniia ob ustanovkakh sovremennogo dukha" (1933, "Surveys on the Principles of the Modern Spirit") (Ivanov 1979, III, 483) he joined the Vysheslavtsev polemics with the "Positivist Jung" (Ivanov 1979, III, 483), but he nevertheless described Jung's interpretation of the feminine counterfigure to the male 'persona' in the collective unconscious as an important source for his poetic etude *Anima* (Ivanov 2009 [1935]), an extended German-language version of the earlier text "Ty esi" (1907, "Thou art"), in which he created his religious Eros model (Ivanov 2009 [1935]; cf. Schahadat 2004, 449). Of particular importance for Ivanov was probably the link between the psychological concept of the anima and the Gnostic interpretation of Sophia as the incarnation of the Holy Spirit, which Jung himself had established (Jung 1957, 111).

The etude *Anima* (also in the Russian retranslation by Semen L. Frank from 1947) is a highlight of Jung's reception in Russian poetry (Titarenko 2006). To a certain extent, this also applies to Ivanov's cultural philosophical essay "Die russische Idee" (1930, "The Russian Idea"), the German version of which is more extensive and richer in content than the Russian text of almost the same name from 1909 ("O russkoi idee"). Soon after the German-language publication, Ivanonv's essay was reviewed in the *Neue Züricher Zeitung* by Metner (Medtner 1930), with the clear intention of bringing "Ivanov's Essence of Russianism" (the title of the review) into the context of analytical psychology. Fractured in this prism, Ivanov's much-discussed problem of 'people and intelligence' in Russian Symbolism seems to be generalized as the contrast between critical and organic cultures, as that of a polar relationship between the conscious and the unconscious. According to Metner, Ivanov sees "what lies hidden in the unconscious sphere of the collective folk soul, at the roots of events" (Medtner 1930, 1). His book "unravels the secret essence of Russianism", "analyses the polarity of Russian culture" (Medtner 1930, 1), which presupposes a future synthesis – the process of national individuation as the implementation of the *mysterium coniunctionis* (Jung 1958, IX/2, 73) under the sign of the unifying 'Russian idea'. If one follows Metner's logic, it is nothing other than the archetype of the 'self' assimilated by

consciousness, which expresses the unity and totality of the collective personality of the Russian people and urges its manifestation in the transcendent symbol. The image of St. Christopher appears in Ivanov's work as a representation of the "god-bearing populus christianus" (Ivanov 1930, 38), whose legend is recounted in the last chapter. Jung mentions this legend in connection with the figure of the "divine child" as an embodiment of the self (Jung 1976, IX/1, 172). Ivanov thus depicts the Messianic idea of Russia as a utopian place of synthesis.

Methodologically, it is above all the extensive critical prose of the Russian *Poeta doctus* that exhibits significant intertextual ties to Jung's mythical psychology. Both authors pursue a hermeneutics of inference: just as every human being is on the journey of self-discovery, every image is on the path towards its archetype. Literary motifs and figures, however much they are anchored in chronotopical realities of the present day, can be traced back to their supertemporal mythical type, to eternal and supra-individual patterns and archetypes of life beyond a narrowly limited, sensually perceptible reality. In Jung's case, this procedure is justified with the help of his correspondence poetics of the multidimensional psyche, while in Ivanov's case it is based on his concept of realistic symbolism, according to which the descending movement of the art producer "*a realioribus ad realia*" ("from the more real to the real") corresponds to the rise of the art recipient "*a realibus ad realiora*" ("from the real to the more real") (Ivanov 1932, 98). The Symbolist concept of 'realiora' or the 'most real reality' is not synonymous with 'the collective unconscious'; the concept of the 'archetype' does not correspond to that of the 'creative forma formans'. Their correlation, however, is strong enough for Ivanov's essay "Dostoevskii: tragediia – mif – mistika" (1932, "Dostoevsky: Tragedy, Myth, Mysticism") to be considered a prime example of a mythopoetic study, similar to that which developed from Maud Bodkin's *Archetypal Pattern in Poetry* (1934) to Northrop Frye's *Anatomy of Criticism* (1957) in the context of influential academic research on myths and archetypes (archetypal criticism) conducted in the US in the 1950s. Particularly revealing in this respect is the second part of the essay on Dostoevskii entitled "Mythologumena", where Ivanov reveals the "mythical inventory" ("mificheskii sostav"; Ivanov 1987, IV, 532) of plots and figures. In his subsequent article entitled "Lermontov" (1947), Ivanov also takes on the task of tracking down "*Universalia ante rem*" ("metaphysical universals / universals before the thing") and reads the poem *Demon* against the background of the "Archetype of the Celestial Virgin" (Ivanov 1979, III, 680).

Traces of the reception of Jung in twentieth-century Russian mythology and literary research can be found *inter alia* in the works of Vladimir Propp, Aleksei Losev, Ol'ga Freidenberg, Mikhail Bakhtin, Vladimir Toporov, and Eleazar Meletinskii. Jung proposes describing the process of individuation in terms of typical situations, places, means, ways and the nature of transformation (Jung 1976, IX/1,

47). This is exactly what Propp does when he describes the heroic journey in the fairytale, whereby both he and Jung relate the path of individuation to the rite of passage. Another example would be the respective understandings of the concept of the archetype, of which each of the abovementioned Russian authors makes use. The detailed description of archetype theory in Meletinskii's standard work *Poètika mifa* (1976, *Poetics of Myth*, 2000) contains a critical remark that seems to be relevant for the entire Russian reception of analytical psychology: Jung dissolves the social in the psychological, ignores the relationship between the inner and outer world, while it is precisely the social environment that nourishes and shapes the poetic imagination to a greater and more decisive extent than the immanent psychological conflict between the conscious and the unconscious. As in Symbolism, metapsychology is contrasted with depth psychology here too, the only difference being, of course, that the status of the objectively real and effective is no longer ascribed to the extrasensory, but to the social environment. In general, however, Jung remains persistently present in Russian research on myths and fairytales, albeit in multiple refractions, so that it is not always possible to point to concrete places. Much of what Freidenberg writes about archaic syncretism, the identity of man and nature, the doppelgänger motif, the origin of metaphors, bears certain parallels with Jung, but not with him alone. In order to summarize these parallels, in-depth case studies are needed.

Translated by Sandra Evans

References

Andreas-Salomé, Lou. "Narzissmus als Doppelrichtung." *Imago: Zeitschrift für Anwendung der Psychoanalyse auf die Geisteswissenschaften* 7.4 (1921): 361–386.

Assmann, Aleida. *Im Dickicht der Zeichen*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 2015.

Averintsev, Sergei. "'Analiticheskaia psikhologiia' K. G. Junga i zakonomernosti tvorcheskoi fantasii." *O sovremennoi burzhuaznoi èstetike: Sbornik statei*. Vol. 3. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1972. 110–155.

Belyi, Andrei. *Simvolizm kak miroponimanie*. Moscow: Respublika, 1994.

Ėtkind, Aleksandr [Etkind, Alexander]. *Eros des Unmöglichen: Die Geschichte der Psychoanalyse in Russland*. Trans. by Andreas Tretner. Leipzig: Gustav Kiepenheuer-Verlag, 1996.

Freud, Sigmund. *Studienausgabe*. Frankfurt/M.: S. Fischer, 1969.

Hansen-Löve, Aage. *Der russische Symbolismus: System und Entfaltung der poetischen Motive. Mythopoetischer Symbolismus: Kosmische Symbolik*. Vienna: VÖAW, 1998.

Jung, Carl Gustav. *Gott und das Unbewusste*. Zurich: Rascher, 1957.

Jung, Carl Gustav. *Gesammelte Werke*. Olten and Freiburg: Walter-Verlag, 1958–1997.

Ivanov, Viacheslav [Iwanow, Wjatscheslaw]. *Die russische Idee*. Trans. by J. Schor. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1930.

Ivanov, Viacheslav [Iwanow, Wjatscheslaw]. *Dostojewskij: Tragödie – Mythos – Mystik*. Trans. by Alexander Kresling. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1932.

Ivanov, Viacheslav. *Sobranie sochinenii*. 4 Vols. Brussels: Foyer oriental Chrétien, 1971–1987.

Ivanov, Viacheslav, and Ėmilii Metner. "Perepiska iz dvukh mirov." *Voprosy literatury* 3 (1994): 281–317.

Ivanov, Viacheslav. *Anima*. Trans. by S. L. Frank. Ed. S. D. Titarenko. St. Petersburg: Fakultet filologii i iskusstv SPbGU, 2009.

Ivanova, Lidiia. *Vospominaniia: Kniga ob ottse*. Moscow: Feniks, 1992.

Le Rider, Jacques. *Das Ende der Illusion: Die Wiener Moderne und die Krisen der Identität*. Trans. by Robert Fleck. Vienna: ÖBV, 1990.

Ljunggren, Magnus. *The Russian Mephisto: A Study of the Life and Work of Emilii Medtner*. Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell Internat, 1994.

Malis, Georgii. *Psikhoanaliz kommunizma*. Kharkiv: Kosmos, 1924.

Marcuse, Herbert. *Eros and Civilization: A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud* [1955]. Boston, MA: Baecon-Press, 1966.

Metner, Ėmilii. "Foreword." C. G. Jung, *Izbrannye trudy po analiticheskoi psikhologii*. Vol. 1: *Psikhologicheskie tipy*. Trans. by Sofii Lorie. Zurich: Musaget, 1929. V–XVIII.

Medtner, Emil. "W. Iwanows Wesensschau des Russentums." Review of *Die Russische Idee*, by V. Ivanov. *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* (28 November 1930): 2; (29 November 1930): 1.

Medtner, Emil. "Bildnis der Persönlichkeit im Rahmen des gegenseitigen Sich Kennenlernens." *Die kulturelle Bedeutung der komplexen Psychologie*. Ed. Psychologischer Club. Zurich and Berlin: Verlag von Julius Springer, 1935. 556–616.

Meletinskii [Meletinsky], E. A. *The Poetics of Myth* [1976]. Trans. by Guy Lanoue and Alexandre Sadetsky. Milton Park: Routledge, 2000.

Sapov, Vadim. "Boris Vysheslavtsev – Rachmaninov russkoi filosofii." *Vestnik RAN* 64.2 (1994): 154–161.

Schahadat, Schamma. *Das Leben zur Kunst machen: Lebenskunst in Russland vom 16. bis zum 20. Jahrhundert*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink-Verlag, 2004.

Smirnov, Igor'. "O nartsisticheskom tekste (diakhroniia i psikhoanaliz)." *Wiener Slavistischer Almanach* 12 (1983): 21–46.

Solov'ev, Vladimir [Solovyov, Vladimir]. *Lecture on Divine Humanity*. Ed. Boris Jakim. Hudson, NY: Lindisfarne Press, 1995.

Titarenko, Svetlana. "Ot arkhetipa – k mifu: Bashnia kak simvolicheskaia forma u Viacheslava Ivanova i K. G. Junga." *Bashnia Viacheslava Ivanova i kul'tura Serebrianogo veka*. Ed. A. B. Shishkin. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 2006. 235–277.

Trotskii, Lev D. "Iskusstvo revolutsii i sotsialisticheskoe iskusstvo." *Pravda* 220 (29 September 1923): 2.

Trotskii, Lev D. "Pis'mo Akademiku I. P. Pavlovu." Lev D. Trotskii, *Sochineniia*. Vol. 21: *Kul'tura Perekhodnogo Perioda*. Moscow and Leningrad: Gosizdat, 1927. 260.

Trotskii, Lev D. "Novogodnii razgovor ob iskusstve." [1908] Lev D. Trotskii, *Literatura i revoliutsiia*. Moscow: Politizdat, 1991. 216–223

Vysheslavtsev, Boris. Review of *Izbrannye trudy po analiticheskoi psikhologii*. Vol. 1: *Psikho-logicheskie tipy*, by C. G. Jung. Ed. Emiliia Metnera. Trans. by Sofii Lorie. *Put'* 20 (February 1930): 110–113.

Vysheslavtsev, Boris. *Ėtika preobrazhennogo ėrosa* [1931]. Moscow: Respublika, 1994.

Zhirmunskii, Viktor. *Gete v russkoi literature*. Leningrad: Nauka, 1981.

Lena Magnone
Psychoanalysis and Literature in Poland

The aim of this chapter is to provide an insight into the cultural transfer of psychoanalysis in Poland, a process that was deeply connected to the country's geopolitical situation at the turn of the twentieth century.

As a result of late eighteenth-century partitions, until 1918 a large part of southern Poland remained within the Habsburg Empire. In this region, known as Galicia, the educational system was the same as in all the other provinces of Austria-Hungary: the classical German *Gymnasium* with its *Matura*, the entry requirement for university. Hence in the early twentieth century, many Poles, among them a lot of young women, found themselves in Vienna. Those who came from assimilated Jewish families were likely to choose the Faculty of Medicine. After the municipal elections were won by Karl Lueger in 1895, anti-Semitism became increasingly prevalent in Austrian society, driving Jews into less profitable branches of medicine such as psychiatry, and eventually obliging them to look for alternative career opportunities (Schorske 1979; Beller 1989; Le Rider 1994; Freidenreich 2002). This is how a number of Polish-Jewish physicians appeared in Freud's first circle of followers. They joined him when he was still an outcast in Vienna's medical circles, participated in the creation and the development of psychoanalysis, and, shortly before the outbreak of World War II, emigrated across the ocean, transferring Freud's thought to the United States. As they didn't return to their domestic provinces when the nation states re-emerged after the disintegration of the Empire in 1918, and later chose to spend the rest of their lives in the USA, available encyclopaedias commonly list them as Austrian (if not directly American) psychoanalysts (Mühlleitner 1992; Roudinesco and Plon 2000; de Mijolla 2005). Furthermore, since few of them ever wrote anything in Polish, their names are hardly known in their country of origin. It is only recently that efforts have been made to restore their standing in social memory (Dybel 2000, 2016; Magnone 2016). Among the eldest Polish Freudians of Galician origin were Ludwik Jekels and Helena Deutsch, both of whom were authors of outstanding works applying psychoanalysis to literature and art.

The path taken by Poles born in the Russian part of divided Poland was slightly different to that of their Galician colleagues. In contrast to Austrian citizens, residents of the Kingdom of Poland rarely ever chose to study in the capital of the hostile empire, favouring the countries of Western Europe. Their circuitous trajectories were thus like those of many Russians: while studying medicine in Switzerland, they first became acquainted with psychoanalysis in its version proposed by Carl Gustav Jung. It was only later that some of them would decide

to undertake a pilgrimage to the source in Vienna. Within the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society, they never played particularly important roles, nor did they get as close to Freud as his devout followers from Galicia. Poles born in Warsaw were also more likely to return to their country once its sovereignty was restored in 1918. Such figures include Eugenia Sokolnicka and Gustaw Bychowski, among others.

In this chapter, I focus on the works of Jekels, Deutsch, Sokolnicka and Bychowski in order to outline the reception of Freudian theory among the Polish intelligentsia.

1 Ludwik Jekels

Ludwik Jekels (1867–1954) was accepted into the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society in 1910, while it still numbered fewer than 10 members. Up to 1912, Jekels owned a health resort in Bystra near Bielsko, where he adopted the new method to treat hysteria. One of his patients was Gabriela Zapolska, the famous Polish writer.

Jekels should be perceived as the leading figure in the earliest cultural transfer of psychoanalysis to the Polish intelligentsia. In particular, he participated in two congresses of Polish psychiatrists, psychologists, and neurologists. The first, organized in Warsaw in 1909, resulted in a growing interest in psychoanalysis among Polish medical circles. Jekels also succeeded in temporarily recruiting to the movement the philosopher Ludwika Karpińska, later the author of extensive studies placing psychoanalysis in the context of previous psychological tradition, in particular Herbart's theory, published in *Przegląd Filozoficzny* (*Philosophical Review*) and *Ruch Filozoficzny* (*Philosophical Movement*) (Karpińska 1913, 1914). The second congress, held in Cracow in 1912 and, due to Jekels's efforts, almost entirely devoted to psychoanalysis, represented the peak of interest in Freudianism among the Poles prior to World War I. The participants in the second congress included the 'wild analyst' Karol de Beaurain, through whom the writer and philosopher Stanisław Ignacy Witkiewicz and the ethnographer Bronisław Malinowski became acquainted with psychoanalysis that same year.

Karol Irzykowski, the author of what is often referred to as a 'pre-Freudian' novel, *Pałuba* (1903, *The Hag*), wrote the report on the proceedings for high-circulation newspapers based in Cracow (*Nowa Reforma* [*New Reform*]) and Warsaw (*Świat* [*World*], *Prawda* [*Truth*]). He was, then, the first Polish writer to recognize the potential of psychoanalysis for culture and put much effort into making the Polish educated circles familiar with its assumptions. Particularly his *Freudyzm i freudyści* (1913, *Freudism and Freudists*) is surprisingly modern and close to the

insights Lacan presented in his memorable Rome lecture of 1953 (Magnone 2013). Irzykowski reproaches Polish and German 'Fraudians' (*freudziści*) (as he mockingly calls them) for not paying enough attention to Freud's theory of dreams, for referring to it merely as one of the methods of working with the patient, and in particular for disregarding the seventh chapter of *Traumdeutung* (1899/1900, *The Interpretation of Dreams*) that he – like Lacan – considered to be the most important. Irzykowski reconstructs the mechanism of dreamwork and questions the idea that the sole purpose of the sophisticated work performed by the unconscious is to avoid censorship. He rejects the reduction of the interpretation of one's dream to a mere act of exposing it as a repressed wish. He is irritated by the manner in which Freud and his disciples disregard the 'style' of their patients' dreams, by the fact that they show no interest in the quasi-literary composition of dreams. By dividing the dream into its structure and physiognomy, Irzykowski seeks to stress the importance of dream language and draw attention to the problem of expression itself. Irzykowski claimed that when dealing with literature, the Freudians should use the methods of analysis and interpretation that Freud developed to explain dreams and jokes. They should, therefore, focus on the linguistic mechanisms that govern them, on the way the unconscious reveals itself in the text (in its 'physiognomy' to use Irzykowski's term), i. e. not on the level of content but on the level of linguistic operations ('poetic figures'). Irzykowski believed that the laws of the unconscious are also the laws of literature, poetry, or, perhaps, of language itself. The Polish writer was particularly interested in the "secondary revision" of dreams, the moment when the hidden thought of a dream "lazily rolls back and forth like a great weight, probing various associations, to later grow more animated, more theatrical, so to speak, and finally – poetical" (Irzykowski 1998 [1913], 181). Irzykowski seems to have foreseen Lacan's famous statement about the linguistic structure of the unconscious when he propounded his theory of using psychoanalysis in interpreting literature, without however depending on biographical data or any other external context, and treating the unconscious and its creations as an autonomous text. The French psychoanalyst would fulfil Irzykowski's wish for acknowledgment of the presence of 'poetic figures' in dreams by identifying the mechanisms of dreamwork discussed by Freud with the poetic processes of metaphor and metonymy (Lacan 1999). Of course, it is still a long way from Irzykowski's essay to Lacan's contention that the unconscious is the discourse of the Other (language itself), but it already shows the Polish writer's interest in the question as to who exactly it is that designs the sophisticated structures appearing in our dreams and slips of the tongue.

A German philologist by training, Irzykowski could read Freud in the original. Still, the first to translate Freud into Polish was Ludwik Jekels. By 1914, the reputable publishing house Wydawnictwo Altenberga issued the Polish edition

of *Über Psychoanalyse: Fünf Vorlesungen* (1911, *Five Lectures on Psycho-Analysis*) and *Zur Psychopatologie des Alltagslebens (1913, The Psychopathology of Everyday Life)*, as well as Jekels's own popularizing work, *Szkic psychoanalizy Freuda* (1912, *An Outline of Freud's Psychoanalysis*). After the war, the Internationaler Psycho-analytischer Verlag (International Psychoanalytic Press) published the second Polish edition of *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life* and a translation of *Drei Abhandlungen zur Sexualtheorie* (*Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality*) (both in 1924). These volumes appeared in the series *Polska Biblioteka Psychoanalityczna* (*Polish Psychoanalytical Library*), launched at the initiative of Beata Rank (née Münzer, 1896–1967), Otto Rank's Polish wife and a psychoanalyst herself, who in 1923 translated Freud's *Über den Traum* (*On Dreams*). She also edited the column devoted to Poland in the periodical *Internationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse* (*International Journal of Psychoanalysis*).

After World War I, Jekels severed ties with the country and ceased to write in Polish. All his crucial psychoanalytical works thus appeared in German. From 1938 on, he was active in the New York Psychoanalytic Society, and in 1952 his *Selected Papers* – a collection of interwar articles – were published in English. His studies on Shakespeare are still worthy of attention (Freud referred to them in *Einige Charaktertypen aus der psychoanalytischen Arbeit* [1916, *Some Character-Types Met within Psycho-Analytic Work*]), as are his *Zur Psychologie der Komödie* (1926, *Psychology of Comedy*). He probably owed his interest in theatre to his first wife, who died prematurely in 1912. Zoë Jekels published several pieces and her comedy *Die Spiele Ihrer Excellenz* (1909, *Her Excellence's Dalliance*) was a great success, playing in houses such as Vienna's Burgtheater and the Neues Schau-spielhaus in Berlin, but also in Cracow and Lvov.

Jekels devoted two articles to studying the riddle of Shakespeare's *Macbeth* (Jekels 1917–1919, 1933). For his purposes, the analyst summarizes the play as follows: after the prophecy of the witches (that although Macbeth will become king, it is Banquo who will give a start to the royal kin), Macbeth murders King Duncan. After being crowned, he becomes a ruthless tyrant. He orders the assassi-nation of Banquo and his descendant, but the young Fleance manages to escape. The plot against Macduff results in his son's murder. In revenge, Macduff leads a revolt against Macbeth and slays him. Finally, Malcolm, King Duncan's son, is made king. Jekels believes that the fundamental idea underlying this drama is that a bad son (Macbeth, who as the murderer of King Duncan commits parricide) turns out to be a bad father (the bloodthirsty persecutor of every son figure) and thus he forfeits the opportunity of posterity. The same psychological situation is elab-orated in the figure of Macduff: he is a bad, rebellious son towards King Macbeth and at the same time a wretched father responsible for the death of his son. Jekels emphasizes that Macduff is only briefly portrayed in the original legend forming

the source of the tragedy's main plot. Macduff is thus mostly the playwright's own creation and, in Jekels' eyes, the true hero of this tragedy, also because the figure reflects the internal conflict of the writer himself. Just as Macduff abandons his family because of the conflict with Macbeth, Shakespeare in his youth had left his wife and children, after a severe quarrel with his father, and fled to London and while he lived there, entirely unconcerned about his family, he lost his only son and the hope for the continuance of his line. Jekels interprets lady Macduff's eruptions against her husband as the poet's own bitter self-accusation. In Macduff's expression of the sense of guilt (completely absent in Macbeth), he sees the terrible self-reproach of Shakespeare himself. This second representation of the main theme finds explication in historical circumstances. The writer was affected by the death of his protectress, Queen Elizabeth, who died childless, passing the throne to the son of Mary Stuart, James I, King of Scotland, just as in *Macbeth* the throne returns to the son of the murdered Duncan.

What was discovered in the analysis of Shakespeare's masterpiece is acknowledged as a universal pattern. According to Jekels, in dramatic works the basic motif is always presented twice, first in a fairly direct and then in a more veiled manner. Due to the regularity of this phenomenon, one could dare to say that every motif which occurs twice in a drama should be considered its basic theme. Analysts also observe the duplicated expression of psychic themes in such compromise formations as dreams, slips of the tongue, and neurotic symptoms. Likewise, they refer to the inner 'main plot', the central psychic constellation which appears in consciousness in two variants, usually significantly different from each other. The therapeutic goal is similar to the dramaturgic purpose: what was once repressed should be recollected and reproduced (acted out). Drama, like psychoanalysis, aims for the successful resolution of the conflict.

In *The Psychology of Comedy,* Jekels begins by pointing out that whereas psychoanalysis provided a valuable insight into the psychology of tragedy, the new science hasn't paid much attention to comedy. He agrees that the problem of the comic is deservedly regarded as one of the most complicated in psychology and, in order to resolve it, he proposes searching for the inspiration in Bergson's essay "Le Rire" (1900, "Laughter"). From among the mechanisms of the comic described by the French philosopher, Jekels singles out inversion ('the robber robbed') as the main ingredient of every comedy. From his analysis of classical dramas, such as *The Merchant of Venice*, *Minna von Barnhelm*, *Phormio*, *Miles Gloriosus,* it appears that every single one of them employed an identical mechanism. Curiously enough, comedies seem to be built with the same elements as tragedies, to the extent that in many cases, a great deal of the action unfolds before the nature of the play becomes clear. Both comedy and tragedy involve an Oedipal situation, the only difference being that the feeling of guilt which, in tragedy, rests upon

the son, in comedy is displaced onto the father. In every comedy he analyzed, Jekels found a father presented as *Störer der Liebe*, a disturber of love (as Freud had called E.T.A. Hoffmann's threatening figure in *Der Sandmann* [1816, *Sandman*] in his 1919 essay "Das Unheimliche" [1919, "The Uncanny"]). It is a projection of an infantine, forbidden desire to disturb the parental love. The displacement of this fantasy onto the father equates to his relegation to the role of the son, which makes it possible to ridicule him over the course of the play, and to vanquish him symbolically. The act of turning the father into the son represents for Jekels the very core of Bergsons's inversion and the ultimate goal of the displacement of guilt (*Schuldverschiebung*).

Finally, Jekels comes to a surprising conclusion concerning a close psychological relationship between tragedy and melancholy, on the one hand, and the comedy and manic states on the other. The comedy represents for the Freudian an aesthetic correlate of mania: "in each case we find the ego, which has liberated itself from the tyrant, uninhibitedly venting its humor, wit, and every sort of comic manifestation in a very ecstasy of freedom" (Jekels 1952 [1926], 104).

Despite their inventiveness in the field of psychoanalysis and literary theory, these articles were never translated to Polish and remained unknown to the Polish public. In the interwar period, Jekels's role in the earliest transfer of Freudianism to Poland was almost completely forgotten.

2 Helene Deutsch

Helene Deutsch, née Rosenbach (1884–1982), notwithstanding the fact that she strongly identified herself as Polish, did not leave behind any academic writings in her mother tongue and was not particularly active in the popularization of psychoanalysis in Poland. She is best known for her work *The Psychology of Women*, written in English after World War II. Indeed, beginning in 1918, when she was admitted as a member of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society, she contributed to expanding Freud's theory of female sexuality, being the one who inspired Freud to re-asses his earlier views on the matter. This lifelong achievement overshadows her numerous other works. One of them is an excellent paper she wrote about George Sand in 1928 (*Ein Frauenschicksal. George Sand*, 1928, *A Woman's Destiny. George Sand*). In this article, Deutsch examines the writer's autobiography and journals, as well as her works of fiction (*La Filleule, La Petite Fadette,* and *Adriani*). Deutsch, an author of memoirs herself (Deutsch 1973), recognizes that while the autobiographical writings reflect merely the consciousness of the writer, the works of fiction give the reader insight into her unconscious.

She considered the problem of constructing narratives about oneself and the status of reality and fiction in her articles about pathological lying (Deutsch 1922) and what she called the 'as if' (*als ob*) personality (Deutsch 1934). In the former article, she suggests that, despite the fictional disguise, pseudology always reveals the deep psychological truth of repressed reality. Pseudology is the reactivation of the unconscious memory trace of a former real experience and as such it resembles poetry. Deutsch is especially interested in the imaginary self-creations of young girls. Adolescents strive to be released from an oppressive burden of memory – for example, of a recollection of an incestuous act – and so they resort to inventing new versions of past events in what amounts to a creative act. A seemingly false, fictitious history which hides but at the same time points to the existence of a real painful experience is by this token more truthful than all self-appraisals based on consciousness. Hence the lie: "as it is already a reality, there is no need for it to become one" (Deutsch 1922, 161). Creation is then an active response to a trauma, opposed to the reactive character of mere repression.

In the essay on the 'as if' personality, the analyst discusses the cases of patients whose psychological structure makes them live their own lives according to the laws of fiction. The 'as if' personality results from a lack or devaluation of the object serving as a model for the development of the child. Once again, it is mostly a female condition. Apparently normal, such women function in society only by means of mimicry. Their passive attitude, impressive plasticity, and readiness for identification veil a complete absence of affectivity, emptiness, and the lack of individuality. They act as if they were living reflections of easily interchangeable objects of identification. Deutsch repeatedly emphasizes that although their feelings are always a masquerade, there is one thing they genuinely desire. Namely, the 'as if' personalities are overwhelmed by the need to find a model to copy, they are, so to speak, engaged in a never-ending quest for a form. However, each shape they adopt is only momentary, volatile, and wavering. This study, remotely inspired by the philosophy of Hans Vaihinger, engages in a dialogue with contemporary literary theoreticians, such as Käte Hamburger and Dorrit Cohn, who supplemented Vaihinger's *Die Philosophie des Als Ob* (1911, *The Philosophy of As If*) with a concept of literary fiction. In *Die Logik der Dichtung* (1957, *The Logic of Literature*) Hamburger claims that literature, except in some special cases, doesn't meet the conditions required by the concept of 'as if' in the way figurative art, especially painting, does. She therefore makes a distinction between *fiktiv* (fictional literary genres, which by the means of third-person narration create an illusion of real life), and *fingiert*, the domain of the fake (first-person narrations which imitate their referential counterparts as memoirs, letters and so on). The *as if* mechanism applies only to the latter, the former uses a mechanism that should be called *as reality* (Hamburger 1968 [1957], 55). In Cohn's *The Dis-*

tinction of Fiction, references to Vaihinger support the author's engagement in the discussion about the supposed fictionality of Freud's case histories (Cohn 1999, 38–58). The questions Cohn asks could be addressed to Deutsch's case reports too, for they have much in common with Freud's psychoanalytic case study novels (*Fallromane*, to adopt Friedrich Kittler's accurate notion; Kittler 1985, 361).

In *The Psychology of Women*, beside her clinical experiences, Deutsch likewise recalls the examples from literature as if it were an equally reliable source of information. As she comments, "very often instructive data for this book have been found in creative literature, which is less objective than clinical observation but all the more true because more inspired. After all, the ultimate goal of all research is not objectivity, but truth" (Deutsch 1944, XII). Especially when it comes to describing female puberty, women's literature proves to be indispensable. Alongside George Sand, Deutsch refers to the modernist novelists Karin Michaëlis and Colette and, interestingly enough, to the contemporary Soviet writer Lidiia Nikolaevna Seifullina. One of the chapters is devoted to the analysis of Aleksandra Kollontai's *Liubov' trekh pokolenii* (1923, *The Loves of Three Generations*). Autobiographical writings, such as the diary of Marie Bashkirtseff (Mariia Bashkirtseva), are taken into careful consideration as well. Deutsch also greatly appreciates the psychological insights of some male writers, including Tolstoi, Balzac, de Unamuno, and two Polish novelists, Stefan Żeromski and Władysław Reymont.

3 Eugenia Sokolnicka

Eugenia Sokolnicka, née Kutner (1876–1934), a member of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society from 1916 onwards, emigrated to Paris after ineffective efforts to establish a local psychoanalytic association in Warsaw. For this reason, she became best known as a pioneer of psychoanalysis in France. Sokolnicka not only led to the creation of the Paris Psychoanalytical Society in 1926 and analyzed and educated in psychoanalysis the very first generation of French analysts, but above all she aroused interest in Freudianism in writers associated with the influential periodical *La Nouvelle Revue Française* (Jacques Rivière, André Gide, Jean Schlumberger, Roger Martin du Gard, Albert Thibaudet, Gaston Gallimard, Georges Gabory, and Jules Romains). The Pole had a particularly great impact on André Gide, who portrayed her as Doctor Sophroniska in his 1925 novel *The Counterfeiters*. Gide also used her only case study (Sokolnicka 1920) to construct the novel's plot. The story of little Boris' treatment reflects the cure of Sokolnicka's young Polish patient, but at the same time it bears close similarity to the writer's childhood memories. Furthermore, it corresponds with the author's own

brief experience on the analytic couch (Gide's analysis by Sokolnicka lasted only six sessions).

The Polish avant-garde circles of the time, distinctly unlike the other Central European groupuscules (Kapidžić-Osmanagić 1968; Borecký 1996; Bahun-Radunovic 2005; Bžoch 2006), lacked interest in psychoanalysis, just as they rejected surrealism. This was due to their hostility towards the traditions of the Young Poland movement, from which Freud's theories and Breton's experiments seemed to set forth. In the 1920s, references to psychoanalysis were mainly made by those artists who expressed a connection with the previous period, in particular, the circles associated with the periodical *Zdrój* (*The Spring*) based in Poznań, with Stanisław Przybyszewski to the fore. The writings of this author, who in his memoir published in 1926 referred to himself as an unacknowledged precursor of Freud, influenced the Polish translation of *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality* published around the same time. The translators, Ludwik Jekels and Marian Albiński, used as the Polish equivalent of libido the word *chuć*, in clear reference to Przybyszewski's *Requiem aeternam*, with its famous opening: "Na początku była chuć" ("In the beginning was lust") (Przybyszewski 1904, 5). Among the members of the Zdrój group were Stanisław Marcus, i. e. the author of the article "Podświadome w *Dziadach*" (1923, "The Unconscious in Mickiewicz's *Forefather's Eve*") in which he interpreted one of the crucial scenes in the fourth part of Mickiewicz's great drama, using methods roughly corresponding to psychoanalysis.

4 Gustaw Bychowski

Gustaw Bychowski (1895–1972), after extended studies abroad, decided to return to independent Poland in 1923. He was thus the only member of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society who had a Polish passport and lived in the capital of the Second Polish Republic in the interwar period. Until 1939 he would do his best to popularize psychoanalysis in his country. In 1928, reviewing Bychowski's book *Psychoanaliza* (1928, *Psychoanalysis*), Karol Irzykowski expressed hope that it would fill "the embarrassing gap in our intelligentsia's education" (Irzykowski 1928, 3). Due to Bychowski's efforts, this wish became reality: in 1936 the periodical *Wiadomości Literackie* (*Literary News*), a widely read weekly literary magazine Bychowski collaborated with, found that "the basic psychoanalytic terminology became incorporated into the language of the Polish intelligentsia" (Bychowski 1936, 4).

Along with his other activities, Bychowski wrote a book-length psychoanalytical study of Juliusz Słowacki, one of the three Bards of Polish Romanticism (*Słowacki i jego dusza*, 1930, *Słowacki and His Soul*), analyzing 'Słowacki's soul'

using Freudian instruments. Autobiographical writings by the poet, especially his extensive correspondence, are examined along with literary works. The author devotes considerable attention to the poet's early childhood as a foundation of his later life and work. Słowacki's fixation on the mother figure, the primary object of his affection, determined all his subsequent relationships with women and made him cherish the ideal of sexual purity. Major female characters in his oeuvre appear as successive incarnations of his mother. She would be portrayed by means of two opposing female types (Salusia and the Princess in *The Silver Dream of Salomea*, Lilla and Roza in *Lilla Weneda*, but also Alina and Balladyna in *Balladyna*, Stella and Diana in *Fantazy*, Laura and Wioletta in *Kordian*, Laura and Naduła in *Zawisza*, and Eloe and Ellenai in *Anhelli*) or, in a highly symbolic way, primarily by use of aqueous metaphors. Bychowski also examines Słowacki's relation with his father. The Oedipus triangle, the rivalry of two men, father and son, over a beloved woman, appears to be one of the constant themes of his literary work (*Kordian*, *Mazepa*, *Beatrix Cenci*). The attitude of the poet to his stepfather is equally significant. Comparing *Lambro* with the excerpts of Słowacki's letters from his voyage to the Middle East, Bychowski also reveals a latent homoerotic undercurrent in Słowacki's writings.

In sections devoted to the poet's late mystical period, Bychowski used the tools he had earlier developed for the analysis of schizophrenia. The footnotes of his book refer directly to the Freudian Schreber case and, repeatedly, to Bychowski's own work, *Metaphysik und Schizophrenie* (1923, *Metaphysics and Schizophrenia*). He does not hesitate to perceive Słowacki's late opus as evidence of his pathological condition. The poet's psyche has thus returned to the primitive (pre-logical, magical, and animistic) forms of thinking. The analyst associates the blurring of the boundaries between ego and the outside world with a regression to the stage of primary narcissism. The whole Genesian system appears as a transposition of the poet's internal conflicts on the cosmic level. It thus resembles the worldviews of tribal peoples, especially totemism. In this context, it is worth noting the numerous mentions of Carl Gustav Jung, whose reception in Polish interwar literary studies was otherwise very limited (Górski 1935).

Bychowski's book appeared at an opportune moment. At this point, Polish literary critics were ready to accept and adopt Freudian theory. Paradoxically, psychoanalytic literary criticism gained popularity at the time of an intensive campaign against psychologism held by the proponents of formalism, structuralism, and phenomenology, i.e. the most prominent representatives of the 'intrinsic' or 'ergocentric' approach (Pawlukiewicz 1987). Literary studies written from a Freudian perspective first appeared as early as 1919 (Marian Albiński's article on Wyspiański) and in the interwar period they constituted a strong trend (Lubański 2008). The most interesting texts are those by Stefan Baley, one of few Ukrain-

ian disciples of Kazimierz Twardowski at the University of Lviv. Although the Lviv–Warsaw school was substantially reluctant to embrace Freud, the members of what Stepan Ivanyk called its "Ukrainian branch" were far more interested in psychoanalysis than their Polish colleagues (Ivanyk 2014, 176–180). In 1916, Baley published in Ukrainian *Z psikhol'ogiï tvorchosti Shevchenka* (*On the Psychology of Shevchenko's Creativity*), an analysis of the poetry of Taras Shevchenko, considered one of the founders of the modern Ukrainian language. This study has been proven to be the first text on psychoanalysis written in Ukrainian (Kut'ko et al. 1996). After World War I, Baley lived in Poland and chose to write mainly in Polish. Thenceforth he published two articles on Juliusz Słowacki (Baley 1921, 1924–1925), in which he used the same conceptual framework as in his book on Shevchenko. Baley reveals a strong "Endymion complex" in both poets, behind their numerous creations of a sexually passive, infantile male hero who fantasizes about a lover who throws herself into his arms without him doing anything to seduce her. Although Baley proposes his own original theoretical notion, he still agrees with the thesis of the fundamental text *Creative Writers and Day-Dreaming* (1908, *Der Dichter und das Phantasieren*), where Freud first suggested the equality between the dream, neurosis, and artistic creation, for each of these forms of unconscious activity is a means by which the forbidden desires come to fruition.

Baley's procedure foreshadows that used by Bychowski. In their respective studies of Shevchenko and Słowacki, they were responding to a need that was then widespread in Central Europe to subject the oeuvres of the most important national poets of the Romantic period to psychoanalysis. For instance, in Romania, Constantin Vlad decided to follow the same path, presenting a Freudian interpretation of the life and work of the preeminent Romanian poet, Mihai Eminescu (Vlad 1932). Nevertheless, while Vlad was largely criticized by Gheorghe Călinescu, the author of the scholarly biography *Viaţa lui Mihai Eminescu* (1932, *The Life of Mihai Eminescu*) and the editor of *Opera lui Mihai Eminescu* (1934, *The Works of Mihai Eminescu*), Bychowski's book and Baley's earlier studies were very well received by Juliusz Kleiner – the champion in the field as the editor of Słowacki's works and the author of a four-volume monograph on him.

Bychowski, extremely erudite and an admirer of literature, wrote a large number of short critical reviews for *Literary News*. Furthermore, in 1930 he published the ambitious essay "Proust jako poeta analizy psychologicznej" (Bychowski 1930b, "Proust as Poet of Psychoanalysis"). Filled with citations from *À la recherche du temps perdu* (1913–1927, *In Search of Lost Time*), subtly translated by the author from the original French, it reveals the enchantment of an analyst who has found in a literary text clear confirmation of Freudian theory. Translated into German and English, today it is considered his most interesting work in the literary field.

By the 1930s, psychoanalysis represented an integral part of the language of the contemporary literary criticism. In his review of Freud's *Vorlesungen zur Einführung in die Psychoanalyse* (1916, *The Introduction to Psychoanalysis*) (translated in 1936 by Salomea Kempner for Wydawnictwo Przeworskiego, the wealthy editor who also published Freud's *Selbstdarstellung* [1925, *Autobiographical Study*], translated by Henryk Załszupin, better known under the pseudonym Adam Tarn), Witold Gombrowicz violently opposed attributing Freud's influence to every literary experimenter (Gombrowicz 1935). It was then a regular practice, even though the psychoanalytic traits in the literature of the second decade of the interwar period clearly appear to be rather a critical construct than the result of a real influence of Freudianism on Polish prose. Although for critics, psychoanalysis was initially proof that Polish literature was keeping up with new European tendencies, in the late 1930s drawing on Freudianism exposed writers to accusations of mere imitation or even opportunism. The debate on Emil Zegadłowicz's novel *Zmory* (1935, *Nightmares*) was thus dominated by the attempt to ascertain whether it is a truly autobiographical work of art or whether it was created simply to benefit from the Freudian trend. Gustaw Bychowski also entered the debate, not only as the writer's close acquaintance and probably therapist (in this role he briefly appears in Zegadłowicz's novel *Motory* [1937, *Motors*]), but mainly as a specialist in psychoanalysis as a literary theory (Bychowski 1937). As such, he was also mocked in Antoni Cwojdziński's play *Freuda teoria snów* (*Freud's Theory of Dreams*), staged at Teatr Mały in Warsaw in 1937 in the character of professor Ziemiański.

In 1939 Bychowski, like almost all of Freud's Jewish disciples, left Europe, ultimately establishing himself as a psychoanalyst in New York. He also joined in the activities of the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences of America (Dorosz 2013). Among his closest friends was Jan Lechoń, the poet whose suicide he was unable to prevent (Dorosz 2004). He did not abandon using Freudianism to interpret literature and art, devoting separate works to *inter alia* Walt Whitman and J.J. Winckelmann. From 1965 on, he belonged to the editorial staff of *American Imago*, a journal continuing the tradition of the pre-war Vienna *Imago* and dedicated to the application of psychoanalysis to the humanities.

At the time, psychoanalysis was frowned upon in the People's Republic of Poland and was no longer considered a valuable method of literary criticism. In the late 1970s, the first efforts were made to recall the achievements of Polish pre-war psychoanalytical interpretation (Speina 1975; Burkot 1978). From the mid-1980s on, psychoanalysis slowly returned to academia (Rosińska 1985; Dziekanowski 1990; Fiała 1991; Danek 1997), although for literary studies its Lacanian and post-Lacanian versions eventually became far more inspiring than classical Freudianism (Dziurla and Groth 1999; Kłosińska 1999; Dybel 2000; Graczyk

2004; Markowski 2004; Potkański 2004; Czapliński 2008; Magnone and Mach 2009; Potkański 2008; Magnone 2011). So far, of all the works mentioned in this chapter, only Gustaw Bychowski's book on Słowacki has been reedited, thanks to the efforts of Danuta Danek, an ardent advocate of psychoanalysis and a literary critic herself (Bychowski 2002).

References

Bahun-Radunovic, Sanja. "When the Margin Cries: Surrealism in Yugoslavia." *Revue des Littératures de l'Union Européenne* 3 (2005): 37–52.

Baley, Stefan. "Psychologiczne uwagi o genezie poematu Słowackiego *W Szwajcarii*." *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 24.1/2 (1921): 115–135.

Baley, Stefan. "Psychoanaliza jednej pomyłki Słowackiego." *Pamiętnik Literacki* 4 (1924–1925): 136–154.

Beller, Steven. *Vienna and the Jews, 1867–1938: A Cultural History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Borecký, Vladimír. "Bohuslav Brouk a psychoanalýza v českém surrealismu v letech 1930–1947." *Český surrealismus 1929–1953*. Eds. Lenka Bydžovská and Karel Srp. Prague: Argo, 1996. 66–76.

Burkot, Stanisław. "Od psychoanalizy klinicznej do literackiej." *Rocznik Naukowo-Dydaktyczny WSP w Krakowie* 68 (1978): 133–157.

Bychowski, Gustaw. "Proust jako poeta analizy psychologicznej." *Droga* 9.1/2 (1930b): 55–66, 149–157.

Bychowski, Gustaw. "Rozmowa z Freudem." *Wiadomości Literackie* 20 (1936): 4.

Bychowski, Gustaw. "Zmory – katarsis poety." *Piszemy listy*. Ed. Emil Zegadłowicz. Warsaw: Księgarnia Powszechna, 1937. 64–79.

Bychowski, Gustaw. *Słowacki i jego dusza: Studium psychoanalityczne*. Ed. Danuta Danek. Cracow: Uniwersitas, 2002.

Bžoch, Adam. "Die Psychoanalyse in der slowakischen Avantgarde der 1930-er und 1940-er Jahre." *Germanoslavica: Zeitschrift für germano-slawische Studien* 2 (2006): 197–224.

Cohn, Dorrit. *The Distinction of Fiction*. Baltimore, MD, and London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1999.

Czapliński, Przemysław (ed.). *Lacan, Žižek – rewolucja pod spodem*. Poznan: Poznańskie Studia Polonistyczne, 2008.

Danek, Danuta. *Sztuka rozumienia: Literatura i psychoanaliza*. Warsaw: Instytut Badań Literackich, 1997.

Deutsch, Helene. "Über die pathologische Lüge (Pseudologia phantastica)." *Internationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse* 2 (1922): 153–167.

Deutsch, Helene. "Über einen Typus der Pseudoaffektivität ('Als ob')." *Internationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse* 3 (1934): 323–335.

Deutsch, Helene. *The Psychology of Women*. New York, NY: Grune & Stratton, 1944.

Deutsch, Helene. *Confrontations with Myself: An Epilogue*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton, 1973.

Dorosz, Beata. "Nowojorskie tajemnice życia i śmierci Jana Lechonia." *Teksty Drugie* 3 (2004): 193–208.

Dorosz, Beata. *Nowojorski pasjans: Polski Instytut Naukowy w Ameryce. Studia o wybranych zagadnieniach działalności 1939–1969*. Warsaw: Więź, 2013.

Dybel, Paweł. *Urwane ścieżki: Przybyszewski – Freud – Lacan*. Cracow: Universitas, 2000.

Dybel, Paweł. *Psychoanaliza – ziemia obiecana? Z dziejów psychoanalizy w Polsce 1900–1989*. Vol. 1: *Okres burzy i naporu. Początki psychoanalizy na ziemiach polskich okresu rozbiorów 1900–1918*. Cracow: Universitas, 2016.

Dziekanowski, Czesław. *Proza życia w "śmierci": Psychoanaliza twórczości powieściowej Wiesława Myśliwskiego*. Białystok: Dział Wydawnictw Filii UW w Białymstoku, 1990.

Dziurla, Rafał, and Jarosław Groth (eds.). *Pisarz i psychoanalityk*. Poznan: Wydawnictwo fundacji humaniora, 1999.

Fiała, Edward. *Modele freudowskiej metody analizy dzieła literackiego*. Lublin: Tow. Nauk. Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 1991.

Freidenreich, Harriet Pass. *Female, Jewish, and Educated: The Lives of Central European University Women*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2002.

Gombrowicz, Witold. "Nauka ściga się o prawdę psychologiczną z literaturą: O brudach i urokach." *Kurier Poranny* 263 (1935): 10.

Graczyk, Ewa. *Przed wybuchem wstrząsnąć: O twórczości Witolda Gombrowicza w okresie międzywojennym*. Gdansk: Słowo/obraz terytoria, 2004.

Górski, Artur. "Psychologia analityczna w sztuce." *Marchołt* 1 (1935): 143–155.

Hamburger, Käte. *Die Logik der Dichtung* [1957]. Stuttgart: E. Klett, 1968.

Irzykowski, Karol. *Pisma rozproszone 1897–1922* [1913]. Vol. 1. Ed. Andrzej Lam. Krakow: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1998.

Irzykowski, Karol. "Badania Acherontu." *Wiadomości Literackie* 36 (1928): 3.

Ivanyk, Stepan. *Filozofowie ukraińscy w Szkole Lwowsko-Warszawskiej*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Semper, 2014.

Jekels, Ludwik. "Shakespeares 'Macbeth'." *Imago* 5 (1917–1919): 170–195.

Jekels, Ludwik. "Das Problem der doppelten Motivgestaltung." *Imago* 19 (1933): 17–26.

Jekels, Ludwik. *Selected Papers* [1926]. New York, NY: International Universities Press, 1952.

Kapidžić-Osmanagić, Hanifa. *Le surréalisme serbe et ses rapports avec le surréalisme français*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1968.

Karpińska, Ludwika. "Psychologiczne podstawy freudyzmu." *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 4 (1913): 508–527.

Karpińska, Ludwika. "O psychoanalizie." *Ruch Filozoficzny* 2 (1914): 33–38.

Kittler, Friedrich. *Aufschreibesysteme 1800/1900*. Munich: Fink, 1985.

Kłosińska, Krystyna. *Ciało, pożądanie, ubranie: O wczesnych powieściach Gabrieli Zapolskiej*. Cracow: eFKa, 1999.

Kut'ko, Igor' I., Lenina I. Bondarenko, and Petr T. Petriuk (eds.). *Istoriia psikhoanaliza v Ukraine*. Kharkiv: Osnova, 1996.

Lacan, Jacques. "L'instance de la lettre dans l'inconscient ou la raison depuis Freud." Jacques Lacan, *Écrits I*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1999. 490–526.

Le Rider, Jacques. *Modernité viennoise et crises de l'identité*. Paris: PUF, 1994.

Lubański, Marek. *Krytyka literacka i psychoanaliza: O polskiej psychoanalitycznej krytyce literackiej w okresie dwudziestolecia międzywojennego*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Psychologii i Kultury Eneteia, 2008.

Magnone, Lena, and Anna Mach (eds.). *Wokół Freuda i Lacana: Interpretacje psychoanalityczne*. Warsaw: Difin, 2009.

Magnone, Lena. *Maria Konopnicka: Lustra i symptomy*. Gdansk: Słowo/obraz terytoria, 2011.

Magnone, Lena. "Karol Irzykowski's Lacanian Reading of Freud." *Kronos. Philosophical Journal* 1 (2013): 104–117.

Magnone, Lena. *Emisariusze Freuda: Transfer kulturowy psychoanalizy do polskich sfer inteligenckich przed drugą wojną światową*. Cracow: Universitas, 2016.

Markowski, Michał P. *Czarny nurt: Gombrowicz, świat, literatura*. Krakow: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 2004.

Mijolla, Alain de (ed.). *International Dictionary of Psychoanalysis*. Detroit, MI: Macmillan Reference USA, 2005.

Mühlleitner, Elke. *Biographisches Lexikon der Psychoanalyse: Die Mitglieder der Psychologischen Mittwoch-Gesellschaft und der Wiener Psychoanalytischen Vereinigung 1902–1938*. Tübingen: Ed. Diskord, 1992.

Pawlukiewicz, Ryszard. "Psychologiczne ujęcie problematyki badawczej w polskiej nauce o literaturze do roku 1939." *Z dziejów polskiej nauki o literaturze*. Vol. 1. Eds. Henryk Markiewicz and Gabriela Matuszek. Cracow: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1987. 75–95.

Potkański, Jan. Sobowtór: *Różewicz a psychoanaliza Jacquesa Lacana i Melanii Klein*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe SEMPER, 2004.

Potkański, Jan. *Parabazy wpływu: Iwaszkiewicz – Bloom – Lacan*. Warsaw: Dom Wydawniczy ELIPSA, 2008.

Przybyszewski, Stanisław. *Requiem aeternam… trzecia księga Pentateuch'u*. Lviv: Księgarnia Polska, 1904.

Rosińska, Zofia. *Psychoanalityczne myślenie o sztuce*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 1985.

Roudinesco, Elisabeth, and Michel Plon. *Dictionnaire de la psychanalyse*. Paris: Fayard, 2000.

Schorske, Carl E. *Fin-de-siècle Vienna: Politics and Culture.* New York, NY: Vintage, 1979.

Sokolnicka, Eugenia. "Analyse einer infantilen Zwangsneurose." *Internationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse 3* (1920): 228–241.

Speina, Jerzy. "Psychoanaliza w badaniach literackich w Polsce okresu międzywojennego." *Z dziejów nauki polskiej: Księga pamiątkowa Towarzystwa Naukowego w Toruniu*. Eds. Artur Hutnikiewicz and Leszek Janiszewski. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawn. Naukowe, 1975. 19–31.

Vlad, Constantin. *Mihai Eminescu din punct de vedere psihanalitic*. Bucharest: Cartea Româneasca, 1932.

Sylvia Sasse

'Aesthetic Reaction' and 'Verbal Reaction': Reader-response Criticism from Vygotskii to Voloshinov

When in the 1920s the Russian literary scholar and psychologist Lev Vygotskii examined the reactions literature can trigger in the reader, his intention was not to consider the text as a pure medium, technical resonator or tool of agitation. Hence, in his book *Psikhologiia iskusstva* (*The Psychology of Art*), written in 1924, he advanced a theory of "aesthetic reactions" which could be regarded to be one of the most complex works on reader-response in the twentieth century. At the same time, Vygotskii's theory provides an insight into the debate in the Soviet Union of the 1920s that sought to show artistic processes to be social and individual reactions beyond reflexology, 'Freudianism' and agitation.

Around the same time, the Russian literary scholar and linguist Valentin Voloshinov wrote a book about Freud's psychoanalysis (*Freidizm*, 1928) and another on Marxism and the philosophy of language (*Marksizm i filosfiia iazyka*, 1929). This book too centred on (verbal) reactions that Bakhtin research would later rather receive as dialogism. Neither theory makes reference to the other, but it strikes me as worthwhile reading them as reactions or responses and as attempts to use psychological and formalist research in the service of Marxist philosophy and to save them from ideological polemics.

1 "Aesthetic reaction"

Let us begin with Vygotskii and the "aesthetic reaction". In this context, aesthetic is not to be understood as an attribute; "the aesthetic" functions as a trigger, or, more precisely, as a stimulus causing a reaction. Vygotskii notes that "for the psychologist any work of art is a system of stimuli, consciously and intentionally organized in such a way as to excite an aesthetic reaction" (Vygotskii 1971, 24). Here, Vygotskii is at pains to point out that the aesthetic response is never merely individual but also social; it neither emanates from an individual psyche (that of the author), nor does it only encounter an individual psyche (that of the recipient). Hence there is no sense in attempting to reconstruct the psychology of the reader or the author via the aesthetic response, since this response does not have direct access to either of their psyches.

This is not the key to Vygotskii's thoughts on "aesthetic reception", however. In his literary analyses and experiments, Vygotskii observed that feelings triggered as part of the aesthetic reaction are not expressed by the reader, at least not in the sensorimotor sense. Instead of being manifested in clenched fists and trembling, they dissolve mainly in the imagination. This sensorimotor inhibition, he writes, is due to the very polar impulses of form and content. Since it is not possible to simultaneously raise and lower something or walk to the right and to the left, this tension can only be resolved in the imagination. Contradictory structures are thus resolved not via muscular activity, but in the activity of the imagination. Hence art's emotions are intellectual emotions, and this is the *differentia specifica* of the "aesthetic reaction".

"Aesthetic", in relation to the reaction, can thus by all means *also* be considered an attribute *too*; for Vygotskiis, the reaction itself is aesthetic. It is the unity of the imagination and feeling that determines aesthetic reaction. Aesthetic reactions take place in the imagination, which is not to say that they are fictive; rather, they are a component of the imagination's activity that is influenced by emotions. In Vygotskii, reception thus goes far beyond the mere act of perception; it is the *interplay* of perception, emotion and imagination.

Here, he takes aim at the experiments conducted between 1912 and 1923 under the leadership of Georgii Chelpanov, the director of the Psychological Institute at Moscow University, and also at the GAKhN. One of the aims of these experiments to was measure immediate feelings or reactions to reading or viewing art. Vygotskii writes: "The response to art begins with sensory perception, but does not end with it. This is why the psychology of art must begin, not with a chapter on elementary aesthetic experiences, but with the two other problem areas—emotion and imagination" (Vygotskii 1971, 200 f). An "aesthetic reaction" is thus not a usual response to perceiving a smell or a colour; rather, the perception of this colour is merely the *precondition* for the developing emotion and the activity of the imagination, which themselves—in their holistic reciprocity—form the foundations of the aesthetic reaction. Vygotskii clearly considers the concept of the response in order not to limit art to perceptions; his idea of the aesthetic reaction includes processes that go beyond perceptual experiences (the imagination, emotion and cognition). He obviously seeks to distance himself from a "naive sensualism", as he puts it, whose empirical analyses and laboratory experiments would also have us believe they can tell us how art functions without analysing the work itself.

2 Reactology

Vygotskii's studies are directly related to the reactology of Konstantin Kornilov. While Vygotskii was already writing his aesthetic studies in the early 1920s, when he was still working as a teacher in Gomel' and head of an experimental psychology laboratory at the local technical college. But as early as 1924, the year he completed *The Psychology of Art*, Kornilov, who was running the Institute of Experimental Psychology in Moscow, brought him to the capital after hearing him speak at the Second Psychoneurological Congress in Leningrad, where he worked in Kornilov's laboratory as part of a collective project researching affective reactions. In 1924, the laboratory was headed by Aleksandr Luriia, then still the institute's secretary; it was very much part of Kornilov's "reactological research programme" (Keiler 2002, 41).

The term "reaction", then, denotes a concept that is clearly bound up with the discipline of reactology, which Kornilov had developed in examining reflexology and phenomenological psychology. As early as 1922, Kornilov distinguished between reflex and reaction, understanding a reflex in narrow physiological terms and a reaction as something biological. Reflexes, he said, were objective, reactions subjective-objective. In essence, Kornilov wanted to find a third way between objective reflexology and the subjective phenomenological psychology of Chelpanov. This third way would combine both objective and subjective methods. It was considered impossible to convert Chelpanov's research into a Marxist psychology, and hence he was dismissed from the Institute of Psychology; Kornilov's reactology, on the other hand, was supposed to cater to this very demand. Luriia critically notes that Kornilov's experiments were of no more experimental value than Chelpanov's; on the contrary, it was more a case of relabeling: "All laboratories were renamed so that their names contained the term 'reaction': there was a laboratory for visual reactions (perceptions), for mnestic reactions (memory), for emotional reactions etc. All that aimed to remove potential traces of subjective psychology and replace it with a variant of behaviourism" (Lurija 1993, 41).

In Kornilov's reactology, "reaction" means a "response of the living organism to environmental stimuli" (Kornilov 1936, 12), applying to all biology (*obshchebiologicheskii*), from the most basic organisms to human beings. In people, however, every reaction also contains a "biosocial" component. Kornilov distinguishes, for instance, between "innate" and "acquired" (via one's origins) and between "reflexive", "instinctive" and "emotional reactions" (Kornilov 1936, 15). "Acquired reactions" are, firstly, "muscular-motor reactions" such as walking, running, work processes etc., and, secondly, other "verbal reactions" (*rechevye*, *slovesnye reaktsii*), which form a specific sub-group of "muscular-motor reactions". Kornilov's "verbal reactions" are not inter-individual, valid reactions dis-

playing the social element of speech, as Valentin Voloshinov would later write in his book on Freudianism. Rather, Kornilov considers the verbal reaction to be an event that has emerged in the process of human labour (the origin of language) and via social conditions (the development of language). Language or speech is a reaction to motor activities that humans perform.

Voloshinov sees things differently. He too speaks of a verbal reaction, but for him it is determined by the psychological, the physiological and the social or cultural. A cry in response to pain, he writes in *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, is not a verbal reaction in his sense (at most, it is a verbal reaction in the behavioural sense or a Pavlovian reflex); rather, the cry is physical, devoid of the social element. It is only when valid interaction takes place between individuals that the cry becomes a verbal reaction, i. e. a signifier (Voloshinov 1973, 22). For Voloshinov, then, we can only speak of a "verbal reaction" if there is verbal interaction. For Kornilov, only motor interaction is the precondition for a verbal reaction.

While Vygotskii distinguishes, like Kornilov, between innate and acquired reactions, he comes to the solution that the "all human behaviour is to be understood as a system of acquired reactions" which are built "on a foundation of hereditary reactions" (quoted in Keiler 2002, 74). Vygotskii subscribes to a hereditary doctrine rooted in cultural history in which the newly acquired reactions always build on prior hereditary reactions and begin to replace them. However, what is much more important to Vygotskii than individual acquisition is social inheritance on the basis of collective social experience. This observation amounts to the notion that it is impossible to conceive of a reaction independently of the culture in which it occurs. If we also consider that the reaction is reflected in the individual's conscious and in culture, for the very reason that it is part of cultural and not only individual experience, then every potential reaction can be reflected and oriented towards an act of perception that has yet to take place. Very much in the Marxian sense, Vygotskii calls this a "double experience" (quoted in Keiler 2002, 81) that is achieved by the conscious. Vygotskii terms the conscious itself the "response apparatus" or the "organism's reaction to its own reactions" (quoted in Keiler 2002, 101).

3 Response reactions

Voloshinov too develops his philosophy of language in contradistinction to reflexology and behaviourism and their "primitive materialism" (Voloshinov 1976, 23). His basic theory is that the psyche is an organisational phenomenon.

For his theory of verbal reactions, he thus adopts not the physiological notion of the behaviourists, but rather Kornilov's concept. Bakhtin, in his early works, also speaks of a reaction or response-reaction, although he certainly does not employ the term in the context of behaviourism, reactology or sociology, but rather uses it in the sense of verbal response.

In *Freudianism*, Voloshinov seeks to consider the psychoanalytical conversation as a complex verbal reaction. He begins with the observation that Freud's "psychological construct" is based solely on the verbal utterances of the patient. Voloshinov's criticism is that Freud does not regard the verbal utterances or reactions from their "objective" side – that is, in terms of their physiological and social roots. The language used in the psychoanalytical conversation does not belong to the patient, he says, and hence it cannot be the expression of his individual psyche either. The "objectivist psychologist" (Voloshinov 1976, 78) may thus not believe a single verbal utterance the patient presents as self-observation. Rather, the patient's utterance must be considered in the context of the reciprocal relationship with the situation in which it occurs, in the conversation with the analysis. However, here, he argues, we have an encounter not only between two people who are entirely different in terms of their origin, sex or profession but also between entirely different speakers – that is, people who use language completely differently. However, because the patient speaks a language characterised by his social background and other circumstances, his utterances are not a sign of an individual statement or his individual psyche but are symptomatic of a social process: "Not a single instance of verbal utterance can be reckoned exclusively to its utterer's account. Every utterance is 'the product of the interaction between speakers' and the product of the broader context in which the utterance emerges" (Voloshinov 1973, 79, emphasis in the original).

Vygotskii, in his work after *The Psychology of Art*, sees the verbal reaction in the context of such a social process. In *The Psychology of Art*, he only hints at the cultural-historical dimension of emotional reactions when he writes that the aesthetic reaction depends on the reading experience itself. In his later writings, however, this insight dominates his understanding of the human psyche. Vygotskii recognised, Luriia summarises, that on the "path of internalising the historically determined and culturally organised possibilities" of dealing with knowledge", "the social nature of man becomes his psychic nature" (Lurija 1993, 56). 'Alien' aesthetic reactions can be internalised to the extent that they become understood as one's own, individual reactions.

Unlike Luriia, Vygotskii is thus not sceptical towards the notion of reaction; rather, he tries to find a foundation to Kornilov's concept in such a way that it can also support a terminological reform within psychology (Vygotskii 1997, 283 f.). While Vygotskii barely describes the processes of reaction explicitly in his early

study *The Psychology of Art*, he later explains that he uses the term "reaction" neither in contradistinction to Kornilov nor to denote a functional relationship between physiological and psychic processes – these would undermine their holism – or a mere reciprocity between individual parts. Rather, he is concerned with an integral relationship between psychological and physiological phenomena. In retrospect, he describes Kornilov's method as mechanistically dialectical; he argues that Kornilov attempted to conduct a physiological investigation of conditional reflexes plus introspective analysis of psychic processes. It is this plus that irritates Vygotskii. For he is concerned not with a mechanistic connection but with an organic whole. He thereby advances an anti-formalist cultural theory, although he does refer to formalism and adopt its terminology and analytical methods. In the debates of the 1920s, the organic was considered a counter-model to the mechanistic and cumulative elements of formalism as formulated by, for instance, Bakhtin, Voloshinov, Medvedev and others, who oppose mechanics with the organic, the chain of individual parts with holism and addition with reciprocity. This is not the case in Vygotskii – who rather represents a kind of 'organic formalism' – not unlike Eisenstein, incidentally.

Luriia too conducted studies intended to test the recipients' reactions to text or words. However, unlike Vygotskii, he is interested not in the workings of the artistic or the aesthetic reaction connected to literariness but in discovering in his test subjects "hidden complexes" or "emotional experiences" that "influence behaviour in the subconscious" (Lurija 1993, 44). For this reason, Luriia did not use artistically valuable texts as his foundation; he rather asked his assistants to construct a narrative themselves.

> One, for instance, was about a thief who breaks into a church through a window and steals a golden candelabra, an icon and a crucifix. The subjects' task was to memorise the story's content but they were not allowed to show that they were familiar with it. They and other test subjects who did not know the story were invited to take part in an experiment. They were told to react to a list of around seventy words, ten of which were the 'critical' ones. They had to squeeze a rubber ball with their right hand and reply with words on the basis of free association. (Lurija 1993, 44)

Luriia measured their reactions using Kornilov's dynamoscope in order to measure "fluctuations in the intensity of motor responses as the objective expression of inner emotional conflict" (Lurija 1993, 43). He wanted to be able to tell from the fluctuations in intensity which subjects knew the narrative to which the 'critical' words belonged. He later used this method as a 'lie detector' with suspected criminals. If the suspects responded to details of the crimes – that is, to 'critical words' – with which they must have been familiar if they were guilty by displaying a "diffuse collapse of coordinated reactions" (of a motor and verbal nature), then

according to Luriia they could be convicted as criminals (Lurija 1993, 46). Quite apart from the fact that here Luriia believes in a more than questionable direct access to the unconscious, for instance via the activity of the imagination, and notwithstanding that Vygotskii would have always doubted such access articulated via language, there is another key difference between the two experimental and analytical processes: Vygotskii always insisted on an experiment's artificiality and abstractness, while Luriia was determined, unlike Kornilov and Pavlov, to create experimental situations connected to the reality of the lives of the test subjects. These 'natural' situations were supposed to bring to light something 'natural' and ontological. Conversely, Vygotskii sought to show how "the action of a specific law" becomes visible. In relation to art, he thereby underlines its constructedness and places the experiment on the same level as analysis, which he terms "abstraction in thought" (Vygotskii 1997, 320). At no point is he tempted to attempt to trace the aesthetic reaction back to the author's psyche as Luriia did; rather, he wishes to understand it as an artistic process.

4 Infection versus pathos formula

If, however, one compares Vygotskii's experiments with individual experiments conducted at the GAKhN using artistic material, or, more rarely, works of art, what becomes apparent is above all the difference between phenomenological psychology and Vygotskii's cultural-historical psychology. At the GAKhN, the focus was on researching aesthetic perception, that is, those experiments that Vygotskii had already rejected as incomplete *The Psychology of Art*, since they only consider the organism's perception of certain stimuli conveyed by the environment, the sensory components.

In *The Psychology of Art*, Vygotskii explicitly distances himself from an understanding of art that sees the work as a mere resonator, amplifier or transmitter of the author's psyche, that is, an understanding that postulates a direct effect. In doing so, Vygotskii refers in particular to the idea of infection (*zarazhenie*) Lev Tolstoi had elaborated in his book *Chto takoe iskusstvo?* (1897, *What is Art?*). Tolstoi postulated that the work of art is a medium of the author's feelings, assuming said feelings are honest and not a pretence. In this theory, the recipient receives the author's feelings, the work unfolding in its transmission, both in terms of form and content. Vygotskii ironically remarks, "If a poem about sadness sought to do no more than infect us with the author's sadness, that would be very sad for art" (Vygotskii 2001, 390). Tolstoi's reductionist theory of art based on direct transmission would certainly have been forgotten had Anatolii Lunacharskii not rediscov-

ered infection in elaborating his concept of agitation. Lunacharskii thereby makes Tolstoi's theory of art, of all things, the point of departure for post-revolutionary Marxist reception aesthetics. As early as 1904, in his essay "Osnovy positivnoi ėstetiki" ("The Foundations of Positive Aesthetics"), Lunacharsky speaks of "aesthetic emotion" (*ėsteticheskaia ėmotsiia*), which also played a central role in the work of French sociologist Jean Marie Guyau in the late nineteenth century. In the early 1920s, Lunacharsky then considers art's role to be that of an "organiser of ideas and emotions". It organises, he writes in "Osnovy khudozhestvennogo obrazovaniia" ("The Foundations of Artistic Education", 1925), with reference to Tolstoi's "infection", "the emotions as a fighting force, as an educating force" ("organizuet ėmotsii, kak boevuyu silu, kak vospitaltel'nuiu silu") (Lunacharsky 1967, 440). Gorkii goes so far in his thinking on the potency of the word as to speak of verbal transmission or transmission of thought, a notion he developed by drawing on Wilhelm Ostwald's energetics, Naum Kotik's telepathy, Vladimir Bechterev's studies on suggestion and Ernst Mach's and Richard Avenarius's writings on the affectional in art.

Sergei Eisenstein, on the other hand, is artistically close to Vygotskii. They were well acquainted with one another, Eisenstein having conducted stimulus-response experiments on the basis of Vygotskii's research on aesthetic reactions. In particular, Vygotskiis aesthetic reaction and Eistenstein's pathos formula are both based on a contradictory, counterfactual relationship between material and form (Vygotskii) or different stimuli (Eisenstein).

The example of Eisenstein, who spent several years developing ever-new reception experiments and reception concepts, also allows us to assess the fine line between totalitarian aesthetics and avant-gardist exploration of reception theories for their own sake ('effect as such'). Both Eisenstein and the theorists of proletarian art are of the opinion that art has to have a direct impact on the viewer, that art has to fixate him by transmitting onto him the emotions it depicts in its themes and its composition. And yet Eisenstein and the representatives of totalitarian aesthetics nevertheless in one crucial aspect: Eisenstein problematises the direct relationship between sense and the sensory system. His somatic aesthetics envisages a shift in sense via the attack on the senses.

While Eisenstein mainly works on the deautomatisation of artistic and social sensory techniques and hence also estranges the history of pathos, Vygotskii – at least in *The Psychology of Art* – primarily has in mind a critique of a history of perception that assumes that feeling is individual. Vygotskii foregrounds the social element of feelings, but not in the same way as Tolstoi and Lunacharskii – he writes: "But this experience does not happen as described in the theory of infection (where a feeling born in one person infects everybody and becomes social), but exactly the other way around. The melting of feelings outside us is performed

by the strength of social feeling, which is objectivised, materialised, and projected outside of us, then fixed in external objects of art which have become the tools of society" (Vygotskii 1971, 415).

For Vygotskii, it is the social aspect of feelings that deposits itself in the work of art and is stored there; it is not, for instance, a question of the author's feelings seeking transmittance onto the community. He considers it a false assumption that the work of art renders the individual's feelings societal; quite on the contrary, art enables social feelings to be experienced by the individual.

In summary, Vygotskii's analysis of art is not only a contribution to the question as to what extent one can determine the effect of art by using scientific methods; it is also primarily a critical commentary on the political instrumentalisation of artistic research or the phenomenological and scientific approach to artistic processes. In particular, Vygotskii criticises research that hopes that its experiments measuring a work's effects will help direct reception and thereby pushes art's material, performative and formal elements into the background while also ignoring its social aspects. As a rule, such research completely overlooks the fact that a work of art is a site of complicated reception processes and believes in the transformation of individual feelings. Secondly, Vygotskii criticises experimental research on perception, since it too chooses not to analyse the complex interplay of form, content and material, but goes no further than measuring individual components such as colour, form and tone before transferring these elements into a theory of aesthetic perception. Moreover, phenomenological research on perception also forgets the cultural-historical aspects of perception – that is, its historical and social prefiguration. Vygotskii's criticism, bound up with both proletarian reception aesthetics and phenomenological perception research, and his development of cultural-historical reaction research are perhaps his most important contribution to the reception aesthetics of the 1920s, rendering it compatible with today's concept of performativity. However, if we ask to what extent the above studies, experiments and theories had an "impact" on the development of literary theories, then as far as, for instance, Voloshinov's and also Bakhtin's theories are concerned, it is a question of delayed, indeed anachronistic reception. Voloshinov and Vygotskii were not received in the context of New Criticism's affective fallacy debate in the 1950s, nor did Vygotskii play a role in the context of the effect and reception aesthetics of the Konstanz School, which took up, here and there, Bakhtin's theory of the dialogic word, less so Voloshinov's philosophy of language. Stanley Fish, who developed an affective stylistics in the 1960s in correspondence with the Konstanz School, asked himself similar questions, however, with regard to the individual or social reaction: "When I talk about the responses of 'the reader,' aren't I really talking about myself, and making myself into a surrogate for all the millions of readers who are not me at all? Yes and no.

Yes in the sense that in no two of us are the responding mechanisms exactly alike. No, if one argues that because of the uniqueness of the individual, generalization about response is impossible" (Fish 1970, 141). What we are dealing with, then, is rather a failed or belated transfer of theory that has taken place only tentatively in recent years. This holds not only for the reception of Vygotskii's and Voloshinov's research but also for the knowledge produced by the GAKhN experiments. These experiments and Vygotskii's criticism of them have yet to play a role in empirical studies on the affective turn (*inter alia* Brian Massumi 1995), empirical aesthetics (*inter alia* Menninghaus et al. 2015) and so-called Neuro Literary Criticism (Michael Holquist).

Translated by John Heath

References

Bechterew, Wladimir [Bechterev, Vladimir]. *Kollektive Reflexologie*. Halle/S.: Carl Marhold, 1928.

Chubarov, Igor'. "Lev Vygotsky's Psychology of Art as an Avant-Garde Project." *Social Sciences* 3/38 (2007): 136–147.

Ėizenshtein, Sergei. "Pafos." Sergei Ėizenshtein, *Izbrannye proizvedeniia v shesti tomakh*. Vol. 3. Moscow: Iskusstvo 1964.

Engels, Friedrich. "Dialektik der Natur." Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *Werke*. Vol. 20. Berlin: Dietz Verlag, 1962. 348–353.

Ferster, N. P. *Vzaimootnoshenie zritel'nykh i dvigatel'nykh momentov pri vospriiatii prostranstvennykh form*. Ed. V. M. Ekzempliarskii (Laboratoriia ėksperimental'noi ėstetiki i iskusstvovedeniia. Vyp. 2). Moscow: Trudy G.A.Kh.N., 1929.

Fish, Stanley. "Literature in the Reader: Affective Stylistics." [1970] *New Literary History* 2.1 (Autumn 1970): 123–162.

GAKhN (ed.). *Biulleten' G.A.Kh.N.* 2–3, Moscow 1926.

GAKhN (ed.). *Biulleten' G.A.Kh.N.* 4–5, Moscow 1926.

GAKhN (ed.). *Biulleten' G.A.Kh.N.* 8–9, Moscow 1927/28.

GAKhN (ed.). *Biulleten' G.A.Kh.N.* 10, Moscow 1927/28.

Keiler, Peter. *Lev Vygotskij – ein Leben für die Psychologie*. Weinheim and Basel: Beltz, 2002.

Kornilov, Konstantin. *Uchebnik psikhologii: Izlozhennoi s tochki zreniia dialekticheskogo materializma*. Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoe Izdatel'stvo, 1936.

Lunacharskii, Anatolii. "Osnovy khudozhestvennogo obrazovaniia." Anatolii Lunacharskii, *Sobranie sochinenii*. Tom sed'moi: Ėstetika, literaturnaia kritika. Stat'i, doklady, rechi (1903–1928). Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1967. 438–460.

Lunacharskii, Anatolii [Lunačarski, Anatolij]. "Die Grundlagen der künstlerischen Bildung." Anatolij Lunačarskij, *Musik und Revolution*: *Schriften zur Musik*. Trans. by Guido Bimberg. Leipzig: Reclam, 1985. 113–141.

Luriia, Aleksandr [Lurija, Alexander]. *Romantische Wissenschaft: Forschungen im Grenzbezirk von Seele und Gehirn*. Reinbek/H.: Rowohlt, 1993.

Massumi, Brian. "The Autonomy of Affect." *Cultural Critique* 31 (Autumn 1995): 83–109.

Menninghaus, Winfried, Valentin Wagner, Julian Hanich, Eugen Wassiliwizky, Milena Kuehnast, and Thomas Jacosen. "Towards a Psychological Construct of Being Moved." *PLoS ONE* 10.6 (June 2015). http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=info:doi/10.1371/journal. pone.0128451 (18 February 2022).

Sasse, Sylvia. "Moralische Infektion. Lev Tolstojs Theorie der Ansteckung und die Symptome der Leser." *Ansteckung: Zur Körperlichkeit eines ästhetischen Prinzips*. Eds. Mirjam Schaub and Nicola Suthor. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 2005. 275–293.

Sasse, Sylvia. "Pathos und Antipathos. Pathosformeln bei Sergej Ėjzenštejn und Aby Warburg." *Pathos: Zur Geschichte einer problematischen Kategorie*. Ed. Cornelia Zumbusch. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2009. 171–190.

Sborniki eksperimental'no-psikhologičeskich issledovanij, Red. V. M. Ėkzempljarskij (Trudy G.A.Kh.N., Psikhofizicheskaia laboratoriia, Vypusk 1). Leningrad: Academia, 1926.

Vöhringer, Margarethe. *Avantgarde und Psychotechnik: Wissenschaft, Kunst und Technik der Wahrnehmungsexperimente in der Sowjetunion*. Göttingen: Wallstein, 2007.

Voloshinov, V. N. [Vološinov, V. N.]. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. Trans. by Ladislav Matejka and I. R. Titunik. New York, NY, and London: Seminar Press, 1973.

Voloshinov, Valentin N., and Mikhail Mikhailovich Bakhtin. *Freudianism: A Marxist Critique*. Trans. by I. R. Titunik, New York, NY, and London: Seminar Press, 1976.

Vygotskii, Lev. *Pedagogicheskaia psikhologiia*. Moscow: Rabotnik Prosveshcheniia, 1926.

Vygotskii, Lev [Vygotsky, Lev S.]. *The Psychology of Art*. London, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1971.

Vygotskii, Lev. *Die Lehre von den Emotionen: Eine psychologiehistorische Untersuchung*. Münster: LIT-Verlag, 1996.

Vygotskii, Lev. "The Historical Meaning of the Crisis in Psychology: A Methodological Investigation." [1927] *The collected works of L. S. Vygotsky*. Vol. 3: *Problems of the Theory and History of Psychology*. Ed. Robert W. Rieber. New York, NY: Plenum Press, 1997. 233–343.

Vygotskii, Lev. *Psikhologia iskusstva. Analiz ėsteticheskoi reaktsii*. Moscow: AST, 2001.

II.6 Sociological and Marxist Theory

Josh Robinson

Realism and Modernism, Aesthetics and Politics: Lukács, Brecht, Adorno

1 Critique, institutions and the idea of Western Marxism

The variations between the development of Marxist theory in east and west are most commonly characterized as a consequence of the development within the USSR and the countries of the Warsaw Pact of an official body of social and political thought as the ideology of a system of government, and of a ruling class, while in Western Europe Marxist thought remained largely plural and outside – oppositional to – state power and its institutions. Indeed, the Marxism that developed before and outside the Soviet Bloc and independently of the Comintern is an immanent critique of capitalism not only in the sense that bourgeois society is the object of critique, but also in the more radical sense that this critique is carried out from within bourgeois society. Moreover, as Alvin W. Gouldner observes, the Marxism that emerged in Western Europe "was never successful in winning state power in the territory of its birth" while the "'socialist' solution to the contradictions and problems of capitalism turned out to be appealing only to societies in desperate straits and often not very capitalist" (Gouldner 1980, 25).

According to this conceptualization there emerges in the capitalist economies an alternative to the official, state-sanctioned Scientific Marxism of the Soviet Union and the Comintern: Marxism as negation or "what came to be called Critical Marxism, Western Marxism, or Hegelian Marxism" (Gouldner 1980, 87). Within this independent and often combatively heterogeneous body of thought there have nonetheless been identified common tendencies, most particularly the rejection of the theory of the primacy of the economic, at least in the form of a crude economic and social determinism. "Its essential characteristic is that it *also* stresses the importance of theory, of ideology, or consciousness, of militant struggle as necessary agencies of revolutionary change, *no less than* of material forces" (Gouldner 1980, 87). In this respect Critical Marxism readmits and recentres the subjective elements that Scientific Marxism had neglected or downplayed in order to draw attention to the material social and economic elements on which the idealism that it sought to criticize had remained silent. In doing so Critical Marxism "focalizes exactly what had been repressed by Scientific Marxism" (Gouldner 1980, 87).

This is no mere disagreement as to methodology, but has profound implications not only for political practice but also for the conditions of the possibility of such a practice. Perry Anderson for example sees in Western Marxism an abandonment not so much of the necessity of transforming the world but of the faith in the possibility of such a transformation that is necessary for any commitment to revolutionary political practice. He identifies as the "fundamental emblem" of Western Marxism a "common and latent *pessimism*" that subsists regardless of any other political or theoretical differences (Anderson 1979, 88). This degeneration of Marxist thought results from the "loss of any dynamic contact with working-class practice" in general, and from the retreat of Marxists into academia in particular, to concern themselves with questions of epistemology and of aesthetics or culture. This retreat "displaced Marxist theory towards contemporary non-Marxist and idealist systems of thought, with which it now typically developed in close if contradictory symbiosis" (Anderson 1979, 93). For Anderson, that is, the survival of (true) Marxism depends on the success of its attempts to avoid contamination with non-Marxist thought. This, however, is to represent Marxism as a hermetic body of theory, and in doing so to ignore the relationship of Marx's own thought to the history of Western philosophy, and more specifically its origin in the immanent critique of German Idealism. As Gouldner observes, the tension, for example, between voluntarism and determinism is not specific to Marxism but rather "part of the deep structure of Western thought that it shares"; "Marxism did not invent this tension and it did not resolve it" (Gouldner 1980, 37).

The contours and stakes of the disagreements which come to light by means of my investigation in this chapter differ from this schema in decisive respects, not least because none of the theorists on whose work I concentrate can be taken unproblematically as exemplary of either tendency of Marxism – indeed, the trajectory of each of their own œuvres contains multiple tensions and rethinkings. What does emerge, however, is a radical alternative to Anderson's famous formulation "[m]ethod as impotence, art as consolation, pessimism as quiescence" (Anderson 1979, 93), as the examination of the disagreements between the thinkers with whom I am principally concerned offers a range of resources not for the analysis and theorization of art as quiescence, but rather for the investigations of multiple complex relationships (and relationships of different kinds) between art, society, the economy and politics – investigations which reveal new potential for the theorization of the political valency of art, and of the relationship between art and capitalist society in particular.

György Lukács (1885–1971) was an early member of the Party of Communists in Hungary, joining in 1918, the year of its foundation, and serving as People's Commissar for Education and Culture in the short-lived Hungarian Soviet Republic. After the Republic's defeat to the forces of the Kingdom of Romania in 1919, he

initially remained in Hungary to organize an underground communist movement, before fleeing to Vienna. In 1930 he was summoned to Moscow, which coincided with the issuing of a police order for his expulsion from Vienna. For a period he was internally exiled in Tashkent, but although he was prohibited from returning to Hungary until after World War II, he survived Stalin's purges. An active member of the Hungarian Communist Party, he participated in the formation of the government of the Hungarian People's Republic under Rákosi; the questions of the willingness of his participation and the nature of his relationship with Stalinism during this time remain unresolved. He was subsequently a minister in the short-lived government of the anti-Moscow revolution of 1956. He escaped execution, was briefly exiled to Romania, returning to Budapest a year later and officially distancing himself from his previously held positions. He remained officially loyal to the Communist Party, but towards the end of his life he was more openly critical of Stalin and the Comintern, particularly after the uprisings of 1968.

Bertolt Brecht (1898–1956) spent his youth in Bavaria, moving to Berlin in 1924, initially to work at the Deutsches Theater under Max Reinhardt, where he was active on numerous theatrical projects and collaborations during the Weimar Republic. Fearing persecution, he fled Germany in February 1933, spending time in Denmark, Sweden and Finland before relocating to the United States in May 1941. He was blacklisted during the post-war Red Scare, and summoned to appear before the House Un-American Activities Committee in September 1947, returning to Europe the following month. During his exile he was not active as a director, instead dedicating himself to writing both theoretical and dramatic works, including many of the plays for which he is most famous. In 1948 he returned to Berlin and founded, with Helene Weigel, the Berliner Ensemble in 1949 in the Soviet Sector of the city, a month before the foundation of the German Democratic Republic, with the subsequent official recognition and support of the East German authorities. He never joined either the Communist Party or the ruling SED, and his shifting relationship to the GDR administration was frequently marked by tension and contradiction. His work is nonetheless characterized by a sustained engagement with the thought of Marx, a respect in which Brecht was deeply influenced by Karl Korsch, whom he chose as a mentor precisely because of his independence from the ruling administration (Bathrick 1974, 91; Barnett 2015, 2). Indeed, the tensions within his practice are helpfully encapsulated in the formulation that the aesthetics of the Berliner Ensemble "were informed by Marxist thought, but came into conflict with a socialist government" (Barnett 2015, 3).

Theodor W. Adorno (1903–1969) was awarded the *venia legendi* at Johann Wolfgang Goethe University in Frankfurt in 1931. After the consolidation of National-Socialist power in Germany in 1933 his right to teach was revoked, and from 1934 he spent fifteen years in exile, first as an advanced student at Merton College,

Oxford, from 1937 in New York with the exiled Institute for Social Research, and from 1941 in Los Angeles. In 1949 he returned to the Federal Republic, and served as co-director and then director of the Institute from 1952 until his death of a heart attack in 1969. Founded as a Marxist research institute in Weimar Frankfurt under the direction of Carl Grünberg (and in its early years closely linked with the Marx–Engels Institute in Moscow), the Institute was initially envisaged as an alternative site of research and training to the intellectually and institutionally conservative German university system. Under the leadership of Friedrich Pollock, then Max Horkheimer and later Adorno, its members developed a multi-disciplinary Critical Theory that increasingly differentiated itself from orthodox Marxism; the principal early influences on its development were Korsch and the Lukács of *Geschichte und Klassenbewusstsein* (1923, *History and Class Consciousness*).

Frankfurt School Critical Theory's relationship with Marxism was complex and conflicted, and frequently characterized by tensions. Both in exile and in the post-war Federal Republic Horkheimer in particular insisted that the Institute avoid the use of terms that might alarm sponsors and threaten its funding. Adorno formulated a complex account of the relationship between theory and political practice, in which he warns of the danger of allowing theory to be shackled by an unreflective practice. He was publicly critical of the New Left, and particularly of what he diagnosed as the authoritarian tendencies of the actions and demands of the student movement in the late 1960s – indeed, in January 1969, in response to occupations of the Institute and interruptions of his lectures by students demanding that he engage in an act of public contrition (an act which he interpreted as a cynical attempt by the leaders of the protest to be taken into police custody in order to prevent the Frankfurt SDS group from disintegrating), he even called the police (Adorno 1998b, 574).

This course of action was unsurprisingly a source of considerable controversy. Herbert Marcuse in particular, at this point working at the University of California, San Diego, was deeply critical of Adorno's decision, declaring unequivocally in a letter to his former colleague that "if the alternative is between the police and students of the left, I am with the students" (Marcuse 1998a, 601). In their correspondence Adorno regarded the students' demand that he express public contrition as "pure Stalinism", insisting that "in its current form the student movement is leading directly to the technocratization of the university which it supposedly wishes to hinder", and that "behaviours such as those which I had to observe [...] truly display something of that mindless violence that quite simply belongs to fascism" (Adorno 1998c, 644–645). While Marcuse (to whom the students increasingly turned for intellectual guidance and support) insisted on the legitimacy of occupying buildings and interrupting lectures as acts of political protest, and referred to the brutality of the police in breaking up student demonstrations in

Berkeley in May 1969, he also conceded that he too would in certain situations call the police – "if there is a real threat of physical injury to persons, and of the destruction of material and facilities serving the educational function of the university" (Marcuse 1998b, 650). Adorno's view was that by the moment of acute threat of physical violence it would already have been too late (Adorno 1998c, 624).

The written exchanges between the figures with whom I am principally concerned are frequently characterized by polemic – a polemic which occasionally has the tendency to generate more heat than light. Perhaps the most famous of these is Lukács's accusation in his critical preface to the 1962 edition of his *Die Theorie des Romans* (*The Theory of the Novel*) that Adorno in particular had taken up residence in a "Grand Hotel Abyss", an opulent residence on the edge of nothingness, the contemplation of which serves merely to heighten the enjoyment of the hotel's comforts (Lukács 1971, 16). Behind this literary and epistolary culture of combative exchange, however, lie a wide range both of affinities and of fundamental disagreements, not all of which have been made adequately clear. Indeed, the conciliatory tone adopted in the letter Adorno dictated to Marcuse from his death bed, in which he acknowledged that the student movement (the merits of which he was "the last to under-estimate") "has interrupted the smooth transition to the totally administered world" (Adorno 1998a, 671), suggests that the potential for further dialogue and clarification was cut short by his untimely death.

In this chapter I take a fresh look at the exchanges, both in print and correspondence, between these figures, re-evaluating the stakes of the famous mid-twentieth-century debate over the mutual implication of aesthetics and politics in order to gesture toward ways in which this dialogue might have continued, and thus to draw its contemporary relevance into sharper focus. What emerge are debates characterized not only by polemic but also by differences both in practice and in institutional and political contexts: Lukács negotiating the changing political configuration of post-revolutionary Hungary; Brecht working in East Berlin, not only in tension with the ruling SED that funded the Berliner Ensemble, but also involved with the realities of seeking to establish a company and its practice; Adorno in (and later as Director of) the Institute for Social Research in Frankfurt am Main, funded by the Federal Republic of Germany. The polemical character of the debate across these different contexts and constraints testifies to an engagement with art and its theorization that is far from the consolation to which Anderson objects.

Moreover, the famous debates over Realism, Modernism and Expressionism form part of a discussion of literature that can be traced back to the emergence of Marxian thought, that not only has wide-ranging ramifications for attempts to theorize the relationship between literature and society, but also has a capacity to reveal hitherto under-examined tensions within Marxist thought. I begin in

this chapter by tracing the debates back to discussions in the writings of Marx and Engels, centering on the figure of Balzac. In doing so I draw out some of the tensions within the concept(s) of realism that are deployed within different attempts to formulate Marxist aesthetics and theories of literature. I then turn to the questions of the relationship between literature and the world, revealing disagreements not only as to how literature should aspire to represent or resemble reality, but also as to the conception of this reality itself. Finally I address the contemporary stakes of these discussions, focusing on their implications for our understanding of the potential of literature to transform our worlds.

2 Contested Realisms: Balzac in Marx and Marxism

The figure of Balzac has played a prominent rôle within the development of Marxist literary theory at least since Marx's brief account in the first volume of *Capital* of how the profound insight of the author of *Les Paysans* (1855, *The Peasants*) into the actual circumstances enabled him accurately and pointedly to depict the increasing entanglement of the peasant in the web of the money-lender – for whom he performs tasks for free in order to safeguard his benev-olence, and thus has less and less labour time at his disposal in order to free himself from his obligation (Marx 1962, 49) – and to Engels's stated preference for the legitimist Balzac over the progressive reformist Zola on the grounds that the former "gives us a most wonderfully realistic history of French 'Society'" (Marx and Engels 1973, 115). Here it is worth drawing attention to the fact that both Marx and Engels are judging literature according to criteria that are at once aesthetic and political. What is praised are the insight and literary technique that enable an accurate depiction of society – the success of literature consists firstly in its ability to accurately and faithfully represent social reality – and the accuracy of this representation is deemed important because of the potential political trans-formation that it aids or enables.

This, then, is an instrumental theory of Realism, a feature which becomes clearer still when Engels remarks that Balzac's "satire is never keener, his irony never bitterer, than when he sets in motion the very men and women with whom he sympathizes most deeply – the nobles" (Marx and Engels 1973, 115): in this conception the political valency of literature diverges from its author's intention and sympathy, but consists nonetheless in what is revealed about society. More-over, it is also a negative conception of Realism, according to which this politi-cal valency consists in the potential revealed by the description of the flaws of

the society that is to be negated. This begins to account for some of the tensions within the concept of Socialist Realism, and for the fact that it represents what Régine Robin terms an "impossible aesthetic". For while, as she observes, the origins of the Socialist Realist aesthetic "are to be found not in Marx but in Belinskii and, later, in those whom the Stalinist vulgate termed the 'revolutionary democrats': Dobroliubov, Chernyshevskii, and Pisarev" (Robin 1992, xx), this prior engagement with Realism, and with Balzac in particular, on the part of Marx and Engels instantiates a conception of Realism that differs in crucial ways from that prominent within the USSR.

The decisive matter in the development of this difference was of course actually existing socialism, and the ensuing demand on the part of its proponents for the reflection in art of the transformation of "tens of millions of peasant atoms into a harmoniously working collective of persons striving towards the same goal as the proletariat" (Radek 1935, 156). Indeed, Radek makes clear that the construction of a socialist state demands a change in the relationship of Marxist practitioners of art and literature to reality: they are faced with the task of "reflecting reality as it is, in all its complexity, in all its contrariety, and not only capitalist reality, but also that other, new reality – the reality of socialism" (Radek 1935, 156–157). That is, the relationship of Marxists to social reality (and, in particular, to the particular social relations that persist) exerts, unsurprisingly, a decisive effect on the nature of their Realism – and specifically, on its positivity or negativity with respect to these social relations.

But there is also a less obviously visible but in many respects equally striking difference: that between Marxist theorists of bourgeois art, and practitioners of a supposedly Marxist art. And between these there are some significant resemblances, as well as some important distinctions. For while both see a political efficacy in their work, its relationship to the work of art or literature is configured rather differently. For the Socialist Realist, the imperative that art not only celebrate the reality of socialism but also contribute to its further movement towards communism leads to a certain prescriptivism with respect both to artists' political views and to the kinds of artworks they produce; Balzac's aristocratic sympathies, in contrast, are in no sense a disqualifying factor for Marx or Engels – indeed, Marx in particular condemns the work of Eugène Sue as a sample of the "most wretched offal of socialist literature" (Marx and Engels 1973, 121). A commitment to Socialist Realism leads to a compulsion to positive Realism, and more specifically to an obligation to focus on the "great deeds of our country" at the expense of the kind of "'great art', which depicts the small deeds of small people" (Radek 1935, 155).

The Marxian conception, in contrast, sees in the analysis of Balzac an opportunity to change the world: what is important here is not only that the political implications of the work of literature are independent of the political sympathies

of its creator, but also that these implications persist as it were at the interface between work and theorist. In some respects this is unremarkable: one need not be a Marxist in order to read, analyse and theorize Balzac. But at the same time, the political potential that Marx and Engels identify is presented not as belonging to their analysis (and less still to their pre-existing views), but rather displaced or transposed into the work that they discuss: it is not the reading of Balzac that has political valency; critical reading rather reveals the valency of the work. As I have shown elsewhere, this is a theoretical presupposition that underpins a wide range of contemporary politically inflected literary criticism and theory (Robinson 2018, 216) – its lineage can be traced back at least to Marx and Engels. In this respect both versions of the Marxist theory of Realism are predicated on a conception of a fundamental and potentially transformative connection between literature and the world. Indeed, in many respects Marx holds more strongly to such a connection than do many of his admirers, for the proponents of Socialist Realism argue for the importance of the celebration in literature of the achievements of the Soviet Union (a celebration which can in turn further motivate its potential heroes), while Engels and in particular Marx credit the work of literature with the critical, theoretical analysis of bourgeois society.

Adorno's discussion of Balzac thus represents a polemical intervention into the debates within twentieth-century Marxist literary theory – but one of which the polemical content remains for the most part unvoiced:

> Despite his penchant for the visual, there is something musical about his work in general. If many symphonies of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries are reminiscent of novels – in their proclivity for great situations, in their passionate rise and fall, in their unruly abundance of liveliness – then Balzac's novels, archetypes of the genre, are musical in the way they flow, the way they generate figures and then suck them back up again, in the establishment and modulation of characters, who drift along on the conveyor belt of dream. (Adorno 1974a, 142–143)

Here Balzac serves not as a representative of Realism but rather as a figure for the resemblance between two apparently very different forms of art: the narrative and representational novel, and the non-verbal, orchestral symphony. It is worth unpicking both the site and the nature of the resemblances Adorno identifies between the two forms. He draws two specific comparisons between the discursive and referential form of the novel and its symphonic counterpart. The first is the resemblance of many nineteenth-century symphonies to the novel, a resemblance which consists in structural elements of tension, anticipation and climax, as the logical or formal development of a symphony is likened to the contours of a novel's plot. The second is the converse and complementary resemblance of Balzacian novels to music, as the sometimes transitory appearance of figures

and the development and variation of characters are compared with the fleeting passing of elements of music. What is significant is that both the novel and the symphony share a linear structure in which an overarching trajectory develops over a significant timespan.

Adorno thus takes issue with the conception of Balzac's writings and the account of their political implications that exerted a decisive influence on the formation of Marxist literary theory. Indeed, in this respect Adorno's essay, first published in the second volume of *Noten zur Literatur* (*Notes to Literature*) in 1961, returns to the sources of the Marxist theory of Realism in order to intervene into the famous Realism-Expressionism debate that predates the considerably more famous essay on "Engagement" ("Commitment"), which was given as a radio talk in March 1962, published in the *Neue Rundschau* later that year, and collected in the third volume of the *Notes* in 1965. And the key contributions to this debate articulate positions that themselves develop and diverge from Marx and Engels's accounts in a variety of ways. Lukács, for example, in contrast with Engels's praise for the political content of Balzac's realism – his "wonderfully realistic history" with its "chronicle-fashion" descriptions in rich detail that is attentive to economic and material-cultural subtleties (Marx and Engels 1973, 115) – develops a normative theory of Realism that takes into consideration his account of reality as "objective totality":

> If literature is indeed a particular form of the reflection of objective reality, then it is absolutely crucial that it conceive this reality as it is actually *constituted*, and not to restrict itself to retelling what appears immediately and how. If the author strives toward such a conception and presentation of reality as it is actually constituted – that is to say, if he really is a *realist* – then the problem of objective totality of reality plays a decisive rôle – regardless of how the author conceives of this reality intellectually. (Lukács 1938, 116)

Here Lukács opens up the distinction between the immediate appearance of reality and its underlying material basis or constitution, a distinction which can be traced back (albeit in mediated form) to Hegel's distinction in *Wissenschaft der Logik* (1812/16, *Science of Logic*) between appearance and essence (Hegel 1986, 147–163). For Lukács any Realist worthy of the name must not be content with the reproduction or representation of the immediate or surface appearance of reality, but must seek to grasp its constitution. From this follows an obligation on any authentically Realist work to carry out work that analyses reality as well as describing it. There is a normative content to Lukács's claim, but it differs from the prescriptivism of the Socialist Realists in that Lukács demands that the Realist work of literature carry out analysis that is compatible with the theory that there is more to reality (and therefore to its description and representation in art) than its immediate appearance.

Lukács thus holds open the possibility of a Realism that is critical rather than celebratory, with the result that the kind of Realist work to which he exhorts differs radically from that of the Socialist Realists. For on the one hand, and in spite of his insistence on the importance of the theoretical underpinnings of artistic movements (Lukács 1938, 114), he does not prescribe either the perspective the author should adopt relative to reality or the particular theoretical conception of the constitution of reality as totality: borrowing a phrase of Lenin's, he raises a "demand for all-round knowledge" or "rule of comprehensiveness" (Lukács 1938, 116; cf. Lenin 1973, 94). At the same time, on the other hand, he insists on the necessity that an author strive both to conceive reality in this deeper sense and to reflect and articulate that conception in its literary presentation. The prescriptive force to his claim thus has significant implications for his theorization of the relationship between the work of art and social reality – and, more specifically, the potential transformation of reality. For this is not a blunt instrumentalism whereby artworks are expected to guide, motivate or inspire the human political agents who will then undertake political change, but rather a means whereby these works in their status as works of literature carry out the critical analysis of society. The Realist literary work, that is, neither reflects a pre-existing theory of reality nor merely aids the theorist in developing or illustrating the theory, but itself makes a contribution to the theorization of reality and its transformation.

This question of the relationship between art and reality is at the heart of the debates between the theorists under discussion. For Lukács Expressionism in particular represents a literary transformation that has abandoned the world and the attempt to transform it. He contends that the theoreticians of Expressionism and Surrealism "deny literature's relationship to objective reality", the matter against which he sets his Marxist theory of literature (Lukács 1938, 116); to the literary revolutions of Modernism he opposes this revolutionary theory of literature. This is the position against which Ernst Bloch for example argues that Lukács's insistence on reality as a totality means that he cannot comprehend any artistic attempt to "shatter an image of the world, (even if the image is that of capitalism)" (Bloch 1985, 270). Lukács, meanwhile objects to "an ever greater *distance from realism*, an ever more energetic *liquidation* of realism" (Lukács 1938, 113) on the part of Expressionism and its proponents. He objects in particular to what he terms the 'unidirectionality' of the use of techniques such as montage and reportage, which he claims results, at least when deployed in the service of giving shape to reality, in a "profound monotony", the "necessary result of abandoning the attempt objectively to mirror reality" (Lukács 1938, 125). For Lukács the task of literature is instead to struggle with the rich and intertwined mediations of society in their plurality and unity, and to suspend them into the work without flattening out or resolving their differences and tensions (Lukács 1938, 125).

3 Realism, reality, mimesis

Against this context, Adorno's comparison of the flow of Balzac's novels first with music and then with dream-sequences is a deeply charged – if nonetheless implicit – objection to the Lukácsian theory of Realism. Indeed, while Adorno too rejects the montages of Surrealism – in his case on the grounds that Surrealist montage affirms the world of reification and the commodity, rather than suspending them critically within the work (Adorno 1975, 54, 1974c, 103–104; cf. Wolin 1997, 108; Robinson 2018, 75–77) – he also explicitly relates the experience of both music and narrative to the matter of the configuration and change of the world's reality:

> If novel-like music seems, in the darkness, screened off against the contours of objectivity, to repeat the movement of objectivity in one's head, then the head of the one who turns Balzac's pages, tensed in anticipation of the continuation, whirs as if all their descriptions and actions were the pretext for a wild and colourful tone that suffuses it. They guarantee what the lines of the flutes, clarinets, horns and timpani promised the child before he could properly read music. If music is once again the world that has been de-objectified in the interior, then the interior of Balzac's novels, projected outward as a world, is the translation of music back into the kaleidoscope. (Adorno 1974a, 143)

What is central here is the relationship between the novel and the world that it both describes and creates – and the way in which the consideration of the person who experiences the work, whether of literature or of music, alters this relationship. In this dense passage Adorno draws a distinction between the "descriptions and actions" of the text, and the "wild and colourful tone" that suffuses the reader's head. It is almost as if the meaning of the novel's words and the characters and events that these words create are secondary to the aesthetic experience of the novel's tone – even if in reality there is no separation between the two. It is important that the novelistic musicality that Adorno identifies once again consists not in the immediate, sonorous melodiousness of particular phrases, but in the complete inner experience of all the aspects of the novel, as it were in its polyphony.

This musicality, then, is not an audible phenomenon, but a way in which the novel is experienced, as a single, temporal flow made up of distinguishable parts which are nonetheless experienced as a unity. In symphonic music this unity is constituted by the interactions (sometimes simultaneous, sometimes overlapping, sometimes temporally discrete) of the different instruments and sections with one another, the ways in which elements such as themes and harmonic progressions recur and vary with respect to qualities such as tone, texture, register. For Adorno its novelistic analogue consists of the ways in which characters

appear and reappear, and the events described relate to one another; this could helpfully be expanded with respect to the technical repertoire of literature to include structural parallels such as repetitions and modulations not only in the events depicted but also in choices of diction, cadence and sentence structure. In this respect his work is underpinned by an alternative theory of the novel, one which focuses not so much on the way in which the literary work experiences the material world as on the reader's material experience of the work.

Although Adorno acknowledges the profundity of Balzac's insight with respect to the social and economic context of nineteenth-century France, and in particular to the destruction of individuals as a result of bourgeois individuation, his emphasis on the as it were second-order experiences of the different elements of the novel in their combination and interaction steers clear of the question of representation. As a result Adorno does not actively consider the interaction between the readerly experience of Balzac's prose and the question of the relationships between the fictional worlds which Balzac novels create and the social and political worlds inhabited by his readers – worlds which we wish to see transformed. This is a question on which Adorno reflects more extensively in the posthumously published *Ästhetische Theorie* (*Aesthetic Theory*):

> Mimetic comportment, an attitude toward reality this side of the fixed opposition of subject and object, is seized in art – the organ of mimesis since the mimetic taboo – by semblance and becomes, as complement to the autonomy of form, the bearer of semblance. The unfolding of art is that of a quid pro quo: expression, through which nonaesthetic experience reaches farthest into the work, becomes the ur-image of everything fictitious about art, as if it is at the point where culture is most permeable to real experience that it keeps guard most strictly to ensure that the boundary is not damaged. (Adorno 1970, 169)

What is important here is the relationship between mimesis and semblance. Semblance is the illusory or fictitious character of the work of art in its appearance; it is "the embodiment of the cognitive subjective attempt to observe, recognize, and copy the object as something foreign to itself" (Robinson 2018, 92). As such it proceeds from and depends on the hypostatization of the historical separation of subject from object. Mimesis, in contrast, predates this separation. It is a comportment rather than a deliberate subjective act, and involves not the subjective representation of an objective other, but rather the admission or reception of the external world into the individual (cf. Bubner 1997, 163; Früchtl 1986; Jay 1997, 32; Robinson 2018, 85–94; Schultz 1990; Wellmer 1985, 12; Wolin 1995, 75). Adorno is thus concerned with the way in which, with the transition from mimesis to semblance, subjective expression begins to take on a more prominent position within the work of art. This expression is the voice of non-art – of nonaesthetic, real experience – speaking within art: this is the force and significance of the

claim that expression is that "through which nonaesthetic experience reaches farthest into the work". The boundary at stake in the extract's final sentence is that between art and reality – the point at which the work of art admits nonartistic experience into itself is also the point at which it must insist the most forcefully on its separation from reality.

This question of the relationship between art and reality lies at the heart of Adorno's disagreement with Brecht, and of his objection to the trivialization of the dangers of fascism in particular:

> The comedy of the resistible rise of the great dictator Arturo Ui shifts what is subjectively null and illusory about the fascistic leader into a glaring and accurate light. The dismantling of leaders, however – like Brecht's consistent dismantling of the individual – is extended into the construction of the social and economic contexts in which the dictator acts. The conspiracy of those of power and means is supplanted by a ridiculous gangster organization, the cauliflower trust. The true horror of fascism is spirited away; it is no longer incubated in the concentration of social power, but haphazard, like accidents and crimes. Thus it prescribes the end to which it agitates: its opponent must be belittled, and that demands the wrong politics, in literature as in political praxis before 1933. (Adorno 1974b, 417–418)

At the heart of this disagreement between Adorno and Brecht is a fundamental difference between the two thinkers' conception of the political valency of the work of art. Against the argument that the politically engaged or committed work of art "demystifies that which only wants to exist as a fetish" that "distracts from the struggle over real interests" (Adorno 1974b, 409), Adorno advances the view that the contemporary political potency of art consists rather in the ideal of the autonomous artwork – of art for its own sake – which exhibits a radical potential precisely because of this autonomous work's refusal to submit to the logic of commodity society. For in commodity society, goods are produced for the sake not of what they are but of what they can be exchanged for. By claiming to stand for itself, the autonomous artwork offers an alternative to the instrumental logic of ends and means, and of production for the sake of exchange, and thus, in the formulation used in *Aesthetic Theory*, "wants to interrupt the eternal exchange of need and satisfaction, and not to offend by providing ersatz-satisfaction of unmet needs" (Adorno 1970, 362).

However, Adorno's objection that Brecht's play agitates toward misguided political action tacitly concedes not only the very link between literature and politics that he claims to reject, but also, moreover, accepts that the criterion for judging the work is political. That is to say, his judgement of *Der aufhaltsame Aufstieg des Arturo Ui* (1941, *The Resistible Rise of Arturo Ui*) already admits not only the motivational link between politics and the work of literature, the denial of which lies at the heart of Adorno's account of their relationship, but also its

decisiveness to the judgement itself. And the criterion at the heart of his indictment of Brecht's play is not that of political efficacy – either that of the play in inspiring its audience to political action or that of the political movements themselves in achieving their aims – but rather that of the particular political content implied by the play. It should be emphasized that this is not a question either of authorial intention (that is, of the political hopes or aspirations of the writer) or of the empirical questions of whether and what kind of actual movements are inspired by the play, but rather of the political implications of the analysis of the work itself – in the dual sense of the political analysis carried out by the work and of the political stance revealed by subjecting the work to critical analysis.

Indeed, it is a recurring motif within a range of Marxist and Marx-influenced discussions of the relationship between literature and society that there is a strong connection between these two aspects; as I have shown elsewhere, the fusing of what is revealed by the work of art or literature with the work of a social theorist is a manoeuvre that underpins, frequently in an unacknowledged manner, a good deal of contemporary socially-oriented literary criticism and theory (Robinson 2018, 214–217). This fusion can be traced back at least to Engels's claim discussed above that in the works of Balzac can be found "a most wonderfully realistic history of French 'Society'" (Marx and Engels 1973, 115): the novel is presented as providing not simply an image, a depiction or representation of society, but its history, as if the work of literature does not simply provide a document or source for the historian to use, but rather itself carries out critical and analytical work. That is to say, the novel carries out work that is akin in scope to – not identical with, but complementary to – that of the historian or social critic.

Adorno recognizes this affinity, and furthermore locates this critical work within what seem to be the smallest and most incidental details of artistic technique:

> It is precisely the faithfulness to the façade on the part of a procedure that has been cleansed of Balzacian deformations that – in socialist realism as in the culture industry – harmonizes with the intentions that are inserted into it – intentions by which Balzac's narration does not for a second let itself be distracted: planning confirms itself with reference to data which are removed from their structure, but what is planned in literature is the tendency. The point of Engels's claims turns against this – and thus implicitly against all art that has been tolerated in the East since Stalin. For Engels the greatness of Balzac proves itself in the depictions that run against his own class sympathies and political prejudices, which disavow the legitimist tendency. (Adorno 1974a, 152)

What is at stake in the first sentence of this quotation is the question of fidelity in the literary representation of the surface details of the society depicted within the novel: Adorno identifies what he describes as Balzacian "deformations" – the

moments where the novelist distorts the reality that he presents and is thereby "less realistic than his scientifically inclined descendant", Zola (Adorno 1974a, 151) – as the moments with the greatest social potential. But while he distinguishes the affirmative naturalism of Socialist Realism from the political potential that Engels identifies in Balzac, he locates this potential in the divergence from Realism rather than in the adherence to it. In some respects this distinction is terminological: Adorno's aim is the unforgetting of the separation that distinguishes Balzac from the compulsory Socialist Realism of Stalinism, which he seeks to achieve by introducing some conceptual distance between Balzac and (Socialist) Realism. More specifically, this distinction is made by means of the analysis that Balzac opposes the normative force of (Socialist) Realism, that he "pummelled the norm of Realism for the sake of truth", and with respect to the conclusion that his prose "does not bend itself before realities, but rather stares at them until they become transparent down to their terrors" (Adorno 1974a, 152): insofar as this is a Realism it is not one that involves either the "slavish faith in the external world as it appears this side of critique" that Adorno rejects in his account of the priority of the object (Adorno 1977b, 746) or the affirmation of that which exists.

4 Literature and the transformation of reality

Adorno's essay on Balzac is thus predicated on a relationship between literature and society that seems to differ from that which he would advance in the "Commitment" essay the following year: for his acknowledgement of the transformative political potential of the social critique enabled and instantiated by Balzac's prose admits the very connection between literature and social reality that his championing of the autonomous work denies. Autonomous works step outside the instrumental logic of means and ends – their dignity lies in the fact that they are "cognition as aconceptual object" (Adorno 1974b, 428). In its embrace of the gesture of addressing and persuading an audience, the message even of a truly politically radical work contains a moment of accommodation to the world as it is, for this gesture is predicated on "a secret agreement with those who are addressed, who could only be torn out of their delusion by the annulment of this very agreement" (Adorno 1974b, 429). The relationship between the committed work and the audience it addresses, that is, perpetuates the social order that the committed work purportedly wants to overturn. In rejecting the contemporary prospects of the committed work *tout court* Adorno thus goes beyond his criticism that Brecht's political theatre fails by implying the wrong political strategy (a readmission of the political criteria for judging the work of art that could be

defended or mitigated insofar as it diagnoses the failure of Brecht's plays on their own political terms).

Adorno emphasizes along with Engels that the work of art is able to carry out political work beyond and even against the intention and political sympathy of its author. Brecht, in contrast, focuses on the currency of the work of art, calling calls for a literature that is responsive to the changing conditions of reality:

> There exists not only *being popular*, but also *becoming popular*. If we want to have a living, combative literature that is fully captured by reality and that fully captures reality, a literature that is truly popular, we must keep pace with the rapacious development of reality. (Brecht 1967b, 331)

What is significant here is that Brecht is arguing not only for a responsiveness of literature to the needs that persist within the particular political situation at any given time, but also for the use in art of a variety of dramatic and technical means that interact with and stem from the current socio-political situation. The context to this remark is that Brecht is responding to Lukács's polemic in favour of Realism in *Das Wort*, objecting not to Lukács's normative claim of the obligation to strive toward "a conception and presentation of reality as it is actually constituted" as such, but rather, more specifically, to the resulting literary and aesthetic prescriptivism:

> The criteria for popularity and realism must thus be chosen both broadly and very carefully, and must not, as often takes place, be derived only from existing realist works and existing popular works. Proceeding in such a way would lead to formalist criteria and a popularity and realism according only to their form. (Brecht 1967b, 330)

Brecht's principal objection is to the petrification implicit in Lukács's insistence on Realism. That is to say, while he dissents from aspects of the understanding of the interaction between literature and society that Lukács develops from Engels, his target is the way in which Lukács derives a formal prescriptivism from this understanding. More specifically, underpinning Lukács's prescription is a static conception of Realism that does not allow for formal innovation or revolution. Indeed, while by the time of his 1938 essay on Realism Lukács's thought had come to differ considerably from the romantic anti-capitalism that characterized *The Theory of the Novel*, this static conception is compatible with the insistence in the earlier book that the novel is the "epopee of an age for which the extensive totality of life is no longer a sensuous given, for which the immanence to life of meaning has become a problem, and which nonetheless has a disposition toward totality" (Lukács 1971, 47). While Lukács in his foreword to the 1962 edition would criticize the limitations of the method of his earlier book (Lukács 1971, 6–8), the static con-

ception of genre that underpins his exhortation to Realism is entirely compatible with the insistence on the appropriateness of the novel to bourgeois society.

Brecht, in contrast, focuses his attention on the changes in society and (including but not only for this reason) insists on the importance of innovation in the means and techniques deployed in art and literature:

> It is of course to be expected that the steam engine, microscope, generator and so on, that the Standard Oil Trust, the Rockefeller Institute, Paramount Film and so on, have correspondences in literary technique which can themselves no more than all these new phenomena simply be buried along with the capitalist system. Even for the description of the processes in which human beings find themselves in late capitalism, the forms of the Rousseauian novel of education, or the techniques by means of which Stendhal and Balzac describe the career of a young bourgeois, are extraordinarily obsolete. (Brecht 1967a, 360–361)

There are multiple interwoven strands contained within these two deceptively rich sentences, the density of which pertains not to the complexity of their argument but rather to the manifold interrelations between the different phenomena to which Brecht alludes. The first of these consists in the changes in the nature and manifestation of industrial capitalism by the late 1960s, as the establishment and power of large-scale corporations come to shape multiple elements of the social world and of the individual's interaction with it, not only through the labour process. This is the sense in which Brecht can claim that "[t]he works of Joyce and Döblin provide a significant indication of the world-historical contradiction into which the forces of production and the relations of production have fallen" (Brecht 1967a, 361): the consolidation of economic and political power comes to constrain the productive forces rather than setting them free.

The second is the relationship of art to its context of the development of technology. In the 1930s Brecht had famously championed the use of technologies on stage – particularly those used in mass communication and advertising – not simply to ensure a more realistic representation of the technological mediation of contemporary life, but to the end of developing new theatrical techniques that challenge the spectator by defamiliarizing the presentation of events that take place on stage (Brecht 1993). This concern with the artistic potential of new technologies was of course not specific to Brecht; Walter Benjamin's insistence that art seek to undo alienation not by embracing and probing the artistic potential of new technologies is perhaps the best-known example (Benjamin 1974; cf. Buck-Morss 1992, 5). The development of these technologies, though, which come to be deployed and explored within art, is frequently motivated by the exigencies of commodity production, and in some cases also by the requirements of the state to exercise control and discipline over human beings within its borders, and not infrequently to demonstrate the potential for military action beyond them.

The use in art of technologies from industrial production thus represents a site of interaction – more specifically, of mediation – between the artwork and the social context to which it offers resistance, regardless of how this resistance is theorized. The precise nature of the differences between the Adornian, Brechtian and Lukácsian – and indeed the Benjaminian, Blochian and all variety of other – accounts of the relationships between art, politics and society is in many respects of secondary importance to the further development of theoretical accounts that are adequate to contemporary capitalism. Indeed, even the incompatibilities between these theories – such as the objection that the proponents of the committed work and the more prescriptive advocates of Realism alike concede an instrumental view of art that distracts from or negates the artwork's potential to offer an alternative to commodity production – can in many respects be softened by recognizing multiple tendencies within the artwork, a recognition that becomes all the more plausible with the increasing permeability of the boundaries not only between the different arts (Adorno 1977a, 432), but also between art and what is not art, or not only art.

This dissolution of the limit between art and non-art has structural parallels with changes in the nature of labour. For as it becomes more and more difficult to distinguish between labour time and leisure time (in part because of the similarity in activities that are carried out within the workplace and outside it, in part because of the increasing extent to which many workers are compelled to spend more and more of their notionally free time seeking and applying or bidding for the next gig), the category of abstract labour, which only comes about in the first place as a result of capital's drive to standardize and intensify labour (Lohoff 1986; Postone 2003, 123–185), itself begins to decompose. One link between these two developments is technology: the same technological advances that are incorporated into the work of art also render increasing amounts of labour redundant, thus expelling them from the process of production (Kurz 2014; Ortlieb 2014). This is in many respects the further development of the phenomenon that underlies Adorno's observation that "the market economy has been perforated to such an extent that it sneers at" the prospect of bringing its dynamic categories into confrontation with its theoretical model (Adorno 1972, 359).

But whereas in Adorno's time it was the case that the productive forces and the relations of production were "entangled in one another; one contains the other in itself", that the productive force were mediated through the relations of production "so thoroughly that the latter appear as the essence for this very reason; they have fully become second nature" (Adorno 1972, 365), the erosion of the material base for commodity production as a result of the expulsion of labour from the process of production now threatens to undermine the basis for capitalist socialization. As Jasper Bernes has observed, these developments in political

economy are already having effects that are visible in much of the most interesting politically engaged contemporary poetry (Bernes 2017, 194–196). The challenge for contemporary Marxian literary theory, in the wake of the debates discussed within this chapter, is not only to theorize the social and political implications of these poetic developments, but also to contribute to the development of a transformative practice that can learn from poetry's resistance to the mediation of life through the commodity form, and that is oriented toward our liberation from it.

References

Adorno, Theodor W. *Ästhetische Theorie*. Theodor W. Adorno, *Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol. 7. Eds. Rolf Tiedemann and Gretel Adorno. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1970.

Adorno, Theodor W. "Spätkapitalismus oder Industriegesellschaft?" Theodor W. Adorno, *Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol. 8: *Soziologische Schriften* 1. Eds. Rolf Tiedemann and Gretel Adorno. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1972. 354–370.

Adorno, Theodor W. "Balzac–Lektüre." Theodor W. Adorno, *Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol. 11: *Noten zur Literatur*. Eds. Rolf Tiedemann and Gretel Adorno. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1974a. 139–157.

Adorno, Theodor W. "Engagement." Theodor W. Adorno, *Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol. 11: *Noten zur Literatur*. Eds. Rolf Tiedemann and Gretel Adorno. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1974b. 409–430.

Adorno, Theodor W. "Rückblickend auf den Surrealismus." Theodor W. Adorno, *Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol. 11: *Noten zur Literatur*. Eds. Rolf Tiedemann and Gretel Adorno. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1974c. 101–105.

Adorno, Theodor W. *Philosophie der neuen Musik*. Theodor W. Adorno, *Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol. 12. Eds. Rolf Tiedemann and Gretel Adorno. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1975.

Adorno, Theodor W. "Die Kunst und die Künste." Theodor W. Adorno, *Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol. 10: *Kulturkritik und Gesellschaft* 1. Eds. Rolf Tiedemann and Gretel Adorno. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1977a. 432–453.

Adorno, Theodor W. "Zu Subjekt und Objekt." Theodor W. Adorno, *Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol. 10: *Kulturkritik und Gesellschaft* 2. Eds. Rolf Tiedemann and Gretel Adorno. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1977b. 645–655.

Adorno, Theodor W. "Letter to Herbert Marcuse: August 6, 1969." *Frankfurter Schule und Studentenbewegung: Von der Flaschenpost zum Molotowcocktail 1946–1995*. Vol. 2: *Dokumente, 1946–1995*. Ed. Wolfgang Kraushaar. Hamburg: Rogner und Bernhard, 1998a. 671.

Adorno, Theodor W. "Letter to Herbert Marcuse: February 14, 1969." *Frankfurter Schule und Studentenbewegung: Von der Flaschenpost zum Molotowcocktail 1946–1995*. Vol. 2: *Dokumente, 1946–1995*. Ed. Wolfgang Kraushaar. Hamburg: Rogner und Bernhard, 1998b. 574–575.

Adorno, Theodor W. "Letter to Herbert Marcuse: May 5, 1969." *Frankfurter Schule und Studentenbewegung: Von der Flaschenpost zum Molotowcocktail 1946–1995*. Vol. 2: *Dokumente, 1946–1995*. Ed. Wolfgang Kraushaar. Hamburg: Rogner und Bernhard, 1998c. 624–625.

Anderson, Perry. *Considerations on Western Marxism*. London: Verso, 1979.

Barnett, David. *A History of the Berliner Ensemble*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Bathrick, David. "The Dialectics of Legitimation: Brecht in the GDR." *New German Critique* 2 (1974): 90–103. https://doi.org/10.2307/487957 (08 August 2019).

Benjamin, Walter. "Das Kunstwerk im Zeitalter seiner technischen Reproduzierbarkeit." Walter Benjamin, *Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol. 1.1. Ed. Rolf Tiedemann. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1974. 431–508.

Bernes, Jasper. *The Work of Art in the Age of Deindustrialization*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2017. http://www.sup.org/books/title/?id=26300 (8 August 2019).

Bloch, Ernst. *Erbschaft dieser Zeit*. Ernst Bloch, *Werkausgabe in 16 Bänden*. Vol. 4. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1985.

Brecht, Bertolt. "Notizen über realistische Schreibweise." Bertolt Brecht, *Gesammelte Werke in 20 Bänden*. Vol. 19: *Schriften zur Literatur und Kunst* 2. Ed. Suhrkamp Verlag in collaboration with Elisabeth Hauptmann. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1967a. 349–373.

Brecht, Bertolt. "Volkstümlichkeit und Realismus." Bertolt Brecht, *Gesammelte Werke in 20 Bänden*. Vol. 19: *Schriften zur Literatur und Kunst* 2. Ed. Suhrkamp Verlag in collaboration with Elisabeth Hauptmann. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1967b. 322–331.

Brecht, Bertolt. "Vergnügungstheater oder Lehrtheater?" Bertolt Brecht, *Große kommentierte Berliner und Frankfurter Ausgabe*. Vol. 22: *Schriften 2.1*. Ed. Werner Hecht. Bern and Frankfurt/M.: Aufbau and Suhrkamp, 1993. 106–116.

Bubner, Rüdiger. "Concerning the Central Idea of Adorno's Philosophy." *The Semblance of Subjectivity: Essays in Adorno's Aesthetic Theory*. Trans. by Cara Gendel Ryan. Eds. Tom Huhn and Lambert Zuidervaart. Cambridge, MA, and London: MIT Press, 1997. 147–175.

Buck-Morss, Susan. "Aesthetics and Anaesthetics: Walter Benjamin's Artwork Essay Reconsidered." *October* 62 (1992): 3–41.

Früchtl, Josef. *Mimesis: Konstellation eines Zentralbegriffs bei Adorno*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 1986.

Gouldner, Alvin W. *The Two Marxisms: Contradictions and Anomalies in the Development of Theory*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1980.

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *Wissenschaft der Logik II*. Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, *Werke in 20 Bänden*. Vol. 6. Eds. Eva Moldenhauer and Karl Markus Michel. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1986.

Jay, Martin. "Mimesis and Mimetology: Adorno and Lacoue-Labarthe." *The Semblance of Subjectivity: Essays in Adorno's Aesthetic Theory*. Eds. Tom Huhn and Lambert Zuidervaart. Cambridge, MA, and London: MIT Press, 1997. 29–53.

Kurz, Robert. "The Crisis of Exchange Value: Science as Productive Force, Productive Labor, and Capitalist Reproduction." *Marxism and the Critique of Value*. Eds. Neil Larsen, Mathias Nilges, Josh Robinson, and Nicholas Brown. Chicago, IL, and Alberta: MCM', 2014. 17–75.

Lenin, Vladimir Ilyich. "Once Again on the Trade Unions, the Current Situation and the Mistakes of Trotsky and Bukharin." Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, *Collected Works*. Vol. 32: *December 1920– August 1921*. Ed. Yuri Sdobnikov. Moscow: Progress, 1973. 70–107.

Lohoff, Ernst. "Die Kategorie der abstrakten Arbeit und ihre historische Entfaltung." *Marxistische Kritik* 1 (1986): 49–69.

Lukács, Georg. "Es geht um den Realismus." *Das Wort* 6 (June 1938): 112–138.

Lukács, Georg. *Die Theorie des Romans: Ein geschichtsphilosophischer Versuch über die Formen der großen Epik*. Darmstadt and Neuwied: Luchterhand, 1971.

Marcuse, Herbert. "Letter to Theodor W. Adorno: April 5, 1969." *Frankfurter Schule und Studen-tenbewegung: Von der Flaschenpost zum Molotowcocktail 1946–1995*. Vol. 2: *Dokumente, 1946–1995*. Ed. Wolfgang Kraushaar. Hamburg: Rogner und Bernhard, 1998a. 601–602.

Marcuse, Herbert. "Letter to Theodor W. Adorno: June 4, 1969." *Frankfurter Schule und Studen-tenbewegung: Von der Flaschenpost zum Molotowcocktail*. Vol. 2: *Dokumente, 1946–1995*. Ed. Wolfgang Kraushaar. Hamburg: Rogner und Bernhard, 1998b. 649–650.

Marx, Karl. *Das Kapital: Kritik der politischen Ökonomie*. Vol. 1. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *Werke*. Vol. 23. Berlin: Dietz, 1962.

Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. *Marx & Engels on Literature and Art: A Selection of Writings*. Eds. Lee Baxandall and Stefan Morawski. St. Louis, MO: Telos Press, 1973.

Ortlieb, Claus Peter. "A Contradiction between Matter and Form: On the Significance of the Production of Relative Surplus Value in the Dynamic of Terminal Crisis." *Marxism and the Critique of Value*. Eds. Neil Larsen, Mathias Nilges, Josh Robinson, and Nicholas Brown. Chicago, IL, and Alberta: MCM', 2014. 77–121.

Postone, Moishe. *Time, Labor, and Social Domination: A Reinterpretation of Marx's Critical Theory*. Cambridge and New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Radek, Karl. "Contemporary World Literature and the Tasks of Proletarian Art." *Problems of Soviet Literature: Reports and Speeches at the First Soviet Writers' Conference*. Ed. H. G. Scott. London: M. Lawrence, 1935.

Robin, Régine. *Socialist Realism: An Impossible Aesthetic*. Trans. by Catherine Porter. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1992.

Robinson, Josh. *Adorno's Poetics of Form* (*SUNY Series in Contemporary Continental Philosophy*). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2018.

Schultz, Karla L. *Mimesis on the Move: Theodor W. Adorno's Concept of Imitation*. Bern, Frankfurt/M., New York, NY, and Paris: Peter Lang, 1990.

Wellmer, Albrecht. *Zur Dialektik von Moderne und Postmoderne: Vernunftkritik nach Adorno*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1985.

Wolin, Richard. *The Terms of Cultural Criticism: The Frankfurt School, Existentialism, Poststruc-turalism*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1995.

Wolin, Richard. "Benjamin, Adorno, Surrealism." *The Semblance of Subjectivity: Essays in Adorno's Aesthetic Theory*. Eds. Tom Huhn and Lambert Zuidervaart. Cambridge, MA, and London: MIT Press, 1997. 93–122.

Craig Brandist
Sociological and Marxist Literary Theory in Colonial Context

Critical engagement with Western scholarship about those parts of the world that were adversely affected by colonialism, and artistic literature from and about those parts of the world have a longer history than is commonly appreciated. Emergent Marxist and Marxist-inflected but more general sociological studies of the question have a particularly rich and complex history that is often elided in mainstream accounts of postcolonial scholarship.

The publication of Edward Said's *Orientalism* in 1978 led to a significant reorientation of literary studies in Europe and the United States. Challenges to the established canon of works studied in universities and a new sensitivity to the colonial and racial biases in many established approaches to culture came to the fore. Said's book was largely directed against those intellectuals in US academia who he regarded as complicit in bolstering the ideological case for the state's intervention in the Middle East and how this continued policies that had been established by British and French imperialism. Here Said developed what Timothy Brennan calls a "patented eclectic amalgam in which the concepts of discursive network, hegemony, the homologies of Lucien Goldmann, and cultural materialism all mix" (Brennan 2006, 111). Michel Foucault's notions of discourse and power/knowledge lay alongside Marxist ideas such as Antonio Gramsci's ideas about hegemony and Raymond Williams's ideas about culture as a way of life, as well as Noam Chomsky's libertarian critique of US foreign policy.

While Said became increasingly outspoken in his criticisms of Foucault, and more nuanced in his attitude towards Marxism (about which he had made a number of unsubstantiated criticisms in *Orientalism*), Said's book was adopted by poststructuralist thinkers as legitimizing a type of postcolonial criticism fundamentally based on Foucault's ideas and as such hostile to Marxism, which was generally portrayed as "an extreme form of European Enlightenment thinking" (Kemper 2006, 6) and as a Eurocentric doctrine. As this form of postcolonialism became established throughout Western universities, it achieved the status of what the philosopher of science Thomas Kuhn (1970, 35–42) called "normal science", with PhD theses written and academic careers built by taking Said's alleged "innovation" for granted and concentrating on "puzzle solving" rather than producing phenomenal or theoretical novelties. Textbooks used to train graduate students often present a historical mythology about the origins of postcolonial theory according to what the theorists themselves regarded as their accomplishments. This involved a straw-man image of the Enlightenment, seen as positing

"an abstract, Eurocentric universalism based on the rationalistic assumption of scientific certainty and on an essentially religious confidence in the inevitability of historical progress" (Callinicos 1995, 736). The highly contested dialogues between the radical, atheistic currents within the Enlightenment, beginning with Spinoza's philosophy, and those moderate *philosophes* determined to reconcile the advance of science with religious prejudices and the established social order on which Jonathan Israel (2006) has written in detail, are largely ignored. The rise of colonialism acted on this field in complex ways (Israel 2006, 590–614). The poststructuralist theory of language relegated considerations of complex historical processes that were refracted through discursive interaction as, at best, of secondary importance.

Said's book overshadowed the publication of another important work on the topic the same year: Bryan S. Turner's *Marx and the End of Orientalism* (1978), in which the author noted that Marx's early work was still insufficiently separated from Hegelian assumptions about the orient, and that these still appeared in certain works by contemporary Marxists. On this issue, as many others, noted Turner, "there is no such thing as a homogenous tradition of Marxist analysis" (Turner 1978, 8). In recent years there has been a considerable amount of scholarship showing the extent to which Marx's own ideas about colonialism, and non-European societies more generally, developed considerably during his long career, particularly in response to anti-colonial uprisings in Ireland, Poland and India. This helped Marx gradually to free his work from the stereotypes embedded in the positivist history he was reading (see, for instance, Habib 2006; Anderson 2010; Achcar 2013). Marx's own musings on literature draw heavily on the European literature he knew well but did not amount to a generalized theoretical perspective. Developing Goethe's ideas, however, Marx sees the development of capitalism facilitating the overcoming of national limitations in culture and the rise of a world literature (Prawer 1978, 138–165). This is a perspective the next generations of Marxists inherited. Such thinkers were often limited by their own familiarity with European rather than other literature as Marxists focused on the development of the labour movement in European states, but they laid the foundations for a more expansive approach to world literature.

1 Studying the literature of the 'East'

European study of non-European languages and cultures was given a major boost by the development of British and French colonialism, and was initially embedded in colonial institutions. Interest in the culture of the Indian subcontinent in

particular soon took on a much more generalized form, however, and found a particularly enthusiastic audience in Germany in the nineteenth century, which became a major centre of Oriental Studies. German nationalist intellectuals often sought to legitimize the historical validity of German *Kultur* in distinction to French *Zivilisation*, by tracing the former's ancestry back to the achievements of Sanskrit, while the latter was traceable to the less ancient Latin (for an overview see McGetchin 2009). This often resulted in formulations critical of British and French oriental studies, but received scant attention in Said's seminal work of 1978. Neither did the development of oriental studies in Russia receive due attention, leading to a significant overgeneralization in the characterization of European scholarship about the East.

For the first half of the nineteenth-century Western engagements with the literature of Asia was subordinated to the narratives of Indo-European philology, which sought to establish kinship relations between languages and cultures and trace the origins of European civilization back to a putative Indo-European homeland by means of the so-called comparative method. The diffusion of phonetic elements and narrative motifs were assumed to have accompanied the migration of peoples from their original homelands. This procedure assumed the Biblical narrative of the descent of all peoples from the sons of Noah and the commonly held belief, based on calculations made about the number of generations detailed in the Old Testament, that the world was only six thousand years old. Some scholarship about the Orient challenged the Biblical timeline, but it was the discovery of fossil remains of early man that led to a paradigm shift in the humanities. Assumptions of European superiority now began to be justified less commonly by the Biblical narrative as by directly racial criteria, often supported by the identification of Indo-European cultures with the Aryan race. One manifestation of this was the attempt to present the life of Jesus as a narrative based on the life of Buddha, which served simultaneously to locate European culture within the Indo-European tradition, and to weaken any reliance of European on Semitic cultures. Nietzsche meanwhile, sought to derive European culture from ancient Greece with no debt either to Persia or pharaonic Egypt, and this was later reinforced by, *inter alia*, Heidegger.

Others rejected such reasoning and posited a universal process of cultural evolution according to the dominant positivist schema of the late nineteenth century. The mental development of all societies was here seen as passing through three universal stages: theological, metaphysical and scientific. European societies were generally viewed as the most developed societies and ways of thinking, while non-Europeans were lagging behind in their development. Such reasoning tended to justify colonialism on the basis of a European 'civilizing mission'. Both trends were often eclectically combined with a romantic nationalism, according

to which the rise of national languages and cultures signified the emergence of a shared, national, psychological makeup (*Völkerpsychologie*). This idea was one that also permeated the movements for national independence that emerged in the late nineteenth century.

Ancient, and especially religious texts were the focus of most European study at the time, and contemporary literature from the colonial world was largely ignored. Thus, the Vedas had been subject to much scrutiny in the early nineteenth century, while the Old Testament was subjected to considerable critical analysis towards the end of the century. The German scholar Julius Wellhausen (1899 [1883]), for instance, revealed the text of the Bible to be a palimpsestic text that resulted from the overlay of a number of texts over time. These 'layers' could be correlated with the development of the Middle East through stages of social evolution. The sociological approach to ancient Judaism was further strengthened by the work of Max Weber (1921) and the Marxist Moses Lurje (1927). At this time the Buddhist sutras were also subjected to analysis and correlated to emergent social forms. In most cases, however, it was assumed that the application of European paradigms was necessary to reveal the worldviews embedded in such texts, and that indigenous scholarship was of extremely questionable value. This was despite the fact that most European scholars of Indo-European languages and cultures had been reliant on Hindu scholars (Pandits) who studied the ancient texts but were rarely credited in European studies.

This condescending attitude towards indigenous scholarship was much less pronounced among Russian orientologists who emerged towards the end of the nineteenth century. The study of Buddhism in Russia, for instance, began with an engagement with the living traditions of the Buddhist communities in Siberia, and drew respectfully on the work of scholar-monks working in so-called *datsans*, the seminaries of Tibetan-style monasteries. Early Russian Buddhologists and Indologists like Vasilii Vasil'ev (1818–1900) and Ivan Minaev (1840–1890), for instance, studied religious doctrines through an engagement with texts collected and translated by indigenous scholars and they encouraged their students to engage with indigenous forms of knowledge. The school of oriental studies founded by Baron Viktor Rozen (1849–1908) in St. Petersburg followed this trend closely, encouraging a study of 'Russia's own orient' that avoided and indeed combated the simplistic dichotomies of East and West that permeated British and French orientalism in particular (Tolz 2011). The established narratives of European superiority suited Russia's Eurasian empire rather poorly, but the positivist notion of a universal process of cultural evolution drawing various peoples together was enthusiastically received. These scholars were very critical of Tsarist nationality policies, which sought to replace indigenous historical, political and social structures with the general structures of the Empire (Lowe 1992), and espoused the pro-

motion of regional cultures and identities within the common civic space of the Empire which would lead to the emergence of a hybrid pan-Russian identity. This was in essence an early version of multiculturalism according to which formal recognition and cultural autonomy would, it was hoped, undermine separatist sentiments. The right to full national self-determination was not something such scholars were prepared to entertain, however, and the imperial Russian state was not interested in any such programme of promoting local cultures and identity within a shared political space. This was, however, to emerge as a central policy in the USSR in the 1920s, and many of the same specialists participated in its implementation.

In Russian academic studies the 'East' signified the space from "the Caucasus and Central Asia to the Indian Ocean and the countries of the African Lakes, from the borders between Iran and India to Gibraltar; the ancient history of this entire space 'represents a fully finalized whole'" (Bartol'd 2012 [1918], 4–5), while China and Japan were considered the Far East and India as Asia. While heavily repressed, the Russian 'East' was subject to considerable study by academic orientologists, who sought to dispel stereotypes about their cultures and celebrated past achievements while seeking to encourage their peaceful integration into the Russian state. These thinkers developed a critique of French and British studies of the Orient, particularly as embedded in Indo-European philology, on the basis of the colonial ideology that permeated them.

2 Russian Marxism

The development of Marxism in the Russian Empire was accompanied by a rise in the topicality of relations between European and non-European cultures. Tsarist nationality policy imposed imperial forms on subject nationalities and created a rigid hierarchy. Meanwhile, intellectuals from subject nationalities such as Poland, and Russian populist revolutionaries developed sympathetic forms of anthropological study of the peoples of Siberia while in political exile there. With the defeat of the Russian fleet by the Japanese fleet in 1905, and the revolutionary upsurge that followed, the politics of national liberation became more prominent as assumptions of the superiority of European civilization were questioned. Lenin in particular recognized the significance of the 1905 defeat of the Russian state by the ascendant Japanese state, noting that "advancing, progressive Asia has dealt backward and reactionary Europe an irreparable blow" (Lenin 1962 [1905], 48–49). The impact of the defeat across Asia was considerable (see Mishra 2012). The formation of Marxist political organisations across the Empire further raised

the importance of the national and colonial question among Marxists, although this remained subordinate to the formation of a political movement across the Empire until after the October 1917 Revolution and the Civil War that followed.

From this time two trends in Soviet oriental studies appeared, one based in the institutions of the Academy of Sciences in Petrograd-Leningrad and dominated by figures who led pre-Revolutionary oriental studies, and a 'new', Moscow-based trend dominated by mainly young Marxist scholars who focused on the contemporary East and foregrounded the study of political and socio-economic formations. They also sought to recast the notion of the 'East' as something based on economic rather than cultural geography. As Mikhail Pavlovich-Vel'tman, head of the new All-Russian Scientific Association of Oriental Studies (VNAV), put it, the task of the association was to study "the entire world on whose exploitation the power of the capitalist society in Europe and the United States rests" (Pavlovich 1922, 9). Oriental philologists nevertheless continued to operate on the basis of the established cultural geography. Indeed, pre-Revolutionary philologists remained oriented on ancient texts and were largely concentrated in the Leningrad institutions, while Moscow oriental studies focused on contemporary economics and politics. There are, however, significant exceptions. One such was the work of Solomon Vel'tman, brother of Mikhail Pavlovich-Vel'tman. In a series of articles in the VNAV journal *Novyi Vostok* (*The New East*), which were subsequently combined into a monograph *Vostok v khudozhestvennoi literature* (*The East in Artistic Literature*, [Vel'tman 1928]), Vel'tman discussed the ways in which literature had become one of the means through which European imperial powers presented ideologically motivated representations of the East that justified their colonial enterprises. While perceptive observations lie throughout these articles, Vel'tman was less able to appreciate the importance of the work of writers resisting colonialism such as the 1913 Nobel Laureate, the Bengali polymath Rabindranath Tagore, who he presented as a mystic or an enigma for the Russian reader. Here Vel'tman treated Tagore's work solely in its relationship to the struggle against British imperialism, locating Tagore alongside Mahatma Gandhi, as characterized (negatively) by the Bengali communist M. N. Roy. Similar to Vel'tman, but more positively, Commissar of Enlightenment Anatolii Lunacharskii connected Tagore to Gandhi, who he called the Indian Tolstoi (Lunacharsky 1923). Another prominent Marxist critic of the time, Aleksandr Voronskii (1918), noted that Tagore is not simply a poet but a "a prophet and the greatest teacher of life", a revolutionary contribution to the Indian struggle for independence. While sensitive to the subtle forms of Tagore's poetry, Voronskii's work remained a piece of journalism and his more systematic literary scholarship remained focused on Russia and Europe. More sustained and academic work on Indian literature can be found in the work of Rozaliia Shor, a trained specialist in Sanskrit who worked at a number

of Moscow institutions, written simultaneously with her work on language and society. Shor's focus remained the literature of the ancient world, however.

In general, Marxist engagement with the literature of the East was limited by the availability of translations and the specialisms of Marxists themselves. Nevertheless, the Vsemirnaia literatura (World Literature) publishing house was established by Maksim Gor'kii as early as 1918, with widespread official support. In its earliest years the publishing house concentrated on making the classics from Western Europe available in cheap editions to a wide audience, but nevertheless managed to publish a two-volume anthology *Literature of the East* in 1919–1920 with critical material provided by the most important specialists of the period, most of whom were representatives of the 'old' oriental studies based in Petrograd-Leningrad.

The division between the two branches of oriental studies began to be eroded once the policy of *korenizatsiia* (nativization or indigenization) was established. A process of cross-fertilization of ideas now took place. New institutions were established to standardize and codify the languages of the former colonies of the empire, to study and raise awareness of their cultural heritage, and to develop an indigenous press, theatre, education system and administrative structure. The promotion of the literature and folklore of the former colonies of the Empire led to a significant amount of research as new specialists were trained in the oriental languages of the USSR. Engaged in collective projects and dealing specifically with the institutional aspects of cultures, the younger generation of researchers imbibed Marxism while developing new specialisms and certain older scholars adapted their approach to certain Marxist ideas to various degrees.

3 Questions of method

In literary studies the pre-Revolutionary substratum of nascent comparative literature, developed by the Neophilological Society of St. Petersburg University under the leadership of Aleksandr Veselovskii, exerted a strong and formative influence. Veselovskii had broken away from the then dominant type of Indo-European philology, which sought to trace forms of language, motifs and narratives back to a putative Indo-European homeland, and posited the idea that there was a single process of literary development in which all cultures participate. The rise of specific literary genres, poetic metaphors and plots could be correlated to stages in the psychic development of societies from a primordial syncretism to fully articulated linguistic and literary forms. While similar but individual semantic units arose independently, they entered into combinations, embodying

the convergence of ways of life and of thinking. All languages and cultures were thus rendered to some extent hybrids, and that was particularly true of the Eurasian Russian Empire where a multitude of ethnic and language groups coexisted within a single state. Prominent specialists in oriental studies, such as the Indologist Sergei Ol′denburg and the archaeologist and Caucasian philologist Nikolai Marr, were also involved in the Neophilological society and sought to develop a study of the cultures of 'Russia's own Orient' in connection with those of the Indian and Semitic cultural spheres.

While Veselovskii's work was an unstable mixture of romanticism, positivism and psychologism, the next generation of scholars, many of whom had been his students, sought to bring a greater theoretical rigor to specific aspects of his work. The Petrograd formalists (Viktor Shklovskii, Boris Ėikhenbaum, Lev Iakubinskii and others), who established the Society for the Study of Poetic Language (OPOIaZ), sought to delineate the object of the sphere of literary studies as such, 'literariness' (*literaturnost'*), a quality which transcended the products of any given culture or tradition. Others sought to develop the historical elements of Veselovskii's theory by grounding them in a systematic sociology of the type advocated by Nikolai Bukharin in his 1921 textbook of Marxism, *Teoriia istoricheskogo materializma (populiarnyi uchebnik marksistskoi sotsiologii)* (*The Theory of Historical Materialism: A Popular Manual of Marxist Sociology*, translated as Bukharin 1926). This book, which was severely criticized by Marxists such as Antonio Gramsci and Georg Lukács, as well as by Lenin himself, became required reading at Soviet universities and research institutes in the 1920s, and proposed such ideas as language is part of the superstructure and that ideology is the crystallization of social psychology. It also built on ideas, earlier advanced by Georgii Plekhanov (1953 [1899–1900]) in his *Pis'ma bez adresa* (*Letters Without Address)* and by Aleksandr Bogdanov in a number of publications, that language and reason arose from cries aimed at coordinating collective labour and developed according to the organization of collective labour (a proposition that had originated in the work of Ludwig Noiré) and that the rhythm of labour exerted a defining influence on forms of art and of thinking (which had originated in the work of Karl Bücher). On this basis the evolution of literary forms could be regarded not as the achievement of any particular ethnic group or culture but as expressions of a universal process of ways of thinking rooted in the development of socio-economic formations and collective human labour.

Although Marxist terminology was ubiquitous in these theories, they might best be characterized as forms of materialist anthropology, ontology of labour, materialistic monism, economic determinism or sociological positivism. They allowed a rather eclectic sociology to emerge that allowed various compromise formations between certain trends in pre-Revolutionary orientalism, philology

and literary criticism on the one hand and Marxism on the other. Typical representatives were Vladimir Friche, Valerian Perevertsev and Pavel Sakulin, who wrote extensively about the history of Russian and Western literature from a sociological perspective. In Leningrad a more sustained and sophisticated sociological approach to verbal culture began to emerge with the development of a type of sociological poetics that treated social factors as internal to the work itself rather than simply an external, conditioning influence. Stylistic features were understood to embody socially specific worldviews, which changed historically and combined in various ways. In the novel, such worldviews intersected as representatives of different social groups engaged in different acts of communication on the basis of a shared national language. Some of these projects are discussed in the article on ILIaZV. Crucially, however, the study of literary forms and verbal culture became more fully comparative, being limited neither to national cultures, nor to assumptions of ethnic and linguistic kinship. Instead of seeking to determine the ethnic or geographical origin of European cultural phenomena, comparison should lead to a reconsideration of all assumptions about the privileged position of Europe. The Indologist Mikhail Tubianskii set out the rationale well:

> Nobody has yet written a history of European culture through comparisons with that of the far East or India. Nobody has carried out these comparisons, though it is quite evident that much, very much, in European culture would appear to us in a completely different light if we were able to juxtapose one to the other. This task is inescapable, for the comparative method is the categorical imperative of science. We cannot with any surety pass judgment on any phenomenon of European culture while it appears to us as only one of a kind, with which there is nothing to compare, just as it is impossible to judge a language if one knows only one language – one's own. (Tubianskii 1990 [1927], 176)

One of the first major products was Nikolai Konrad's publication of a number of translated extracts from Japanese literature with detailed introductions relating the extracts to their sociohistorical contexts. Seeking to popularize Japanese literature and to combat Eurocentric assumptions, Konrad (1927, 522–535) brought the narrative forms of Japanese literature under the nomenclature of European scholarship. The *monogatari* (extended prose narrative tale) Konrad identified with the *povest-gunki monogatari* (literally 'war tales') he related to the epic and *yomihon* (literally 'reading books') he designated the novel. These were all forms written in high style but coexisted with so-called *gisaku* texts, verse or prose works often accompanied by graphic art, that Konrad terms the literature of the grotesque. Such works were comic and humorous, but often also parodic, satirical, pornographic in the form of short verses, bawdy stories, anecdotes and the like. Such literature served the cause of realistic portrayal, especially as the barriers between the two types of literature began to break down, with the social

changes that accompanied the rise of trade and the beginnings of capitalist development.

Konrad published a second volume of translations of Japanese literature with commentaries in 1935, by which time he was drawing explicit parallels between stages in the development of Japanese, Chinese and European literatures. He now found the epic, chivalric novel, intimate lyric and religious drama to be among the forms common to each society. While conceding one cannot find Chinese or Japanese analogues for Dante or Rabelais, Konrad asserted that there is nothing in European literature to rival a developed realist novel like the eleventh-century *Genji monogatari* (*The Tale of Genji)* (Konrad 1935, 9–10). In the USSR, he noted, "there is no place for bourgeois limitations, that doesn't want to see anything apart from the West and the ancient world". The great works of the East, just like those of the West, needed to be "critically assimilated" (Konrad 1935, 12). Konrad here was following the rather rigid scheme of social development through a series of socioeconomic formations that came to dominate Soviet Marxism in the 1930s.

4 Influence

Studies of other non-European literature also became more common at this time. The literary and critical works of Tagore began to be published in translations from the original Bengali, by Tubianskii and others. Tagore himself visited the USSR in 1930, where he was warmly received, consolidating a trend that was to have significant effects on the formation of postcolonial thought. In the 1930s, and particularly following the rise to power of the Nazis in Germany, the Stalin regime presented itself as the champion of humanistic values, aiming to lead a popular front of progressive politics and culture across the world. Following behind Tagore, a number of influential figures from the cultural sphere visited the USSR at the time including the black US poet Langston Hughes in 1932, the black US actor and singer Paul Robeson in 1934, the Chinese actor Mei Lanfang in 1935 and the Indian Indologist and novelist Rahul Sankrityayan in 1937–1938 and 1947–1948. Hughes travelled to Soviet Central Asia and wrote about the sharp differences between the condition of non-Russians in the USSR and the systematic discrimination faced by African Americans (Hughes 1934). This built upon the connections between the Soviet regime and the various anti-colonial movements that were developed after the Revolution, with the growth of Communist Parties in various parts of the world, coordinated by the Communist International (Comintern), and the education of foreign revolutionaries at institutes like the Communist University of the Toilers of the East (KUTV) in Moscow. Such institutions and channels spread the

early Soviet critique of Western scholarship about the 'East', but with the rise of the Stalin regime and the transformation of the Comintern into an instrument of foreign policy, according to which all struggles would be subordinated to the security of the USSR, many intellectuals became alienated from the Communist Parties. Representative of this trend was the Pan-Africanist George Padmore and the Bengali revolutionary M. N. Roy, who broke with the communist movement entirely, while many others remained critical fellow travellers of the USSR.

After World War II and the commencement of the Cold War culture re-emerged as an important dimension of the struggle for hegemony between the USA and USSR as victorious national liberation movements often turned to the latter as both a model of state-led economic development and as a trading partner to reduce dependence on the structures established by the imperial powers. Important landmarks were the victory of the Communist Party in the Chinese Civil War in 1950, followed by the April 1955 Bandung Conference which eventually led, in 1961, to the formation of the Non-Aligned Movement. As the USSR attempted to utilise decolonisation for its own ends, the critique of 'bourgeois orientalism' continued to be taught to generations of intellectuals from the decolonizing parts of the word at institutes like as the Patrice Lumumba Peoples Friendship University in Moscow, founded in 1960, the same year that the USSR hosted the 25th International Congress of Orientalists. At the opening of the congress senior Politburo member Anastas Mikoian (1960) declared that henceforth the peoples of the East would be transformed from the objects to the creators of their own history, culture and economy. The intellectual loosening in the USSR after Stalin's death did allow some significant theoretical engagements with non-European cultures. One prominent example was Konrad's collection of essays from the 1950s and 1960s (Konrad 1966), an abridged version of which was published in English translation as *East-West: Inseparable Twain* in 1967. Testifying to the continuing vitality of Soviet literary studies and developing his earlier work, Konrad here drew many, and controversial, parallels between Western literature and that of China and Japan with explanations based on sociological criteria. Nevertheless, the practice of Moscow-oriented Communist Parties alienated many, and heterodox intellectual formations that selectively drew upon the heritage of Soviet thought became dominant in the field of literary and cultural studies outside academic life in the West. Particularly influential were figures like the Martiniquais-French Hegelian Marxist and pan-Africanist Franz Fanon and the Egyptian-French pan-Arabist and Marxist Anouar Abdel Malek who foregrounded cultural, linguistic or civilizational considerations in their hybrid analyses. Both these figures exerted a significant influence on Edward Said, whose 1978 book *Orientalism* brought such concerns into the heart of US academic life while taking the eclecticism of the approach to new levels by drawing selectively on both Foucault and humanists.

5 Postcolonial Studies

In the context of the defeat of US imperialism in Vietnam and the introduction of new multicultural hiring policies in US universities achieved by the Civil Rights movement, Said's book led to a widespread critique of the evident biases of the literary canon that was studied. The new postcolonial studies that arose were however, quite unlike the engaged scholarship that Said had envisaged since they were firmly rooted in the poststructuralist theory of language, the 'postmodern' spurning of meta-narratives and in Foucault's paradigm discussed above, and often replaced engagement in the struggles of the time with a textually-based analysis of the construction of identity as reflected in literary texts. As Said noted, some thinkers had employed the ideas of Foucault "to justify political quietism with sophisticated intellectualism, at the same time wishing to appear realistic, in touch with the world of power and reality" (Said 1983, 245). Rejecting the Marxist account of imperialism, and often withdrawing into academic debates, many post-colonial theorists perceived power to be fluid and ever-present rather than rooted in socioeconomic structures. Engagement with that power came to be diffuse and unfocused, so interventions in historical struggles and politically charged social dialogues were often dissolved into discussions of textual ambiguity and paradox. One particularly clear example of this would be Homi Bhabha's influential work on hybridity, according to which postcolonial texts exhibit the instability of the structure of signification (understood in a poststructuralist fashion) and identity in conditions of globalization. While widely received in the 1990s, this has been subject to criticism for overgeneralizing the experience of the privileged cosmo-politan intellectual to a general account of postcolonial identity formation.

One of the most significant recent engagements has been the emergence of a more engaged form of postcolonial theory among Indian writers under the label of subaltern studies. Borrowing selectively from Marxism (especially a debatable interpretation of Gramsci's ideas about hegemony), poststructuralism and third-worldist politics, this trend has led to work spanning historical, cultural and literary studies. While focusing attention on the important role of non-elite (subaltern) social groups in the struggle against colonialism (especially, but not exclusively) in India, the subalternists illustrated important, previously understudied aspects of the formation of contemporary India. Analyses of the discourses and rhetoric of emerging political and social movements, rather than limiting attention to the most visible forms of collective action, proved of significant interest. In recent years, however, the trend has been subject to some searching critiques by scholars who have questioned the caricatured image of Marxism to be found in the work of practitioners of subaltern studies such as Ranajit Guha, Dipesh Chakrabarty and Partha Chatterjee. In particular, Marxists have raised the danger of their

tendency sharply to counterpose the social consciousness of Indian and European workers as leading to a restatement of the orientalist stereotype of the religious East versus the rational West (Chibber 2013; Kaiwar 2014). In literary studies Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, whose work combines Jacques Derrida's deconstructive method with postcolonial, Marxist and feminist elements, is perhaps the most prominent representative. While widely received and praised by some critics such as the Marxist Terry Eagleton (1999) among others, Spivak has been criticized for participating in a "Brahminization of theory" (Figueira 2008) according to which a certain privileged stratum of South Asian intellectuals have entered US universities as part of a quota system originally designed to address African-American educational failings. Alluding to Spivak's well-known 1988 essay, Figueira argues this group has proceeded to presume to speak *for* the subaltern masses, just as members of the Brahmin caste traditionally presumed to produce authoritative interpretations of religious scripture and popular religious practices.

Critical scholarship placing literary and cultural studies with the context of the history of imperialism and colonialism thus remains a vibrant and vigorous field of debate. Important discussions between Marxists themselves, between Marxists and exponents of competing approaches, and between scholars with a more general sociopolitical perspective are ongoing. It is, however, crucial to view these discussions in a historical perspective that moves beyond the assumptions of contemporary 'normal science'.

References

Achcar, Gilbert. "Marx, Engels and Orientalism: On Marx's Epistemological Evolution." Gilbert Achcar, *Marx, Orientalism, Cosmopolitanism*. London: Saqi Books, 2013. 68–102.

Anderson, Kevin. *Marx at the Margins: On Nationalism, Ethnicity and Non-Western Societies*. Chicago, IL, and London: Chicago University Press, 2010.

Bartol'd, V. V. *Kul'tura musul'manstva* [1918]. Moscow: URSS, 2012.

Brennan, Timothy. *Wars of Position: The Cultural Politics of Left and Right*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2006.

Bukharin, Nikolai I. *Historical Materialism – A System of Sociology*. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1926.

Callinicos, Alex. "Review: Postmodernism as Normal Science." *British Journal of Sociology* 46.4 (1995): 734–739.

Chibber, Vivek. *Postcolonial Theory and the Specter of Capital*. London: Verso, 2013.

Eagleton, Terry. "In the Gaudy Supermarket." *London Review of Books* (13 May 1999).

Figueira, Dorothy M. *Otherwise Occupied: Pedagogies of Alterity and the Brahminization of Theory*. New York, NY: State University of New York Press, 2008.

Habib, Irfan. "Marx's Perception of India." *Karl Marx on India*. Ed. Iqbal Husain. New Delhi: Tulika Books, 2006. XXIX–LIV.

Hughes, Langton. *A Negro Looks at Soviet Central Asia.* Moscow: Cooperative Pub. Society of Foreign Workers in the U.S.S.R., 1934.

Israel, Jonathan. *Enlightenment Contested: Philosophy, Modernity, and the Emancipation of Man 1670–1752.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Kaiwar, Vasant. *The Postcolonial Orient: The Politics of Difference and the Project of Provincialising Europe.* Leiden: Brill, 2014.

Kemper, Michael. *Studying Islam in the Soviet Union.* Amsterdam: Vossiuspers Uva, 2006.

Konrad, N. I. *Japonskaia literatura v onraztsakh i ocherkakh.* Leningrad: IZhVIa, 1927.

Konrad, N. I. *Vostok: Literatura Kitaia i Japonii.* Moscow: Academia, 1935.

Konrad, N. I. *Zapad i Vostok: Stat'i.* Moscow: Vostochnaia literatura, 1966.

Kuhn, T. S. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Lenin, V. I. "The Fall of Port Arthur." [1905] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works.* Vol. 8. Ed. V. J. Jerome. Trans. by Bernard Isaacs and Isidor Lasker. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1962. 47–55.

Lowe, Heinz-Dietrich. "Russian Nationalism and Tsarist Nationality Policies in Semi-Constitutional Russia, 1905–1914." *New Perspectives in Modern Russian History.* Ed. Robert McKean. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1992. 250–278.

[Lunacharskii] Lunacharsky, Anatolii V. "Indiiskii Tolstoi." *Krasnaia nov'* 1 (1923): 28–30.

Lurje, Moses. *Studien zur Geschichte der wirtschaftlichen und sozialen Verhältnisse im israelitisch-jüdischen Reiche von der Einwanderung in Kanaan bis zum babylonischen Exil.* Giessen: Verlag von A. Töpelmann, 1927.

McGetchin, Douglas T. *Indology, Indomania, and Orientalism: Ancient India's Rebirth in Modern Germany.* Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2009.

Mikoian, A. I. "Rech na XXV mezhdunarodnom kongresse vostokovedov." *Problemy vostokovedeniia* 5 (1960): 3–6.

Mishra, Pankaj. *From the Ruins of Empire: The Intellectuals Who Remade Asia.* New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2012.

Pavlovich, M. "Zadachi Vserossiiskoi Nauchnoi Assotsiatsii Vostovovedeniia." *Novyi Vostok* 1 (1922): 3–15.

Plekhanov, G. V. "Letters Without Address" [1899–1900]. G. V. Plekhanov, *Art and Social Life.* London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1953. 19–139.

Prawer, S. S. *Karl Marx and World Literature.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.

Said, E. *The World, the Text and the Critic.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983.

Tolz, Vera. *Russia's Own Orient: The Politics of Identity and Oriental Studies in the Late Imperial and Early Soviet Periods.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Tubianskii, Mikhail I. "Rabindranat Tagor i ego tvorchestvo." [1927] *Pis'mennyj pamjatniki i problem istorii kul'tury narodov Vostoka.* Eds. V. S. Sobolev and E. N. Temkin. Moscow: Nauka, 1990. 175–216.

Turner, Bryan S. *Marx and the End of Orientalism.* London: Allen & Unwin, 1978.

Vel'tman, Solomon. *Vostok v khudozhestvennoi literature.* Moscow and Leningrad: Gosizdat, 1928.

Voronskii, Aleksandr. "Po povodu odnogo aresta." *Rabochii krai,* 1 Oct. 1918.

Weber, Max. *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie, Vol. III: Das antike Judentum.* Ed. Marianne Weber. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1921.

Wellhausen, Julius. *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels* [1883]. Berlin: Druck und Verlag von G. Reimer, 1899.

Michał Mrugalski
Marxism in Poland

In a post-communist country like Poland, Marxism seems omnipresent, be it even as a negative counterpoint against which other approaches assert their distinctiveness. In this chapter, rather than recounting the history of Marxist aesthetics in Poland, I will depict its most characteristic, most 'Polish' features. Together they form a kind of anthropology which conceives of humans as self-insufficient and thus socially sensual (or socially aesthetical in the original sense of the term deriving from the Greek *aesthesis*, perception).

Karl Marx is known for not having articulated a systemic aesthetics, instead cramming his works and letters with occasional remarks on art and beauty which combined fill two large volumes (Lifshits 1957; cf. Lifshits 1973 [1933]). And yet in both the early and the mature stages of Marx's development, the Kantian or Schillerian vision of beauty – understood as the at once purposeful and free play of all human faculties – symbolises the ideal goal of history, i. e. the liberation of humans from the constraints related to the process of production. This constraint amounts to arresting free movement and accordingly to impeding aesthetical appreciation, which hinges on the unhindered activity of humans. According to the early *Ökonomisch-philosophische Manuskripte aus dem Jahre 1844* (1932, *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*), "man produces even when he is free from physical need and only truly produces in freedom therefrom" (Marx 1977, 74), and therefore the 'true', non-alienated work, this exchange of forces with the milieu, bears the principal traits of aesthetic creation and responsiveness, predominantly the autotelic character and the enjoyment of one's own faculties as they relate to the outside word. In *Das Kapital* (1867–1894 [posthumously], *Capital*), written more than twenty years later, labour ideally remains a purposeful activity which engages "the free play of [the worker's] bodily and mental powers" (Marx 1992 [1867], 284). Labour thus possesses, at least potentially, the two essential features of aesthetic experience even though capitalism effectively de-aestheticises it. Regardless whether the goal of the socialist movements consists in sublating the instrumental nature and division of work or simply introducing a shorter working day because it is only after hours that humans can enter "[t]he true realm of freedom, the development of human powers as an end in itself" (Marx 1993 [1894], 959), the aesthetic experience serves as the regulative ideal of Marx's project. The constructivist currents within Marxism – a number of them will be presented below – strived to return to productive labour its art-like qualities, while some critics, such as Stanisław Baczyński, claimed that a truly proletarian culture emerges not in the factory but in the time off from work:

> Literature [...] is not the creator of a new life, it does not transform the shape of the world, but expresses and depicts that rest of being that cannot be realised in fact, in action, in a concrete phenomenon, in the field of sensual, material reality. The entire field of associations, imagination and feelings, the entire superstructure of the contemporary soul, unrealised in the daily effort of the worker, in the movement of machines, in the cauldron of civilisation, will find its outlet in art, which will again expand the scale of new, resilient values, compatible with the common development of creative work. And literature will gain its proper position in society not by the cult of irrelevant factors, by the cult of the work pertaining to other fields, but by an organised, purposeful movement in its own right. (Baczyński 1927, 160)

The most seminal Polish thinkers associated with Marxist thought, beginning with Stanisław Brzozowski and Edward Abramowski (see the chapter on the Eastern European origins of the contemporary activist humanities in this volume), treated Marx's theory as one of collective creation, i. e. of culture provided it also encompasses nature as explored by science, technology, and art. In a book which can be regarded as the summa of Polish Marxian art theory, *Inquiries into the Fundamentals of Aesthetics* (1974), Stefan Morawski endeavours to provide an explanation of artistic activity which avoids the pitfalls of vulgar sociologism, understood here as a stance which recognises the class position of a creator in a specific society as the ultimate explanans of a creation's content and form. To this end, he quotes from the inherent aesthetics of Marx's *Manuscripts* of 1844: "Only through the objectively unfolded richness of man's essential being is the richness of subjective human sensibility (a musical ear, an eye for beauty of form – in short, senses capable of human gratification, senses affirming themselves as essential powers of man) either cultivated or brought into being" (Marx 1977, 103; quoted in Morawski 1974, 43). From this, Morawski concludes that "the genus *homo sapiens*" had innate "predispositions to aesthetic perception, but these were formed only in a humanizing (i. e. social) context" (Morawski 1974, 43). Marxism thus seems to pursue a vision of man as the *homo aestheticus* who can produce and perceive aesthetically, i. e. freely and purposely, by virtue of living in society. And society, for its part, can develop towards the maximum of freedom thanks to the at least potentially aesthetical nature of humankind. To support his claims concerning human nature, Morawski (1974, 43) refers to Karl Katsky, Christopher Cauldwell, Ernst Fisher, and Georgii Plekhanov, who recognised the sex drive – along with imitative impulse and a responsiveness to an antithesis, to symmetry, to rhythm, and to animistic phemomena – as one of the main sources of artistic creation: this assumption corresponds with one of the most insipiring theories of art formulated by a Polish Marxist, Leon Winiarski (see section 1).

The specifity of Polish Marxism, especially in the field of art and literature, consists, firstly, in its perceived belatedness in relation to neighbouring cultures,

since the Polish scholars regard the Russian and the German contributions to Marxist theory as images of the future striven for. Secondly, the self-induced receptiveness influenced the Marxists' general attitude to the currents in literary studies which were susceptible to accusations of aestheticism or formalism: the formalist-structuralist schools as well as the phenomenological aesthetics of Roman Ingarden. The Polish lands witnessed, moreover, the inception of the Jewish socialist movement; however, its character was more strictly political, the theory of culture concentrating on the questions concerning the creation of a modern Jewish nation rather than the specific questions of aesthetics and literary theory (Laskowski 2015, 134–135, 140–141, 146; Wisse 1991).

1 Wandering ideas beetween imitation and organisation. The janus nature of Socialist Realism

The most accurate expression of the self-consciousness of Polish Marxism was the concept of wandering ideas that Ludwik Krzywicki developed in 1888 and which was then reinvented almost 100 years later by Edward Said (1983) and Mieke Bal (2002). Krzywicki formulates his concept in connection with capitalist globalization (Krzywicki 1951 [1888], 100). In the foreword to the first edition of *Capital*, the first volume of which Krzywicki translated into Polish, Karl Marx uses England as the generally applicable model of development:

> The country that is more developed industrially only shows, to the less developed, the image of its own future. [...] In all other spheres, and just like the rest of Continental Western Europe, we [the Germans] suffer not only from the development of capitalist production, but also from the incompleteness of that development. (Marx 1992 [1867], 91)

The present day of a developed country thus becomes in the eyes of the inhabitants of a backward country the image of their future, i. e. an idea to strive for or a regulative idea. According to Krzywicki, the idea emerges in the developed country as something secondary, a reflection or an aspect of practice, but can then, after crossing the border of a backward country, develop its own activity, agency (Krzywicki 1951 [1888], 92). A "wandering parasite" (Krzywicki 1951 [1888], 92) turns into the driving force of development provided it responds to the needs of large portions of the receiving society; it may also, like all production, give rise to new needs. The perceived provinciality endows ideas with an enormous importance as they give purpose and thus a gestalt to social practices. As they wander,

they cease to be mere effects of social practice. The autonomy, the existence of the idea as a provoking agent or an ideal, however, moves it into the scope of aesthetics – ideas are images and, furthermore, they function not according to causality but according to teleology.

No wonder then that since the first Polish Marxist literary critic Bronisław Białobłocki took his cue from Krzywicki, who in return took care of his legacy after his premature death in 1888, he focused on ideas emanating from abroad – Russia – especially regarding the image of the countryside undergoing capitalist transformation in the writings of Gleb Uspenskii and Nikolai Zlatovratskii (Białobłocki 1932, 60–112). Perhaps more interestingly, he recognised the post-Romantic female writer Deotyma (the pseudonym of Jadwiga Łuszczewska [1834–1908], alluding to Diotima of Mantinea, Socrates's teacher in the theory of love) as a symbolic figure of the limitations imposed on women from the upper classes: "By dissecting the works of Deotyma, I seek to highlight the moments of the profile of the woman of her sphere, living and moving according to the forms established by tradition and fashion, animating them with fictions of religion, art, and knowledge approved by the Church" (Białobłocki 1932, 3). The most salient piece of evidence that this woman leading a superficial and insular existence remains incapable of living according to "the normal laws of life" is the fact that her long stay in Russia left no traces whatsoever on her poetics (Białobłocki 1932, 4–5).

The question of the agency of wandering ideas helps us understand why the Polish reception of Marxism tends to locate the main dividing line in Marxian aesthetics between simulating (*mimesis*) and organising (*poesis*) the social (Owczarek 1979, 14–25). Do the works of (literary) art mirror or shape the relations between people and between people and nature? Eponyms of both currents are Plekhanov and Aleksandr Bogdanov, the latter associated with Franz Mehring (Baczyński 1932, 94). Plekhanov treats literature as a reflection of social life and an expression of the class psychology of the author; class psychology mediates between work and life. The task of the critic consists in translating the idea of a work from the language of art into the language of the sociology of art in order to obtain the sociological equivalent of a literary work (Plekhanov 1974). Bogdanov, on the other hand, is interested in the structure of experience, the two poles of which are the subject and the object. Art does not imitate reality, but it organises experience in the most effective, economical way according to the amount of energy invested in the work on being (Bogdanov 1924; Bogdanov 1980 [1924]).

All this may help explain the prominence of Polish Socialist Realism, which lasted for no more than seven years but still functions as the prototype of Marxist theory and practice (Artwińska et al. 2016). Socialist Realism appears firstly as a prototypical wandering idea reflecting reality in a more developed country and about to bring about a change in a backward one. Secondly, since its very mode of

existence as a wandering idea evokes the dualism of mimesis and poesis (the simulating and the organising principle), it becomes, by virtue of its ephemerality, a failed attempt to unite the two strands – imitative and initiating. As for the first feature, the wandering poetics of Socialist Realism explicitly unites imitation with organisation; on the one hand, a work should provide an image of reality, but on the other hand it should contain an ideal and thus inspire the recipients to certain practices (Baculewski 1951; Markiewicz 1952; Żółkiewski 1950). Socialist Realism, introduced to Polish literature with a fifteen-year delay in relation to the Soviet Union (1949–1950), was as if forced into the scheme of wandering ideas. Henryk Markiewicz rejected "the false belief that such literature may arise only in the condition of the full development of socialism" (Sławiński 2016 [1981], 80). Rather, Socialist Realism, an idea coming from a more developed country and as such allegedly endowed with agency, was introduced with the goal of precipitating and facilitating "the full development of socialism". Hence the quality of theory which Janusz Sławiński called "the imperative of being secondary" (Sławiński 2016 [1981], 87). The reception of the Soviet literary techniques apparently suffices to organise the Polish reality anew. The attempt's failure, resulting in probably the strongest caesura of Polish literature and criticism after World War II, revealed the deficit on the mirroring side of a poetics, which could not be recuperated by the sheer violence invested in the alternation of reality.

The (dis-)equilibrium between the imitating and the organising functions of art becomes even more significant in the light of the Polish tradition of rendering literature harmless by means of reducing it to a mere depiction devoid of practical consequences. The device repeats itself, for example, in virtually all writings that Róża Luksemburg (Rosa Luxemburg) devoted to literature. She had a penchant for writers whose art and ideas did not agree with Marxism – Adam Mickiewicz, Lev Tolstoi, Fedor Dostoevskii, and Gleb Uspenskii (she portrayed the latter as an anti-novelist in a way which foreshadows the theory of the literature of the fact [Luxemburg 1972, 15, 21], on which I expand in section two). Tolstoi, for example, was then considered a great challenge to the hegemony of the proletariat (the Bolsheviks) in the rural Soviet Union (Lunacharskii 1963 [1924]). Luxemburg defuses the political potential of her favourite authors' writings by explaining them as images of historical states of mind or past social psychology; as such they must not inspire the proletariat, which has to produce its own consciousness (Luxemburg 1972, 12, 59).

The other prominent Polish communist active in Germany before World War I and writing partly in German, Julian Marchlewski, stood firm for the organisational role of art. For Marchlewski, the Arts and Crafts Movement voiced most clearly the ideal of socialist art – one which according to the principles of John Ruskin, William Morris, Walter Crane, Edward Burne-Jones, and Willem van

de Velde permeated and transformed the entire surroundings and the human psyche. Art must not reside in a special quarter; its task is to shape the milieu so it becomes truly humane. The machines – Marchlewski claims – render this utopian project affordable for the working class too (Marchlewski 1974 [1901], 10–12).

Leon Winiarski, a prominent sociologist active first in Warsaw and then in Lausanne and Geneva, where he formulated the theory of social mechanics (Winiarski 1967), likewise expressed his fascination with the artist and poet William Morris as the originator of the Arts and Crafts Movement. In a small book, *William Morris*, he depicts his hero – like Luksemburg with Uspenskii – as a precursor of the demise of the novel, the popularity of which, according to Morris, stems from social inequalities which force onto individuals the idea of duty (Winiarski 1900, 55). Literature will shed the shackles of duty and fictional narrative and will eventually become the managerial part of life. This thought – as I will show in more detail in section two – remained viable in the 1930s, when the Polish Marxists imported from the Soviet Union and Germany the literature of the fact and reportage. Aleksander Wat (1930a, 334) wrote: "While the novel organises emotions and human consciousness, the reportage directly organises practice. A reporter is not only a journalist or writer – he is an activist-social worker."

Admittedly, Leon Winiarski recognised the mimetic function of literature; however, he shifted emphasis towards its constructive capacities. As early as in 1890, he translated the findings of the French positivists Hippolyte Taine, Pierre-François Tissot, and Palisser into the language of political economy by recovering the economic causes of the cultural processes they described. And so Winiarski demonstrates that the complex of absolutism as a French cultural formation has its roots in the struggle between feudalism and nascent capitalism, the fight in which the king assumed the role of the sole arbiter (Winiarski 1960 [1890], 89), or that Romantic individualism agrees with the advent of capitalism and the dissolution of feudal bonds and dependencies. He argues that positivism in general and Taine in particular should concentrate rather on a writer's position in society than on his or her race (Winiarski 1960 [1890], 96–103).

Eight years later, Winiarski no longer depicts literature as an expression of economy, but rather perceives economy and art as homologous in terms of a more fundamental language of description which encompasses the sum total of scientifically cognisable reality – Lagrangian mechanics (Winiarski 1898, 575). Both economy and aesthetic experience tend essentially towards the equilibrium and the maximum gain (of pleasure in the case of aesthetics). While pure economy is the science of value and prise, pure aesthetics is the science of the totality of aesthetic judgements (Winiarski 1898, 588–589). "Pure aesthetics must indicate all the necessary and sufficient conditions for the production of the totality of aesthetic judgments, just as pure economy does for prices. These conditions can

be studied by the following three theories" (Winiarski 1898, 589): the theory of aesthetic consumption (of taste); the theory of aesthetic production that treats artists and poets as entrepreneurs managing resources and the means of production; and the theory of aesthetic capitalisation in which the artist features as a worker using up his or her personal energy to produce a surplus of interpersonal energy (Winiarski 1898, 589–590).

Like later in Bogdanov, the organisational role of art amounts to the proper management of energy, which in the artistic case – Winiarski claims – originally stemmed from the sublimation of the erotic drive to other activities involving the body (Winiarski 1898, 569–573) or "the transformation of a certain part of the potential biological energy into work necessary to produce" an ornament, an adornment, or the like (Winiarski 1898, 573–574). While the members of primitive societies embellish their bodies single-handedly, in capitalism a division of labour occurs; under these conditions, the artist assumes the position of an observer elevated above the separated parts of society and traces energy flows between the "salon" and the "workshop" of, say, a tailor (Winiarski 1898, 569–573). Winiarski's economy of art may explain the scientific rationale behind the formalist aesthetics of making difficult, because according to his take on Lagrange's equations, "a balance in the satisfaction of needs" – the goal of all aesthetic activity – "is established only when the intensity of the last satisfied desires is proportional to the expenditure in energy (or in money)" (Winiarski 1898, 575); the more energy is invested in an aesthetic experience, the more gratifying the experience. "[T]here is an equivalence between [aesthetic] pleasure and the expenditure of energy or the trouble obtaining it takes" (Winiarski 1898, 587).

Moreover, the aesthetic experience becomes possible thanks to a surplus of energy – just as in Shklovskii's "Iskusstvo kak priem" (2018 [1917], "Art as Device"), even though the probability of an influence is close to zero. On Winiarski's account, the organism reacts to a stimulus with a series of movements with the goal of returning to equilibrium, whereby the biological energy is subsequently turned into impressions, sentiments, ideas, and finally actions. When after the execution of an action the organism still has energy left, it re-enters in a reverse order, rhythmically shaping ideas, sentiments, and impressions. The aesthetic energy accompanies potentially all life processes, as a luxury attaching itself to economical energy necessary to uphold life functions. The most perfect artform – Greek tragedy – encompasses the most media, the most modes of sensibility, the most aspects of corporeal activity (Winiarski 1898, 578–580, 586).

The analogy of art and economy established itself in Polish Marxian art theory in the interwar period. In 1929, Aleksander Wat speaks about the influence of monetary inflation not only on the perpetual inflation of futurist programmes, but also on the shape of metaphors: "Back then, inflation became a way of perceiving

things. The measure of things lost its consistency, it jumped together with the price of foreign currencies. The law of identity ceased to hold. The thing ceased to be itself" (Wat 1930b, 75).

2 Futurism, formalism, fact, and class consciousness

Alongside the tension between mimesis and agency, another distinctive feature of Polish Marxian aesthetics is its deep entanglement with aestheticism, i. e. the currents in art and theory which underscore the autonomy of art: formalism, futurism, structuralism, and even phenomenology. Both qualities are conditional on the process of the wandering of ideas, during which they gain both agency and aesthetical qualities. As I will attempt to demonstrate, in this context the literature of the fact takes on a slightly different meaning than it had in its original Soviet setting, even though it opened the space in which – just like in the case of the Soviet Left Front of the Arts (Levyi front iskusstv, LEF) – the paths of the futurists and the formalists on the one side and the Marxists on the other crossed.

In Poland, the press organ in which this merger took place, *Miesięcznik Literacki* (1929–1930, *Literary Monthly*), featured in its second and third issue editor-in-chief's memoirs of his futurist years. Aleksander Wat, said futurist turned Marxist, may be regarded as the specialist in remembrance: he initiated his communist adventure with a retrospective glance at the avantgarde and thirty or so years later authored a memoir based on his lengthy conversations with Czesław Miłosz and relating his years of fascination with communism and subsequent repressions in the Soviet Union (Wat 1990 [1977]).

In 1929, Wat depicts the path of the Polish futurists who debuted as petit-bourgeois individualists and anarchists and eventually joined the proletarian movement. They first attempted a rapprochement with the communist party around 1923, when they contacted the Polish offshoot of the *proletkul't* ('proletarian culture') movement, represented in the journals *Kultura Robotnicza* (1922–1923, *Workers' Culture*) and *Nowa Kultura* (1923–24, *New Culture*), both edited by Jan Hempel. According to the editorial statement opening the first issue, the programme of *Workers' Culture* concentrated on the criticism of existing conditions and contributing to the creation of the new autonomous workers' culture ([Hempel] 1922a, 2). Hempel stressed in another article that the proletarian revolution differs from previous rebellions in that it does not turn against culture but fights for a new one (Hempel 1922b, 4). The programme of the new culture consisted mainly in demasking the purported classlessness of culture products

(only achievements of science and technology were free from class suspicion; Hempel 1922b, 5) and the criticism of religion, the most dangerous contestant to the organization of the masses (Hempel 1922c, 1922d). Positive examples were Aleksei Gastev's cosmic poetry of the great metamorphosis of the world (Stawar 1922a, 13–14) and the proletarian mass theatre (Stawar 1922b; Trages 1923), which supposedly emerges in the process of the self-organisation of the audience that knows the spectacle by heart after having worked on it for months, with the effect that it ceases to be a cheap thrill and resembles rather a great religious ceremony (*nabożeństwo*; Stawar 1922b, 5). Workers' culture opposes all individualism – just as a Jesuit monk submitted himself to the Catholic Church, a contemporary prole- tarian toes the line of the process of production (Hempel 1923b, 195). "The revolu- tionary, i. e. creative, thought of the proletariat is disciplined and most thoroughly organised" (Hempel 1923b, 196).

And yet, the same collectivist, Hempel, struck up a cooperation in *The Liter- ary Monthly* with the ex-petit-bourgeois individualist aesthete Wat. According to Wat's memoir from 1929, the futurist revolt against boring and disgusting official art, enabled by Filippo Marinetti's discovery of art's autonomy with respect to the logic of life and of discursive thought (Wat 1930b, 68), could not have devolved in such a backward country as Poland into a social revolution, as it did in Russia, nor into fascism *alla Italiana*. In Poland, futurism could catch on only as "the malcontent anarchism of petit-bourgeois elements", driven by hedonism and the fear of true revolution (Wat 1930b, 70). The machine meant for them only a deco- rative requisite, not a means of the cosmic transformation of reality (Wat 1930b, 71). In reference to Karol Irzykowski's accusation of plagiarism, supported by the fact that the futurists evoked 'the Negro' (*Murzyn*) in their poems while Poland never had colonies or overseas territories, Wat writes: "The Negro was neither pla- giaristic nor decorative, but all this was true – in Polish futuristic poetry – of the machine. The Negro symbolised the regressive wave of anti-civilization, while we treated the machine like those Negro dandies handle trousers – they wear them over their shoulder" (Wat 1930b, 71). However, the final point of Wat's essay is not to prove the parochialism of his poetic youth, but to show that Polish futurism – one may add: just like the Dada movement in the German-speaking countries and France – eventually enabled the dawn of proletarian poetry: "by breaking the existing aesthetic canons of its time, expanding the material, combating lyrical exhibitionism, inventing economic means of expression, and at the same time gravitating habitually towards leftist ideology – [futurism] could in many ways become the starting point for Polish proletarian poetry" (Wat 1930c, 128).

The application of formal inventions to the purpose of expressing and organ- ising the proletariat became the main task of *The Literary Monthly*. The undertak- ing had its noteworthy antecedence in Stanisław Burcz's attempt to translate the

formal features of language as identified by cutting-edge linguistics into the language of class psychology. The first and the second issue of the journal *Dźwignia* (1927–1928, *The Lever*) opened with his articles demasking the assumed neutrality of the findings made by the precursors of Polish structuralism Jan Baudouin de Courtenay and Jan Rozwadowski (Burcz 1927a, 1927b). What they took to be purely formal differentiation of language actually reflects the stratification of society with respect to the means of production. In particular, the universal distinction between poetic and communicative language, pertaining to all cultures and therefore justifying the theory of poetic language's claims to be scientific, showed its class nature, as the very existence and the nature of poetic language point toward a privileged leisure class. The distinction between poetic and communicative language marking the point of departure of formalist and structuralist literary theory, Burcz subsumed the description of the formal aspects of the art of the word under the Marxist theory of society. Poetic language, with its semantic and emotional plasticity, proved to be a privileged playground of ideology and political provocation.

Once again, as was the case with Socialist Realism, self-appraisal – in the case of Wat and his collaborators their identity as Marxist converts – determined the reception of foreign ideas emanating from cultures perceived as more advanced. In the first issue of *The Literary Monthly*, Henryk Drzewiecki (1929) presents Viktor Shklovskii's development as a process of rooting formalism, which drew on the experience of futurism, in Marxism. The key evidence is Shklovskii's sociology of literature in the book on the material and style of Tolstoi's *Voina i mir* (1868–1869, *War and Peace*) (Shklovskii 1928) and his participation in the literature of the fact movement. According to Drzewiecki, Shklovskii's formalism gravitated toward Marxism from the outset: the formalist scheme of the deformation of material by form was admittedly indifferent to class, yet 'democratic' in nature, since it treated geniuses exclusively in the framework of schools, by which it flattened the relationships between writers. Moreover, Shkovskii always assumed the existence of two currents in a given epoch – a dominant one and a subaltern, non-canonical one; the future at all times belonged to the latter. Now, in his book on Tolstoi and the theory and praxis of the literature of the fact, Shklovskii related this somewhat abstract revolutionary schema to the historical shapes of class consciousness (Drzewiecki 1929, 39–40). The deformation now affects not only previous forms but also the ideology or the psychology of the class to which a writer belongs (Drzewiecki 1929, 43).

Conversely, the anonymous reviewer of Viktor Vinogradov's *O khudozhestvennoi proze* (1930, *On Artistic Prose*) – the most seminal book for Polish Structuralism before World War II (see the chapter on structuralism in Poland in this volume) – accuses the author of being incapable of finding the social equivalent of the phe-

nomena he analyses. According to the reviewer, Vinogradov's interests in rhetoric reflects the interest in non-fictional prose and the Soviet life itself bursting with gatherings and celebrations (N.N. 1930, 462). And still Vinogradov refuses to acknowledge the contingency of his figures of thought on social realities. The reviewer demonstrates this using the example of Vinogradov's treatment of two responses to a court speech delivered by the Polish barrister Włodzimierz Spasowicz during the trial of a certain Kronenberg, who was charged with maltreatment of his stepdaughter. Fedor Dostoevskii and Mikhail Saltykov-Shchedrin retorted by criticising Spasowicz's depiction of the case and the relationships between adults and children. Vinogradov's principal error consists in attempts to reduce the difference between Dostoevskii and Shchedrin to two parallel treatments of one topic which differ exclusively in their choice of devices, while the primary difference lies within their social-political stance (the reactionary Dostoevskii vs. the progressive Shchedrin, N.N. 1930, 464). Devices deprived of the social context remain intelligible and whoever pretends to operate otherwise simply smuggles into his or her theoretical statements implicit class-induced appraisals.

The drive towards embedding formal devices in social conditions with the goal of rendering them meaningful inclines Wat to perceive even the theory of the literature of the fact – associated with *LEF* magazine – as a symptom of a much broader social transformation (Wat 1930a, 330). Not only does literature in the revolutionary moment abandon the invention in favour of the fact so that the former assumes merely an auxiliary function (as a metaphor emphasising a quality of a factual element or diverting censorship), not only does the reportage replace the novel as the leading genre of contemporary literature, but the straightforward opposition of fact vs. fiction reveals its conventional, unstable, and historically derived nature; there exist only transitional forms, fictional and factual at the same time. "The fact is not something fixed and unambiguous, but an assembly of different relationships so that a writer who describes a certain fact or process sees and describes these and no other relationships depending on his class psychoideology" (Wat 1930a, 330). The opposition of invention, the fact has its own history (in a backward country it can be a fact-in-the-making or an idea). This attitude toward the fact impedes dogmatism and to a degree rehabilitates the novel, since the reportage blends in the potentially endless chain of the transformations of the factual.

This also applies to the modernist experimental novel. It suffices to compare Karl Radek's widely quoted speech at the Soviet Writers Congress of 1934 notoriously likening Joyce's *Ulysses* to "a heap of dung, crawling with worms, photographed by a cinema camera through a microscope" (Radek 1977 [1934], 153) with an essay Wat devoted to Marcel Proust and James Joyce and in retrospect interpreted as the first expression of his doubts about communism (Pietrych 2008,

301). In his essay on the contemporary novel, titled "W pracowniach stylu" (1930, "In the Workshops of Style"; Wat 1930d), Wat remains reticent about the bourgeois dung and concentrates on literary techniques or, precisely, on why Proust and Joyce focus on literary techniques rather than their topics. Wat's essay adheres to the principles of endowing artistic forms with social semantics – the very style of thought which led me to include the leading Marxist literary scholars Dawid Hopensztand, Kazimierz Budzyk, and Stefan Żółkiewski in the chapter on Polish structuralism and semantics. Like Wat and Drzewiecki, they assume the position at the crossroads of Marxist sociologism and aestheticism, while working on a model of the literary work which would be both integral and flexible, i. e. which would account for both the formal and the social dimensions of a work without reducing one aspect to the other. This approach also resonated with the dialects of the individual and the typical, which dominated the discussion on realism and Socialist Realism in particular but which the Poles associated not only with the world presented but also with the functioning of linguistic and artistic forms in the social world. Drawing on Dawid Hopensztand, one may call their core operation a search for correspondences between morphology and semantics, while Wat, in his essay on Proust and Joyce, speaks about "highlighting the worldview significance of style, literary technique" (Wat 1930d, 773).

Moreover, this method unites the collectivism of proletarian culture, represented here by intersubjective semantics, with the appreciation of the individual and as such is a good fit for *The Literary Monthly*. The futurist individualist and the *proletkul't* activist can agree on the principle that forms must be related to meanings. Moreover, this modus operandi is modelled on suspicion towards the products of culture which present themselves as self-sufficient, universal and not pertaining to any class. Its very claim to being "formalistic, classless, humane" (Wat 1930c, 122) amounts to the kind of dissimulation that brands ideology. According to Hempel's theory of workers' culture, every, even the most *l'art pour l'art* product, cannot be seriously regarded as a pure form devoid of socioeconomic significance: the task of specifying a form's relation to society falls to the specialists who have gone through the school of futurism and formalism. Sociology makes imperative the preoccupation with form, while at the same time formalism evolves into informed political praxis.

Wat assumes that the 'formalism' of Proust and Joyce – meaning their preoccupation with narrative techniques – corresponds with the term 'formalism' as deployed by Shklovskii and other OPOIaZ (Society for the Study of Poetic Language, Obshchestvo izucheniia Poeticheskogo iazyka) formalists, who claimed that a form emerges to replace an old, worn-out one. The contemporary prose, according to Wat, "appeals not to a reader's knowledge of life elements, but to his acquaintance with the literary ways of presenting these elements" (Wat 1930d,

773). And still Proust and Joyce symbolically represent the demise of the bourgeoisie.

Formalism, even technically understood, evokes decadence and not for example the joyful pathos of avant-gardist experimentation. This assumption becomes intelligible in the light of what was probably the most systematic work in Marxist literary criticism in interwar Poland, Ignacy Fik's *Rodowód społeczny literatury polskiej* (1938, *Social Genealogy of Polish Literature*, Fik 1960 [1938]). In a way typical of Polish Marxism, Fik pleads for an existence of the dialectical interrelation between autonomous literary works and society at large. Fik correlates the various theories concerning the role of literature in society, which were then an object of controversy in the Soviet Union, Germany and elsewhere, with the historical moment in the development of a given social class. The three general attitudes of the class towards social reality that become discernable in the historical development of its literature relate to imitation, organization, and formalism – the main topics of the present chapter. Fik took what some theoreticians treated as irreconcilable, mutually exclusive positions to be merely phases in the development of the socioideology of a class as it struggles for control over the means of production. In its social life, a class professes different views on its own role in reality and, accordingly, different views of the literary work. It moves from the realism of a striving class to constructivism and production art of the leading class, and only then to decadent formalism.

According to Wat, Proust and Joyce's seemingly nonaligned experimentation which explicitly posits literature as a technique of arousing aesthetic satisfaction of a metaphysical or a biological nature in fact meets the vital interests of the modern bourgeoisie in the field of ideology. On the one hand, high-brow literature serves as – in Pierre Bourdieu's idiom (Bourdieu 1984 [1979]) – a "distinction", separating and elevating the privileged class which it pertains to, and, on the other, it imitates and induces the process of the dematerialization of reality (Wat 1930d, 774). All previous forms of the novel in its historical development ultimately served the purpose of affirming the existence of objective reality; the contemporary novel breaks with this fundamental scheme.

> It's not about summing up the social experience, about which the author knows in advance that it is disheartening. It is more important to deny social experience, reduce it only to the experience of an individual, and to subjectivise it to the greatest possible extent. Meticulousness serves in Proust, and even more so in Joyce, to eliminate the life material, to equate all resources to the act of perception and to the mental activities associated with it. (Wat 1930d, 776)

These authors are interested not in the external reality, but in impressions as such, "the laws that govern them, the basic sensations of pleasure and pain and the basic

reservoir of the sub-conscious, from which they draw their powers" (Wat 1930d, 776–777). The same motives of snobbery and climbing the social ladder, which in Balzac produce enormous amounts of social energy and provoke consequential actions with an impact on social and economic structures, mutate in Proust "into mere peeping at intrigues, a game that is very distant from the active social forces but that irritates and stimulates purely vegetative mental systems" (Wat 1930d, 776). Interestingly enough, when ten years later Wat finds himself detained in the dreaded Lubianka prison, Proust's reduction of social facts to the pretextual means of exposing and making palpable the great visceral and metaphysical duration of all phenomena appears to him to be an invitation to experience the deepest possible solidarity between individuals (Wat 1990 [1977], 203–205).

3 The styles of culture

The spectre of individualism will haunt Polish post-war Marxism. An important stage on the way to the emancipation of the individual was, paradoxically, the reception of Stalin's theses on language, which in sharp distinction to the preceding orthodoxy – that of Nikolai Marr – acknowledged the relative autonomy of language and, consequently, of literary forms in relation to the economic basis (described in more detail in the chapter on structuralism).

In general terms, mainstream Polish Marxists assumed after the demise of Socialist Realism in 1956 that in the literary process first the new topics or the new contents emerge and subsequently inspire the rise of new forms, which are thus always ideologically marked. "At the same time, however, [the Marxists] acknowledged a relative independence of the development of forms from their original ideological context as well as their multifunctionality. It has also been pointed out that in the creative process a dialectical interference of content and form takes place" (Markiewicz 1983, 258).

The Marxists who assumed the autonomy of the artwork went as far as to allow themselves to be inspired by Roman Ingarden, who had been denounced as an idealist during the Stalinist period. Ingarden's influence concerned, on the one hand, the autonomy of aesthetical values and, on the other, these values' ontological basis, namely the intersubjective presented world, created and experienced by acts of consciousness on the part of both the author and the perceiver.

Stefan Morawski, for example, favoured the consistency of aesthetic values in his criticism of sociological reductionism or relativism (Morawski 1974, 28) represented by the classic authors of Marxist aesthetics Plekhanov, Mehring, and Paul Lafargue. Morawski combines Marx's wonder at the resilience of Greek art's

charm (Marx 1904 [1857], 310–323) with reflection on the autonomy of aesthetical values (cf. Ingarden 1966). "Our subject of inquiry [...] is whether aesthetic values may occur which last longer than a single period and are found in several geographical locations" (Morawski 1974, 40). While searching for "the strands of continuity within the cultural and historical fabric" (Morawski 1974, 41), he arrives at the theory of invariants and variants (Morawski 1974, 57), which resembles the approach of Roman Jakobson, who in this respect made no bones about his phenomenological inspirations (Holenstein 1991 [1976]). Other Marxists such as Henryk Markiewicz and Jerzy Kmita took a leaf out of Ingarden's book on the presented world as the substrate of aesthetic and all other values, even though they openly disagreed with his conception's metaphysical underpinning (Markiewicz 1961, 1962, 1964, 1965, 78; Kmita 1967, 1985, 129–178). Kmita (1967) believed he could translate Ingarden's philosophy into the language of semantics free from the burden of metaphysics.

The most prominent scholar who perceived Marxism and structural semiotics as homogenous or mutually translatable was Stefan Żółkiewski, the author of numerous works on the sociology of literature ('literary culture'), who also took centre stage in the chapter on structuralism in Poland. In his programmatic essay, published in two reactions (Żółkiewski 1966a, 1966b), he equates Marx's holistic method of studying society with structuralism, more specifically phonology and Jakobson's functional approach to linguistic utterances. Via a series of decompositions and re-compositions of capitalist society, Marx arrives "at the basic opposition between seller and buyer, at the commodity exchange relationship" (Żółkiewski 1966b, 10). This corresponds with structuralism's binary oppositions, which, present at the particle level of phonology, function just like trade in a border context of goal-oriented (communicative) activities. Żółkiewski understands the word function in a fashion typical of Polish Marxism with its penchant for individualism; for him, 'function' presupposes an individual will, since an activity cannot be recognised as goal-oriented unless it suggests the existence of a factor which resists being forced into general patterns. In this respect, he resembles literary scholars such as Eugeniusz Czaplejewicz (1981, 1990) who assign Bakhtin the role of enlivening and humanising Marxism and/or structuralism by countering the general patterns with an individualist element. Obviously, in 1966 the re-discovery of Bakhtin still lay in the future, and hence Żółkiewski's example demonstrates why the first to embrace Bakhtin's work were the structuralists and the Marxists.

Żółkiewski emphasises that culture is not a state but a process in which general patterns collide and harmonise with individual intentions. Culture should be understood, then, the way style is in literary science – as "the style of pattering" (Żółkiewski 1966b, 12). In its ultimate form, Polish Marxism acknowledges lit-

erature and culture as style or rather the activity of styling, not the superstructure of the economic basis. And it still assumes a homology between these two realms.

4 Conclusion

In Żółkiewski, Polish Marxist criticism becomes more Polish than Marxist (or structuralist for that matter): it implicitly refers to and fulfils Kazmierz Wóycicki's concept which initiated Polish modern literary theory at large. In 1914, Wóycicki formulated the programme of studying the unity and the differentiation of style on all levels of the literary and artistic realm, from an individual work, to an artist's oeuvre, a group, an epoch, and culture at large (Wóycicki 1914; see the chapter on Polish formalism in this volume). The wandering ideas, emanating mostly from German and Russian scholarly culture, must have been thoroughly, albeit often tacitly, modified to gain agency and make an impact in the Polish lands. Both subchapters – devoted to Marxism as an imported and therefore revolutionary idea and to the interplay of aesthetic and social values – end on a similar note. Winiarski and Żółkiewski, seventy years and the Russian Revolution and two world wars apart, assume the homology between economic and artistic processes, a homology which hampers all attempts at economic reductionism and paradoxically protects the autonomy of art (you cannot reduce to one another two phenomena which function according to the same principles). Constancy is a laudable virtue, but since it adorns rather Penelope than Odysseus, the question arises whether Polish (and not only Polish) Marxism does not resemble Białobrzeski's Diotyma, the oblivious woman who, enthused by her great visions, turns a deaf ear to the factual.

References

Artwińska, Anna, Bartłomiej Starnawski, and Grzegorz Wołowiec (eds.). *Studies on Socialist Realism: The Polish View*. Frankfurt/M.: Peter Lang, 2016.

Baculewski, Jan (ed.). *O sytuacji w historii literatury polskiej: Wybór referatów wygłoszonych na Zjeździe Polonistów w dniach od 8 do 12 maja 1950 roku*. Warsaw: PWN, 1951.

Baczyński, Stanisław. *Losy romansu*. Warsaw: Rój, 1927.

Baczyński, Stanisław. *Literatura w Z.S.R.R.* Krakow: Wydawnictwo Literacko-Naukowe, 1932.

Bal, Mieke. *Travelling Concepts in the Humanities: A Rough Guide*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002.

Białobłocki, Bronisław. *Szkice literackie*. Ed. Ludwik Krzywicki. Warsaw: Instytut Gospodarstwa Społecznego, 1932.

Bogdanov, Aleksandr. "The Workers' Artistic Inheritance." *The Labour Monthly* 9 (1924): 549–597.

Bogdanov, Aleksandr. *Essays in Tekstology* [1924]. Trans. by George Gorelik. Seaside, CA: Intersystems Publications, 1980.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste* [1979]. Trans. by Richard Nice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984.

Burcz, Stanisław [S. Bur.]. "Struktura językowa społeczeństw klasowych." *Dźwignia* 1 (1927a): 2–7.

Burcz, Stanisław [S. Bur.]. "Drogi powstania języka klasowego." *Dźwignia* 2–3 (1927b): 11–15.

Czaplejewicz, Eugeniusz. *Poezja jako Dialog*. Warsaw: Krajowa Agencja Wydawnicza, 1981.

Czaplejewicz, Eugeniusz. *Pragmatyka, dialog, historia:* problemy współczesnej teorii literatury. Warsaw: PWN, 1990.

Drzewiecki, Henryk. "Etapy formalisty." *Miesięcznik Literacki* 1 (1929): 38–46.

Fik, Ignacy. "Charakter społeczny literatury polskiej." [1938] *Teoria badań literackich w Polsce*. Vol. 2. Ed. Henryk Markiewicz. Krakow: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1960. 297–310.

Hempel, Jan. "Od redakcji." *Kultura Robotnicza* 1 (1922a): 1–2.

Hempel, Jan. "Kultura robotnicza." *Kultura Robotnicza* 1 (1922b): 2–5.

Hempel, Jan. "Religia a ruch robotniczy." *Kultura Robotnicza* 3 (1922c): 1–5.

Hempel, Jan. "Ślady kierunków społecznych w Ewangelijach." *Kultura Robotnicza* 6 (1922d): 9–12.

Hempel, Jan. "Wielkanoc." *Kultura Robotnicza* 12.34 (1923a): 354–358.

Hempel, Jan. "Myśl zorganizowana." *Kultura Robotnicza* 7.29 (1923b): 193–197.

Holenstein, Elmar. *Roman Jakobson's Approach to Language: Phenomenological Structuralism* [1976]. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1991.

Ingarden, Roman. *Przeżycie – dzieło – wartość*. Krakow: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1966.

Kmita, Jerzy. *Problematyka terminów teoretycznych w odniesieniu do pojęć literaturoznawczych*. Poznan: Poznańskie Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Nauk, 1967.

Kmita, Jerzy. *Kultura i poznanie*. Warsaw: PWN, 1985.

Krzywicki, Ludwik. "Idea a życie." [1888] *Studia socjologiczne*. Ed. Adam Schaff. Warsaw: PIW, 1951. 39–149.

Laskowski, Piotr. "The Autonomous Commune, the Independent Country and World Revolution: The Left in Polish Lands, 1830–1939." *Genealogy of Contemporaneity: A History of Ideas in Poland, 1815–1939*. Eds. Bartłomiej Błesznowski, Marcin Król, and Adam Pucheda. Warsaw and Vienna: Wydawnictwo UW/IWM, 2015. 121–155.

Lifshits, Mikhail (ed.). *Karl Marks i Fridrikh Engel's ob iskusstve*. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1957.

Lifshits [Lifshitz], Mikhail. *The Philosophy of art of Karl Marx* [1933]. Trans. by Ralph B Winn. London: Pluto Press, 1973.

Lunacharskii, Anatolii. "Tolstoi i Marks." [1924] *Sobranie sochinenii v 8-mi tomakh*. Vol. 1. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1963. 290–314.

Luxemburg, Rosa. *Schriften über Kunst und Literatur*. Ed. Marlen M. Korallow. Dresden: VEB Verlag der Kunst, 1972.

Marchlewski, Julian. "Moderne Kunstströmungen und Sozialismus." [1901] Julian Marchlewski, *Sezession und Jugendstil: Kritiken um 1900*. Dresden: VEB Verlag der Kunst, 1974. 5–16.

Markiewicz, Henryk. O *marksistowskiej teorii literatury*. Wroclaw: Ossolineum, 1952.

Markiewicz, Henryk. [Recenzja książki Romana Ingardena, *O dziele literackim*]. *Estetyka* 2 (1961): 266–277.

Markiewicz, Henryk. "Sposób istnienia i budowa dzieła literackiego." *Pamiętnik Literacki* 2 (1962): 331–352.

Markiewicz, Henryk. "Jeszcze o budowie dzieła literackiego." *Pamiętnik Literacki* 2 (1964): 422–434.

Markiewicz, Henryk. *Główne problemy wiedzy o literaturze*. Krakow: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1965.

Markiewicz, Henryk. "Polnische Diskussionen über Form und Inhalt." *Russian Literature* 13 (1983): 233–268.

Marx, Karl. *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* [1857]. Trans. by N.I. Stone. Chicago, IL: Kerr, 1904.

Marx, Karl. *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1977.

Marx, Karl. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy* [1867]. Vol. 1. Trans. by Ben Fowkes. London: Penguin, 1992.

Marx, Karl. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy* [1894]. Vol. 3. Trans. by Ben Fowkes. London: Penguin, 1993.

Morawski, Stefan. *Inquiries into the Fundamentals of Aesthetics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1974.

[N.N.] "W. Winogradow, *O chudożestwiennoj prozie*. Wydawnictwo państwowe. Moskwa. 1930." *Miesięcznik Literacki* 10 (1930): 462–464.

Owczarek, Bogdan. "Wstęp: marksizm i literaturoznawstwo." *Marksizm i literaturoznawstwo współczesne. Antologia*. Eds. Bogdan Owczarek and Andrzej Lam. Warsaw: PIW, 1979. 5–44.

Pietrych, Piotr [Komentarze wydawcy]. Aleksander Wat, *Pisma Zebrane*. Tom 5: *Publicystyka*. Warsaw: Czytelnik, 2008.

Plekhanov, Grigorii. *Art and Society and Other Papers in Historical Materialism*. New York, NY: Oriole Editions, 1974.

Radek, Karl. "Contemporary World Literature and the Tasks of Proletarian Art." [1934] *Soviet Writers' Congress 1934*. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1977. 73–182.

Said, Edward. "Travelling Theory." *The World, the Text, and the Critic*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983. 226–247.

Sławiński, Janusz. "The 'New Type' of Literary Criticism in the Stalinist Period." [1981] Trans. by Kalina Iwanek. *Studies on Socialist Realism: The Polish View*. Eds. Anna Artwińska, Bartłomiej Starnawski, and Grzegorz Wołowiec. Frankfurt/M.: Peter Lang, 2016. 77–100.

Shklovskii, Viktor. *Material i stil' v romane L'va Tolstogo 'Voina i mir'*. Moscow: Federatsiia, 1928.

Shklovskii, Viktor. "Iskusstvo kak priem." [1917] *Sobranie sochynenii*. Vol. 1. Ed. Ilia Kalinin. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2018. 250–268.

Stawar, Andrzej [AS]. "O sztuce proletariackiej." *Kultura Robotnicza* 1 (1922a): 11–14.

Stawar, Andrzej [AS]. "Teatr proletariacki." *Kultura Robotnicza* 6 (1922b): 1–6.

Trages. "Teatr masowy." *Kultura Robotnicza* 8.30 (1923): 234–236.

Wat, Aleksander. "Reportaż jako rodzaj literacki." *Miesięcznik Literacki* 7 (1930a): 330–334.

Wat, Aleksander. "Wspomnienie o futuryzmie." *Miesięcznik Literacki* 2 (1930b): 68–77.

Wat, Aleksander. "Metamorfozy futuryzmu." *Miesięcznik Literacki* 3 (1930c): 121–128.

Wat, Aleksander. "W pracowniach stylu." *Miesięcznik Literacki* 17 (1930d): 773–780.

Wat, Aleksander. My Century: *The Odyssey of a Polish Intellectua*l [1977]. Trans. by Richard Lourie. New York, NY, and London: Norton, 1990.

Winiarski, Léon. "Essai sur la mécanique sociale." *Revue Philosophique de la France et de l'Étranger* 45 (1898): 351–386.

Winiarski, Leon. *William Morris*. Warsaw: Natanson, 1900.

Winiarski, Leon. "Czynniki społeczne w literaturze." [1890] *Teoria badań literackich w Polsce*. Vol. 1. Ed. Henryk Markiewicz. Krakow: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1960. 85–103.

Winiarski, Léon. *Essais sur la mécanique sociale*. Ed. Giovanni Busino. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1967.

Wisse, Ruth R. *I. L. Peretz and the Making of Modern Jewish Culture*. Washington, WA: University of Washington Press, 1991.

Wóycicki, Kazimierz. *Jedność stylowa utworu poetyckiego*. Warsaw: Towarzystwa Naukowe Warszawskie, 1914.

Żółkiewski, Stefan. *Stare i nowe literaturoznawstwo*. Szkice krytyczno-naukowe. Wroclaw: Ossolineum, 1950.

Żółkiewski, Stefan. "A Contribution to the Problem of the Relation between Style and Culture." *The Polish Sociological Bulletin* 14 (1966a): 20–29.

Żółkiewski, Stefan. "Notes on the Relationship between Style and Culture." *Poetics = Poetyka = Poetika, II*. Eds. Roman Jakobson, et al. Hague and Paris: Mouton; Warsaw: PWN – Polish Scientific Publishers, 1966b. 3–13.

II.7 Walter Benjamin and the Frankfurt School

Michał Mrugalski

Siegfried Kracauer and Walter Benjamin. Precursors of the Frankfurt School in Transference with the Slavic Body of Thought

In this chapter, I seek to demonstrate how, on the one hand, Siegfried Kracauer and Walter Benjamin perceived Russia – and marginally Poland – through the lenses of their respective theories and how, on the other hand, numerous Russian ideas frequently embodied in works of art shaped the very way in which the two comprehended art, history, and contemporaneity at large. This process of projection–reception remains relevant after many decades in view of the fact that the confrontation with the Slavic body of thought inspired Kracauer and Benjamin to formulate the ideas for which the Frankfurt School and, more generally, the German intellectual Left subsequently became celebrated.

Siegfried Kracauer had the greatest impact on the exchange with Russian thought conducted by the influential group of Jewish-German progressive thinkers who to this day receive the lion's share of the attention from German departments the world over. First, he was a leading intellectual figure in the circle of thinkers also encompassing Benjamin, Ernst Bloch, and Theodor W. Adorno, whom he introduced to Benjamin as his long-time friend and a youthful protégé. Secondly, in his capacity as an editor of the newspaper *Frankfurter Zeitung*, he influenced the selection of books Benjamin reviewed – and the present chapter owes much to the reviews they both penned for said publication. That this chapter rests on Kracauer and Benjamin's journalistic work reflects a recent surge in interest in Benjamin's entanglement in the Weimar Republic's media change (Duttlinger and Weidner 2019–20). From the new vantage point, Slavic elements appear more prominent than ever before.

Scholars in the field of comparative literature (for example Géry 2017) have pointed out striking resemblances between Walter Benjamin's notion of the storyteller and the Russian formalist Boris Ėikhenbaum's theory of *skaz* (the imitation of oral narration in writing), both concepts having been explained in relation to the material of Nikolai Leskov's writings. I will argue that this concurrence is only one aspect of a broader complex encompassing the dialectical relations between the archaic and the modern, sleep and awakening, the word and the body (or gesture), Enlightenment and nature. All these problems – all of them the most influential tenets of Benjamin's philosophy of culture – took shape in a creative process fuelled by Slavic resources and oriented toward the comprehension and

justification of the Soviet Union. Benjamin's thought demonstrates a particular proximity to the Leningrad formalism of the Society for the Study of Poetic Language (Obshchestvo izucheniia Poėticheskogo Iazyka, OPOIaZ) and semantic palaeontology understood broadly so as to engulf Nikolai Marr's linguistics and Mikhail Bakhtin's vision of the carnival as a feast of endless life and the collective body (on communal ecstasy see sections 1 and 2). Benjamin's confrontation with Russian formalism foregrounds in the latter the elements generally not considered central to the movement but which have aroused ever-increasing interest, namely the legacy of Romanticism as precisely the sober, prosaic, and technically-minded attitude, 'the living word' (*zhivoe slovo*), i. e., the bodily performance of (literary) utterances, 'production art' and the 'literature of the fact', in the development of which, alongside Sergei Tret'iakov, whom Benjamin appreciated greatly, the old formalists Viktor Shklovskii and Osip Brik played an active role. In the light of Benjamin's comments, Shklovskii's formalism shares with Marr's semantic palaeontology the assumption of the historicity of perception and the general ways in which the human body thinks, speaks, behaves and experiences (the world and itself) (on semantic paleontology see Galin Tihanov's chapter on this topic in this volume).

1 Relative identities: Germans, Russians and Dostoevskii

The transfer of Russian ideas to the German intellectual milieus of the first four decades of the twentieth century bore a resemblance to the situation of transference in Freudian therapy, given that the Germans redirected to Russia the fascination and enthusiasm which they had experienced towards the Ancient Greeks at the turn of the nineteenth century, the time when German modern identity was formed (Chytry 1986; Marchand 1996; Ferris 2000). The situation of transference explains why the engagement with Russian ideas bore the traits of "reception in distraction", to use the term with which Benjamin described going to the movies (Benjamin 2002a [1935–1936], 120); fascination intermingled with philological ignorance as many an intermediary, Kracauer and Benjamin included, had a less than rudimentary command of the Russian language (Benjamin 1991a [1927] *passim*), often relying on stereotypical notions relating to the "national character" of the Russians. With regard to philological proficiency, Kracauer and Benjamin differed from their prodigious predecessors from the turn of the nineteenth century, who defined Germanness by relating it to the Greek ideal. But other than that, Kracauer and Benjamin took up the tried and tested figures of thought about

the role of the Other in the advent of the self. Kracauer repeats in his early but consequential essay titled "Nietzsche und Dostojewski" (1921, "Nietzsche and Dostoevskii", 1990a) the scheme once formulated by Friedrich Hölderlin (1988 [1801]), whose popularity was then enjoying a resurgence. (Benjamin wrote about him in 1996a [1914–1915] and probably took some cues from his notion of *caesura* (Hölderlin 2001 [1804], 64–68) while working on his notions of discontinuity and the dialectical image – cf. below; moreover, he devoted his formative works to the epoch of Romanticism and Goethe – 1996b [1920]; 1996c [1924–1925].) According to Hölderlin, the Germans as a nation epitomise a mirror reversal of the Greeks with a view to two essential features which prefigure Nietzsche's dichotomy of the Dionysian and the Apollonian – in Hölderlin's terms: the "fire from heaven" and the "clarity of the presentation", i. e., the formal (Hölderlin 1988 [1801]: 149). Just as the Greeks, unbridled by nature, had to adopt the strictly formal classical form in order to attain full humanity, so too must the phlegmatic Germans admit more fire to their personal and political lives. Kracauer projects these figures of thought onto the Germans and the Russians, as represented by their most distinctive individuals, Nietzsche and Dostoevskii.

In the eyes of both conservatives and progressives, Dostoevskii commonly embodied the Super-Russian who in the situation of transference holds answers to German woes. Hermann Hesse stated plainly in 1918 that without doubt Germany's youth regarded Dostoevskii, and not Goethe or Nietzsche, as their great writer (Koenen 2005, 350); Thomas Mann (1986 [1920], 109) wrote in 1920 about Dostoevskii's reign over 'European' (in Germany it usually means 'German') youth. As in the case of the translations of Shakespeare in the nineteenth century (Höfele 2016), some Germans believed to have enhanced Dostoevskii so that in the future the world would be able to take possession of the Russian Dostoevskii only through the mediation of the German one (Koenen 2005, 351–352). In accordance with Dostoevskii's own worldview, he was celebrated mostly by the conservative circles; the trailblazer of the 'conservative revolution', Arthur Moeller van den Bruck, together with the Russian culture pessimist Dmitrii Merezhkovskii, edited the German version of Dostoevskii's collected writings. However, revolutionary thinkers such as Ernst Bloch also mimicked the Russian's sombre apocalyptic style and frequently evoked his name in a utopian context (Bloch 1918, 184, 216, 431–432). And in this spirit, I would like to read Kracauer's essay on Nietzsche and Dostoevskii and some passages from Benjamin as attempts to appropriate the significant writer, admittedly a conservative one, for the progressive revolution, which should nevertheless render the entire past available to enfranchised humanity.

In "Nietzsche and Dostoevskii", Kracauer fills in Hölderlin's scheme of transcultural reversal to the effect that Germans now correspond with the formal, the

Apollonian, the individualist, and the upward movement, whereas the Russians appear as the informal, Dionysian, communal, and downward-striving people (Kracauer 1990a [1921], 98–99). German youth cannot, however, identify with either ideal; confronted with the choice between individualism and communitarianism, they balk (Kracauer 1990a [1921], 102). As is so often the case in critical German thought, the danger itself conceals the salvation: the impossibility to take sides amounts to the proper answer. What the identity crisis of youth lays bare is, according to Kracauer, the true nature of the two nations. In harmony with Hölderlin's model, the Apollonian nature of the Germans, their individualism, turns out to be nothing but a defensive reaction to their own nature, endowed with a proclivity towards orgiastic and mystical ecstasy, as Nietzsche's intellectual biography purportedly demonstrates. The Russians' (Dostoevskii's) tendency towards a dissolution in the unity with humanity directed toward God results from overcoming innate individualism, the proponent of which the young Dostoevskii supposedly had been before the punishment and the tsar's clemency made him a new man (Kracauer 1990a [1921], 104). The undecidedness of German youth attests to its intuitive openness to the ideal of the whole human which reconciles the formal with the informal, unites the upward and the downward tendencies, Germans and Russians. The people, *das Volk*, embodies the "third party", the mediator who strives towards an ideal while standing in solidarity with the huddled masses; however, the mediator's spirit still remains muffled, dull (*dumpf*, Kracauer 1990a [1921], 107). The youth ought to awaken the people's spirit without, however, forcing it to relinquish their universality and spontaneity. As I will demonstrate below, this figure of thought will be prominent in the dialectics of the Enlightenment developed by Kracauer using the material of Soviet prose (see section 4).

In "Nietzsche and Dostoevskii", Kracauer refrains from foisting upon his readers a utopian ideal of an archaic community. On the contrary, he validates its qualities as only a point of reference and departure for a future-oriented youth culture. Moreover, a traditional culture simply cannot survive in the modern world. In his report on a public lecture by the long-standing minister of culture Anatolii Lunacharskii, Kracauer expands on the different meanings phrases acquire while travelling across time and space; the Russians' apparent scientism in fact expresses something completely different than the aspirations of the nineteenth century (Kracauer 1990b [1931], 397). The same applies to the term "the people", which no longer evokes Slavophile sentiments.

On another occasion, Kracauer deems his vision of the people instrumental in understanding the culture of the Soviet Union. As the Soviet Union purportedly makes a great leap in 1930, Kracauer states that in the Soviet Union, "under the guise of Marxism, contemporary Slavdom (*Slaventum*) is lived out" (Kracauer 1990c [1930], 183). He mentions in this context Dostoevskii and Vladimir Solov'ev

and adds: "One only half understands Russian communism if one deliberately overlooks its reliance on the national" (Kracauer 1990c [1930], 183). Not that the Soviet cultural activists, who faced the task of implementing proletarian culture in an overwhelmingly rural country, were unaware of this: the quality of *narodnost'* (popularity/nationality) soon became a distinctive feature of Socialist Realism. But Kracauer also foregrounded another element of the Russian communitarian legacy present in the Soviet project. The former bears on Soviet socialism in that its creators understand their work in religious or even ecclesiastical terms. For example, Lunacharskii likens socialism in the period of its construction to an *ecclesia militans* (church militant) and its eventual triumph would amount to an *ecclesia triumphans* (church triumphant, Kracauer 1990b [1931], 397).

An important aspect of this secularised "doctrine of salvation" (*Heilslehre*, Kracauer 1990b [1931], 397) is the seriousness of the Soviet approach to even the most minute things, which tends to be regarded in the light of the ultimate truth. It is precisely this interest in theory that Kracauer appreciates. He describes theory's importance for everyday life as a continuous confrontation of quotidian practices with theory; every activity turns out to have a political meaning (Kracauer 1990b [1931], 396). Germany's spiritual life would profit – Kracauer (1990b [1931], 396) suggests – from such a decomposition of the apparent neutrality dominating discussions in Germany, while the Russians attest to the fact that everything is political and thus theoretical. Serious theory thus appears to combine science with the doctrine of salvation.

Benjamin likewise devoted one of his early essays (1996d [1917]) to Dostoevskii, specifically to his novel *Idiot* (1868, *The Idiot*). The preoccupation with Dostoevskii inconspicuously frames Benjamin's oeuvre, as the essay contains the first formulation of the notion of the "aura", which will be essential in his late works in media theory (see section 2). Benjamin depicts Prince Myshkin, the hero of Dostevskii's novel, as somebody who travels between Russia with its boundless life and the West firmly set on individualism. Hence in Benjamin, too, Dostoevskii appears as a figure of cultural transference regarded in Hölderlin's and Nietzsche's categories. As I will show in the next section, Benjamin's rendering of Dostoevskii correlates with another grand topic in the former's philosophy of culture, dream and awakening, to which the unfinished *Passagen-Werk* (*Arcades Project*) in particular was (to be) devoted. The image of Dostoevskii in Benjamin's writings oscillates between a dream, which must be confronted with the soberness of an operative artist like Sergei Tret'iakov, and the moment of awakening, in which all pieces of the dream fall into place.

2 Dream and awakening: from Hofmannsthal's *The Tower* to the Molotov–Ribbentrop Pact

But it was Poland, Dostoevskii's *bête noire*, which provided the arena where Benjamin's most important motifs – dream and awakening, myth and reflection, body and word – converged. The action of Pedro Calderón's play *La vida es sueño* (1635, *Life is a Dream*) is set in Poland; the setting remained unchanged in Hugo von Hofmannsthal's 'tragic drama' (*Trauerspiel*) *Der Turm* (1925/1927, *The Tower*) based on Calderón's prototype. In his first review of Hofmannsthal's reworking of Calderón from 1926 (two years later, Benjamin also penned a review of a new version of the play – Benjamin 1999a [1928]), Benjamin refers to the mythical Poland of the tragic drama as an arena where politics consist in radical uncertainty as to whether we find ourselves in a dream or in reality. In all versions of the tragic play, King Basilio imprisons his son Segismundo in a tower in order to avoid the fulfilment of an oedipal prophecy. One day, the king frees the prince by way of trial, convincing him that he only dreamt his incarceration, but when the prince displays his roughness, the king has him imprisoned again and persuaded that the entire adventure was just a dream. The plot appealed to Benjamin's theoretical imagination. The passages from dream to reality and back serve as a master metaphor in Benjamin's concept of history. He perceives the tragic drama as an allegory of the fact that dreams are the royal road to the meaning of history: "The dream as the lynchpin of historical event – this is [Hofmansthal's] fascinating, strange formula" (Benjamin 1991b [1926], 31). And just as the historian described in Benjamin's mature work, Hofmannsthal leads his audience into the awakened world, the *Wachwelt* (Benjamin 1991b [1926], 31).

In his unfinished magnum opus, *The Arcades Project*, Benjamin states: "The realization of dream elements in the course of waking up is the canon of dialectics. It is paradigmatic for the thinker and binding for the historian" (Benjamin 1999b [1982], 464). And in another fragment:

> Just as Proust begins the story of his life with an awakening, so must every presentation of history begin with awakening; in fact, it should treat of nothing else. [*The Arcades Project*], accordingly, deals with awakening from the nineteenth century. (Benjamin 1999b [1982], 464)

The moment of awakening is paradigmatic for the historian of culture because it unifies all the *gestalten* of false consciousness, which truthfully express the false conditions in which they emerged, with an ultimate state of consciousness that sees through them and arranges them in a meaningful way. The awakening can be understood both in economic-political and theological terms (since theological

metaphors manage the distribution of political imaginary even in the minds of Soviet operatives like Lunacharskii). Benjamin parallels the moment of awakening with the "now of recognisability" of the "dialectic image", an instant in which "what has been comes together in a flash with the now to form a constellation" (Benjamin 1999b [1982], 463) and to show its actual nature:

> Is awakening perhaps the synthesis of dream consciousness (as thesis) and waking consciousness (as antithesis)? Then the moment of awakening would be identical with the "now of recognizability", in which things put on their true – surrealist – face. (Benjamin 1999b [1982], 463–464)

The fundamental issue as to why the main task of historical materialist consists in combining the dream and the waking state becomes less perplexing when it is related to the Soviet discussions concerning proletarian culture. At the same time, such a contextualisation of Benjamin reveals that even the most esoteric and quasi-theological areas of his thought were permeated with considerations on current political issues, most notably Soviet ideology. The utmost pressing issue in the relations between formalist literary theory as the voice of the avant-garde and the Bolshevik state concerned the attitude towards the pre-revolutionary past (the dream-reality). Should the proletariat create its own culture from scratch, renouncing all achievements of the past as expressions of false consciousness, as the futurists, the Left Front of Art (Levyi front iskusstv, LEF) and some representatives of the *proletkul't* ('proletarian culture') would have it, or should the proletariat perceive itself as the rightful heir of the whole of human history? Benjamin suggests a kind of "historical apocatastasis" (Benjamin 1999b [1982], 459) as a result of which all elements of the past without exception are "brought into the present" (Benjamin 1999b [1982], 459). However, they are altered, displaced in the dialectical process of destroying the previous contexts (cf. Benjamin's comments on the nature of criticism, for example in 2003 [1928], 180–182). The whole past thus belongs to the liberated working class, but the past turns out to be something different than it was before the professional historian began his or her work of fragmentation and montage. The answer to the question as to whether Benjamin proposed his own separate approach to the problem of legacy or just tried to implement the "Leninist approach" (Garzonio and Zalambani 2011, 14) to the best of his abilities depends on the scope of the destructive work. According to Lenin, all elements of past culture could be used in the construction of socialism and Benjamin's cringeworthy kowtowing to Lenin in his review of the former's correspondence with Maksim Gor'kii on religion and myth suggests he might wish to raise the banner of Leninism (Benjamin 1991c [1926]). The discussions of the 1920s on the pre-revolutionary legacy were placed in a new light after the instauration of Socialist Realism in 1934. During the First Congress of Soviet Writers, where

the doctrine of Socialist Realism was proclaimed, Maksim Gor'kii spoke about the necessity of mythology and mythological thinking in socialist creation (Gor'kii 1977 [1935]). Socialism was to combine collective mythmaking with the sobriety of an engineer, which corresponds with Benjamin's moment of awakening, likewise consisting of dream and clearheaded re-structuration. Was Benjamin's *Arcades Project* simply a Socialist Realist take on the cultural history of the nineteenth century? It definitely repeated the most general tenets of Socialist Realism. However, since Socialist Realism imitated the aesthetics and the poetics of nineteenth-century prose, Benjamin's theory and practice of the dialectical image, which leans on the latest innovations in the humanities and the arts and does not resemble or imitate but displaces and reinterprets, derails the official doctrine. In this veritably Kafkaesque way, the strictest conformity with party policy turns out to be the most subversive.

While Proust, whom Benjamin regards as the poet of awakening (Benjamin 1999b [1982], 464) and translates into German during his visit to Moscow in preference to learning Russian (1991a [1927], 298, 327), prompts the organisation of the materialist image of the past, the poet of the dream – the nightmare – is none other than Dostoevskii. Benjamin writes in a review of a contemporary Russian writer that the experience of finishing reading a Dostoevskii novel differs drastically from what one undergoes with other writers. Whereas closing a book usually resembles closing the door while going outside, the Dostoevskii reader has to come to; he must collect himself:

> I have to, as when waking, find my bearings. While reading, I feel only so shadow-like, as if I were a dreamer. It is because Dostoevskii delivers my bounded consciousness to the petrifying laboratory of his imagination, exposes it to events, visions, and voices in which my consciousness becomes alien to me and dissolves. It surrenders unconditionally even to the most minor of his characters, it is bound, at his mercy. (Benjamin (1991d [1927], 64)

Dostoevskii is the primordial poet of the dream – and likewise of the 'aura'. Benjamin introduces the very important notion of his theory of media – the contemporary mode of perception is characterised precisely by the dissolution of the "aura" (Benjamin 2002a [1935–36], 104–105) – in an essay on Dostoevskii's *The Idiot*, published in 1917, but written even earlier. The two occurrences of the word 'aura', separated by two decades, cannot be deemed merely homonymous, since the Dostoevskii aura possesses the two most important qualities of the aura as outlined in "The Work of Art in the Age of its Reproducibility" ("Das Kunstwerk im Zeitalter seiner technischen Reproduzierbarkeit", 1935–1936): an auratic work of art, on the one hand, pertains to a particular place in time and space and on the other it evokes the feeling of an insurmountable distance, hailing from the cultic origins of art. As for the first quality, "[i]n even the most perfect reproduction,

one thing is lacking: the here and now of the work of art – its unique existence in a particular place", writes Benjamin in 1936 (Benjamin 2002a [1935–36], 103). The embeddedness of every work of art in a unique context amounts to founding auratic artworks' most cherished qualities – genuineness and situatedness in tradition. Similarly, for Dostoevskii as Benjamin sees him during World War One, i. e., as the "great nationalist",

> there is no profound human impulse which would not find its decisive place in the aura of the Russian spirit. The ability to represent such impulses together with their aura, freely suspended in the context of the nation and yet inseparable from it, is perhaps the quintessence of freedom in the great art of this writer. (Benjamin [1917] 1996, 78; translation altered)

Furthermore, the profoundly auratic art of Dostoevskii demands a respectful distance, which likewise defines the aura in the later essay on reproducibility: "What, then, is the aura? A strange tissue of space and time: the unique apparition of a distance, however near it may be" (Benjamin 2002a [1935–36], 104–105). In the case of *The Idiot* (read before 1917) the distancing force of the aura is so strong that it inhibits the critic in conducting his destructive procedures. Whereas in Benjamin's later thought criticism displays a resolve towards works of arts which the critic fragments with the aim of creating dialectical images while at the same time destroying their beautiful appearance, in 1917 Dostevskii's aura strikes awe into the heart of the reader: "Criticism can justify its right to approach works of art only by respecting their territory and taking care not to trespass on that forbidden soil" [Again, the auratic work of art is thought of as a special place – M.M.] (Benjamin 1996d [1917], 78–79).

In Benjamin's theoretical imagination, the polar opposite of the dreamy and auratic Dostevskii is another Russian writer, Sergei Tret'iakov, the hero of the lecture "Der Autor als Produzent" (1936, "The Autor as Producer") and, incognito, of "The Work of Art in the Age of its Reproducibility". Benjamin's biographer stresses that he repeatedly tried to publish the "Work of Art" essay in the Soviet Union and wrote in a letter to Margarete Steffin (an actress and a translator, one of Bertolt Brecht's closest collaborators) that it would mean a lot to him if Tret'iakov could acquaint himself with this article (Jäger 2017, 309). Tret'iakov, who, incidentally, spoke excellent German and needed no translation into Russian, represents in Benjamin the fading of the aura in the shape of a radical reduction of the distance between the author and the audience. Any member of the reading public can – thanks to the new means of literary production such as a newspaper, magazine, or radio – assume the function of the creator (Benjamin 1999c [1934], 770–772; 2002a [1935–36], 114–115). This exchangeability of positions between authors and receivers hinges on the organisational role of the writer. The "opera-

tional writer", as Tret'iakov sees him, intervenes in reality, taking the side of the proletariat and changing the conditions in accordance with the most progressive (awakened) consciousness. He takes, for instance, an active part in establishing collective farms. In the controversy within Russian Marxism concerning the role of literature and art in general – should it reflect reality as Georgii Plekhanov would have it, or should it organise it, as Aleksandr Bogdanov and the *proletkul't* and the avant-garde posited? (Novozhilova 1968, 20; Owczarek 1979, 14–25) – Benjamin sides with the latter stance. Consequently, he can assume that the proper political tendency of the work guarantees its artistic refinement, that, in other words, the political tendency, which always ultimately relates to the proper usage of the means of production, encompasses the successful deployment of literary devices, i. e., the literary means of production (Benjamin 1999c [1934], 768–770). A writer not only works on products, but he incessantly develops the means of production too; the organisational function of his writing consists precisely in this double task, which endows his work with exemplary qualities, potent enough to turn a reader into a writer. Thanks to Tret'iakov – Benjamin repeats in both essays – labour or work (*Arbeit*) itself speaks.

The difference between a Dostoveskii and a Tret'iakov is best expressed in "The Work of Art..." in the form of an opposition between the magician and the surgeon (*Operateur* – Benjamin 1991e [1939], 495–496 – a clear allusion to Tret'iakovs "operative writer" as well as to the cameraman, the *Kameraoperateur*):

> The attitude of the magician, who heals a sick person by a laying-on of hands, differs from that of the surgeon, who makes an intervention in the patient. The magician maintains the natural distance between himself and the person treated; more precisely, he reduces it slightly by laying on his hands, but increases it greatly by his authority. The surgeon does exactly the reverse: he greatly diminishes the distance from the patient by penetrating the patient's body, and increases it only slightly by the caution with which his hand moves among the organs. [...]. – Magician is to surgeon as painter is to cinematographer. (Benjamin 2002a [1935–36], 115–116)

And the painter is to the cinematographer as Dostoevskii is to Tret'iakov. Nevertheless, the materialist historian does not have to take sides: the moment of awakening by no means involves the abandonment of Dostoevskii in favour of Tret'iakov, but rather a synthesis of the two moments. This is the reason why Benjamin – in contradistinction to Kracauer (1990d [1931]) – could spare himself the indignation at Tret'iakov's disregard for the writer's individuality and his or her particular gift. Upon hearing Tret'iakov, Kracauer could not stand the effacement of the borderline separating a profane native speaker of a language who can pen a letter to the editor from a creator steeped in captivating the audience. For Benjamin, Tret'iakov's sober-mindedness, anti-auratic as it were, amounts to being just

an element of the dialectic process of the materialist historiography of culture – an element which, by way of reacting with remnants of the dreamworld, enters a dialectical image of tradition. Just as in the essay about surrealism, the roughness of, say, Adam Mickiewicz, Mikhail Bakunin, and Lautréamont's "revolt" should coincide with a clearheaded engineering to result in a "revolution" (Benjamin 2002b [1929], 215) and just as in the finale of *Einbahnstraße* (1928, *One-Way Street*) modern technology opens a chance for humanity to renew its ancient liaison with the universe by way of collective ecstasy (Benjamin 1996e [1928], 486–487), so the angel of history needs the two wings to soar and recuperate the past. These central motives of Benjamin's thought resonate with the Soviet discussion on myth and technology in Socialist Realism and reality as expressed in Gor'kii's programmatic speech at the first Congress of Soviet Writers in 1934.

Furthermore, the synthesis of Dostoevskii's dream-and-mythmaking with the modern technique of montage already occurred in Dostoevskii. The technique of montage itself was prefigured in Dostevskii's *Besy* (1871–1872, *Demons*). Benjamin writes on his uncompleted work on the Parisian passages: "Method of this project: literary montage. I needn't say anything. Merely show", with the help of ready-made unflashy quotes (Benjamin 1999b [1982], 460). One of the protagonists of Dostoevskii's novel, Lizaveta Nikolaevna, discussed with Shatov the idea of a book consisting only of citations from newspapers and showing a complete image of "the has been":

> A multitude of metropolitan and provincial newspapers and other journals is published in Russia, and these report daily on a multitude of events. The year goes by, the newspapers are everywhere stacked up in bookcases, or turned into litter, torn up, used for wrapping things or for hats. Many of the facts published produce an impression and remain in the public memory, but are then forgotten over the years. Many people would like to refer to them later, but what an effort it is to search through that sea of pages, often without knowing the day, or the place, or even the year when the event occurred. And yet, if all these facts for a whole year were brought together in one book, with a certain plan and a certain idea, with a table of contents, an index, a classification by month and day – such a combined totality could present a whole characterization of Russian life for that whole year, notwithstanding the extremely small portion of facts as compared with all that had happened. [...] [T]he main thing was the plan and the way the facts were presented. (Dostoevskii 2011 [1871], 128)

Benjamin came up with the plan to focus the symbolic history of the nineteenth century on the Parisian arcades as a kind of dreamy space of commodity fetishism shaped by implacable economic factors.

This is what the ideal awakening would look like if Benjamin were able to bring his project to completion. Instead, a rude awakening occurred in the form of Stalin's complicity in the outbreak of World War II. The Ribbentrop–Molotov Pact achieved what the Moscow show trials could not (Jäger 2017, 286, 316) and swept

away Benjamin's illusions about the Soviet Union and with it a big chunk of the foundations of his later thought, whose starting point was the strict distinction between fascist and anti-fascist ('proletarian') tendencies and the identification of the latter with Soviet communism. His theory embodied a stage in the Soviet propaganda – the 'popular front' manoeuvre, which aimed to turn all non-fascist political movements into the broad margins of the Komintern – when he preached a philosophy of art, the most important feature of which was its complete unsuitability for fascism (Benjamin 2002a [1935–36], 102); and when he claimed that the autonomy of the contemporary writer actually means a surrender to the service of the proletariat (Benjamin 1999c [1934], 768–769) because one needs to respond to the fascist anesthetisation of politics with the politization of aesthetics (Benjamin 2002a [1935–36], 122), i. e., a purposeful combination of sober-mindedness and ecstasy, waking state with oneiric visions. Actual politics bypassed the thought which imagined itself as belonging to the organising committee of reality itself.

3 Materialism, formalism, and the bodily thought

I would like now to come back to my starting point drawing on Benjamin's review of Hofmannsthal's *The Tower*. Here, Benjamin not only introduces the dialectics of awakening, but also relates it to what would form the core of his take on historical 'materialism' – the relationship of the word to the body, which is the prototypical means of production and reproduction. The worker brings to the market his or her body and his or her mind, which usually interface with a machine. In Hofmannsthal, the word and the body meet in a place called 'the pre-tragic' (*das Vortragische*), testifying to the drama's origins in religious rites, which Benjamin conceives of in accordance with his time as a dual action: verbal behaviour that accompanies ceremonial gestures. Accordingly,

> the prototype of the dramatic tension is the tension between word and action. [...] [N]either a tension in the province of words alone (one of the debate), nor the tension of the speechless struggle (of the fight as such) is dramatic. The only thing that is dramatic is the tension of the ritual, which oscillates between the poles of activity and speech itself. (Benjamin 1991b [1926], 32)

Hofmannsthal's tragic drama (*Trauerspiel*) transports its viewers into the vicinity of the pre-tragic because tragedy (*Tragödie*), which Hofmannsthal renounces, stages as a later formation the tension between "body and language – action and word" (Benjamin 1991b [1926], 32) in a purely linguistic fashion (Benjamin 1991b [1926], 32–33).

The concept of the pre-tragic weighs on Benjamin's attitude towards literary theory (precisely: literary formalism) and the sociology of language. As for literary formalism, it suffices to compare the contempt he expresses for the German formalist Oskar Walzel with his enthusiastic praise of Viktor Shklovskii – on grounds of the relation of their writing to their bodily experiences in time and space. In his Moscow diary, Benjamin (1991a [1927], 339; cf. 1999d [1927], 37–38) shudders at the thought that the State Academy of Artistic Sciences (Gosudarstvennaia Akademia khudozhestvennykh nauk, GAKhN) elected Walzel a member; the event mars his image of the Soviet Union. From Benjamin's earlier review of Walzel's seminal book *Das Wortkunstwerk* (1926, *The Literary Work of Art*) follows that he particularly disdains Walzel's pedantic detachment from his object. "What he studies," Benjamin writes in a review, "is not poetry itself, but writing and talking about it" (Benjamin 1991f [1926], 50). And he sharply distinguishes the Walzel-like kind of 'formal analysis' (*Formanalyse*) from another, masterly way of dealing with form which does not consist in superficial, albeit conscientious, application of methods to material, but in penetrating pragmatic contents (*Sachgehalte*) so thoroughly that "the curve of their heartbeat appears as the line of their form" (Benjamin 1991f [1926], 50). Whatever he means by that, Benjamin definitively stresses the dialectical unity of form and content and, moreover, the fact that their relationship is mediated by the body, its rhythms and shape. Benjamin praises in passing the mastery of the Viennese art historian Alois Riegl as opposed to Walzel's ways. A decade later, in "The Work of Art in the Age of its Reproducibility", he expands on Riegl's and Franz Wickhoff's resourcefulness in demonstrating, using the material of art from the so-called eras of decadence, the historicity of human perception (Benjamin 2002a [1935–36], 104). The formalist master works, therefore, at the interface of the body and history. He or she relates, as it were, every work of art to the pre-tragic, the cultic origin of the work of art, and to the historicity of human (collective) sensibility contingent on the dominant forms of organisation (of production).

This is how Benjamin perceived "the Bolshevik epic writer" (Benjamin 1991g [1928], 108) Viktor Shklovskii, with whose work he became acquainted via the French translation of his *Sentimental'noe puteshestvie* (1923, *Sentimental Journey*). Benjamin puts Shklovskii's book in the context of the pre-tragic (without explicitly referring to the notion), i. e., he counts it among the works that show how "today, the most trained, the strictest thinking is forced to turn into political activity" (Benjamin 1991g [1928], 108). "There is nothing banal about Shklovskii's theories", affirms Benjamin, in crass contrast to his opinion of Walzel's bookish formalism, and he goes on to quote typical Shklovskiianisms on how art is in its origin destructive and ironic, how it aims to produce unevenness by using the device of comparison, how the creation of new forms involves the canonisation of subaltern ones – Pushkin's point of departure is the friendship book,

Nekrasov draws on vaudeville and Blok on gypsy romances. Finally, Benjamin quotes Shlovskii's claim that the fate of protagonists, the time of action, of every element of narrative serves exclusively as a motivation of form (Benjamin 1991g [1928], 108–109). If the scholarly work of reconstructing the motivation behind forms is not to degenerate into a pedantry of lesser formalism, Benjamin suggests, the hero's fate, the time of his actions, every element of a narrative must affect or at least relate to the body. And this is exactly the topic of Shklovskii's *Sentimental Journey* as Benjamin perceives it, namely as a Baroque mediation on the futility of existence. That is, what interests him is the lived experience behind the paradoxical book which purports to be written by a sentimental formalist but shows no traces of sentimentalism and remains formless: "[T]he form of the book consists not in the mode of presentation (*Darstellung*), but in the previously experienced, in the perceived itself" (Benjamin 1991g [1928], 108). And further he identifies the form of the book as a gesture:

> [I]f [Shklovskii] is right and the energy, the courage, the love he deployed against the chaos have achieved nothing, the clear, convincing gesture of this man is his book: an unforgettable gesture full of ruthless sadness (*Trauer*) and full of superior tenderness. (Benjamin 1991g [1928], 109)

Shklovskii therefore penetrates the pre-tragic domain of sadness, *Trauer*, where the negotiations between the word and the gesture take place. Benjamin's approach to Shklovskii's theory, seen as an expression of his embodied experiences in the space of revolutionary Russia, agrees with the mode of presentation adopted by the editor of Shklovskii's collected works, Ilia Kalinin, who classifies his writings as expressions of different aspects of the revolution (in politics, science, art, etc. cf. Shklovskii 2018). While unfolding in the latter writings the shock character of new media and the avant-garde art, Benjamin (2002a [1935–36], 118–119) does not refer to Shklovskii's conceptualisation of 'estrangement' (*ostranenie*), but he does correlate, as Shklovskii did, the renewal of perception with new sensual and bodily experiences enabled by the development of technology:

> Our bars and city streets, our offices and furnished rooms, our railroad stations and our factories seemed to close relentlessly around us. Then came film and exploded this prison-world with the dynamite of the split second [...]. [T]he tasks which face the human apparatus of perception at historical turning points cannot be performed solely by optical means, that is, by way of contemplation. They are mastered gradually – taking their cue from tactile reception – through habit. (2002a [1935–36], 117, 120)

The active, gesticulating body of the speaking human would preoccupy Benjamin throughout his career, especially in relation to Kafka and Brecht. Accordingly, in the domain of linguistics his interest lies at the juncture of word and action. The

bulk of his report, dated 1935, on the most relevant works on the sociology of language (Benjamin 2002c [1935]; Gess 2012) concentrates not on the interpersonal exchanges but on the tension between the gesture or the "sound gesture" and articulated language. Benjamin assumes at the outset that "[t]he central problems of philology and sociology come together most naturally and obviously in the question of the origin of language" (Benjamin 2002c [1935], 68), which since the Baroque era entails dealing with onomatopoeia, expressive screams, and hand gestures. In this extremely interdisciplinary field of study, bordering on child and animal psychology, ethnology, and psychopathology (Benjamin 2002c [1935], 68), two Soviet scholars contribute most to the mapping of the space of the pre-tragic. Nikolai Marr produces the most convincing (for Benjamin) model of the connection between articulated language and the material process of production, whereas Lev Vygotskii (1929) elucidates the necessity of interruption and of making-difficult for thought to emerge – the motif is especially salient in relation to the importance of discontinuity in Benjamin's philosophy (as in the notion of criticism, dialectic image, his understanding of epic theatre etc.). As for the genetic relationship between gestural and articulated language, Benjamin acknowledges (just as every citizen of the Soviet Union was supposed to back then) the authority of Nikolai Marr's vision of the origin of language (Marr 1926).

Marr starts by acknowledging the hand as the principal tool of both production and communication. Prior to the invention of external tools, the hand managed communication in its entirety: "The hand or hands were a person's tongue. Hand movements, facial expressions, and in some cases body movements as well were the only available means of linguistic creation" (Benjamin 2002c [1935], 74). The invention of articulated language depends on the invention of the first technical devices. Marr denies that

> the hand 'could have been replaced as the producer of a mental value – language – before it was replaced by tools as the producer of material goods [...].' Rather, [...] 'articulated language could not have emerged before mankind's transition to productive work with the aid of artificially fashioned tools'. (Benjamin 2002c [1935], 74)

This vantage point allows Marr to put forward a history of language the principal collective of which is class as defined by its relationship to the means of production rather than ethnicity, the main hero of traditional historical linguistics and *Völkerpsychologie*.

In Benjamin's eyes, Vygotskii supplements Marr's theory, which relates the emergence of articulated language to the invention of tools (on Vygotskii also see Sylvia Sasse's chapter on "'Aesthetic Reaction' and 'Verbal Reaction': Reader-response Criticism from Vygotskii to Voloshinov" in this volume). "But since the former activity is impossible without thought", Benjamin points out soberly,

"there must have been a kind of thought which antedated speech" (Benjamin 2002c [1935], 81). Vygotskii looks for cues as to the nature of this thought in chimpanzees and children; Benjamin devotes most detailed attention to his acknowledging polemics with Jean Piaget's concept of egocentric childhood language (Benjamin 2002c [1935], 82). Children under the age of six tend to mumble away in a continuous commentary on their playful activities, without showing any intention of communication. Vygotskii notices that children speak to themselves more frequently when confronted with an obstacle. Benjamin quotes Vygotskii's conclusion "that impedance or interruption of a smooth-running occupation is an important factor in generating egocentric language. [...] Thinking is brought into action only when an activity which has run unhindered up to then is interrupted" (Benjamin 2002c [1935], 83). That is to say, if thought emerges, as Vygotskii assumes to Benjamin's delight, in early childhood's egocentric language, making a practical task difficult or interrupting it facilitates the inception of thinking. Consequently, one can depict both the formalistic device of making-difficult (*zatrudnenie*) and Benjamin's special penchant for discontinuity in criticism as means of provoking thought.

Marr points to the passageway from quasi-theological or anthropological questions of the pre-tragic and the cultic function of the work of art to the historico-materialist focus on the means and the organization of production; Vygotskii, for his part, helps appreciate the significance of interruption and making difficult, which happen to be not only basic formal devices of Baroque and modernist art, but also the principal techniques of literary criticism.

4 The Russian dialectic of the Enlightenment

Literary techniques and devices thus relate to the body, and through the body the word and the thought permeate both animate and inanimate nature. In the art of Nikolai Leskov, as the prototypical storyteller for Benjamin,

> storytelling, in its sensory aspect, is by no means a job for the voice alone. Rather, in genuine storytelling what is expressed gains support in a hundred ways from the work-seasoned gestures of the hand. [...] That old coordination among the soul, eye, and hand [...] is that of the artisan which we encounter wherever the art of storytelling is at home. In fact, one might go on and ask oneself whether the relationship of the storyteller to his material, human life is not in itself a craftsman's relationship – whether it is not his very task to fashion the raw material of experience, his own and that of others, in a solid, useful, and unique way. (Benjamin 2002d [1936], 161–162)

Earlier on in this essay (Benjamin 2002d [1936], 160–161), Benjamin describes how the art of the storyteller Leskov gives the floor to the 'voice of nature' – crystals speak of the political history of Russia under the reign of Aleksander II. Storytellers, endowed with insight into matter, precede novelists, the chroniclers of the purely human. Indeed, the novel with its incessant search for the unachievable meaning of life – here the influence of Lukács's *Die Theorie des Romans* (1971 [1916], *Theory of the Novel*) makes itself felt – marks the demise of the art of storytelling. The craftsman as the prototypical storyteller, on the one hand, combines the knowledge of faraway lands, since his apprenticeship comprised a journey, with the wisdom of sedentariness – he displays insight into space and time. On the other hand, his narratives coincide with the movements of his body, which gesticulates and works on animate and inanimate materials; he therefore draws on the 'pre-tragic'. I would argue, however, that the storyteller serves not as a regressive ideal, pertaining to the patriarchal and rural Russia, but as a model of the proper approach to technique and material progress. The intellectual strives to establish a more fruitful rapport between the word (thought) and the material than mere domination. It is no accident that this future-oriented ideal came to Benjamin from Russia, since Kracauer likewise had located the lieu where the dialectics of the Enlightenment *avant la lettre* took place in the Soviet Union. Long before Theodor W. Adorno and Max Horkheimer coined the term in their book of the same title in 1947 (Adorno and Horkheimer 2002 [1947]), Kracauer described the very process in his Weimar essays – most notably in "Das Ornament der Masse" (1995 [1927], "The Mass Ornament") and in at least two reviews of Soviet books in which, in contradistinction to his refined essays, he cuts right to the heart of the matter.

The dialectics of the Enlightenment explains how reason itself became irrational; how the instance which was supposed to dispel the power of mythical forces over human lives became the myth itself. Instead of waking us up, reason drives us deeper into the dream. A short answer to this conundrum points to the fact that reason reduced itself to the intellect; it identified with instrumental reason alone und thus became irrational. Instrumental reason is driven by fear and set on domination and control with the help of which it expects to do away with anxiety and inadequacy. It pursues the domination of nature by and in human beings and consequently the domination of some humans by others as a means of managing nature (Adorno and Horkheimer 2002 [1947], 11). In contrast, art displays – at least potentially – a true enlightenment, as it appeals to the whole human (soul, eye, and hand – to revert to Benjamin); it displays a coherent organisation which does not boil down to the blind violence of the struggle between man and nature. This partly explains why by Benjamin's lights the organisational role of art trumps its mimetic function – which shows itself most clearly in the art of the avant-garde.

Kracauer observes first signs of the true Enlightenment in narratives on Soviet Russia. In Mikhail Sholokhov's *Tikhii Don* (1928–1932, 1940, *And Quiet Flows the Don*), the hero is "the natural community of the Cossacks" (Kracauer 1990e [1931], 277), which the story places in the situation of the revolution. The author knows that "it is nature, too, that in his Cossacks rears up against revolutionary knowledge, nature that can be bent and shaped, but never curtailed. On the basis of this insight, he affirms the revolution without negating the people" (Kracauer 1990e [1931], 278). In Sholokhov, it is the form of the epic time that allows nature to come to terms with itself in reason and reason to be reconciliated with nature without truncating it (Kracauer 1990e [1931], 276–278). Similarly, Franz Carl Weiskopf's reportage from 1932 suggests to Kracauer that the Soviet Union may be the place where the dialectic of the Enlightenment is being brought to a fortunate conclusion. To begin with, the land is free from fear, the driving force of rampant instrumental reason, the very fear that serves as the distinctive feature of "our new nationalism: the fear that the intellect could cause harm to nature" (Kracauer 1990 f [1932], 166). In the light of the dialectic of the Enlightenment, the fascist celebration of the irrational amounts to its apparent opposite, obsessive control over nature. In contrast, Weiskopf's reportage tells a story about simple people who soak up polytechnic knowledge as a sponge and about the active role of nature in the industrial re-shaping of the land (Kracauer 1990 f [1932], 166–167). In Germany, one tends to confuse

> two kinds of intellect (*Intellekt*): that which is itself a bad product of nature and which unfolds blindly and selfishly, and that which, thanks to its origin in reason (*Vernunft*), undertakes to regulate human society. The latter is not an enemy, but a friend of any nature that wants to be arranged at all, and the Russians only mean this second kind of intellect. This is clear from their relationship to technology. (Kracauer 1990 f [1932], 167)

Admittedly, they like to intoxicate themselves, not with technology as such, but with technology as placed at the service of society. And this is the only way the intellect can bound the arrogance of the nationalist principle driven by fear. Likewise, in this case, the scheme of thought outlived its real-life inspiration as the historical Soviet Union did not live up to its narrative depictions, the symbolic representation of which is the Chernobyl disaster in its technological and societal dimensions.

5 Conclusion: Back in Russia

As this chapter began with the Russo-German transference, so it concludes with the knowledge that the true relationship between mind and body, word and action, intellect and instinct, individuality and communality, the social and the national can only be attained in a transcultural setting.

Kracauer and Benjamin spun their theories while constantly referring to Russia and the Soviet Union. One can assume that without their fundamental illusions and deep knowledge about Eastern Europe they would probably have lacked the courage to formulate their most impactful ideas – they assumed the existence of a land in which the realisation of their notions of the dream and the awakening, embodied, narrative-based and non-violent reason seemed more likely. These ideas subsequently gained their own agency and had a bearing on the development of the humanities and, consequently, human reality.

For a long time, speakers of Russian were forced to ignore the input of Kracauer and especially Benjamin. While Kracauer's works on film appeared in the Soviet Union in the 1970s (Kracauer 1974, 1977), Benjamin had to wait for another two decades and the decline of the empire; his writings on the theory of media came first (Benjamin 1996 f), flanked by his *Moskauer Tagebuch* (*Moscow Diary*, 1997). The diary has aroused the interest of Russian researchers, who seek in it a vantage point from which to study Russian Modernism (as in the special issue of the journal *Logos* volume 28/1, 2018). Alongside abundant Russian translations, two approaches prevail in the process of reception. On the one hand, scholars scrutinize similarities with Russian thinkers. On the other hand, Igor' Chubarov (2018), Ivan Boldyrev (2012), Elena Vogman (2014, 2016) and others apply Benjamin's categories to describe the Russian avant-garde, while Krill Ospovat mostly focuses on the literature of the eighteenth century (Ospovat 2016a), but also on Andrei Belyi and Osip Mandel'shtam (Ospovat 2016b).

It is only recently that the situation has started to change so that delusional (dreamy, mythical) transference may become an aspect of a transfer taking place on a give-and-take basis. For the transfer to hold, the Western reader should remember how much Benjamin and Kracauer owe to Russian culture and to their own illusions about it.

References

Adorno, Theodor W., and Max Horkheimer. *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments* [1947]. Trans. by Edmund Jephcott. Ed. Gunzelin Schmid Noerr. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2002.

Benjamin, Walter. "Moskauer Tagebuch." [1927] *Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol. 6. Eds. Rolf Tiedemann and Hermann Schwäppenhäuser. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1991a. 292–408.

Benjamin, Walter. "Der Turm. Ein Trauerspiel in fünf Aufzügen." [1926] *Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol. 3. Ed. Hella Tiedemann-Bartels. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1991b. 29–33.

Benjamin, Walter. "W[ladimir] I[ljitsch] Lenin, *Briefe an Maxim Gorky*." [1926] *Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol. 3. Ed. Hella Tiedemann-Bartels. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1991c. 51–53.

Benjamin, Walter. "Iwan Scheljow, *Der Kellner*." [1927] *Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol. 3. Ed. Hella Tiedemann-Bartels. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1991d. 63–65.

Benjamin, Walter. "Das Kunstwerk im Zeitalter seiner Reproduzierbarkeit. Dritte Fassung." [1939] *Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol. 2. Eds. Rolf Tiedemann and Hermann Schwäppenhäuser. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1991e. 471–508.

Benjamin, Walter. "Oskar Walzel, *Das Wortkunstwerk. Mittel seiner Erforschung*." [1926] *Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol. 3. Ed. Hella Tiedemann-Bartels. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1991f. 50–51.

Benjamin, Walter. "Drei Bücher." [1928] *Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol. 3. Ed. Hella Tiedemann-Bartels. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1991g. 107–113.

Benjamin, Walter. "Two Poems by Friedrich Hölderlin." [1914–15] *Selected Writings*. Vol. 1. Eds. Marcus Bullock and Michael W. Jennings. Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 1996a. 18–36.

Benjamin, Walter. "The Concept of Criticism in German Romanticism." [1920] *Selected Writings*. Vol. 1. Eds. Marcus Bullock and Michael W. Jennings. Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 1996b. 116–200.

Benjamin, Walter. "Goethe's Elective Affinities." [1924–1925] *Selected Writings*. Vol. 1. Eds. Marcus Bullock and Michael W. Jennings. Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 1996c. 297–360.

Benjamin, Walter. "Dostoevsky's *The Idiot*." [1917] *Selected Writings*. Vol. 1. Eds. Marcus Bullock and Michael W. Jennings. Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 1996d. 78–81.

Benjamin, Walter. "One-Way Street." [1928] *Selected Writings*. Vol. 1. Eds. Marcus Bullock and Michael W. Jennings. Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 1996e. 444–488.

Benjamin, Walter [Ben'iamin, Valter]. *Proizvedenie iskusstva v ėpokhu ego tekhnicheskoi vosproizvodimosti. Izbrannye ėsse*. Ed. Iurii Zdorovyi. Moscow: Medium, 1996f.

Benjamin, Walter [Ben'iamin, Valter]. *Moskovskii dnevnik*. Trans. by Sergei Romashko. Ed. Mikhail Ryklin. Moscow: Ad Marginem, 1997.

Benjamin, Walter. "Hugo von Hofmannsthal's *Der Turm*." [1928] *Selected Writings*. Vol. 2.1. Eds. Michael W. Jennings and Marcus Paul Bullock. Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 1999a. 103–106.

Benjamin, Walter. *The Arcades Project* [1982]. Ed. Rolf Tiedemann. Trans. Howard Eiland and Kevin McLaughlin. Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 1999b.

Benjamin, Walter. "The Author as Producer." [1934] *Selected Writings*. Vol. 2.2. Eds. Michael W. Jennings and Marcus Paul Bullock. Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 1999c. 768–782.

Benjamin, Walter. "Moscow." [1927] *Selected Writings*. Vol. 2.1. Eds. Michael W. Jennings and Marcus Paul Bullock. Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 1999d. 22–46.

Benjamin, Walter. "The Work of Art in the Age of Its Technological Reproducibility." [1935–36] *Selected Writings*. Vol. 3. Eds. Howard Eiland and Michael W. Jennings. Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 2002a. 101–133.

Benjamin, Walter. "Surrealism. The Last Snapshot of the European Intelligentsia." [1929] *Selected Writings*. Vol. 3. Eds. Howard Eiland and Michael W. Jennings. Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 2002b. 207–221.

Benjamin, Walter. "Problems in the Sociology of Language: An Overview." [1935] *Selected Writings*. Vol. 3. Eds. Howard Eiland and Michael W. Jennings. Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 2002c. 68–93.

Benjamin, Walter. "The Storyteller: Observations on the Works of Nikolai Leskov." [1936] *Selected Writings*. Vol. 3. Eds. Howard Eiland and Michael W. Jennings. Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 2002d. 143–166.

Benjamin, Walter. *The Origin of German Tragic Drama* [1928]. Trans. by John Osborne. London and New York, NY: Verso, 2003.

Boldyrev, Ivan. *Vremia utopii. Problematicheskie osnovaniia i konteksty filosofii Ėrnsta Blokha*. Moscow: Izdatel'skii Dom VShE, 2012.

Bloch, Ernst. *Geist der Utopie*. Munich and Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1918.

Chubarov, Igor'. "Teoriia media Val'tera Ben'iamina i russkii levyi avangard: gazeta, radio, kino." *Logos* 28.1 (2018): 233–260.

Chytry, Josef. *The Aesthetic State: A Quest in Modern German Thought*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 1986.

Dostoevskii, Fedor [Dostoevsky, Fyodor]. *Demons: A Novel in Three Parts* [1871]. Trans. by Richard Prevar and Lisa Volokhonsky. London: Penguin Random House, 2011.

Ferris, David S. *Silent Urns: Romanticism, Hellenism, Modernity*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2000.

Duttlinger, Carolin, and Daniel Weidner. *Walter Benjamins publizistische Netzwerke. The Berlin-Oxford Research Partnership 2019–20*. https://www.zfl-berlin.org/projekt/walter-benjamins-publizistische-netzwerke.html (27 August 2020).

Garzonio, Stefano, and Maria Zalambani. "Literary Criticism during the Revolution and the Civil War, 1917–1921." *A History of Russian Literary Theory and Criticism: The Soviet Age and Beyond*. Eds. Evgeny Dobrenko and Galin Tihanov. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2011.

Géry, Catherine. *Leskov, le conteur. Réflexions sur Nikolaï Leskov, Walter Benjamin et Boris Eichenbaum*. Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2017.

Gess, Nicola. "'Schöpferische Innervationen der Hand'. Zur Gestensprache in Benjamins *Problemen der Sprachsoziologie*." *Walter Benjamins anthropologisches Denken*. Eds. Caroline Duttlinger, Ben Morgan, and Anthony Phelan. Freiburg: Rombach, 2012. 181–199.

Gor'kii, Maxim [Gorky, Maxim]. "Soviet Literature." [1935] *Soviet Writers' Congress 1934*. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1977. 25–69.

Höfele, Andreas. *No Hamlets: German Shakespeare from Nietzsche to Carl Schmitt*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Hölderlin, Friedrich. "[Letters] [t]o Casimir Ulrich Böhlendorf." [1801] *Essays and Letters on Theory*. Trans. and ed. Thomas Pfau. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1988. 149–153.

Hölderlin, Friedrich. *Hölderlin's Sophocles: Oedipus and Antigone* [1804]. Trans. by David Constantine. Tarset: Bloodaxe, 2001.

Jäger, Lorenz. *Walter Benjamin. Das Leben eines Unvollendeten*. Berlin: Rowohlt, 2017.

Kracauer, Siegfried. [Krakauer, Zigfrid]. *Priroda fil'ma: Reabilitatsiia fizicheskoi real'nosti*. Trans. by Dar'ia Sokolova. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1974.

Kracauer, Siegfried. [Krakauer, Zigfrid]. *Ot Kaligari do Gitlera: Psikhologicheskaia istoriia nemetskogo kino*. Trans. by Dar'ia Sokolova. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1977.

Kracauer, Siegfried. "Nietzsche und Dostojewski." [1921] *Schriften*. Vol. 5.1. Ed. Inka Mülder-Bach. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1990a. 95–110.

Kracauer, Siegfried. "Lunatscharski über die Russische Kultur. Bemerkungen zu seinem Vortrag." [1931] *Schriften*. Vol. 5.2. Ed. Inka Mülder-Bach. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1990b. 395–398.

Kracauer, Siegfried. "Oktober. Zu dem Buch von Larissa Reißner." [1930] *Schriften*. Vol. 5.2. Ed. Inka Mülder-Bach. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1990c. 181–183.

Kracauer, Siegfried. "Instruktionsstunde in der Literatur. Zu einem Vortrag des Russen Tretjakow." [1931] *Schriften*. Vol. 5.2. Ed. Inka Mülder-Bach. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1990d. 308–311.

Kracauer, Siegfried. "Kosaken reiten in die Weltgeschichte." [1931] *Schriften*. Vol. 5.2. Ed. Inka Mülder-Bach. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1990e. 275–278.

Kracauer, Siegfried. "Bericht aus der Sowjetunion." [1932] *Schriften*. Vol. 5.3. Ed. Inka Mülder-Bach. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1990 f. 166–168.

Kracauer, Siegfried. "The Mass Ornament." [1927] *The Mass Ornament. Weimar Essays*. Trans. and ed. Thomas Y. Levin. Cambridge, MA, and London: Harvard University Press, 1995. 75–88.

Koenen, Gerd. *Der Russland-Komplex: die Deutschen und der Osten 1900–1945*. Munich: Beck, 2005.

Lukács, György. *The Theory of the Novel [1916]*. Trans. by Anna Bostock. London: Merlin, 1971.

Mann, Thomas. "Knaben und Mörder." [1920] Thomas Mann, *Aufsätze, Reden, Essays*. Vol. 3. Ed. Harry Matter. Berlin and Weimar: Aufbau, 1986. 108–110.

Marchand, Susanne L. *Down from Olympus: Archaeology and Philhellenism in Germany, 1750–1970*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996.

Marr, Nikolai [Nikolaus]. "Über die Entstehung der Sprache." *Unter dem Banner des Marxismus* 1 (1926). 587–588.

Novozhilova, Larisa. *Sotsiologiia iskusstva: iz istorii sovetskoi èstetiki 20-kh godov*. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Leningradskogo universiteta, 1968.

Ospovat, Kirill. *Terror and Pity: Aleksandr Sumarokov and the Theater of Power in Elizabethan Russia*. Boston, MA: Academic Studies Press, 2016a.

Ospovat, Kirill. "Der Eherne Reiter: Politischer Barock und russische Revolution zwischen Puškin, Belyj und Benjamin." *Le Foucaldien* 2.1:12 (2016b). http://doi.org/10.16995/lefou.20 (27 August 2020).

Owczarek, Bogdan. "Wstęp: marksizm i literaturoznawstwo." *Marksizm i literaturoznawstwo współczesne. Antologia*. Eds. Bogdan Owczarek and Andrzej Lam. Warsaw: PIW, 1979. 5–44.

Shklovskii, Viktor. *Sobranie sochinenii*. Vol. 1 and 2. Ed. Ilia Kalinin. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2018.

Vogman. Elena. "Striking Factory and Strike of Consciousness in the Work of S. M. Eisenstein." *View. Theories and Practices of Visual Culture* 6 (2014). http://widok.ibl.waw.pl/index.php/one/article/view/196/355 (27 August 2020).

Vogman, Elena. "Dynamographie. Andrej Belyjs rhythmische Figuren." *Le Foucaldien* 2.1 (2016). DOI: 10.16995/lefou.18 (27 August 2020).

Vygotskii, Lev [Wygotski, Lew]. "Die genetischen Wurzeln des Denkens und der Sprache." *Unter dem Banner des Marxismus* 3 (1929): 450–470.

Francesco Tava

Tragic Realism: On Karel Kosík's Insights into Kafka

The publication in 1963 of *Dialektika konkrétního: Studie o problematice člověka a světa* (1976, *Dialectics of the Concrete: A Study on the Problem of Man and World*), the most celebrated work by Karel Kosík, represented a decisive turn not only within Marxist theory, but also within European philosophy and intellectual history more generally. From Masaryk to Havel, the destinies of national philosophy and politics in Czechoslovakia have always gone hand in hand. Kosík's book played an important role on both the intellectual and political level, becoming a focal point for the reform movement that led to the Prague Spring in 1968 (Kusin 1971; Kohák 2008; Landa 2019; Mervart 2017; 2019; for a more critical account of the role Kosík played in 1968–1969, see Tucker 2000, 124–125).

Dialectics of the Concrete addresses some of the most important themes in Marxist thought, such as alienation, labour, historicism, and economic determinism, from a complex perspective that presupposes not just Kosík's expertise in Marxist doctrine, but also his solid knowledge of the main trends in Western philosophy, such as phenomenology, existentialism, and Critical Theory. In particular, as the subtitle suggests, with this book Kosík seeks to investigate the human condition in the world. He intermingles Marx's analysis of labour and economics with a phenomenological investigation of the relationship between individuals and the totality of what is, understood both in its authentic and alienated facets. Phenomena such as history, temporality, culture and art are all part of this picture, and all contribute to a critique and a reinterpretation of Marxist methodology in light of the historical changes the twentieth century was facing.

Besides these interpretative patterns, another peculiar and rarely thematised subtext detectable in the *Dialectics of the Concrete* and in Kosík's later output regards his insights into literature, particularly the writings of Franz Kafka. The aim of this chapter is to shed light on this topic in order to clarify how Kafka's work influenced Kosík's philosophy of praxis and critique of modern society. Dealing with this topic will also involve examining the great echo that Kafka's work enjoyed in the socialist countries during the 1960s, especially as a consequence of Sartre's speech at the 1962 Moscow Peace Conference, where he addressed Kafka's literary work and underlined the need to interpret it through Marxist categories

(Sartre 1962). A further stage of this rehabilitation was the conference held in 1963 in Liblice (Czechoslovakia), in the same period when both *Dialectics of the Concrete* and Kosík's essay "Hašek a Kafka neboli groteskní svět" (1963, "Hašek and Kafka, or, the World of the Grotesque"; Kosík 1995, 77–86) were published. I will conclude by referring to Kosík's later account of Kafka, in which he focused on the figure of Grete Samsa in order to explain a crucial aspect of our world today and suggested the need to recover a 'tragic' element within it.

1 Kafka or the Destruction of the Pseudoconcrete

In the *Dialectics of the Concrete*, Kosík refers to Kafka in a short yet meaningful footnote in which he shows that he had knowledge not only of Kafka's writings, but also of the essays that Günter Anders and Wilhelm Emrich dedicated to him (Anders 1960; Emrich 1957; both quoted in Kosík 1976 [1963], 87). This circumstance is noteworthy, given the limited access to both Kafka's writings and research on Kafka in Czechoslovakia at that time. Although Pavel Eisner's translation of *Das Schloss* (1926, *The Castle*) had already been published in 1935 (Kafka 1935), when the first Czechoslovak Republic was on the verge of its dramatic conclusion, the first Czech edition of *Das Urteil* (1912, *The Trial*) did not appear until 1958 (Kafka 1958), while *Amerika* came out four years later (Kafka 1962). Despite these limitations, however, during the 1950s the figure of Kafka already enjoyed a sort of underground reputation in the eyes of readers and intellectuals, who saw in his works (whose unofficial translations were widespread) both a critique and a possible path out of the social and political apparatus in which they were forced to live (Zábrana 1992, 886; quoted in Nekula 2016, 16; Václavek 1993; Čermák 2000). By mentioning Kafka in the *Dialectics of the Concrete*, Kosík seems to share this feeling in full:

> The theory and practice of 'epic theatre' based on the principle of estrangement is only *one* artistic way of destroying the pseudoconcrete. Bertold Brecht's connection with the intellectual atmosphere of the twenties and with the protest against alienation is obvious. One might also consider the work of Franz Kafka as an artistic destruction of the pseudoconcrete. (Kosík 1976 [1963], 87)

By this term – pseudoconcrete – Kosík means that

> collection of phenomena that crowd the everyday environment and the routine atmosphere of human life, and which penetrate the consciousness of acting individuals with a regularity, immediacy and self-evidence that lend them a semblance of autonomy and naturalness. (Kosík 1976 [1963], 2)

Among these phenomena, Kosík includes manipulation, routine ideas, and fixed objects that are not seen for what they are – i. e. mere outcomes of human social activity – but as immutable natural conditions. These are all consequences of a decayed version of human praxis, which has lost the creative and revolutionary character that Marx originally attributed to it, and thus became fetishized. The idea of a "fetishized praxis" is widespread in Kosík's *Dialectics of the Concrete* (Kosík 1976 [1963], 2–5) and can be read as an extension of Marx's commodity fetishism to the realm of human activity per se (Schmidt 1977). The world of the pseudoconcrete, which goes along with this "everyday utilitarian praxis", is described by Kosík as a "chiaroscuro of truth and deceit" (Kosík 1976 [1963], 2). Ambiguity is its main trait, as the essence of what exists appears in this context only partially, in an incomplete and therefore misleading fashion. Phenomena, rather than revealing essences and allowing the observer to constitute clear meanings, become deceitful, insofar as instead of simply directing us to essences, they are 'themselves' perceived as pure essences. The world which follows this description is thus a fictitious one, and yet people understand it as though it were a petrified historical condition, and not something merely contingent, i. e. the mere outcome of uncritical reflective thinking, in which fixed ideas relate to fixed conditions, with no chance to overcome this closed scheme.

While describing this world of the pseudoconcrete, Kosík clearly has in mind liberal capitalism, but also actually existing socialism, in which the critical and dialectical praxis at the core of Marx's thinking has been substituted for a fetishized one, with the consequence of a general bureaucratization of the social and political apparatus (on this see also Kosík's articles on the issue of the socialist political crisis, which appeared in 1968 in the journal *Literární Listy*, under the title "Our Current Crisis"; Kosík 1995, 17–55). This world, however, also corresponds to Kafka's. One can indeed find the same ambiguity between the real and the unreal, between existence and appearance, which characterizes the situation of socialist republics in the aftermath of Stalinism, in the reality that Kafka describes in his works. This parallelism, which Kosík outlines explicitly in the *Dialectics of the Concrete*, has various consequences. On the one hand, it implies looking at the crisis of socialism through Kafka's viewpoint, namely as an absurd and grotesque reality which recalls the one experienced by K. in *The Trial* and *The Castle*. On the other hand, it also entails interpreting Kafka in a realist way, as if his works do not consist of an expressionist account of the human condition as such, as suggested by many Western commentators; the approach of universalizing Kafka is especially criticized by Marthe Robert (1946; 1961), while Jo Bogaerts (2014; 2015) has recently challenged this critique by reappraising the "existentialist Kafka" and advocating the universal meaning of his literary work. A realist interpretation, on the other hand, suggests Kafka's works can rather function as a description of a

determinate historical situation that he could not directly witness but foretold in his novels: that lived by people in East Central Europe after 1945.

An alternative, realist reading thus emerged during the 1960s in opposition to the universalising interpretation of Kafka that had become popular particularly within French existentialism (Camus 1955; Sartre 1956 – this existentialist reading, which privileged the allegorical meaning of Kafka's work rather than its concrete implications, was later criticized both in France and abroad; see, for instance, Deleuze and Guattari 1975). The 1963 Liblice conference represented a fundamental step in this direction (the conference proceedings are published in Goldstücker et al. 1966; a selection of papers from this conference are available in English in Hughes 1981, 53–122). Its participants included, on the one hand, unreformed Marxists who rejected any possible reappraisal of Kafka's work within socialism, while on the other hand, scholars who were closer to the emerging reform movement took the chance to show how Kafka's world can faithfully portray the aporias of socialism (Liehm 1975; French 1982; Steiner 2000; Nekula 2016). The Czech Germanist Eduard Goldstücker, who organized the conference, represents through both his research and his life a junction between these two stances. He himself had been a victim of Stalinism, having been convicted in the Slánský show trial in 1952 before being rehabilitated three years later. Despite these dramatic circumstances, however, during the Liblice conference he took a cautious position, focusing on the major importance of the historical context that Kafka witnessed in order to understand his work. He also rejected the idea that this could provide any valid criticism of the current establishment. In his late autobiography, Goldstücker abandoned this cautiousness and explicitly related his own experience as a victim of political persecution to the events described by Kafka in *The Trial* (Goldstücker 1989; for a detailed analysis of Goldstücker's standpoint, see Tuckerova 2015).

A much more explicit stance was taken by Goldstücker's former student Alexej Kusák, according to whom Kafka was neither simply an alert observer of the conflicts that were widespread in Austro-Hungarian society, nor a prophet of the forthcoming catastrophes of the twentieth century. The greatness of Kafka as a 'monumental realist' was due to his ability to identify and depict the profound alienation that was already ongoing in his day, an alienation that was also at the origin of twentieth-century social and political crises that led to the rise of totalitarian regimes. This point of view is certainly debatable, not only from a historical perspective, but also because it implies a peculiar notion of realism. For Kusák, being a realist means

capturing and typifying not only characters and situations but also human relationships, the devilish in this world, its dehumanization, but also the countermovement, protest, outcry, the enraged scream. (Kusák 1966, 169)

This definition clearly diverges from György Lukács' classic definition of realism, which Kusák recollects critically. As Lukács clarified in his 1938 essay "Es geht um den Realismus" (1938, "Realism in the Balance", 2001), and later in other works on this topic, such as his book *Wider den mißverstandenen Realismus* (1958, *Against Misunderstood Realism*), realism simply consisted in grasping reality as it truly is, by avoiding any superficial account of it. A realist work of art is indeed nothing but a form through which objective reality is reflected. In this sense, for him the perfect realist writer was Thomas Mann, and certainly not Kafka (on Mann and Kafka, see also Lukács 1963, 47–92). According to Lukács, the idea of interpreting Kafka as a realist writer relies on a fundamental misunderstanding; the many details and thorough descriptions that Kafka scattered in such a meaningful way in his writing are not, as in realism, "concentrations, intersections of those expressions and conflicts that characterize their own existence", but rather "mere indicators [*Chiffrezeichen*] of an incomprehensible beyond" (Lukács 1958; quoted in Kusák 1966, 174). In other words, the raw descriptions, the insistence on futile and often scabrous details, are always balanced in Kafka's works by the onset of something completely irrational and absurd that inevitably causes turmoil in both the characters and the reader. The clearest example of this mechanism is probably the metamorphosis of Gregor Samsa, which bursts into an otherwise perfectly banal scene whose ordinariness is well represented by the figure of his sister Grete. Abrupt passages such as this are the reason why Lukács can confidently argue against the idea of a 'realist Kafka'.

In order to contrast this critique, and show how one can detect a deeper realist meaning in Kafka's work, Kusák does not negate the existence of this 'beyond' in Kafka's writing. Nor does he disregard this abrupt passage by means of which the writer seems to point to a further level of existence, abandoning what is real. Kusák rather turns this argument upside down by showing that for Kafka, this beyond does not consist in an escape from reality, but simply in a way out of the alienated condition in which the characters of his novels find themselves in their everyday lives. In other words, for Kafka, the true alienation from reality corresponds not to the transcendent beyond, but to everydayness, while reality, in its deepest sense, shows itself precisely in that 'beyond' which allows one to elude this alienation. The beyond for which Kafka longs is not a fantasy, but rather what is real, what in one's existence is truly authentic, while the expressions and the forms that Lukács evokes as the very core of realism are for Kafka nothing but the surfaces, the mere phenomena that are wrongly taken for essences (to use Kosík's

words: the pseudoconcrete), and that must be revealed for what they truly are. What is of interest here is that Kusák (1966, 176), in order to support his argument, refers directly to Kosík's *Dialectics of the Concrete*, from which he cites a long excerpt:

> The world of everyday familiarity is not a known and recognized one [as it is for realism]. In order to *present* it in its reality, it has to be ripped out of fetishized intimacy and exposed in alienated brutality. [...] In one instance, the alienation of the everyday is reflected in consciousness as an uncritical attitude, in the other as a feeling of absurdity. To behold the truth of the alienated everyday, one has to maintain a certain distance from it. To do away with its familiarity, one has to "force" it. What kind of society and what kind of world is it whose people have to "turn into" lice, dogs and apes in order for their real image to be represented adequately? In what "forced" metaphors and parables must one *present* man and his world, to make people *see* their own faces and *recognize* their own world? One of the main principles of modern art, poetry and drama, of painting and film-making is, we feel, the "forcing" of the everyday, the destruction of the pseudoconcrete. (Kosík 1976 [1963], 48–49)

The references to human transformations into animals and to parables are clearly allusions to Kafka. To show the world in a realist way, a faithful description is not enough; to see how it really is, its alienated crust must be broken. In this sense, one can say that Kafka's parables are examples of realist writing: because they are able to represent the pseudoconcrete, and also because they succeed in shattering and destroying it through this representation.

2 Hašek and Kafka

The foregoing analysis has shown how the *Dialectics of the Concrete* played an important role in the reappraisal of Kafka's work in the socialist context. Kusák, recalling the Liblice Conference 40 years on in 2003, emphasized the importance of the *Dialectics of the Concrete* for his interpretation of Kafka, and more generally for cultural and political life in Czechoslovakia during the 1960s (Kusák 2003, 76). Nevertheless, examining at the proceedings of the Liblice conference, one might notice that various speakers did not deal with this work, but rather focused their attention on an article that Kosík wrote shortly before the conference. The subject of this article was a comparison between Kafka and another great Prague-born writer, Jaroslav Hašek (Kosík 1995, 77–86; both František Kautman and the then director of the literature and art journal *Plamen*, Jiří Hajek, referred to this article during the conference). The idea of comparing these two authors is not new, as many other commentators had addressed the same topic from various angles. F.C. Weiskopf, for instance, stressed how Kafka was deeply influenced by

the literature and culture of his country, and especially by the work of Hašek, with whom he shared humour and melancholy (Weiskopf 1956 [1945]; other analyses of this relationship can be found in Pytlík 1962; Ripellino 1994; Kundera 1981; 1986). Besides their biographical similarities, however, one can easily detect a more profound link between them. Walter Benjamin briefly addressed this topic in an essay that he wrote on the tenth anniversary of Kafka's death. According to Benjamin, this link rests on a fundamental contrast which reverberates in their main characters: whereas K. is astonished at everything, the good soldier Švejk is never astonished (Benjamin 1968, 137). What they both share, however, is the way in which they manifest these opposite attitudes; the way in which they move around, their *Gestus*, which to a stranger's eye might look like odd behaviour. Benjamin insisted particularly on the gestures or gestic behaviour of Kafka's characters, underlining their peculiarity and weirdness. Indeed,

> Kafka's entire work constitutes a code of gestures which surely had no definite symbolic meaning for the author from the outset; rather, the author tried to derive such a meaning from them in ever-changing contexts and experimental groupings. (Benjamin 1968, 120; on the idea of gesture in Benjamin, see Sussman 1977)

This explains why for Benjamin the appropriate setting of Kafka's stories – "the logical space of these groupings" – is theatre, whose function should precisely consist in "dissolv[ing] happenings in their gestic components" (Benjamin 1968, 120). The idea of *Gestus*, understood as the embodiment and revelation of a character's attitude, is at the core of Bertolt Brecht's acting technique, to which Benjamin is probably referring here (Doherty 2000). This is precisely the function of the Nature Theatre of Oklahoma in Kafka's *Der Verschollene* (1927, *The Man Who Disappeared*). At the end of the novel, the theatre promises to find employment for *everybody* who decides to apply (Kafka 2012, 195). Everybody – that is, including the protagonist Karl Rossmann, whom Benjamin describes as a character without character, insofar as he is as purely transparent and without any essential connotation, besides his postures and gestures. As is the case with most of Kafka's figures – these gestures are always amiss, almost grotesque and offensive in comparison with their surroundings, thereby causing a sense of estrangement. "The greater Kafka's mastery became, the more frequently did he eschew adapting these gestures to common situations explaining them" (Benjamin 1968, 121). Because they are always out of proportion, these gestures end up disrupting the whole scene, becoming events in themselves: dramas within the drama.

In order to demonstrate his point, Benjamin refers in his article to several episodes in which the disproportion of the gestures of Kafka's characters becomes more apparent (Benjamin 1968, 120–121). When, for example, in the short story *Ein Brudermord* (1920, *A Fratricide*) Wese rings the doorbell, Kafka tells us that it

was too loud for a doorbell, so much so that it rang "right over the town and up to heaven" (Kafka 1971, 403). Another example is in the penultimate chapter of *The Trial*, when K. stops at the first rows of the Cathedral:

> [...] but the distance still seemed too great for the priest. He stretched out his arm and indicated, his forefinger pointing sharply downwards, a place just in front of the pulpit. K. obeyed him in this as well, from that spot he had to bend his head back to see the priest. (Kafka 2009b, 151)

All these gestures imply exaggeration and distortion, and contribute to stage a grotesque scene. The characters who accomplish these gestures end up being infused with this same distortion, which emerges in their physical constitution. This is the case of Odradek in *Die Sorge des Hausvaters* (1919, *The Cares of a Family Man*): "the form which things assume in oblivion. They are distorted" (Benjamin 1968, 133), as well as of Gregor, who turns into a bug, and also of the half-lamb, half-kitten animal in *Eine Kreuzung* (1931, *A Crossbreed*) whose "skin feels too tight for him" (Kafka 1971, 427). Despite their many differences, Kafka's characters succeed in accomplishing these excessive gestures, and in so doing they are able to disrupt the setting in which they are placed: "Like El Greco, Kafka tears open the sky behind every gesture" (Benjamin 1968, 121). Nonetheless, nothing opens beyond the gesture itself: "the gesture remains the decisive thing, the center of the event" (Benjamin 1968, 121). In other words, Kafka's gesture points to what is beyond itself; beyond the same grotesque situation that his characters continuously witness. Nonetheless, what is decisive for him is not the beyond, which remains unreachable, but the opening gesture itself, the excessive act which breaks the mise-en-scène.

If we now look at how Kosík addressed the work of Hašek, we find something very close to what Benjamin argued about Kafka. For Kosík, the good soldier Švejk is indeed what Benjamin would call a gestic character, and this constitutes one of the main points of comparison between the two writers. Švejk's peculiar gestures emerge in the way in which he relates to the other characters of the novel, and especially to his superiors, whom Hašek depicts as a series of petty bureaucrats in the Austrian-Hungarian army (see, for instance, the description of Lieutenant Dub and of his relationship with Švejk; Hašek 1973, 606–609). In this rigid scheme, Švejk – the 'good soldier' – is an exception. Unlike his comrades, he is not interested in making a career in the army, he laughs at his superiors' orders, he never does what he is supposed to do: "Švejk does not take part in the game" (Kosík 1995, 80). In everything that he does, he is so unconcerned that he does not even realize that every gesture he performs ends up being scandalous and reprehensible in the eyes of others. This makes him "dangerous and suspect against his will": he is at once an "idiot" and a "rebel" (Kosík 1995, 80). Just like Kafka's

characters, Švejk's behaviour continuously threatens to tear up the scenery, by shattering its internal rules, and pointing to something that lies beyond. This is indeed the same 'beyond' that Kosík already identified in the *Dialectics of the Concrete* as the site of what is truly real, beyond the pseudoconcrete and alienated world in which both Hašek's and Kafka's stories take place. Hašek particularly highlights the 'gestic' component of Švejk's behaviour, such as in the scene in which the good soldier faces the doctor in the lunatic asylum in which he was interned: "'Take five paces forward and five to the rear'. Švejk took ten. 'But I told you to take five', said the doctor. 'A few paces more or less are all the same to me', replied Švejk" (Hašek 1973, 34). Commenting on this passage, Kosík argued that the very essence of Hašek's anti-hero comes to light.

> This is a key to understanding Švejk: people are always being placed in a rationalized and calculated system in which they are processed, disposed of, shoved around, and moved, in which they are reduced to something not human and extrahuman, that is to say to a calculable and disposable thing or quantity. But for Švejk a few paces here or there don't matter. Švejk is not calculable, because he is not predictable. A person cannot be reduced to a thing and is always more than a system of factual relationships in which he moves and by which he is moved. (Kosík 1995, 85)

A strong critique of any kind of political and economic determinism clearly emerges in these last words. However, what is most important here is the link between this interpretation of Hašek and the way in which Kosík tackles the work of Kafka. This confrontation emerges in the conclusion of Kosík's article. Both Hašek and Kafka offered with their works a vision of modernity, which is characterized as an alienated reality in which people are powerless before the bureaucratic machinery that regulates their lives. In this sense, they are both realist writers: they simply named these phenomena, and endowed them with an artistic form. Nonetheless, what essentially distinguishes their works is the tone of their realism: the way in which they choose to describe the same reality. Whilst Hašek opts for farce, in which only laughter can reveal the absurdity of the system, Kafka's realism is somehow tragic. Kafka's characters are indeed incapable of opposing the reality in which they live with humour. Their reaction to the absurd situations they run up against is an unstoppable search for truth, which invariably ends up failing. "Kafka's man is condemned to live in a world in which the only human dignity is confined to the interpretation of that world; while other forces, beyond the control of any individual, determine the course of the world's development and change" (Kosík 1995, 86). No matter how hard they try, the only thing they can accomplish by laying claim to their freedom is reaffirming the same necessity that they always try to escape. While Hašek can therefore show through Švejk's humour that humans can transcend their own status as objects, that they

are more than that, as they always harbour within themselves "the enormous and indestructible force of humanity" (Kosík 1995, 86), Kafka's characters can shatter this reality, but never really overcome it. In this respect, Kosík's conclusion recalls Benjamin's interpretation of Kafka: the essence of the dramatic event is indeed not what it aims at, the beyond that it opens up, but the dramatic gesture that points at this beyond but that can never touch it. For this reason, Benjamin can argue in a letter to Scholem that Kafka's parables are a sort of Haggadah (exegetical texts) without Halakha (religious laws), in the sense that they present narratives without referring to any truth or positive doctrine: "Kafka's real genius was that he tried something completely new: he sacrificed truth for the sake of clinging to its transmissibility, its haggadic element" (Benjamin 1968, 144). Similarly, while referring back to Benjamin's standpoint, Adorno defined Kafka's prose as a parabolic system the key to which has been stolen: "Each sentence says 'interpret me' and none will permit it" (Adorno 1981, 245). The same tragic condition that seals the fate of Kafka's characters therefore seems to extend to Kafka's readers too, who can only guess but never fully grasp what lies beyond the absurdity of the world that he depicts.

3 The End of Silence

The two works by Kosík considered so far, the *Dialectics of the Concrete* and "Hašek and Kafka, or, the World of Grotesque", were both written in the early 1960s, when Kosík was one of his country's most influential intellectuals. After the failure of the Prague Spring and the following political normalization in Czechoslovakia, the situation abruptly changed. In 1970 Kosík, who had become a professor at the Charles University in 1968 and had been a member of the Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Communist Party in 1968–1969, was expelled from the party and dismissed from the university; he was not re-admitted until 1990. Unlike many other philosophers and writers, who resorted to spreading their works through the *samizdat* network, Kosík resolved rather to silence himself; he did not publish anything until after 1989. The only occasion on which he broke his silence was in 1975, when he wrote an open letter to Jean-Paul Sartre, denouncing the secret police's theft of a thousand-page manuscript during a search of his apartment (Kosík 1975). When this long period finally ended, Kosík was invited to give a talk at a conference on Kafka held in November 1992 at the Goethe Institute in Prague (see Krolop and Zimmermann 1994). This was the first public event dedicated to Kafka for almost thirty years after the 1963 Liblice conference. The title of Kosík's presentation was "Das Jahrhundert der Grete Samsa: Von der Möglichkeit oder

Unmöglichkeit des Tragischen in unserer Zeit" ("The Century of Grete Samsa: On the Possibility or Impossibility of the Tragic in our Times"). ("The Century of Grete Samsa" is also the title of a collection of essays that Kosík published a year later; Kosík 1993.) This text provides a clearer explanation of the tragic discourse that Kosík detected in Kafka's work and that – as the above has shown – lies at the core of his interpretation.

According to Kosík, Kafka's work came to the conclusion that modernity is not hospitable to the tragic, as it tends to hide and substitute it with the grotesque. This stance reveals a change from what Kosík had maintained in his previous writings. Whilst in "Hašek and Kafka" all the emphasis was placed on the tragic aspect of Kafka's characters, exemplified by their never-ending search for meaning, in "The Century of Grete Samsa", Kosík focuses his attention on the non-tragic context in which this search takes place, that is, on the way in which the modern world strives to conceal any tragic element within it. The contradiction between these two perspectives is only superficial: the concealment of tragedy is in fact what makes the agency of Kafka's characters even more tragic, as in this way the search for truth that they undertake ends up being not just endless, but also meaningless. In a context in which all the tragic aspects of life are negated, the 'beyond' that their gestures always evoke is not only unreachable, but even inconceivable.

In "Hašek and Kafka", the character that seems to interest Kosík the most is Josef K. At the end of *The Trial*, while two men wearing top hats lead him to the Strahov quarries – the place where eventually one of them will "thrust a knife into his heart" (Kosík, 1995, 77) – Josef K. still struggles to get a better image of what is happening: "[he] is preoccupied with studying the physiognomy and behaviour of his mysterious attendants" (Kosík 1995, 78). In other words, even in this extreme situation, this man's search for truth has not ended. On the other hand, in "The Century of Grete Samsa", Kosík focuses on *Die Verwandlung* (1915, *The Metamorphosis*). What interests him is not the tragic destiny of Gregor Samsa, but rather the figure of his sister Grete, who becomes for him the real protagonist of the story. According to Kosík, Grete Samsa embodies the negation of the tragic. The real metamorphosis which lends Kafka's short story its title is not Gregor's, but rather that which Grete undergoes once her brother has turned into a bug. From then on, Grete immediately stops looking at Gregor as a human being. In so doing, she has no doubts or regrets: Gregor is now called a monster (*Untier*), and she loses any interest in his fate (Kafka 2009a, 68):

> It is simply in the logic of things that Grete Samsa, the anti-Antigone of our age, does not bury her brother, but lets the housemaid take care of removing [*wegschaffen*] his remains, and wiping them off the face of the earth. (Kosík 1993, 16)

Grete tries to justify her behaviour by ascribing to Gregor the guilt of disrupting with his transformation the calm of family life, which nothing should ever disturb, not even death or despair. "Grete Samsa personifies the imperturbable 'calmness' of the modern age, which nothing can upset and which therefore proceeds towards its goal, whatever the cost" (Kosík 1993, 16). Kafka represents Grete as young and in great shape: all that interests her is the future and the prospect of successfully affirming herself in the world.

> Grete Samsa, whom nothing can shake, not even her brother's death, goes towards her future, which is the reproduction of her past, and will therefore repeat in her upcoming life its sterility, narrowness, and routine. (Kosík 1993, 17)

By staging both the tragic and its negation, Kafka portrays in realist fashion the main historical trends of the twentieth century. Not only does he model the figure of Grete, who for Kosík represents the modern anti-tragic zeitgeist, but also suggests with his many characters – distorted, enslaved, and yet still active and struggling – the need to renew the tragic discourse within reality. This contradicts what Adorno argued about Kafka, namely, that in his works there can be no tragedy, insofar as his characters are not free, but rather subjected to a principle of "objectless inwardness", which allows them to manifest themselves in external reality only through an inexorable estrangement. "Kafka's figures are struck by a fly-swatter even before they can make a move; to drag them onto the tragic stage as heroes is to make a mockery of them" (Adorno 1981, 261). This principle of inwardness is, according to Adorno, the only aspect by which Kafka can be seen to be Kierkegaard's pupil. Kosík rejects this interpretation by showing how Kafka's and Kierkegaard's positions are far apart precisely in this respect, and he does so by referring again to the myth of Antigone. In *Enten – Eller* (1843, *Either/Or*) Kierkegaard reinterpreted the figure of Antigone in terms of pure inwardness, insofar as unlike the ancient Antigone, the modern variant that he depicts is aware of her father's secret from the very outset and therefore suffers, as she loves him and yet cannot forgive his terrible guilt (Kierkegaard 1987, 154). For a modern Antigone, any public action would in fact make her more isolated since, according to Kierkegaard, a public view would not be able to recognize her betrayal as love. Antigone's suffering is therefore purely passive; it cannot imply any possible action, as it is utterly limited to Antigone's inner world.

In dealing with this theme, Kosík shows how Kafka's stance diverges from Kierkegaard's. According to Kafka, in modern times Antigone did not simply withdraw to her inner being, but rather did something much more radical: she chose to repress her suffering by entirely committing herself to an outward existence. In so doing, she transformed and took the shape of an anti-Antigone – Grete Samsa – who does not even think whether burying her brother would be the right

or the wrong thing to do, as this problem does not concern her at all. Contrary to Kierkegaard's Antigone, who suffers without acting, Kafka's anti-Antigone is always acting, but never suffers. However, as this anti-Antigone can freely inhabit today's world, Kosík asks himself at the end of "The Century of Grete Samsa" whether one might follow the opposite path – thereby not rejecting but renewing the sense of the tragic. Can a new Antigone emerge who could contrast with both the pure outwardness of Grete and the pure inwardness of Kierkegaard's modern heroine? According to Kosík, this difficult posture consists of bravely resisting all the attempts at hiding what is tragic in the world.

> What identifies Sophocles' Antigone with the present one is the fact that they both get out of the silenced and fearful crowd, they step out of line, and while standing alone in that position they become outstanding figures. They step out of line in order to speak and act against what they reckon to be an evil system. (Kosík 1993, 18)

In the attempt to think this new Antigone, Kosík particularly deals with the figure of Milena Jesenská, the Czech journalist who with her life and destiny faithfully embodied the above-described posture (Boella 2013; Buber-Neumann 2014; Tava 2022). It is noteworthy that, as for Kafka, what characterizes these figures is not so much their words or ideas as, again, the small, futile gestures, the everyday acts of resistance and dissent on which the hope of creating a new polis depends. These are, for Kosík, the gestures of Josef K., of Švejk, and of anybody else who decides to break the surface of the pseudoconcrete, revealing its inner conflicts. This is the only way in which people living through years of political normalization could maintain a space of individual freedom. A dimension that Kafka's literature, with its tragic and yet realist account, helped him to define and defend.

References

Adorno, Theodor W. *Prisms*. Trans. Samuel and Shierry Weber. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1981.

Anders, Günther. *Kafka*. Cambridge: Bowes and Bowes, 1960.

Benjamin, Walter. *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections*. Ed. Hannah Arendt. New York, NY: Schocken Books, 1968.

Boella, Laura. *Le imperdonabili: Milena Jesenská, Etty Hillesum, Marina Cvetaeva, Ingeborg Bachmann, Cristina Campo*. Milano: Mimesis, 2013.

Bogaerts, Jo. "Sartre, Kafka and the Universality of the Literary Work." *Sartre Studies International* 20.1 (2014): 69–85.

Bogaerts, Jo. "Against Allegory: A Reappraisal of French Existentialism's Encounter with Kafka." *Journal of the Kafka Society of America* 37/38 (2015): 27–44.

Buber-Neumann, Margarete. *Milena: The Tragic Story of Kafka's Great Love*. Trans. by Ralph Manheim. New York, NY: Arcade Publishing, 2014.

Camus, Albert. "Hope and the Absurd in the Work of Franz Kafka." Albert Camus, *The Myth of Sisyphus and Other Essays*. Trans. by Justin O'Brien. New York, NY: Knopf, 1955. 124–138.

Čermák, Josef. "Recepce Franze Kafky v Čechách (1913–1963)." *Kafkova zpráva o světě: Osudy a interpretace textů Franze Kafky*. Ed. Milena Masáková. Prague: Nakladatelství Franze Kafky, 2000. 14–36.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. *Kafka: Pour une littérature mineure*. Paris: Minuit, 1975.

Doherty, Brigid. "Test and 'Gestus' in Brecht and Benjamin." *MLN* 115 (2000): 442–481.

Emrich, Wilhelm. Franz *Kafka*. Frankfurt/M.: Athenäum, 1957.

French, Alfred. *Czech Writers and Politics: 1945–1969*. Boulder, CO: East European monographs, 1982.

Goldstücker, Eduard. *Prozesse: Erfahrungen eines Mitteleuropäers*. Munich: Knaus, 1989.

Goldstücker, Eduard, Frantisek Kautman, and Pavel Reiman (eds.). *Franz Kafka aus Prager Sicht*. Berlin: Voltaire, 1966.

Hašek, Jaroslav. *The Good Soldier Schweik*. Trans. Cecil Parrott. London: William Heinemann, 1973.

Hughes, Kenneth. *Franz Kafka: An Anthology of Marxist Criticism*. Hanover: Published for Clark University Press by University Press of New England, 1981.

Kafka, Franz. *Zamék: Román*. Trans. by Pavel Eisner. Prague: Spolek výtvarných umělců Mánes, 1935.

Kafka, Franz. *Proces*. Trans. by Pavel Eisner. Prague: Československý spisovatel, 1958.

Kafka, Franz. *Amerika*. Trans. by Dagmar Eisnerová. Prague: SNKLU, 1962.

Kafka, Franz. *The Complete Stories*. Ed. Nahum N. Glatzer. New York, NY: Schocken Books, 1971.

Kafka, Franz. *The Metamorphosis and Other Stories*. Trans. by Joyce Crick. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009a.

Kafka, Franz. *The Trial*. Trans. by Mike Mitchell. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009b.

Kafka, Franz. *The Man who Disappeared (America)*. Trans. by Ritchie Robertson. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Kierkegaard, Søren. *Either/Or: Part I*. Edited by Howard V. Hong and Edna Hong. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987.

Kohák, Erazim. *Hearth and Horizon: Cultural Identity and Global Humanity in Czech Philosophy*. Prague: Filosofia, 2008.

Kosík, Karel. "Le philosophe Tchécoslovaque Karel Kosík écrit à J.-P. Sartre." *Le Monde* (29 June 1975).

Kosík, Karel. *Dialectics of the Concrete: A Study on Problems of Man and World* [1963]. Trans. by Karel Kovanda and James Schmidt. Dordrecht and Boston, MA: Reidel, 1976.

Kosík, Karel. *Století Markéty Samsové*. Prague: Český spisovatel, 1993.

Kosík, Karel. *The Crisis of Modernity: Essays and Observations from the 1968 Era*. Ed. James H. Satterwhite. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1995.

Krolop, Kurt, and Hans Dieter Zimmermann. *Kafka und Prag: Colloquium im Goethe-Institut Prag 24.–27. November 1992*. Berlin and New York, NY: De Gruyter, 1994.

Kundera, Milan. "The Czech Wager." *New York Review of Books* (22 January 1981).

Kundera, Milan. *The Art of the Novel*. Trans. by Linda Asher. New York, NY: Grove Press, 1986.

Kusák, Alexej. "Bemerkungen zur marxistischen Interpretation Franz Kafkas." *Franz Kafka aus Prager Sicht*. Eds. Eduard Goldstücker, Frantisek Kautman, and Pavel Reiman. Berlin: Voltaire, 1966, 169–180.

Kusák, Alexej. *Tance kolem Kafky: Liblická konference, 1963 – vzpomínky a dokumenty po 40 letech*. Prague: Akropolis, 2003.

Kusin, Vladimir. *The Intellectual Origins of the Prague Spring: The Development of Reformist Ideas in Czechoslovakia, 1956–1967*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.

Landa, Ivan. "Historical Bloc and Revolution: The Radical Democratic Interpretation of the Prague Spring of 1968." *The Prague Spring as a Laboratory*. Ed. Martin Schulze Wessel. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019. 117–142.

Liehm, Antonín J. "Franz Kafka in Eastern Europe." *Telos* 23 (March 1975): 53–83.

Lukács, György. *Wider den missverstandenen Realismus*. Hamburg: Claassen, 1958.

Lukács, György. *The Meaning of Contemporary Realism*. Trans. by John and Necke Mander. London: Merlin Press, 1963.

Lukács, György. "Realism in the Balance." *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*. Ed. Vincent B. Leitch. New York, NY: Norton, 2001. 1033–1058.

Mervart, Jan. "Czechoslovak Marxist Humanism and the Revolution." *Studies in East European Thought* 69 (2017): 111–126.

Mervart, Jan. "Radical Democrats between Reform and Revolution." *The Prague Spring as a Laboratory*. Ed. Martin Schulze Wessel. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019. 99–116.

Nekula, Marek. *Franz Kafka and His Prague Contexts: Studies in Language and Literature*. Trans. by Robert Russell and Carly McLaughlin. Prague: Karolinum Press, 2016.

Pytlík, Radko. *Jaroslav Hašek*. Prague: Československý spisovatel, 1962.

Ripellino, Angelo Maria. *Magic Prague*. Trans. by David Newton Marinelli. Ed. Michael Henry Heim. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1994.

Robert, Marthe. *Introduction à la lecture de Kafka*. Paris: Éditions du Sagittaire, 1946.

Robert, Marthe. "Kafka en France." *Mercure de France* 342 (1961): 241–255.

Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Being and Nothingness: An Essay on Phenomenological Ontology*. Trans. by Hazel E. Barnes. New York, NY: Philosophical Library, 1956.

Sartre, Jean-Paul. "La Démilitarisation de la culture." Jean-Paul Sartre, *Situations*. Vol. 7. Paris: Gallimard, 1962. 322–331.

Schmidt, James. "Praxis and Temporality: Karel Kosik's Political Theory." *Télos* 33 (1977): 71–84.

Steiner, Peter. *The Deserts of Bohemia: Czech Fiction and Its Social Context*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000.

Sussman, Henry. "A Reading of Walter Benjamin's Kafka Study." *Diacritics* 7.1 (Spring 1977): 42–54.

Tava, Francesco. "Praxis in Progress: On the Transformations of Kosík's Thought." *Karel Kosík and Dialectics of the Concrete*. Eds. Joe Grim Feinberg, Ivan Landa, and Jan Mervart. Dordrecht: Brill, 2022. 57–74.

Tucker, Aviezer. *The Philosophy and Politics of Czech Dissidence from Patocka to Havel*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2000.

Tuckerova, Veronika. "Reading Kafka, Writing Vita: The Trials of the Kafka Scholar Eduard Goldstücker." *New German Critique* 42.1 (2015): 129–161.

Václavek, Ludvík. "Zur Vielschichtigkeit der Kafka-Rezeption in der CSR, 1945–1989." *Franz Kafka in der kommunistischen Welt*. Eds. Norbert Winkler and Wolfgang Kraus. Vienna: Böhlau, 1993. 144–154.

Weiskopf, Franz Carl. "Franz Kafka und die Folgen: Mythus und Auslesung." [1945] Franz Carl Weiskopf, *Literarische Streifzüge*. Berlin: Aufbau, 1956. 212–216.

Zábrana, Jan. *Celý život: výbor z deníků 5. listopadu 1976 – července 1984*. Prague: Torst, 1992.

II.8 **Bakhtin, Bakhtin Circles and the (Re)Discovery of Bakhtin in the West**

Craig Brandist
Bakhtin Circles

The term 'Bakhtin Circle' is a designation retrospectively applied to an informal group of young scholars who met in the Soviet cities of Nevel (a town now in the Pskov region of Russia, 1918–1920), Vitebsk (a city now in the Republic of Belarus, 1920–1924) and Leningrad (now St. Petersburg, 1924–1929). The name derives from the Russian philosopher and literary theorist Mikhail Mikhailovich Bakhtin (1895–1975), who attended the meetings, while the idea of the 'Circle' (*krug*, or small circle, *kruzhok*) derives from the tradition of progressively-minded, literary discussion groups that appeared in the Russian Empire in the nineteenth century. Perhaps the most famous such group was the so-called 'Petrushevskii Circle', a group established to discuss philosophy and literature prohibited by the Imperial government of Nicholas I, by the utopian socialist Mikhail Petrushevskii. This group at certain times involved the writers Fedor Dostoevskii and Mikhail Saltykov-Shchedrin, and the poets Aleksei Pleshcheev, Apollon Maikov, and Taras Shevchenko, some of whom suffered arrest and exile to Siberia. The term is therefore associated with the idea of dissidence, and has some historical purchase since a number of members of the 'Bakhtin Circle' were arrested at the time of the consolidation of the Stalin regime in 1928, though for involvement in another group, the quasi-Masonic sect *Voskresen'e* (the Resurrection). The 'Bakhtin Circle' designation is problematic, however, because Bakhtin did not establish or lead the group, the membership of which remained informal and fluid, and the ideas they discussed were not prohibited at the time. Members of the group were involved in a number of other formal and informal groups that did not involve Bakhtin, and it is unclear whether the so-called 'Bakhtin Circle' was regarded by most of them as the main arena in which they developed their ideas. In the case of Bakhtin, whose poor health prevented him from holding down a permanent job throughout much of the decade, however, it is more likely that the group played a more central role in his intellectual development. The designation is neither neutral nor uncontroversial, therefore, and needs to be treated with caution, though there does not appear to be a more appropriate alternative available (see Brandist et al. 2004, 251–75).

1 The Nevel Circle

There is some evidence that at least some of the group perceived their work to have sociocultural, if not necessarily political significance, and that some were engaged in early post-Revolutionary activities to democratise the spheres of edu-

cation and culture. Bakhtin himself worked as a school teacher in Nevel, during which time he began attending a 'Kant seminar' that had been established by the Jewish philosopher Matvei Isaevich Kagan (1889–1937) on his return, under the terms of the Brest-Litovsk peace agreement between Russia and Germany, from studies in Leipzig, Berlin and Marburg. This 'seminar', which was attended by Kagan, Bakhtin, the pianist Mariia Veniaminovna Iudina (1899–1970), and some young intellectuals working on literature, philosophy and music, Lev Vasilievich Pumpianskii (1891–1940), Valentin Nikolaevich Voloshinov (1895–1936) and Boris Aleksandrovich Zubakin (1894–1938), met to discuss philosophical matters with a focus on neo-Kantianism. This was the first group that was retrospectively designated the 'Bakhtin Circle'. Previous to this (1916–1918) Bakhtin, his brother Nikolai, who completed a classical education in St. Petersburg, and Pumpianskii attended meetings of the Religious-Philosophical Society and the so-called 'Omphalos Circle' in St. Petersburg. There is, however, no evidence that Bakhtin completed any formal higher educational courses at this time. It seems it was Kagan, the oldest member of the group and the person who had completed a formal education in German universities under some of the leading academic philosophers of the time, who was the dominant figure in the Nevel Circle, which discussed a range of issues and participated in some public debates and lectures. Kagan and Pumpianskii lectured on topics that would soon appear in their early publications, including "Filosofskaia sistema Germana Kogena" (1919, "Herman Cohen's Philosophical System"), "Kak vozmozhna istoriia?" (1919, publ. 1921, "How is History Possible?", 2004) and "O lichnosti v sotsiologii" (1918–1919, "The Personality in Sociology") (Kagan), "Dostoevskii kak tragicheskii poet" (1919, "Dostoevsky as a Tragic Poet"), Gogol's *Revizor* (1836, *Government Inspector*) and the poetry of Pushkin (Pumpianskii). Bakhtin participated in public discussions about Russian culture (with Kagan) and 'God and Socialism' (with Pumpianskii). The sole publication of this time is Bakhtin's very brief piece "Iskusstvo i otvetstvennost'" ("Art and Answerability") in the Nevel newspaper *Den' Iskusstva* (*The Day of Art*) in September 1918 (Kagan 1992).

Vitalii Makhlin (1995) and Nikolai Nikolaev (2004) have argued the Nevel Circle should be considered a distinctive school of Russian philosophy, which he calls the Nevel School of Philosophy. It is, however, difficult to sustain such a claim on the basis of just one very brief sketch in a newspaper as the entire published output of a school of philosophy. It may feasibly be argued that for Bakhtin this Circle acted as a school of philosophy in the pedagogical sense, and that here he learned about contemporary philosophical ideas and began to emerge as an independent thinker in philosophical matters. The Nevel Circle did not last long. Bakhtin moved to Vitebsk in 1920, where he met the literary scholar Pavel Nikolaevich Medvedev (1891–1938) and Ivan Ivanovich Sollertinskii (1902–1944),

who was to become a prominent Leningrad musicologist. The same year Kagan left Nevel to take up a teaching post at the newly established university in Orel at the invitation of the Japanologist Nikolai Iosifovich Konrad (1891–1970), who was also acquainted with Bakhtin. While in Orel, Kagan wrote up and published "How is History Possible?", the only sustained piece of philosophy to be published by a member of the group before the late 1920s. The Nevel Circle now dispersed, as Pumpianskii and Iudina departed for Petrograd (soon to become Leningrad), Zubakin moved to Smolensk, and Kagan soon moved on to Moscow.

2 The Vitebsk Circle

Medvedev had become a prominent and influential figure in Vitebsk by 1920. He had been the city's last mayor in 1917 and had been rector of the new Proletarian University there, as well as serving on a committee to establish an Institute of Humanities and Arts. He helped Bakhtin secure teaching posts at the State Pedagogical Institute and at the Vitebsk Conservatoire, where he taught literature, history and the philosophy of music. Voloshinov moved to Vitebsk sometime in 1921 where he worked as deputy head of the local arts subdivision of *Narkompros*, the Commissariat of Enlightenment. At this time Vitebsk was home to a remarkable collection of avant-garde artists including Marc Zakharovich Chagall (1887–1985) and Kazimir Severinovich Malevich (1878–1935) and the public sphere was animated by intense debates about the relationship between art and life. Bakhtin, Medvedev and Voloshinov again participated in public lectures and debates on, *inter alia*, modern Russian poetry, Nietzsche's philosophy (Bakhtin), the history of Russian literature (Voloshinov), and Dostoevskii's literary legacy (Medvedev) (see Mikheeva 1988, 28–29). Medvedev reported, at various times, that over this period Bakhtin had finished a book on moral philosophy (which may be based on the incomplete manuscript now known as *K filosofii postupka* [1986, *Toward a Philosophy of the Act*]), one on Dostoevskii, and one called *Ėstetika slovesnogo tvorchestva* (1986, *The Aesthetics of Verbal Creation*) (see, for instance, Medvedev 1922).

Toward a Philosophy of the Act (the date of composition has not conclusively been established) was Bakhtin's early attempt to negotiate a path between the abstractions of neo-Kantian philosophy, which sought to delineate the object domains of the sciences according to 'mathematical' principles, and other trends in German philosophy such as *Lebensphilosophie* (the philosophy of life) and phenomenology, which foregrounded the concrete act of consciousness. It may be that Bakhtin's reading of the Danish philosopher Søren Kierkegaard (1813–1855) played a role in the strategy Bakhtin adopts here (Sandler 2012). Be that as it may,

in this work of moral philosophy we find Bakhtin seeking a way of transcending the rationalism of Kantian ethics and the nullity of utilitarianism by focusing on the active, individual consciousness located between the realms of life and culture, and evaluating morally appropriate ways to act in unique situations, the 'event' (*sobytie*). This dense fragment of text has been subject to a number of different evaluations, but it is important to note that it is an early text not only in a chronological sense, but also in terms of the development of his ideas. The notion of responsibility (*otvetstvennost'*) discussed here does not have any specifically discursive features and so should not be interpreted as an early version of *dialogism*, even though there are certain continuities.

It is unclear what evidence or claims by Bakhtin that mention the other putative works mentioned by Medvedev were based upon. Most likely it refers to sections of the long, incomplete manuscript now known as *Avtor i geroi v ėsteticheskoi deiatel'nosti* (*Author and Hero in Aesthetic Activity*). The dating of this manuscript is uncertain, and it seems Bakhtin worked on parts of it until as late as 1927, when it was finally abandoned. The putative text on Dostoevskii may have been the relevant section of *Author and Hero*, but it is possible that it was a lost, or discarded early work that was heavily reworked in the latter part of the decade and published as *Problemy tvorchesva Dostoevskogo* (*Problems of Dostoevsky's Art*) in 1929. Voloshinov and Medvedev moved to Petrograd in 1922, Bakhtin joined them in May 1924.

3 The Leningrad Circle

While Bakhtin was still in Vitebsk Pumpianskii attended meetings of the Free Philosophical Association (Vol'naia filosofskaia organizatsija, Vol'fila, 1920–1922) along with prominent thinkers of the so-called 'Silver Age' like Andrei Belyi (1880–1934) and Konstantin Ėrberg (1871–1942) (see, especially, Belous 2005). At this time he published his short monograph *Dostoevskii i antichnost'* (1922, *Dostoevsky and Antiquity*) and worked on a book about Gogol' (Pumpianskii 2000). Iudina graduated from the Conservatoire in 1921, and Sollertinskii and Voloshinov from Petrograd University in 1924. Medvedev published work on the recently deceased poet Aleksandr Blok and worked as editor of the journal *Zapiski peredvizhnogo teatra* (*Notes of the Travelling Theatre*) until 1924. When Bakhtin arrived the fragments of the Nevel and Vitebsk Circles that were located in Leningrad began to meet together, often at the flat of the geneticist and historian of science Ivan Kanaev (1893–1984) where Bakhtin and his wife lived until 1927. The Circle was now supplemented by a number of significant scholars such as Boris

Mikhailovich Ėngel'gardt (1887–1942), then Professor of Verbal Art at the State Institute for the History of the Arts (Gosudarstvennyi institut istorii iskusstv, GIII), who had studied under a number of German neo-Kantians in 1909–1911, and who was the author of a significant study of the work of one of the founders of comparative literature Aleksandr Nikolaevich Veselovskii (Engel'gardt 1924); the poet and novelist Konstantin Konstantinovich Vaginov (1899–1934) and the Indologist Mikhail Izrailevich Tubianskii (1893–1937). In his youth Tubianskii was a follower of neo-Kantian ideas before becoming an important writer on Buddhism, editor, translator and commentator on the works of Nobel Laureate Rabindranath Tagore and the person who established the teaching of the Bengali language at Leningrad University (see Brandist 2015). Among the more occasional attenders of meetings of the Circle was Konrad, who had met Bakhtin several years before and who was now one of the leading Japanologists in the USSR.

It was in Leningrad that the Circle became a significant arena for the development of ideas that are now regarded as 'Bakhtinian'. The members of the Circle had by now begun to mature into significant scholars in their own right, embarking on careers in important Leningrad institutions at a crucial moment. The second half of the 1920s was a time in which economic recovery and the progressive political environment led to the setting up of new research institutions and the provision of funding for projects aimed at overcoming the imperial heritage of the Russian Empire and facilitating a fundamental reconsideration of received ideas in social sciences and the humanities. New, sociologically oriented and critical approaches were taking shape in different areas ranging from the emergence of a new 'sociological poetics', the theory of language (Medvedev and Voloshinov) and the history of Russian literature (Pumpianskii) to new approaches to oriental studies (Tubianskii and Konrad) and the history of science (Kanaev). The Circle became the unofficial point of intersection of a number of institutionally embedded research projects, perhaps best represented in the form of a Venn diagram where circles of intellectuals and projects overlap. Bakhtin was the person who, owing to his infirmity depriving him of full employment, remained focused on the Circle as his main point of intellectual engagement.

4 Discussion, debate, and authorship

It appears various members would read some of their work in progress at Circle meetings, and this was then discussed by the group, in some cases leading to some reworking or amendment of the texts under preparation. It may be that by this time members of the Circle respected Bakhtin as, perhaps (though not necessar-

ily), the most philosophically accomplished member of the group and so took his comments seriously. This does not suggest members of the group were in any way under Bakhtin's leadership or regarded his pronouncements as authoritative since various members of the Circle had developed significant expertise independently of Bakhtin. Tubianskii, for instance, was already translating and preparing a collection of works by the Marburg neo-Kantian Hermann Cohen, and working on the importance of dialogue in Plato before meeting Bakhtin. This, and his subsequent training under some of the most significant specialists in oriental studies at the time, gave him a level of intellectual autonomy that is difficult not to acknowledge. Examining the fragmentary evidence of discussions within the Circle, some of Bakhtin's biographers have been led to divide the Circle into Bakhtin's 'disciples' and 'interlocutors' (Clark and Holquist 1984, 103) with Iudina, Kanaev, Voloshinov, and Medvedev in the former category and Tubianskii, Sollertinskii, Pumpianskii, and Kagan in the latter category. Traces of different perspectives in some surviving notes and jottings are the basis for these claims, but the absence of such notes does not prove others slavishly followed Bakhtin's every word.

In their biography Clark and Holquist produced the most systematic argument that Bakhtin was the real author of works published in the names of his 'disciples' Voloshinov and Medvedev. This is an argument that achieved some traction in the 1980s and 1990s. It originated in some gossip of the 1920s, for instance, in her diary the classicist Ol'ga Freidenberg (1880–1955) painted an unflattering portrait of Voloshinov, suggesting work published in his name had really been written by a certain 'Blokhin' (Braginskaia 2005). Such arguments were repeated by a number of people who had been acquainted with the elderly Bakhtin in the 1960s and 1970s. Published reminiscences about their private conversations emerged after Bakhtin's death, and although there was no opportunity to verify the accounts, biographers often took such testimony at face value. Such evidence is clearly of a low-quality, however, and the motivations of those involved are not above question. Moreover, Bakhtin declined to claim the authorship when offered the opportunity to do so, the accounts of Bakhtin's various interlocutors are often inconsistent with each other and, in any case, evidence has emerged to show that on a number of occasions Bakhtin gave false information about his biography (for an overview and evaluation see Hirschkop 1999, 111–195). Archival documents about the work of Voloshinov and Medvedev at The Institute for the Comparative History of the Literatures and Languages of the West and East (Nauchno-issledovatel'skii institut sravnitel'noi istorii literatur i iazykov Zapada i Vostoka, ILIaZV) on the other hand provide compelling evidence that the work in question emerged chiefly as part of an institutional project to lay the foundation for a new 'sociological poetics', and even some early drafts of their publications exist (Voloshinov 2004; Brandist 2008, 190–195). Arguments suggesting,

for instance, that Medvedev's works written during the period of the Leningrad Circle are of a greater significance than his previous work and that this indicates Bakhtin's covert authorship of his work remain speculative at best in the absence of substantial documentary evidence suggesting the opposite. As Iurii Medvedev (1998) has shown, Pavel Medvedev's knowledge of German art scholarship and formal theory exceeded that of Bakhtin in the 1920s and was fundamental to his one of the key 'disputed texts', the 1928 book *Formal'nyi metod v literaturovedenii: kriticheskoe vvedeniie v sotsiologicheskuiu poėtiku* (*The Formal Method in Literary Studies: A Critical Introduction to Sociological Poetics*), written as part of the ILIaZV project. It is significant that the editors of Bakhtin's *Collected Works* (Bakhtin 1997–2012) finally decided not to publish a seventh volume of works 'covertly' authored by Bakhtin even though the commentaries of the early volumes made strong claims about Bakhtin's authorship and noted that such a volume was forthcoming.

5 Bakhtin's work 1924–1927

Until around 1927 Bakhtin continued to labour away on his philosophy of verbal art, drawing chiefly on neo-Kantian and phenomenological sources. His early work on moral philosophy seems to have been abandoned around the time of his move to Leningrad. Bakhtin prepared one article on "Problema formy, soderzhaniia i materiala v slovesnom khudozhestvennom tvorchestve" ("The Problem of Content, Material, and Form in Verbal Art") for publication in 1924, but the journal was closed and the article did not appear until after Bakhtin's death. Here Bakhtin drew heavily on the German neo-Kantian philosopher Broder Christiansen's *Philosophie der Kunst* (1909, *Philosophy of Art*) to develop a critique of positions then being developed by Russian formalists (see Matejka 1996). In his most sustained, but incomplete work of the 1924–1927 period, *Author and Hero*, Bakhtin argues that the key to a successful piece of narrative literature is an author's relationship to his or her hero that gives the latter's consciousness full validity while completing the image of the hero from without. Author-hero relations in narrative literature become analogous to those between God and man in Marburg School neo-Kantianism. Here it is the idea of a monotheistic God, who views all and passes judgement, which is the fundamental factor in guiding ethical behaviour. Rather than remaining within the abstract realm of Marburgers' 'consciousness in general', however, Bakhtin's account is rendered more concrete through his incorporation of the phenomenological notion of intentional consciousness. The aesthetically valid subject in verbal art now becomes the intentional object of

the act of authorship. The specific modality of this act is modeled on Max Scheler's work on forms of sympathy from 1913 (*Wesen und Form der Sympathie, The Nature of Sympathy*) according to which ethical interaction requires the conditional merging of the self and other before a return to one's own unique position in the world (see Poole 2001). In Bakhtin's inventive reworking, concrete acts of authorship can be analyzed according to the modes of interaction they embody, especially whether the author (a) gives sufficient autonomy to the hero who exists in the 'open event of being' and (b) fulfills the authorial responsibility to bestow completeness and pass judgment on the hero. Dostoevskii is found wanting in the second phase of 'aesthetic activity', unable finally to relinquish the hero's perspective and to bestow closure.

6 Medvedev and Voloshinov 1924–1930

Medvedev's work in the period critically explored the state of Soviet literary scholarship in both its formalist and sociological forms and culminated with the monograph *Formal'nyi metod v literaturovedenii* (1928, *The Formal Method in Literary Studies*). While often considered as a critique of Russian formalism, the book is actually best summarized by its subtitle, which places it firmly within the project on sociological poetics at ILIaZV. Here Medvedev aimed to delineate a new form of sociological poetics that considered the social conditioning of literature not as an extrinsic influence, but as part of the very fabric of artistic literature itself. Drawing on neo-Kantianism, phenomenology, Marxism, nascent comparative literature (especially Veselovskii) and contemporary German art scholarship, Medvedev argues that the formal characteristics of a work should be considered as evidence of the artist's orientation within the social world rather than as phenomena that can be defined apart from the thematic content of the work. While posing a range of important questions, Russian formalists are shown to be unable to propose an adequate framework to understand the specificity of artistic form, especially in comparison to recent discussions of form in German art scholarship and literary studies where movements in artistic form are viewed as embodiments of a 'form-shaping ideology'. Literary scholarship therefore takes its place as one of the 'sciences of ideology', examining the various ways ideological material is incorporated into and reprocessed in literature. Such material acquires an aesthetic validity, and in the process important and hitherto hidden aspects of social reality come into focus. Moreover, literature takes its material not only from other clearly defined spheres of ideology, but from ideologies that are in the process of formation as they emerge from lived experience.

This marked an important step forward in the work of the 'Bakhtin Circle', for while consideration of relations between art and life, and the intentionality of authorship, had been aspects of Bakhtin's early work, here a fully formed sociological perspective begins to emerge that has the capacity to subsume those philosophical concerns within literary and social analysis. Crucial in this regard was Medvedev's orientation within the ILIaZV project on sociological poetics and his expertise in German art scholarship. The methodological individualism of Bakhtin's early work is quite different to the sociological and generic considerations emerging in Medvedev's study, and these were to have a considerable influence on Bakhtin's own development.

Voloshinov's work of the period was another crucial development, for it is here that questions of language are first posed systematically. A short, critical monograph about Freudianism published in 1927 already showed Voloshinov's insistence that the psyche needs to be understood as socially integrated from the emergence of the human being as such. It was in the 1926 essay "Slovo v zhizni i slovo v poėzii" ("The Word in Life and the Word in Poetry") that Voloshinov's importance as a thinker first appears, however. Drawing heavily on Anton Marty's (1847–1914) psychology of language (1908) and Karl Bühler's (1879–1963) theory of the speech act (1922), Voloshinov shows how lexical units must be understood as part of a complex whole (a *Gestalt*), that is embedded in an utterance in which speaker, hearer and object or state of affairs are all present (see Brandist 2004). The meaning of a word uttered in 'life', a unique moment of social interaction, must actively be discerned by the hearer according to its embeddedness in a given linguistic context and a shared social space. The meaning of a word within poetry, on the other hand, must be defined only from the linguistic context.

Voloshinov's work culminated in the monograph *Marksizm i filosofiia iazyka: Osnovnye problemy sotsiologicheskogo metoda v nauke o iazyke* (*Marxism and the Philosophy of Language: Fundamental Problems of the Sociological Method in the Science of Language*, hereafter *MPL*, 1929). In this remarkable book, Voloshinov set Marty's and Bühler's accounts of language in use and meaning-making as verbal interaction within a sociological framework, so that configurations of speaker, hearer and objects or states of affairs are set within a class divided society. Each concrete utterance thus registers socio-specific orientations on the extra-discursive world, which is 'refracted' in verbal material. Moreover, the utterance registers social relationships, so that structures of social hierarchy and conflict leave traces in the style. Voloshinov also notes how the use of the same sign system by different social classes results in a struggle over the meaning of crucial terms such as 'freedom' or 'democracy', with the ruling class trying to present its own perspective as both authoritative and neutral. At times of revolutionary unrest, however, this struggle over different social accents, the 'inner dialectic'

of the sign, comes out into the open. Such features of language require a fully sociological analysis, and this places the dominant linguistic paradigms of the time, represented by Benedetto Croce (1866–1952) and Karl Vossler's (1872–1949) romantic individualism and Ferdinand de Saussure's (1857–1913) structuralism inadequately. There are questions about the accuracy of Voloshinov's characterization of the ideas of Vossler and Saussure, but his emerging theory of language nevertheless has important features at odds with both approaches.

The final part of Voloshinov's book discusses modes of social relations between narrative and characters' voices in prose texts, with particular focus on what philologists now call 'free indirect discourse'. This is closely related to the collective project on sociological poetics at ILIaZV in which Voloshinov was engaged, and of which *MPL* was a product. These and other important parts of *MPL* actually began as 'An Essay in Sociological Poetics' at ILIaZV in 1925–1926 (see Brandist 2008, 190–195).

7 Bakhtin's 1929 book on Dostoevskii

It seems clear that Bakhtin's work at the end of the decade was profoundly affected by his friends' work on sociological poetics. The book on the philosophy of authorship, which Bakhtin had labored over for a number of years finally joined the list of his aborted projects, and he recast his approach according to sociological, discursive and literary-historical concerns. As a result, with the help of his friends Bakhtin was finally able to publish a monograph, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Art*, in the ILIaZV series resulting from the collective project on sociological poetics. While much of the earlier philosophical perspective on author-hero relations here remains implicit, it has radically been overwritten by the sociological and linguistic concerns pioneered by Voloshinov and Medvedev. As a result, by 1929:

– Bakhtin overlays his early theory of intersubjectivity with an account of discursive interaction so that the 'event' (*sobytie*) becomes the utterance and dialogue becomes the discursive embodiment of intersubjective interaction;
– Bakhtin views literature as a specific form of social discourse, which incorporates and reflects upon other social discourses in their process of becoming.

Along with this shift, Bakhtin's perspective on Dostoevskii has been revised, so that the novelist's inability to complete and 'finalise' the image of the hero is now regarded not as a failing, but as a positive intervention in a particular social and historical situation. Living in a bluntly hierarchical society and surrounded by people who seek to categorise him or her once and for all, the Dostoevskian

hero seeks to assert his or her own right to be a self-defining subject. All this is now considered as verbal relations in the text embodying social relationships. Dostoevskii's unwillingness to participate in the 'monologic' objectification of his heroes results in the emergence of a new, 'polyphonic novel' in which neither the narrative nor authorial voice can claim precedence over that of the hero. This is the beginning of Bakhtin's theoretical reflection on dialogue and on the novel as a genre, though at this stage any historical considerations remain subordinated to an essentially synchronic analysis of Dostoevskii's authorial practice.

8 History and geography

Bakhtin's most important work is probably his essays on the history of the European novel in the 1930s. This takes us beyond the period of the 'Bakhtin Circle', but the foundations of this conception were nevertheless laid in this period. As are detailed in the chapter on ILIaZV within this volume, there were important projects being pursued at that institute in the 1920s, about which Bakhtin most probably learned from his friends working there. The work of people such as Izrail' Frank-Kamenetskii (1880–1937), Ol'ga Freidenberg (1890–1955) and Viktor Zhirmunskii (1891–1971) were to prove important influences on Bakhtin's work of the 1930s, even though these figures may not have been acquainted with Bakhtin personally (Tihanov 2000; Brandist 2016). The importance of semantic palaeontology in Bakhtin's work on realism, carnival and related matters appears substantial. In addition, the work of Lev Iakubinskii (1892–1945), head of the linguistic section at ILIaZV on the rise of the Russian national language appears to be a significant influence on Bakhtin's account of the rise of the socially stratified national language, *raznorechie* (heteroglossia) (see Brandist and Lähteenmäki 2010). Yet there were other important influences from within the 'Bakhtin Circle' itself, the importance of which was not apparent in Bakhtin's work of the late 1920s. Here I will mention only two: Tubianskii and Konrad.

   As is discussed in the chapter on "Sociological and Marxist Literary Theory in Colonial Context, Hegemony", these figures were strongly opposed to the privileging of European literature and culture and encouraged the development of categories that would apply to world culture as a whole. Tubianskii (1990 [1927]) championed the philosophical sophistication of classical Buddhism and traced the emergence of ideas akin both to neo-Kantian and Marxism in the work of Tagore. Konrad (1927) proposed a sociological history of Japanese literature in which he drew strong parallels between forms of Japanese prose genres and the nomenclature of western literary studies, highlighting, *inter alia*, the importance

of the comic and the grotesque in the rise of modern culture and a realistic portrayal of the world. In his work of the 1930s we see Bakhtin developing an account of literary history that has much in common with these perspectives. There is little doubt that there are shared sources here, but discussion within the Circle undoubtedly affected patterns of interpretation and application.

These concerns inevitably came to the fore when, in the 1930s and 1940s, Bakhtin was giving lectures and working on a dissertation at the Institute of World Literature in Moscow. Subsequently, in the 1950s, Bakhtin was to work as a Professor of World Literature at the Mordvinia Pedagogical Institute in Saransk. Though focused on the European novel, Bakhtin never makes any claims about the superiority of European literature and culture, and never seeks to follow lines of transmission of literary forms from one society to another. Instead, we have a correlation of certain forms of society and literary genres that may be applied regardless of kinship between language groups or direct contact between cultures. Such approaches avoid narrowly Eurocentric perspectives, but unless careful attention is paid to institutional specificities one may be tempted to making some rather superficial and formalistic correlations.

The arrest of some members of the Circle in 1928, and Bakhtin's consequent move into internal exile in Kazakhstan the following year effectively ended the Circle as an informal discussion circle. Operating in the much more restrictive environment of Stalin's USSR, it was difficult for many members to publish work of a similar scope or quality for some time, and some of them suffered premature deaths either through direct repression (Medvedev and Tubianskii) or illness (Voloshinov and Kagan). For this reason, some of Bakhtin's most important work remained unpublished until his death in 1975, and when it was finally published the intellectual environment from which it emerged had been obscured. Reconstructing the dialogues to which these works were contributions has been a task that remains unfinished.

References

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Moscow: Russkie slovari, Iazyki slavianskoi kul'tury, 1997–2012.

Belous, Vladimir. *Vol'fila*. 2 Volumes. Moscow: Tri kvadrata, 2005.

Braginskaia, Nina. "Mezhdu svideteliami i sud'iami. Replika po povodu knigi: V.M. Alpatov. Voloshinov, Bakhtin i Lingvistika. M. Iazyki slavianskikh kul'tur, 2005." *Bakhtin v Saranske: Dokumenty. Materialy. Issledovaniia*. Ed. Oleg Osovskii. Saransk: s. n., 2005. 39–73. https://davaiknam.ru/text/n-v-braginskaya-mejdu-svidetelyami-i-sudeyami-v2 (4 March 2022).

Brandist, Craig. "Voloshinov's Dilemma: On the Philosophical Roots of the Dialogical Theory of the Utterance." *The Bakhtin Circle: In the Master's Absence*. Eds. Graig Brandist, David Shepherd, and Galin Tihanov. Manchester and New York, NY: Manchester University Press, 2004. 97–124.

Brandist, Craig, David Shepherd, and Galin Tihanov (eds.). *The Bakhtin Circle: In the Master's Absence*. Manchester and New York, NY: Manchester University Press, 2004.

Brandist, Craig. "Sociological Linguistics in Leningrad: The Institute for the Comparative History of the Literatures and Languages of the West and East (ILJaZV) 1921–1933." *Russian Literature* 63.2–4 (2008): 171–200.

Brandist, Craig, and Mika Lähteenmäki. "Early Soviet Linguistics and Mikhail Bakhtin's Essays on the Novel of the 1930s." *Politics and the Theory of Language in the USSR 1917–1938: The Birth of Sociological Linguistics*. Eds. Craig Brandist and Katya Chown. London: Anthem Press, 2010. 69–88.

Brandist, Craig. "The Eastern Side of the Circle: the Contribution of Mikhail Tubjanskij." *Studies in East European Thought* 67.3 (2015): 209–228.

Brandist, Craig. "Bakhtin's Historical Turn and Its Soviet Antecedents." *Bakhtiniana. Revista de Estudos do Discurso* 11.1 (2016): 17–38.

Clark, Katerina, and Michael Holquist. *Mikhail Bakhtin*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984.

Hirschkop, Ken. *Mikhail Bakhtin: An Aesthetic for Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Kagan, Iudif'. "O starykh bumagakh iz semeinogo arkhiva (M.M. Bakhtin i M.I. Kagan)." *Dialog. Karnaval. Khronotop* 1 (1992): 60–88.

Konrad, Nikolai. *Iaponskaia literatura v obraztsakh i ocherkakh*. Leningrad: IZhVIa, 1927.

Makhlin, Vitalii. "Nevel'skaia shkola." *Russkaia filosofiia: Malyi entsiklopedicheskii slovar'*. Ed. Aleksandr Abramov. Moscow: Nauka, 1995. 359–365.

Matejka, Ladislav. "Deconstructing Bakhtin." *Fiction Updated: Theories of Fictionality, Narratology, and Poetics*. Eds. Calin Andrei Mihailescu and Walid Hamarneh. Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1996. 257–266.

Medvedev, Iurii. "Na puti k sozdaniiu sotsiologicheskoi poètiki." *Dialog. Karnaval. Khronotop* 2 (1998): 6–57.

Medvedev, Pavel. "Teatral'naia khronika." *Zhizn' iskusstva* 856.33 (1922): 4.

Mikheeva, Liudmila. *I.I. Sollertinskii: Zhizn' i nasledie*. Leningrad: Sovetskii kompozitor, 1988.

Nikolaev, Nikolai. "Lev Pumpianskii and the Nevel School of Philosophy." *The Bakhtin Circle: In the Master's Absence*. Eds. Graig Brandist, David Shepherd, and Galin Tihanov. Manchester and New York, NY: Manchester University Press, 2004. 125–149.

Poole, Brian. "From Phenomenology to Dialogue: Max Scheler's Phenomenological Tradition and Mikhail Bakhtin's Development from 'Toward a Philosophy of the Act' to his Study of Dostoevsky." *Bakhtin and Cultural Theory*. 2nd edition. Eds. Ken Hirschkop and David Shepherd. Manchester and New York, NY: Manchester University Press, 2001. 109–135.

Pumpianskii, Lev. *Klassicheskaia traditsiia: sobranie trudov po istorii russkoi literatury*. Moscow: Iazyki russkoi kul'tury, 2000.

Sandler, Sergeiy. "Bakhtin and the Kierkegaardian Revolution." https://www.academia.edu/10389403/Bakhtin_and_the_Kierkegaardian_Revolution. 2012– (11 February 2019).

Tihanov, Galin. *The Master and the Slave: Lukács, Bakhtin and the Ideas of Their Time*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.

Tubianskii, Mikhail. "Rabindranat Tagor i ego tvorchestvo." *Pis'mennye pamiatniki i problemy istorii kul'tury narodov Vostoka*. [1927] Ed. Vladimir Sobolev and Ėduard Temkin. Moscow: Nauka, 1990. 175–216.

Voloshinov, Valentin. "Archival materials." *The Bakhtin Circle: In the Master's Absence*. Eds. Craig Brandist, David Shepherd, and Galin Tihanov. Manchester and New York, NY: Manchester University Press, 2004. 223–250.

Rainer Grübel

Bakhtin's Philosophy of Literature and its Relation to Literary Theory, Literature and Culture

1 The questions of Bakhtin's timelessness and his profession

If 125 years after his birth and 45 years after his death we once again take a look at Bakhtin's concepts of literature and philosophy and their reception, mainly in Europe, we find a stimulating motif in the question as to what his thinking can mean for human beings, the humanities and human cultures in the early twenty-first century, after the end of postmodernism and its theoretical correlative, deconstruction: what do his concepts say to us after the end of the extreme relativism of postmodern culture with its negation of the responsibility of authorship ('anything goes', 'death of the author') and the doubt concerning all essential(ist) propositions besides the essential(ist) proposition that an essential proposition is not possible that have formed and deformed Bakhtin's reception for half a century? A similar question was posed in 2010 by Natan Tamarchenko with regard to Bakhtin's poetics and its relation to aesthetics. He came to the conclusion that Bakhtin's poetics finds its position between philosophical aesthetics and philosophical linguistics (Tamarchenko 2010, 70).

Bakhtin has received more discussion over the world than any other philosopher and scholar of the humanities in Eastern Europe of the last fifty years. It is tempting to consider the migration of his thinking through foreign continental European countries (and back to Russia) in the framework of the model of a 'dialogue of cultures' (that is, an 'intercultural dialogue'). This notion was developed by the Russian philosopher Vladimir Bibler (1991) in his dispute with Bakhtin's ideas on culture. It is based on the consideration that we can shape a culture only if we presuppose a minimum of 'two' cultures (Bibler 1991, 85). If this is the case, we can conceive cultures in analogy to the relationship between languages in the field of communication, which implies different languages – that is, at least more than one. The diverse views on Bakhtin can serve, then, as complementary parts of a multifocal panopticon:

> Languages of heteroglossia, like mirrors that face each other, each of which in its own way reflects a little piece, a tiny corner of the world, force us to guess at and grasp behind their inter-reflecting aspects for a world that is broader, more multi-levelled and multi-horizoned than would be available to one language, one mirror. (Bakhtin 1981, 415)

In this respect, cultures can be seen as acting somewhat like human beings, which in Bakhtin's anthropological model (1996g, 351; 2002c, 379; Isupov 1990) can be understood exclusively in terms of their (for instance verbal) interaction with other people. In this context, the dialogue of cultures includes not only the perceivable answers of one culture to another and the reaction of the latter to the counter-action of the former, but also by their reciprocally enriched potentials. Besides this cultural-anthropological parallel, we also have to take into consideration the possibility that concepts of culture themselves develop in relation to the historically changing notions of the human being and vice versa. We point to the recent 'anthropological turn', which not only gave anthropological concepts a new standing in culture but in so doing also changed the very model of culture we examine here. Bakhtin's claim that truth is not available for a single person or in a temporally restricted moment ("truth is only revealed in an unfinished/unfinisheable dialogue"; Bakhtin 2002d, 464) is valid for both his own thinking and reflection on it. This approach is legitimately carried out both inside and outside of Russia and also finds in this double location an impulse for its dialogical diversity.

After Malcolm Jones (1990, 720) registered Bakhtin's reception in world culture as an extremely diverse accumulation of concepts presenting the figures of "structuralist and post-structuralist, Marxist and post-Marxist, speech-act-theorist, sociolinguist, liberal, pluralist, mystic, vitalist, Christian, and materialist" and Carol Adlam (2000, 156) wrote about the "mastering and appropriation" of Bakhtin, Klaus Städtke (2001, 131) even lamented the "intercultural mystification of [his] theory". Nataliia Avtonomova (2008, 635) objected that the Bakhtinian dialogue is only a positive parade form of the relationships between cultures: they also occur as indifference and as fights. For instance, after the Cold War the American political scientist Samuel Huntington (1993) expected a *Clash of Civilizations* as the main way cultures in the world would be interrelated in the future. And indeed: in the international discussion about Bakhtin and his friends Jean-Paul Bronckart's and Cristian Bota's book *Bakhtine démasqué. Histoire d'un menteur, d'une escroquerie et d'un délire collectif* (2011, *Bakhtin unmasked. The story of a liar, a fraud and a collective delusion*) we find an example of interculturality in the form of a fight: it reminds us of the worst traditions of Stalinist 'class struggle'. Here, Bakhtin is denigrated as a representative of a "radicalment réactionaire" (radical reactionary, meaning 'evil') ideology (Bronckart and Bota 2011, 408). This negative picture has stimulated the 'unmasking' of Bakhtin by Aleksej Korovashko

(2017) in the first extensive Russian Bakhtin biography, which completely ignores his philosophical impact. With regard to Bakhtin's remarkable (non-)reception, for instance in Israel (Ginsburg 1996), we have to state that (verbal) non-action in a case where action is possible or even expected is also an act.

For half a century, the international reception of Bakhtin's thinking has been interferingly shaped by the (usually implicit) question as to whether the author of the famous books on Dostoevskii and Rabelais could/should be regarded as a philosopher, a linguist and/or a literary critic. Although from his earliest lectures and publications up to the very last Bakhtin seems to have seen himself primarily as a philosopher, if not more generally as a 'thinker' (*myslitel'*), for quite some time, in the Soviet Union, in Russia and also abroad, he was read primarily as a literary critic and/or a linguist. (We must bear in mind the difference between the Russian notion of the *myslitel'* and its English equivalent thinker. A significant case of the use of the Russian noun *myslitel'* is Aleksej Losev's novel *Zhenshchina-myslitel'* [1933/1934, *The Woman Thinker*], which has been seen as a parody of the gifted pianist Mariia Iudina, a member of Bakhtin's Vitebsk circle.)

In Bakhtin's case, the question of his profession is not a minor one; it is not a question of the optics or the main emphasis of his concepts. Rather, it makes an enormous difference whether one reads his books on dialogue and carnival as treatises on French and Russian prose or on the human being and world culture. The question as to the place of the spoken word, the role of the human body in human life, in culture and the cosmos, implies an altogether different problem (a philosophical and anthropological one) than asking in the context of literary studies how the narrative is organized in Dostoevskii's prose or laughter in Rabelais' novels. Vitalii Makhlin (1997, 198–199) determines the "social ontology of participation" as the foundation for both Bakhtin's philosophy and his philology, for his social anthropology as well as for his metalinguistics. Today it seems to be evident that Bakhtin's handling of language was much less that of a linguist than that of a philosopher of language. His concept of 'speech genres' grasps the interference of (everyday) life, thinking and talking (Lachmann and Sasse 2017, 186–190).

As we have stated previously (Grübel 2008, 329), we are convinced that it was Bakhtin's aim to revise traditional metaphysics, to found a new one which was to be closely grounded in life (*bytie*). Bakhtin (2003a, 12) formulated this 'first philosophy' (cf. Guseinov 2017) as the mediation of ethical practice, cognition and aesthetic processing on the one hand (Bakhtin 2003c, 284–289) and of cognition, perception and 'experience' (*perezhivanie*) on the other (Bakhtin 2003b, 116–119). This project, formulated by Bakhtin (Averintsev et al. 2003, 496–497, 711) in 1922–1924, conceived of a 'critical' or 'negative' metaphysics: it could be neither a rational metaphysics of science, which is abstract and completely independent

from the experiencing and thinking person (Bakhtin 2002c, 379) nor an arbitrarily subjective metaphysics grounded solely in individual experience. It was thought as a responsible relationship with the world itself and a response to the vision of the world of other human beings.

Scholars have yet to profoundly investigate (cf. Turbin 1990, 10–14) how Bakhtin's heavy illness, his meningitis and pulmonary tuberculosis, but most of all his chronic multiple osteomyelitis from which he suffered from his childhood and youth (Bakhtin 2002a, 53–54, 232; Korovashko 2017, 20) to his later years, the operations they necessitated (as a child, and again in 1921 and 1929) and the amputation of his right leg in 1938 influenced not only his biography (he probably did not receive a high school diploma, and no university degree until his doctorate in 1952 at the age of 56) but also his philosophical thinking, his 'singular place in being' (as he called it). This is not the case with Albert Camus, whom Bakhtin (2002c, 382; 2002d, 461) mentions as a follower of Dostoevskii. Bakhtin's heavy illness prevented his wife, a trained librarian, from ever taking a job (besides as a cashier around 1935 out of economic necessity). More attention has been paid to the biographical fact that until 1917 the brothers Nikolai and Mikhail, only one year separating them, lived like mental twins (Clark and Holquist 1984, 16–35). In the mid-1920s, after Lenin's expulsion of all prominent philosophers from socialist Russia in 1922, Bakhtin, who always considered himself a philosopher and sometimes a literary critic, but never a linguist, was well aware of the fact that in this Soviet context he could present neither his philosophical work on the ethical foundation of the human act nor that on the complementary relationship between the author and the hero in aesthetic activity; nor could he present himself as an independent, non-Marxist thinker. Unlike Aleksej Losev (1893–1988), who in the years 1926–1930 dared to publish six philosophical volumes in his 'own' publishing house, and was therefore sentenced to ten years in a labor camp (where he lost his sight), unlike his friend Matvei Kagan (1889–1937), who in 1924 switched to a principally non-ideological position at an Institute of Energy and later wrote philosophical texts only seldom and strictly privately, and also unlike Gustav Shpet (1879–1937), who, after losing his philosophical position in 1929, no longer wrote philosophical texts and nevertheless was shot, Bakhtin changed his public philosophical focus from life and ethics to literature and language.

The (misleading) idea that Bakhtin's authorship is primarily that of a literary critic and only then that of a linguist and only incidentally or implicitly also that of a philosopher was caused inter alia by the Russian editors of his works in the 1960s and 1970s. Sergei Bocharov and Vladimir Kozhinov initially published his fragments about the epistemology of humanities (on the many misreadings, cf. Sadeckij 1997, 101–105) under the banner "K metodologii literaturovedenija"

("On the methodology of literary criticism"; Bakhtin 1975), then under the label "K metodologii gumanitarnykh nauk" ("On the methodology of the humanities"; Bakhtin 1979a; Bakhtin 1986a). It was only in 1996, years after the breakup of the Soviet Union, that it appeared under Bakhtin's own title "K filosofskim osnovam gumanitarnykh nauk" ("On the philosophical principles of the humanities", Bakhtin 1996a). Caryl Emerson has accurately stated that "like many scholars of the Stalinist Soviet period, who had something profoundly their own to say, Bakhtin was often obliged to route those ideas through disciplines not of his own choosing" (Emerson 2003, 297).

The reason for this evident shift is twofold: on the one hand, in the Soviet Union the place of philosophy was occupied by the ideology of Marxism-Leninism(-Stalinism). As an only incidentally changing dogma it was strictly controlled by the Communist Party. On the other hand, in the ever-changing framework of the doctrine of *Socialist Realism* first established in 1934, control over the methodology of literary critics was less strict: it rather developed, as demonstrated for instance by the discussion of the novel as a genre in the 1930s and 1940s, in which, besides Bakhtin (Pan'kov 2009), the Marxist Lukács (Tihanov 2000) participated, and by the emergence of Tartu and Moscow semiotics (to which Bakhtin reacted, cf. Avtonomova 2008; on the Moscow Tartu School also see Rainer Grübel's chapter in this volume) in the 1960s and 1970s, and it remained a subject of continuous, sometimes even fierce debate. While in the Stalinist and post-Stalinist USSR it was practically impossible to have a (public) dialogue about the strictly installed truth of Marxism-Leninism(-Stalinism) (at least beyond minor questions), the rules of literary criticism in correlation with its object were debated constantly (cf. Segal 2011; Dobrenko and Tikhanov 2011). Genrikh Batishchev's (1997) Bakhtin-inspired "Introduction to dialectic aesthetics", ready for print in 1981, could not be published until the end of the Soviet Union.

After the dethronement of Socialist Realism (due to the collapse of the USSR in 1990), some Russian Bakhtin followers even expected that his work itself could/should become the foundation of the coming (Russian) literary criticism if not of a new aesthetics in general (Frolov 1995, 131). In Germany, Rolf Klöpfer (1999) proposed Bakhtin's concept of 'dialogicity' as the foundation of the literary and cinematic criticism of the future. Recently, Matthias Freise (2018), in cooperation with some colleagues from different countries and diverse disciplines, introduced a four-part model evolving Bakhtin's concept of dialogical intersubjectivity as the foundation for a common epistemology in the humanities. However, in the early 1990s, the Russian philosopher Aleksandr Piatigorskii (1992), an expert on Indian philosophy who has taught in London since 1974, could write the article "'The other' and 'my own' als notions of literary philosophy" without (in a figure of philosophical litotes) even mentioning the name Bakhtin.

The publication of the anthology *Bakhtin kak filosof* (*Bakhtin as a philosopher*) in 1992, edited by L.A. Gogotoshvili and I.S. Gurevich at the Nauka (Science) publishing house signaled the broadening of his reception in the direction of philosophical thinking. The ground had already been prepared in 1982 by Igor' Nikolaevich Sukhikh with the programmatic article "The philosophy of literature of M.M. Bakhtin" (Sukhikh 1982). Bakhtin himself practiced a special concept of philosophy that placed it in opposition to (literary and linguistic) theory as well as to criticism. Reflecting on it and its place in culture(s), he wrote: "It [philosophy] starts where precise science ends and other science begins. It can be defined as the metalanguage of all sciences (and all kinds of cognition and consciousness)" (Bocharov and Gogotishvili 1996, 384; Bakhtin 2002c, 424). This philosophy has to overcome the traditional opposition of the Cartesian 'I' and 'the world' (later: subject and object) in epistemology (cf. Makhlin 2018, 287). Thus philosophical thinking is – unlike the appeal of analytical philosophy – opposed to exact science (for instance physics, chemistry, biology). It is called a "different science" ("ino-nauchnost"; Bakhtin 2002c, 424), a science of its own kind, which is seen as the way we can think and communicate about science(s). For Bakhtin, philosophy and science are engaged in a permanent dialogue, which presupposes their principal difference. Linguistics and literary criticism also differ from philosophy, but they can either be closer to science, if they use (for instance) empirical data, or they can come closer to philosophy when they reflect on the theoretical (for instance epistemological and anthropological) foundations of their possibility. And this is, for Bakhtin, always necessary. Historically, we can trace shifts of Bakhtin's main focus from the philosophy of the act – that is, ethics – via aesthetics to the philosophy of literature and the philosophy of language. In English-language-contexts, Bakhtin emerged as a philosopher of culture and as a theorist of literature simultaneously in the 1980s (cf. Ulicka 2006), but in historical inversion: English-speaking audiences first encountered the late Bakhtin. In contrast to some critics, we do not see a shift from an idealistic philosophy to a materialistic one. We also have our doubts about his "shift to science" (Hirschkop 1999, 157–169). As we have explained elsewhere (Grübel 2008, 317–330), we understand Bakhtin's philosophy as a new metaphysics that includes (Bakhtin would say: does not exclude) the material world. In this sense, it comes close to the New realism of Maurizio Ferraris, Markus Gabriel and Rossano Pecoraro. Very recently, Vitaly Makhlin (2019, 276), a leading Russian Bakhtin scholar, has described Bakhtin's reception as a "sad misinterpretation of the thinker's ideas, which is present worldwide, but particularly in Bakhtin's fatherland". Today, Scarlett Baron (2020) relates "The Birth of Intertextuality" to Darwin's theory of evolution, thus binding Bakhtin, against his intention (Bakhtin 2003b, 250), back to positivism.

Bakhtin's work about questions of language is surely not part of linguistic research but part of a philosophy of language, more precisely: a philosophy of communication that crystallized in his productive concept of speech genres (*rechevye zhanry*, Bakhtin 1996d; 1996e). This philosophy of dialogic communication essentially contributes to his understanding of the human being, his anthropology, and to his project of a 'first' philosophy. For Bakhtin, it is only by communication that the human being is able to perform his/her dialogical anthropological nature. Confronted with the world and him/herself, seen in the perspective of 'the Other', the human 'I' achieves a non-monological idea of the world and of him/herself. Besides the inter-subjectively conceived single person and the in-dismissible Other, Bakhtin's anthropological philosophy also implies the possible presence of a Third – be it a witness, a judge or (a) God. In our context, it is the philosophy of literature that is our main interest.

2 Dialogic consciousness as the basis or Bakhtin's philosophy

Bakhtin's early ethical philosophy of the act and his aesthetics of the interrelation between the author and the hero implies the concept of a dialogic consciousness (cf. Samokhvalova 1992). This notion denies the Cartesian idea of the autonomous consciousness of a subject and its counterposition to the world, which can be traced up to Fichte and Hegel and in its collective form also to the 'class consciousness' (*Klassenbewusstsein*) of Marx and Lukács. For Bakhtin, consciousness itself takes part in 'being' (*bytie*) and is itself also a part of this being (Zinchenko 2010, 81–85). He creates the figures of the "event of being" (*sobytie bytiia*; Bakhtin 2003a, 41) and the "being of the event" (*bytie sobytiia*; Bakhtin 2003a, 31), which even in their phonetics and graphics stress the inner binding of acting and being.

Bakhtin's dialogic concept of consciousness is grounded in the principal otherness of human understanding. His notion of being (*bytie*) is opposed to the concept of an objective 'reality' (*deistvitel'nost'*), which traditionally is separated from, if not confronted with, the recognizing and deliberating 'I'. Being itself, the 'I' inevitably takes part in the material and the spiritual world, in the universe and culture. Inspired by his friend Matvei Kagan (a scholar of Hermann Cohen), who conceived a new – messianic but not teleological – philosophical model of history which includes the human being's relationship with God (Kagan 2004), Bakhtin created a new concept of the phenomenon, which in opposition to Husserl always has to be seen at least from two sides (Haardt 2000, Pape 2016). It was developed

in (sometimes implicit) discussions with the philosophies of Bergson and Simmel, of Cassirer and Scheler.

Unlike the French reception, which more or less integrated Bakhtin into Russian literary (post-)structuralism, the German reception saw in Bakhtin someone who overcame Russian formalism in the field of the theory of communication (Hansen-Löve 1978), a reformer of the Western and the Russian philosophical tradition (Grübel 1979) and of the traditional theory of culture (Lachmann 1995). Hansen-Löve (1978) published in his book on Russian formalism an extended chapter about Vygotskii's psychology of art (and especially on his concept of *inner speech*) and Bakhtin's (/Voloshinov's) model of a semiotic science of ideology (also see Sylvia Sasse's chapter on Vygotskii in this volume). Hansen-Löve considers Bakhtin's (Voloshinov's) concept of inner speech a continuation and reformation of Vygotskii's thinking. (The authorship of Voloshinov's books is debated.) The aim is to develop a metalinguistic concept of the theory of communication that stresses the dialogical aspect of communication and polyphonic speech, also in the relationship between the author (the narrator) and the hero. Hansen-Löve (1978, 438, 451–455) interprets Bakhtin's concept of polyphony as a model of narrative multi-perspectivity and ideological pluralism and his concept of 'carnivalism' as a model of the principle of 'estrangement' (*ostranenie*), the foundation of which is ambivalence.

3 The (philosophical) problem of the translatability of Bakhtin's word(s) and the quest for historical concreteness

Participating in the dialogue of cultures, we use different formats. These formats differ in their closeness to or distance from the donor culture, which are (also) expressed by the language used. Formats very near to the original are those dialogic responses known as transcripts and excerpts of books in a foreign language. From 1929 onwards, far away from good libraries (Bocharov and Melikhova 2000b, 657–680; Bakhtin 2008b), Bakhtin himself engaged in this practice a lot, one reason being that he did not have the opportunity to make copies of the books; he usually had them to hand for a limited time only, sometimes just a week. With respect to the first Dostoevskii book, the handwritten transcripts were produced by Bakhtin's wife; with respect to the Rabelais book, they were mainly outlines and summaries produced by Bakhtin himself, going along with translations. Even the process of writing-up is a dialogical response: it transforms the original text

or its part into new, different material as well as into a new context. A greater act of intervention that is much more evident, however, is this dialogical moment in the process of translation and transcription in(to) another language, because it unavoidably implies the interpretation of the original text in order to make its incorporation into the target language possible in the first place.

Such translations of texts are an important part of, if not a precondition for, the dialogue of cultures in our time too. Their philosophical implication is the question as to whether translation is possible at all. Bakhtin himself had a very ambivalent opinion regarding translatability (cf. Zbinden 2006b). In its ambiguity, it can be compared with Benjamin's (1968) thesis concerning the un-translatability of texts and the necessity of their translation. On the one hand, Bakhtin was convinced that every 'language' can be translated from any culture to another without any difficulty. In later years, he formulated this conviction in a way that testifies to his mental contact with (Soviet) semiotics of the 1960s and 1970s:

> Any sign system (i. e. any language), on which narrow collective its conditionality would not rely, can always be deciphered, that is, translated into other sign systems (other languages); therefore, there is a common logic of sign systems, a potential single language of languages (which of course can never become a concrete single language, never one of the languages). (Bakhtin 1996 f, 309–310; my translation)

On the other hand, Bakhtin articulated fundamental philosophical doubts about the translatability of 'texts': "But the text (in contrast to the language as a system of means) can never be translated to the end, because there is no possible single text of texts" (Bakhtin 1996 f, 310). Sergei Fokin (2011) has related Bakhtin's thesis of the untranslatability of texts to a general disdain for translation in Russian philosophy. This is in contrast with the well-known openness of Russian literature to translation (Emerson 2017).

Due to the discussion concerning the question as to whether translation is a prerequisite of understanding or (vice versa) understanding a prerequisite of translation, we interpret this relationship as a double bind: each translation presupposes understanding, all understanding presupposes translation. The same is the case with the relationship between dialogue and translation. For Iurii Lotman, dialogue presupposes translation, while for Bakhtin, translation presupposes dialogue (Avtonomova 2008, 552–553). Whereas Bakhtin sees a (possible) meta'language' which enables us to transgress the boundaries of any (natural) language in the direction of any other language and to see each language as a concretization of this abstract metalanguage, he denies the possibility of an abstract meta'text', which could be the common wording of the concrete original and even its concrete translation. Hence, in Bakhtin's vision, unlike languages, texts behave like individuals that cannot be converted into one another. The reason for this astonish-

ing consideration is the fact that each text is generated in a certain unrepeatable (un-reproducible) historical, cultural and personal situation. For instance, Bakhtin's book *Fransua Rable v istorii realizma* (1940, *Rabelais in the History of Realism*; Bakhtin 2008a) was originally written by a politically oppressed person in the culture of high Stalinism, before World War II. Its correlate (reworked) equivalent published in 1965 – *Tvorchestvo Fransua Rable i narodnaia smekhovaia kul'tura Srednevekov'ia i Renessansa* (*Rabelais' Work and the People's Laughter-Culture of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*; Bakhtin 2010; translated into English as *Rabelais and his World* in 1968, Bakhtin 1968) – is a different book because it came into being in the area of Soviet post-Stalinism and was published by the professor of a provincial university. The editors of Bakhtin's Russian *Sobranie sochinenii* (*Collected Writings*) got it right, then, when they took 'both' books as independent items into their canon of Bakhtin's writings, as one and the same sentence has a very different sense in the years 1940 or 1960: "All swearing always contains in one corporal-topographical form or another a picture pregnant with death" (Bakhtin 2008a, 355; Bakhtin 2010, 378). Immediately after the Great Terror of 1937–1938, death was actually present in the corpses of hundreds of thousands of innocent victims of Stalinism illegally killed by the state and in the topographical concretion of the GULag and exile, which applied to the author himself, who risked his life by leaving his place of banishment, Saransk, in the fall of 1937 (Korovashko, 2017, 308–318). Bakhtin was not 'rehabilitated' until 1967 – that is, 38 years later. In 1960, these deaths were part of the (suppressed) Soviet memory and supplemented by the memory of the million deaths of Soviet people during World War II. In its methodological perspective, the first book is a contribution to the discussions of (Socialist) Realism, the second a vote for a more comprehensive and more complex view on and practice of human culture in the late Soviet Union.

A similar change can also be observed in Bakhtin's two books on Dostoevskii: the first (Bakhtin 2000) with its main label 'creation' (*tvorchestvo*) is still placed in the framework of an aesthetics of creativity (also in the context of the artistic avant-garde, cf. Bakhtin 2002a, 140–142), whereas the second (Bakhtin 2002b) with its notion of 'poetics' is more closely connected with literary criticism, even though it involves the history of the dialogical word much more than its earlier counter-part. In this respect, it also stands in the historical perspective of Bakhtin's own development and witnesses the growing relevance of prose genres as well as that of carnival: the second Dostoevskii includes the possible knowledge of the first Rabelais and the second Rabelais includes the potential acquaintance with the second Dostoevskii. Both are opposed to Lenin's and Gor'kii's ban on Dostoevskii.

The reason for the untranslatability of texts is the same as the reason for the un-reproducibility of human lives and human beings: it is their concrete situation in history, their personal character as 'life events' (*sobytie bytiia*) in world

history. This history (a sequence more of ideas than of authors and texts) is, as 'great time', marked much less by its development than by the possibility of its renaissance. Even if we were able to replicate a human being genetically, we could never replicate them with their concrete situation in life, history and the cosmos, which is marked by its personal events (impressions, experiences, acts). As early as *K filosofii postupka* (Bakhtin 2003a; *Toward a Philosophy of the Act*, Bakhtin 1993), Bakhtin conceives a theology of the act, highlighted by the repeated use of the word 'communion', convinced that the event cannot be determined within the categories of a non-participant theoretical consciousness. For him, it can be grasped only in the categories of actual communion, that is, of an act actually performed in the presence of another person. In "Avtor i geroi v ėsticheskoi dei-atel'nosti" (Bakhtin 1986b; "Author and Hero in Aesthetic Activity", Bakhtin 1990) his emphasis is on the consequences of the introduction of a second participating consciousness into the event. He notes that without co-evaluating the other to some extent, one cannot contemplate an event as an event in its specific quality. In his book *Problemy tvorchestva Dostoevskogo* (1929, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*), he explored the idea that the inner interpenetration of aesthetic and ethical events might be played out at the point of the dialogic meeting between two or several consciousnesses (Bakhtin 1929). H. J. M. Hermans (2003) has traced this aspect in the direction of constructive psychology without taking into consideration Bakhtin's discussion of Vygotskii's concept of inner speech (cf. Hansen-Löve 1978, 436–440).

One could even see the constitution of events as the permanent process of interpersonal translations. Historical concreteness, then, is itself a phenomenon which is grounded in its aesthetics, in the tone and the rhythm of the act, which are the precondition for their answerability: as recent research argues (Gritten 2016), the balancing of aesthetic and ethical moments within an answerable act even requires a specifically musical attitude of consciousness.

4 The historical reception and problems of translation

Bakhtin's books themselves lived in the perspectives of their historical national and international reception. After the long break of almost three decades and after Seduro's (1958) retrospective of Dostoevskii critics, including passages on Bakhtin's 1929 book, in March 1961 Vittorio Strada (1997, 374) proposed in a letter to the author the publication of a reworked version of the Dostoevskii book in Italian translation by the Turin publisher Einaudi. Originally planned as the

introduction to a new (never realized) edition of Dostoevskii's complete works in Italian by the same publishing house (Bocharov and Melikhova 2000a, 504–505; Bocharov and Gogotishvili 1996, 550–551; Bocharov and Gogotishvili 2002, 476–477), according to Strada the new version was sent to Turin with official Soviet approval in the summer 1962. (This foreign publication has to be seen against the background of the publication of Pasternak's *Doktor Zhivago* 1957 by Feltrinelli, which Soviet officials considered a scandal.) As the first translator couldn't cope with the difficult text, the book was given to another one, Giuseppe Garritano, whose translation did not appear until 1968, however. Almost ten years later, Strada (Bakhtin 1976) edited Lukács's and Bakhtin's main texts on the theory of the novel in Italian. And as late as 1997, Margherita De Michiel and Augusto Ponzio also edited a translation (by M. De Michiel) of the first version of Bakhtin's Dostoevskii in Italian (Bakhtin 1997). Meanwhile, Bakhtin's Russian original of his 1962 reworking was published in 1963 by the Moscow press Sovetskii pisatel' (The Soviet Writer) thanks to the commitment of Vladimir Kozhinov. This took place despite the stubborn resistance of Soviet hardliners such as A. Dymchits, I. Vasilevskaia and A. Miasikov, but with the help of the daughter of the chief of the KGB and later leader of the Communist Party Andropov. The Russian journalist Sergei Kurginian (over-)interpreted this support for the publishing of Bakhtin's book on Dostoevskii (and also of that on Rabelais) as the reason for the end of the Soviet Union: "The shell is Bakhtin. The cannon – Andropov. The goal is the Communist Party of the USSR as a secular red church" (Kurginian 2009).

Translations play an irreplaceable role in the process of intercultural reception. They transfer books and articles, notions and terms not only from one language to another but also from the donor culture with its specific historical situation to the target culture (Avtonomova 2008, 397) with its different specific historical context. Due to profound changes of mental and ideological and verbal and historical contexts, this process often entails enormous problems. The transfer of utterances from one culture to another confronts us with the question of the extent to which the (con)text and the lingual specificity of the original can and should be preserved and the extent to which they should be adapted to the target culture and its language.

In the early 1980s, Todorov (1981, 11) already complained about the weakness of the French Bakhtin translations. When the linguist (with a Russian background) Marina Yaguello rendered Bakhtin's and Voloshinov's book *Marksizm i filosofiia iazka* (1929, *Marxism and the philosophy of language*) in 1977 into French (Bakhtin 1977), she rendered the Russian words "rech'", "vyskazyvanie" and "slovo" ("speech", "utterance" and "word") with the French noun "*discours*", as Foucault's analysis of discourse was in fashion in Paris at the time (Avtonomova 2008, 383–384). This translation was accompanied by a preface by Jakobson

(Bakhtine [and Voloshinov] 1977, XI–X); however, we do not know whether he had access to the translation before it went into print. Some thirty-three years later, Patrique Sériot (Voloshinov 2010) avoids the term *discours* in the second French translation of this book completely, and with good reason. The context of the receiving culture has changed.

In English translations, one of the most drastic violations was the representation of Bakhtin's clearly different terms 'multilingualism' (*raznoiazychie)*, which refers to the abstract level of languages and 'heteroglossia' (*raznorechie)*, which is related to concrete utterances, by only one single concept: 'heteroglossy' (cf. Zbinden 2006a, 23, 69). Following the problematic French example, in English translations the expressions 'word' (*slovo*) and 'speech' (*rech'*), so important and different to Bakhtin, have often been replaced by one and the same current term, discourse, for instance even in the title: *Discourse in the novel* (Bakhtin 1981, 259–422).

An even more rigid rendering was the replacement of Bakhtin's concept of the dialogicity of words in utterances and texts with their 'intertextuality' in the work of Kristeva (1970; cf. Rolet 2010) (on Kristeva's theory of intertextuality via Bakhtin also see Valentin Peschanskyi's chapter on "Case Study of a Migrating Concept: Intertextuality" in this volume). Its basis was the negation of the role of the author in Foucault's philosophy. One even could suppose that Kristeva's deletion of Bakhtin's concept of personal responsibility rhymes with her possible covert work as Sabina for the Bulgarian secret service from the 1960s onwards (Kenarov 2018; Kristeva 2018). In her early works, Kristeva intended not only to construct a "sémanalyse et gnoseologie materialiste" ("materialist semanalysis and gnosis", Kristeva 1969, 191–198, 380) but also to found it (possibly influenced by the stochastics of the Russian mathematician Andrei Kolmogorov) in mathematics! This already reduced the role of the author, who in Bakhtin's thinking is determined by his extremely relevant intersubjectivity (Batishchev 1997, 129–130), to a minimum: "Instead of the notion of intersubjectivity, that of intertextuality is installed" (Kristeva 1969, 146). Thus in France, Bakhtin's texts were broadly used as instruments in the debate between poststructuralists and structuralists. These interventions resulted in the deletion of the concept of the subject that was so indispensible for Bakhtin and that in his case culminates in an intersubjective personalism (Kovács 2012). In the translation of Bakhtin's work on aesthetics produced by Reese and myself, we had to restore Husserlian terms such as 'intention' (*Einstellung*, *ustanovka*) and 'horizon' (Horizont, *gorizont*) to the German text, which the editor of the publishing house had eliminated and replaced with 'more pleasant' German expressions (Bachtin 1979b).

What Bakhtin had seen as a quality of the perception of texts – "Every understanding is the [inter]connection of the given text with other texts" (Bakhtin

2002c, 423) – has been transformed by the deconstruction into a quality of its production: the discourse arises via its inter-correlation with other discourses. The author no longer has any function. It is the death of the author. Nevertheless, the negation of the notion of the text as a stable phenomenon was Bakhtin's strongest contribution first to French and then to international poststructuralism.

In 1967, Bakhtin had already been related to structuralism by the philosopher Nikola Miloshevich, who wrote the preface to the Serbian translation of Bakhtin's second book on Dostoevskii (Bahtin 1967, 8). Bakhtin's integration of the human person into a relationship with at least one other person in Russian contexts is often seen as rooted in the religious tradition of a sociality inalienable to every person (*sobornost*') (cf. Esaulov 1997, who traces the path from Viacheslav Ivanov's *sobornost*' to Bakhtin's 'polyphony'), while in the West it is most often related to sociology and/or Marxism (Bernard-Donals 1994, Hirschkop 1999). Ulrich Schmid (2011) detected crypto-marxistic elements even in Bakhtin's early texts, but Sériot (2011) claimed that even Voloshinov's (and Bakhtin's) *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* is not a Marxist book. Carol Adlam and David Shepherd (2000) have compared the different reception of Bakhtin's work in Russian and the West and Danuta Ulicka (2006) has shown how in American academic circles Bakhtin's works have been used as an argument for both a textual (poststructuralist) and the opposite contextual (deconstructivist) concept of culture. When Kulikov (2012, 186) recently stressed the relevance of value in Bakhtin's concept of the 'chronotope' for political discussions, he completely disregarded Bakhtin's skeptical attitude towards the then current notion of the text. Gogotoshvili (1992) had long since discussed the problem of relativism in Bakhtin's model of value from a much broader perspective.

There are evident obstacles that make adequate reception of an element of another culture very difficult or even impossible. One of them is reflected in Bakhtin's thesis of the untranslatability of texts due to their special situational context. Because of the deformations of Bakhtin's concepts in the West, Larissa Polouboiarinova even stated there was "almost a non-reception" (Polouboiarinova 2000, 385) of Bakhtin's thinking (excluding from this negative assessment Lehmann [1977] and Grübel [1979]). We have already encountered one of the reasons for this difficulty in the case of the delayed Italian translation of the Dostoevskii book. This problem is caused on the one hand by Bakhtin's specific tendency to use metaphorical, sometimes almost poetical expressions, as for instance in his counter-reflexive word combinations *sobytie bytiia* and *bytie sobytiia*, which cannot adequately be translated as 'the event of being' and 'the being of the event' (cf. Shchitcova 2002, 40–49, 153–156; Grübel 2005). In other cases, too, in translations of Bakhtin's writing into languages that use articles, such as Danish, Dutch, English, German or Swedish, we encounter the problem of having to decide to

choose in the target-language a syntagma either with definite or indefinite articles or even without any article at all (cf. Denishenko and Spektor 2017, 149). For instance, "Metalingvistika i filosofiia slova" (Bachtin 2002c, 371) can be translated as "Metalinguistics and philosophy of the word" or "The metalinguistic and the philosophy of the word", or "A metalinguistics and the/a philosophy of the word", giving three very different philosophical senses to Bakhtin's idea.

Problems of the translation of Bakhtin's texts into Western languages are also related to one of his most fundamental terms, the word (*slovo*), which he uses very often. In his most elaborate linguistic work, the draft of the book *Problema rechevykh zhanrov* (*Speech genres*, Bakhtin 1996d, 1996e), he distinguishes between the word as an abstract linguistic item that we find for instance in a dictionary from the word in its specific usage ('my' word and the word of the 'other'). The second he defines as the "abbreviation of an utterance" (Bakhtin 1996d, 192). It has been noted by Sadeckij (1997, 19) as *mot* and *parole* in Daria Oliver's translation of "The aesthetics of the verbal creation" ("Ésthetique et théorie du roman", Bakhtin 1978) and as *mot*, *terme*, *parole*, *vocabulaire* in the French translation of the Rabelais book (Bakhtin 1970). The transformation of a notion (not a term!) into a different concept becomes obvious when we recall the representation of Bakhtin's title "The 'word' in the novel" ("Slovo v romane") as "'Discourse' in the novel" in the American translation (Bakhtin 1981, 258, my emphasis). Here we should keep in mind the difference between the homonyms discourse 1 – the logical-linguistic unfolding of a perception – and discourse 2 – a socially regimented utterance. Avtonomova (2008, 379) has shown the complementary problems with the reverse translation of Foucault's lemma "discourse" into Russian.

As Danuta Ulicka (2009) stressed, Todorov retained Bakhtin's conceptual difference between *raznorechie* (different speech-acts) and *raznoiazychie* (different languages), whereas it has been abandoned in the English translation and replaced by the misleading single term heteroglossy. Other neologisms of Bakhtin's presenting difficulties for translations are *odnoaktsentnost'* (being defined by only one accent, one vision of the world), *vnenakhodimost'* (outsidedness/exotopy), *inoiazychie* (being situated in another language) and *raznomirnost'* (differing in terms of the world in which something/someone is situated). Considering the Russian situation with regard to the philosophical terminology, Makhlin (2004, 63) has stressed that even in its homeland Bakhtin's work has to be translated – from a Soviet context into a post-Soviet one. At the same time, he expresses his doubt as whether such a translation is at all possible (Makhlin 2004, 54). And once more we must recall Bakhtin's skeptical view of all conceptualisation as translation: "I translate into the language of an abstract worldview that which was the subject of concrete and vivid vision and became the principle of form. Such a translation is always inadequate." (Bakhtin 1996g, 345)

5 Bakhtin reception as a historical process

In the study of the international reception of Bakhtin's theories, it is elucidating to trace the temporal sequence of translations appearing in different languages, for instance that of the (second) Dostoevskii book (cf. Adlam and Shepherd 2000, 32): the first foreign editions appeared in (Serbian) Yugoslavia in 1967 (new editions in 1997 and 2019), followed by translations in Italy and Japan in 1968, (in part) in (West) Germany in 1969, in France, Poland, Romania and Switzerland (here in French) in 1970, and in Czechoslovakia and (this time as a complete version) in (West) Germany in 1971. In 1973, the first English translation, by R. William Rotsel, appeared in the USA (Bakhtin 1973), followed by editions in Bulgaria, Hungary and Portugal in 1976 and Brazil in 1981. In 1984, a new English translation (Bakhtin 1984; by Caryl Emerson) was published in the USA, and in 1986 the first Spanish version appeared in Mexico. Finnish, Norwegian and Swedish editions were published in 1991. As late as in 2007, there appeared a Slovenian translation in Ljubljana, while a Croatian edition was not published until 2020, in Zadar (Bakhtin 2020).

For publishing houses it is, of course, a relevant argument on the part of an editor and/or translator that a book has already been transferred (with success) into (an)other language(s). While a Turkish translation was published in Istanbul in 2004, we have no information about a Chinese translation, or one in India or Africa, whereas an eight-volume Bakhtin edition has been published in Japan, perhaps because a certain congruence has been recognized between Bakhtin and Nishida Kitarō, the founder of modern Japanese philosophy (Botz-Bornstein, 2004). In East Germany, no translation was published of either the Dostoevskii or the Rabelais book. Hence neither was available for the average East German reader until the end of the GDR.

The history of Bakhtin reception also knows isolated *unica* without evident consequences. For instance, as early as 1937, a Serbian translation of Voloshinov's (Bakhtin's?) book on Freud's psychoanalysis by Vladimir Fabijančić (Voloshinov 1937; Adlam and Shepherd 2000, 18, indicate the wrong date of 1939) appeared in Belgrade. There seems to have been neither a review nor any other testimony to its reception.

In the intriguing framework of an 'alternative history', we can bear in mind even the potential translation of Bakhtin's first book on Rabelais into French as early as the late 1940s. At least, Louis Aragon, who was married to Elsa Triolet, the sister of Maiakovskii's lover Lili Brik, seems to have transported the manuscript from Moscow to Paris in 1946 (Popova 2008a, 9; 2008b, 900–902; 2010, 633). The entire Bakhtin reception would have surely taken a different turn if his book on carnival had been published in Paris then instead of in 1970.

Of much interest for the question of intermingling cultures is the role of migrating scholars such as, for instance, Jakobson and Matějka (to the USA), Todorov and Kristeva (to France), and Smirnov and Groys (to Germany). One of the first cases of migration relevant in this context is, however, that of the Polish classical philologist Stanisław Srebrny (1890–1962), who studied in St. Petersburg, where he was in contact with Bakhtin and took his concepts (developed as a scholar of T. Zieliński) from Petrograd to Lublin as early as 1918 and later to Torun. He was the classical counterpart to Bakhtin's philosophical friend Matvei Kagan, who transported the ideas of Cohen's neo-Kantianism from West to East.

Another aspect is the appearance of 'secondary' translations, such as the Portuguese version of *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* (Bakhtin 1979c), which appeared in Sao Paulo and was a translation from the French (Bakhtine 1977; cf. Brait and Pistori 2020). Of course, the problems are compounded in secondary translations. Another relevant phenomenon is the fact that languages are not restricted to countries and even not to continents. For instance, French publications from Paris or Lausanne were also broadly read in francophone Canada (and vice versa) and Portuguese publications in Brazil (and vice versa), and the Spanish Bakhtin publications from Madrid also reached the Spanish-speaking public in both Americas (and vice versa). Anglo-American editions of Bakhtin texts were widely read in the English-speaking communities in Europe and on other continents. An interesting Anglo-American point of view on translation is expressed by Emerson (2017).

A further aspect deserving attention is the ideological horizon of the recipients. From the 1960s to the 1980s, in socialist countries such as Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Poland, Bakhtin was often seen as an alternative to the official, philosophically repressive materialism. In August 1968, at the Sixth International Congress of Slavists, the name Bakhtin was associated with the slogan of 'socialism with a human face'; in that very year, Iurii Lotman curated an anthology including work by Bakhtin and the Russian formalists. In Poland too, the early readers of Bakhtin saw in him an ally against the dogmas of Socialist Realism. Irina Wutsdorff (2006) has reconstructed the principal openness of the aesthetic work as the main congruence of Bakhtin's aesthetics with Prague structuralism, the main difference being the personal subjectivism of the former and the impersonal objectivism of the latter. As late as 1992, Emil Volek edited in Madrid an anthology with works by the Russian formalists and the Bakhtin group. In Yugoslavia, the early reception of Bakhtin was significantly limited to Serbia, if we consider the translations' places of the publication. It is only recently that Croatian translations of Bakhtin's work have started to appear (Bakhtin 2019).

In German cultures there was an obvious difference between the reception of Bakhtin in the socialist GDR and in the ideologically more diverse West. While in

East Berlin and in Jena literary critics were interested in Bakhtin's historical model of narrative genres (particularly the novel) in order to modernize the theory of genre evolution and the book translations thus concentrated on the corresponding texts (Bachtin 1986a), the interest in Austria, West Germany, and Switzerland was much broader and also involved Bakhtin's ethical and aesthetic-philosophical (Grübel 1979, Freise 1993, Haardt 2009), theoretical (Hansen-Löve 1972, 1978), general culture (Lachmann 1995) and rhetorical (Lachmann 1999) concepts. In the French context, the philosophical quality of Bakhtin's work was taken up by Emmanuel Lévinas (Lévinas 1991, Haardt 2007, 2011) and Maryse Dennes (1997).

In the West, Bakhtin's investigations of the history of the novel, which paved the way from the early monograph on Dostoevskii to the first version of the Rabelais book, and which presented the novel as the genre of the future, in opposition to the epos and the tragedy, have repeatedly been read as an riposte to Lukács theory of the novel (Tihanov 2000). First Russian and later Western critics compensated for this all too narrow a perspective with the reconstruction of the Russian view of the novel, for instance that held by Gustav Špet, who was much more important for Bakhtin (2012a, 21, 27). Bakhtin (2012b, 584–585) saw Lukács as a consistent follower of Hegel: "Hegel today" ("Gegel' segodnja"; Bocharov and Kozhinov 2012, 809). This becomes evident above all in the different views held by Lukács (1938, 320–321) and Bakhtin (2012c, 324; 2012b 557; Bocharov and Kozhinov 2012, 811–812) on James Joyce. Of great relevance for narratology are Bakhtin's ideas about the relationship between the creating 'primary' (*pervichnyi*) author and the created 'secondary' author in prose (Gölz [Gël'c] 2011, Dzhun 2020) and his concept of the cultural integration of time and space in different chronotopes.

While Peter Zima (born 1947 in Prague, but studying and working in the West, first in Germany, then in the Netherlands, and finally in Austria) reads Bakhtin as a continuation of Young Hegelianism, he later stressed his semiotic relevance and the dialogical aspect of the subject in Bakhtin's writing and proposed a dialogical theory of the subject (Zima 2000, 2020 [1991]). We (Grübel 1979) initially also traced Bakhtin's relevance for semiotic research and regarded his thought as emanating in neo-Kantianism and highlighted the aspect of value in his philosophic work and his literary criticism. Hans Günther (1981) and Renate Lachmann (1990) underscored Bakhtin's position as a counterpoint to Stalinism (as Carina Pape did again in 2015), while the philosopher und art historian Boris Groys (1989, 1997), born in Berlin in 1947, but educated in Moscow and later living in Germany and the USA, read Bakhtin's Rabelais book in a provocative manner as a legitimation of Stalin's terror. The same reading was offered five years later by Vladimir Linetskii (1994), who considered the concept of dialogism itself to be monologic. From the perspective of the philosophy of culture, Igor' Smirnov (1996) accepted Bakhtin's phenomenological analyses of carnival, but reverted its possibility of a concept

of rebirth, of the regeneration of 'sense' (*smysl*). For Smirnov, carnival "generates the ungeneratable" (Smirnov 1996, 128–129). In opposition to this skepticism, Nikiforov (2006) finds in Bakhtin (as also in Husserl and Rickert) the rebirth of philosophy itself.

For forty years, reconstructions of Bakhtin's philosophy have been carried out from very different starting points. On the one hand, Grübel (1979, 1988, 2001) and recently Faraco (2017) have pointed out axiology (ethics, aesthetics, etc.) as a main field of interest in Bakhtin's philosophy. On the other hand, Glück (1976) and later Friedrich (1993), Brandist (2000) and many American scholars (Hirschkop 1999; cf. also Ken Hirschkops chapter on "The (Re)discovery of Bakhtin in Anglophone Criticism" in this volume) have tried to study Bakhtin and/or Medvedev and/or Voloshinov and Vygotskij on a materialistic basic with respect to the relationship between meaning and form. Recently, a further aspect has once again been exposed, this time systematically, by Tatiana Shchitcova (2002): the relevance of the 'event' (*sobytie*). Later, Carina Pape (2016) reinvestigated Bakhtin's relationship with phenomenology and recently Vera Sandomirskaia (2017) established the 'disaster' of Blanchot as the core changing point in Bakhtin's concept, which she also sees in accordance with the formalists' concept of estrangement.

Bakhtin's relationship with semiotics has been traced most intensively in Italy. Umberto Eco (1980) wrote a positive review on the translation of the Rabelais book, and used the concept of carnival in his novel *Il nome della rosa* (1980, *In the Name of the Rose*). Here, William of Baskerville (Guglielmo da Baskerville) represents Mikhail Bakhtin in his dialogue with Jorge of Burgos (Jorge da Burgos alias Jorge Luis Borges). Later, Eco was convinced that humor plays a much more positive role in culture generally than in carnival, because of its temporal limitation in the year. More direct intertextual contact, in this case also in the field of cultural semiotics, can be observed in the case of the philosopher of language and semiotician Augusto Ponzio (1977, 1980, 1992). With reference to Bakhtin, he considers signs as cultural elements between the mode of production and ideology.

Primarily, the agreement about the Italian translation of the second Dostoevskii book, which was possible due to the help of the Italian Communist Party and Georgii Breiburd, the leader of the Italian section of the foreign department in the Soviet writers' organization, seems to have prompted Bakhtin's revision of the early version. Without the stimulus of the anticipated Italian translation, the second version probably would not have been published so quickly in Moscow. A translation as an element of the dialogue of cultures stimulated the immediate publication of a work of Bakhtin's once again when his fundamental essay "Èpos i roman" ("Epos and novel") appeared in East Berlin (Bachtin 1969) a year earlier than the original in Moscow (Bakhtin 1970). Edward Kowalski (2008, 353) has documented the conspiratorial conditions of the typescripts traveling from Moscow

to East Berlin. Thus the manuscripts' journey manifested the possibility that a phenomenon in the receiving culture can inspire the donor culture to make this item of the original culture available to its own members too.

This observation can serve as a microcosm of what happened with Bakhtin in Soviet and post-Soviet Russian culture after his most intensive reception in Western Europe and America in the 1980s and 1990s, the so-called 'Bakhtin industry' (cf. Morson 1986, 86). One of its manifestations has been the long string of biannual International Bakhtin Conferences since 1983, only two (!) of which have been held in Russia: 1. 1983 Kingston (Canada), 2. 1985 Cagliari, 3. 1987 Jerusalem, 4. 1989 Urbino, 5. 1991 Manchester, 6. 1993 Mexico, 7. 1995 Moscow, 8. 1997 Calgary, 9. 1999 Berlin, 10. 2001 Gdansk, 11. 2003 Curitiba, 12. 2005 Jyväskylä (Finland), 13. 2008 London (Canada), 14. 2011 Bologna, 15. 2014 Stockholm, 16. 2017 Shanghai, 17. 2021 Saransk, 18. 2021 Sheffield. There have also been ten International Conferences on the 'Dialogical Self', less focused on Bakhtin but also held biannually and staggered with the International Bakhtin Conferences since 2000. The peak of the Bakhtin cult was marked in October 1994 by the foundation of the Bakhtin Center in Sheffield by David Shepard, who edited the journal *Dialogism: An International Journal of Bakhtin Studies* from 1998 to 2001. Later, the Center became more interested in the Bakhtin circle (Brandist 2002; cf. also Craig Brandist's chapter on Bakhtin circles in this volume), as did some Russian colleagues (cf. Korovashko and Vasil'ev 2015). The hiatus in the Bakhtin conferences between 2008 and 2011 seems to have been caused by the scandalous book on Bakhtin by Bronckart and Bota, *Bakhtin Unmasked. The Story of a Liar, a Fraud and a Collective Delusion*, which appeared in Geneva in 2011. Its premise is the unsolved (and possibly unsolvable) riddle of the authorship of a dozen publications (1926–1931), which some ascribe to Bakhtin, others to his friends Pavel Medvedev and Valentin Voloshinov, and many – to all the three. In vivid contrast to Bakhtin's philosophical appeal to an ethical habitus, the Russian journalist Anna Kudinova (2013) insinuated that he had close contacts with the Russian secret service (NKVD, MGB, KGB), on the basis that as someone banned for political reasons for fifteen years, he not only survived the Great Terror of 1937 but even became the dean of his faculty at the Mordovian Pedagogical Institute and deputy dean at the University in Saransk, which, incidentally, opened a Bakhtin Center in 2015.

There has been much speculation and fierce discussion about the authorship of three books and a dozen articles which appeared in the years 1926–1930 under the names of Bakhtin's close friends Medvedev and Voloshinov. Their main (philosophical) content most likely derives from Bakhtin, as publication under the ever stronger Stalinist control of Soviet culture became more and more difficult and Bakhtin had no place of work and was short of money. A valuable testi-

mony to this version is the letter from 14 March 1978, written by the geologist and paleontologist Nina Arkad'evna Voloshinova (1901–1994, the first wife of Voloshinov; quoted by Radovan Matijašević (1980, 14; my translation): "Both books […] really come from the pen of M.M. Bakhtin; so too the book you have translated […] [i. e. *Marxism and the philosophy of language*]. As well as the book on Freudianism."). However, the linguist Vladimir Alpatov (2005) is convinced that the book on Marxism and the philosophy of language belongs more to the nominal author than to Bakhtin. The Russian critic and Bakhtin researcher Natan Tamarchenko (2008) provides good reasons for the assumption that the main ideas in Medvedev's first book on formalism are Bakhtin's. The most adequate discussion of the problem of the Bakhtin circle hitherto has been provided in French by Bénédicte Vauthier (2007; however, she overlooks the philosopher Kagan, the most important influence on Bakhtin in the early 1920s) and in Russian by Nikolaj Vasil'ev (2013). It is possible that this debate will never be decided because there do not seem to be any manuscripts that could prove one of the three assumptions. And perhaps this result corresponds best not only with the dialogic situation in the Bakhtin circle but also with Bakhtin's concept of authorship as answer-ship instead of owner-ship.

6 Bakhtin's concept of the unfinished consciousness, *gaya scienza* and some perspectives on future research

Bakhtin's philosophy of literature is grounded in the conceptualization of its dialogicity, which in his view cannot be brought to an end. In his notes, he wrote explicitly of the "inconclusivity/unfinalizability of the dialogue" ("nezavarshimost' dialoga"; Bakhtin 1996e, 280; my translation; cf. Lipovetskii and Sandomirskaia 2012). As Hegel's view on history, and also on the history of culture and with it that of literature, culminates in a teleological celebration of the end, all the attempts to reconstruct a Hegelian line in Bakhtin's way of thinking the open-endedness of culture (cf. Brandist 1999, 12) are dubious. Bakhtin referred explicitly and repeatedly to Hegel's *Philosophy of the Spirit* (1807, *Phänomenologie des Geistes*) as "monologism" (Bakhtin 2002c, 424). In his philosophy, the openness of the dialogue corresponds with the "inconclusivity/unfinalizability of the human being" (Bocharov and Gogotishvili 1996, 465), the "inconclusivity/unfinalizability of the hero" (Bakhtin 1996b; 1996c, 66) in the novels of Dostoevskii and the basic inconclusivity/unfinalizability of consciousness

("inward unfinalized consciousnesses", Bakhtin 2002b, 199). This aspect could be compared to the discussion between Benjamin and Horkheimer about the infinity (*Unendlichkeit*) of history. In Bakhtin's case, it is related to the concept of 'great time' (Makhlin 2015), in which nothing is forgotten and everything can return.

Bakhtin's concept of dialogue rejects, with reference to Dostoevskii, "dialectical, philosophical completion" (Bakhtin 2002b, 40) and also presents an alternative to Habermas's (ethical) philosophy of discourse (cf. Roberts 2012). The word with a "loophole" (*lazeika*; Bakhtin 2002b, 259) is the seemingly definite but in reality indisclosable sense of speaking, the "loophole addressee" (*lazeichnyi adresat*; Bakhtin 1996b, 37) – the guarantee of the fundamental openness of communication (cf. Sasse 2013). The dependence of Bakhtin's dialogicity on Russian (and not only Russian) philosophy has been pointed out by Russian and Western Bakhtinologists (Ivanov 1976; Hirschkop 2002; Tamarchenko 2001, Schmid 2008). Koraev (2018, 19) has recently noted the replacement of religious transcendence with secular transgredience as a feature of Bakhtin's transformation of traditional religion.

Bakhtin's positive predicate is the (utopian) idea of an everlasting becoming. This is at odds not only with Marxism but also with its source, Jewish and Christian religious entelechy, the end of all history in the return of the messiah. Hence the precise investigation of religious elements in Bakhtin's philosophy (inspired by Joachim de Fiore and Franciscan theology, its praise of the inter-religious dialogue and its demand of nonviolence) is of importance (Turbin 1990, Coates 1998, Bagshaw 2013, Sasse 2007).

I (Grübel 2013) have proposed considering Bakhtin's carnival as a secular 'art of religion' ('Kunstreligion'). One of continental Europe's most carnivalistic answers of to Bakhtin's Rabelais book is "*Askonsdag*" ("Ash Wednesday"), the third act of Lars Kleberg's Swedish drama *Stjärnfall* (1988, *Starfall*). Here, Eisenstein and Bakhtin are discussing the former's plans to stage Wagner's *Valkyrie* in Moscow in 1940, although the name of the composer features nowhere in Bakhtin's work. Towards the end, the film director tells the philosopher about the dialogue, that he would like to make a movie with him as the main character, who falls to his knees at his wife's grave and holds an endless monologue, both apologizing to her and attacking her, as prosecutor, accused, judge and witness in one person. Bakhtin replies that he would prefer to play Chapletto in Boccaccio's *Decamerone*, who – he says – is at once a superman and a usurer.

At the end of her dense work on *The First Hundred Years of Mikhail Bakhtin* (1997), Caryl Emerson foresees the probable impact of the Bakhtinian thought on the fields of pedagogy, literature, and the meta-humanities. And indeed, there have been relevant investigations into the possibility of using Bakhtin's philosophy of

literature and culture as a basis for a new, dialogical concept of *Bildung* (Bakhtin 2002b, 287–297; Miller 1984; Brandist 2016) and education, pedagogy (Osovskii and Fradkin 1994; Mudrik 2003; White 2011) and didactics (Sandomirskaia 2017). All this emphasis on teaching should not overlook Bakhtin's legacy of Nietzsche's *gaya scienza* (cf. my chapter on Carnival/Laughter in this volume). It is one of the components of Bakhtin's philosophy that will probably guarantee the endlessness of the dialogue with his thinking about the philosophy of literature and thus correspond to literature's main contribution to world culture.

References

Adlam, Carol. "Ot imeni Bakhtina: osvoenie i prisvoenie v issledovanijakh russkoi i zapadnoi bakhtinistiki poslednikh let." *Dialog. Karnaval. Khronotop* 1 (2000): 156–175.

Adlam, Carol, and David Shepherd. *The Annotated Bakhtin Bibliography*. Leeds: Maney Publishing, 2000.

Alpatov, Vladimir. *Voloshinov, Bakhtin i lingvistika*. Moscow: Jazyki slavianskikh kul'tur, 2005.

Averintsev, C. C., L. A. Gogotishvili, V. V. Liapunov, V. L. Makhlin, and N. I. Nikolaev. "Kommentarii." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 1: *Filosofskaia èstetik 1920-kh godov*. Moscow: Russkie slovari, 2003. 343–878.

Avtonomova, Nataliia Sergeevna. *Pozanie i perevod. Opyty filosofii iazyka*. Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2008.

Bagshaw, Hilary B. P. *Religion in the Thought of Mikhail Bakhtin: Reason and Faith*. London and New York, NY: Routledge, 2013.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. *Problemy tvorchestva Dostoevskogo*. Leningrad: Priboj, 1929.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. [Bahtin, Mihail M.] *Problemi poetike Dostoevskog*. Trans. by Milica Nikolić. Preface Nikola Milošević. Belgrade: Nolit, 1967. (2nd edition: Belgrado, 2000; 3rd edition: Novi Sad, 2019)

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Rabelais and His World*. Trans. by Helene Iswolsky. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1968.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. [Bachtin, Michail] "Epos und Roman." *Konturen und Perspektiven: Zum Menschenbild in der Gegenwartsliteratur der Sowjetunion und der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik*. Eds. Anton Hiersche and Edward Kowalski. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1969. 191–222.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. "Èpos i roman (O metodologii issledovanija romana)." *Voprosy literatury* 1 (1970): 95–122.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. *Problems of Dostoyevsky's Poetics*. Trans. by R. William Rotsel. Ann Arbor, MI: Ardis, 1973.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. "K metodologii literaturovedeniia." *Kontekst 1974*. Moscow: Nauka, 1975. 203–212.

Bakhtin, Mikhail [Bachtin, Michail], and György Lukács. *Problemi di teoria del romanzo: metodologia letteraria e dialettica storica*. Ed. Vittorio Strada. Torino: Einaudi, 1976.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. [Bakhtine, Mikhaïl [and Valentin Volochinov]]. *Le marxisme et la philosophie du langage.* Ed. and trans. by Marina Yaguello. Foreword by Roman Jakobson. Paris: Minuit, 1977.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. [Bakhtine, Mikhaïl]. *Esthétique et théorie du roman.* Ed. M. Aucouturier. Trans. by Daria Oliver. Paris: Gallimard, 1978.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. "K metodologii gumanitarnykh nauk." *Ėstetika slovesnogo tvorchestva.* Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1979a. 363–373.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. [Bachtin, Michail]. *Die Ästhetik des Wortes.* Ed. R. Grübel. Trans. by R. Grübel and S. Reese. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1979b.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. *Marxismo e filosofia da linguagem: problemas do método sociológico na ciência da linguagem.* Trans. by Michel Lahud and Yara Frateschi. Sao Paolo: HUCITEC, 1979c.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. *The Dialogic Imagination. Four essays.* Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. by C. Emerson and M. Holquist. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1981.

Bakhtin Mikhail M. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics.* Ed. and trans. by Caryl Emerson. Introduction by Wayne C. Booth. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.

Bakhtin, Mikhail [Bachtin, Mikhail M.] "K metodologii gumanitarnykh nauk." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Ėstetika slovesnogo tvorchestva.* 2nd edition. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1986a. 381–393.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Avtor i geroi v ėsteticheskoi deiatel'nosti." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Ėstetika slovesnogo tvorchestva.* 2nd edition. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1986b. 9–191.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Author and Hero in Aesthetic Activity." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Art and Answer-ability. Early Philosophical Essays.* Eds. Michael Holquist and Vadim Liapunow. Trans. by Vadim Liapunow. Austin, TX: Texas University Press, 1990. 4–256.

Bakhtin, Mikhail [Bakhtin, M.M.]. *Toward a Philosophy of the Act.* Ed. by Vadim Liapunov and Michael Holquist. Trans. by Vadim Liapunov. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1993.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "K filosofskim osnovam gumanitarnykh nauk." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh.* Vol. 5. Moscow: Russkie slovari, 1996a. 7–10.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Satira." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh.* Vol. 5. Moscow: Russkie slovari, 1996b. 11–38.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "'Ritorika, v meru svoei lzhivosti…'." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh.* Vol. 5. Moscow: Russkie slovari, 1996c. 63–70.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Problema rechevykh zhanrov." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh.* Vol. 5. Moscow: Russkie slovari, 1996d. 159–206.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Iz arkhivnykh zapisei k rabote 'Problemy rechevykh zhanrov'." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh.* Vol. 5. Moscow: Russkie slovari, 1996e. 207–286.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Problema Teksta." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh.* Vol. 5. Moscow: Russkie slovari, 1996 f. 306–326.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "1961 god. Zametki." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh.* Vol. 5. Moscow: Russkie slovari, 1996g. 329–360.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. [Bachtin, Michail] *Problemi dell'opera di Dostoevskij.* [1968]. Ed. and trans. by M. De Michiel and A. Ponzio. Trieste: Edizioni dal Sud, 1997.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Problemy tvorchestva Dostoevskogo." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh.* Vol. 2. Moscow: Russkie slovari, 2000. 5–175, 431–543.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Besedy s Duvakinym.* Moscow: Soglasie, 2002a.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Problemy poètiki Dostoevskogo." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 6. Moscow: Russkie slovari, 2002b. 5–300.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Rabochie zapisi 60-kh – nachala 70-kh godov." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 6. Moscow: Russkie slovari, 2002c. 371–439.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "O polifonichnosti romanov Dostoevskogo." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 6. Moscow: Russkie slovari, 2002d. 458–465.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "K filosofii postupka." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 1: *Filosofskaia èstetik 1920-kh godov*. Moscow: Russkie slovari, 2003a. 7–68.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Avtor i geroi v èsteticheskoi deiatel'nosti." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 1: *Filosofskaia èstetika 1920-kh godov*. Moscow: Russkie slovari, 2003b. 69–265.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "K voprosam metodologii èstetiki slovesnogo tvorchestva." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 1: *Filosofskaia èstetika 1920-kh godov*. Moscow: Russkie slovari, 2003c. 265–325.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Fransua Rable v istorii realizma." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 4.1. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kultur, 2008a. 11–505.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Iz konspektov k 'Rable'." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 4.1. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kultur, 2008b. 755–828.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Tvorchestvo Fransua Rable i narodnaia smekhovaia kul'tura Srednevekov'ia i Renessansa." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 4.2. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kultur, 2010. 7–508.

Bakhtin, M. M. *Toward a Philosophy of the Act*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2010b.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Slovo o romane." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 3. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kultur, 2012a. 9–179

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "K voprosam teorii romana." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 3. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kultur, 2012b. 557–607.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "K 'romanu vospitaniia'." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 3. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kultur, 2012c. 218–335.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. [Bahtin, Mihail M.] *Teorija romana*. Trans. Ivo Alebić and Danijela Lugarić. Zagreb: Edicije Božičević, 2019.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. [Bahtin, Mihail M.] *Problemi poetike Dostojevskoga*. Trans. by Zdenka Matek Šmit and Eugenija Ćuto. Zadar: Sveučilište u Zadru, 2020.

Baron, Scarlett. *The Birth of Intertextuality: The Riddle of Creativity*. New York, NY, and London: Routledge, 2020.

Batishchev, Genrikh S. *Vvededenie v dialektiku tvorchestva*. St. Petersburg: Russkii Gumanitarnyi Khristianskii Institut, 1997.

Benjamin, Walter. "The Task of the Translator." Walter Benjamin, *Illuminations*. Ed. Hannah Arendt. Trans. by Harry Zohn. New York, NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1968. 69–82.

Bernard-Donals, Michael. *Mikhail Bakhtin between Phenomenology and Marxism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Bibler, Vladimir. *Mikhail Mikhailovich Bakhtin, ili Poètika kul'tury*. Moscow: Progress, 1991.

Bocharov, S. G., and L. A. Gogotishvili. "Kommentarii." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 5. Moscow: Russkie slovari, 1996. 379–680.

Bocharov, S. G., and L. A. Gogotishvili. "Kommentarii." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 6. Moscow: Russkie slovari, 2002. 466–731.

Bocharov, S. G., and L. S. Melikhova. "Kommentarii." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 2. Moscow: Russkie slovari, 2000a. 428–653.

Bocharov, S. G., and L. S. Melikhova. "Opisanie konspektov, prednaznachennykh dlia ispol'zovaniia v knige 'Problemy poètiki Dostoevskogo'." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 2. Moscow: Russkie slovari, 2000b. 654–758.

Bocharov, S. G., and V. V. Kozhinov. "Kommentarii." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 3. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kultur, 2012. 713–858.

Botz-Bornstein, Thorsten. "The 'I' and the 'Thou': A Dialogue between Nishida Kitarō and Mikhail Bakhtin." *Japan Review* 16 (2004): 259–284.

Brait, Beth, and Maria Helena Cruz Pistori. "Marxism and the Philosophy of Language: The Reception of Bakhtin and the Circle in Brazil." *Bakhtiniana: Revista de Estudos do Discurso* 15.2 (2020): 33–63. https://figshare.com/articles/dataset/Marxism_and_the_Philosophy_ of_Language_The_Reception_of_Bakhtin_and_the_Circle_in_Brazil/12171210/1 (22 Feb 2022)

Brandist, Craig. "Bakhtin's Grand narrative: The significance of the Renaissance." *Dialogism. An International Journal of Bakhtine Studies* 3 (1999): 11–30.

Brandist, Craig. *Materializing Bakhtin: The Bakhtin Circle and Social Theory*. Ed. by Craig Brandist et al. Oxford: Macmillan Press, 2000.

Brandist, Craig. *The Bakhtin Circle: Philosophy, Culture and Politics*. London, Sterling, and Virginia: Pluto Press, 2002.

Brandist, Craig. "Bakhtinian Bildung and the Educational Process: Some Historical Consid-erations." *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 49.9 (2016): 867–878. https://doi.org/10.1 080/00131857.2015.1135411 (21 February 2022).

Bronckart, Jean-Paul, and Cristian Bota. *Bakhtine démasqué. Histoire d'un menteur, d'une escroquerie et d'un délire collectif*. Geneva: Droz, 2011.

Coates, Rugh. *Christianity in Bakhtin: God and the Exiled Author*. Cambridge and London: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Clark, Katerina, and Michael Holquist. *Mikhail Bakhtin*. Cambridge, MA, and London: Harvard University Press, 1984.

Dennes, Maryse. "Bakhtine, philosophe?" *L'Héritage de Mikhaïl Bakhtine*. Ed. Catherine Depretto. Bordeaux: Presses Universitaires de Bordeaux, 1997. 79–106.

Denishenko, Irina, and Alexander Spektor. "Forum Introduction." *The Slavic and East European Journal* 61.2 (2017): 189–200.

Dobrenko, Evgenij, and Galin Tikhanov (eds.). *Istoriia russkoi literaturnoi kritiki: sovetskaia i postsovetskaia èpokhi*. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2011.

Dzhun, Mira. "'Pervichnyi avtor' M.M. Bakhtina i 'implitsitnyi' avtor sovremennoi narratologii." *Novyi filologicheskii vestnik* 2 (2020): 36–47.

Eco, Umberto. "Corpo Dio." *L'Espresso* (3 February 1980), 68–72.

Emerson, Caryl. *The First Hundred Years of Mikhail Bakhtin*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997.

Emerson, Caryl. "Bakhtin at 100: Art, Ethics, and the Architectonic Self." *Mikhail Bakhtin*. Vol. 2. Ed. Michael E. Gardiner. London: SAGE, 2003. 296–314.

Emerson, Caryl. "Perevodimost'." *Bachtinskii sbornik* 5. Ed. V.L. Makhlin. Moscow: Litres, 2017. 186–194.

Esaulov, I. A. "Polifoniia i sobornost' (M.M. Bakhtin i Viacheslav Ivanov)." *Bakhtinskii tezaurus. Materialy i issledovaniia*. Ed. N. D. Tamarchenko. Moscow: RGGU, 1997. 133–137.

Faraco, Carlos Alberto. "Bakhtin and Philosophy." *Bakhtiniana: Revista de Estudos do Discurso* 12.2 (May/August 2017). https://doi.org/10.1590/2176-457331815 (22 February 2022).

Fokin, S. L. "Perevod kak nezadacha russkoi filosofii. Shestov, Bakhtin, Podoroga… Pushkin." *Logos* 84.5–6 (2011): 212–236.

Freise, Matthias. *Bachtins philosophische Ästhetik der Literatur.* Frankfurt/M.: Peter Lang, 1993.

Freise, Matthias (ed.). *Inspired by Bakhtin: Dialogic Methods in the Humanities*. *(Studies in Comparative Literature and Intellectual History)*. Brighton, MA: Academic Studies Press, 2018.

Friedrich, Janette. *Der Gehalt der Sprachform: Paradigmen von Bachtin bis Vygotskij.* Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1993.

Frolov, E. "Rol' M. M. Bakhtina v razrabotke osnov novoj metodologii gumanitarnogo poznaniia." *M. M. Bakhtin i gumanitarnoe myshlenie na poroge XXI veka.* Vol. 1. Ed. N. J. Voronina. Saransk: Izdatel'stvo Mordovskogo universiteta, 1995. 131–133.

Ginsburg, Ruth. "Bakhtin Criticism in Israel: A Short Story of NonReception." *Le Bulletin Bakhtine/The Bakhtin Newsletter* 5 (1996): 179–88.

Glück, Hans. "Einleitung." Pavel Medvedev, *Die formale Methode in der Literaturwissenschaft.* Ed. and trans. by Hans Glück. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1976. XIII–LV.

Gölz, Christine [Gël'c, Kristina]. "Teorii avtorstva v vostochnoevropeiskoi filologii XX veka." *Narratorium* 1.7 (2011). http://narratorium.rggu.ru/article.html?id=2633111 (22 February 2022).

Gogotoshvili, Ljudmila. "Filosofiia iazyka M.M. Bakhtina i problema cennostnogo reliativizma." *Bakhtin kak filosof.* Eds. L. Gogotoshvili and I. Gurevich. Moscow: Nauka, 1992. 142–174.

Gritten, Anthony. "Music in Bakhtin's Philosophical Aesthetics." *Music Semiotics: A Network of Significations. In Honour and Memory of Raymond Monelle.* Ed. Esti Sheinberg. London and New York, NY: Routledge, 2016. 59–69.

Groys, Boris. "Grausamer Karneval. Michail Bachtins 'Ästhetische Rechtfertigung' des Stalinismus." *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* (21 June 1989).

Groys, Boris. "Totalitarizm karnavala." *Bakhtinskii sbornik* III. Ed. V. L. Makhlin. Moscow: Labirint, 1997. 76–80.

Grübel, Rainer. "Zur Ästhetik des Wortes bei Michail M. Bachtin." Michail Bachtin, *Die Ästhetik des Wortes.* Ed. Rainer Grübel. Trans. by Rainer Grübel and Sabine Reese. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1979. 21–88.

Grübel, Rainer. "Ästhetischer Wert zwischen Kontinuität und Diskontinuität. Bachtins Beitrag zu einer dialogischen Ästhetik." *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 33.4 (1988): 540–558.

Grübel, Rainer. "Zum Entwurf des ästhetischen Wertes bei Michail Bachtin, Jan Mukařovský und Roman Ingarden." *Literaturaxiologie: Zur Theorie und Geschichte des ästhetischen Wertes in slavischen Literaturen*. Ed. Rainer Grübel. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2001. 87–108.

Grübel, Rainer. "La philosophie de la communication créative de Bakhtine et les problèmes de sa réception." *La Quadrature du Cercle Bakhtin: traductions, influences et remises en contexte.* Eds. Karine Zbinden and Irene Weber Henking. Lausanne: Centre de traduction littéraires, 2005. 63–124.

Grübel, Rainer. "Bachtins Philosophie der ästhetischen Handlung und ihre Aktualität." Michail Bachtin, *Autor und Held in der ästhetischen Tätigkeit.* Eds. Rainer Grübel, Edward Kowalski, and Ulrich Schmid. Trans. by Rainer Grübel, Alexander Haardt, and Ulrich Schmid. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 2008. 317–352.

Grübel, Rainer. "Rozanovs Ägyptenmythos und Bachtins Karnevalismus: Religionskunst versus Kunstreligion." *Zeitschrift für Slavistik* 38 (2013): 253–275.

Günther, Hans. "Michail Bachtins Konzeption als Alternative zum sozialistischen Realismus." *Semiotics and Dialectics: Ideology and the Text*. Ed. Peter V. Zima. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1981. 137–177.

Guseinov, Abragam. "Filosofiia postupka kak pervaia filosofiia (opyt interpretatsii nravstvennoi filosofii M. M. Bakhtina)." *Voprosy filosofii* 6 (2017): 65–74.

Haardt, Alexander. "Michail Bachtin – ein Phänomenologe der Intersubjektivität?" *Phänomenologische Forschungen* 5.2 (2000): 217–229.

Haardt, Alexander. "Répondre de quelque chose c'est répondre à quelqu'un: un dialogue imaginaire entre Bakhtine et Lévinas." *Slavica Occitana* 25 (2007): 109–121.

Haardt, Alexander. "Ethische und ästhetische Persönlichkeit. Zum Verhältnis des Ethischen und Ästhetischen bei Sören Kierkegaard und Michail Bachtin." *Studies in East European Thought* 61.2–3 (2009): 165–179.

Haardt, Alexander. "Verantwortlichsein als Antworten auf den Anspruch des Anderen. Ein Thema in zwei Variationen bei Michail Bachtin und Emmanuel Lévinas." *Das normative Menschenbild in der russischen Philosophie*. Eds. Alexander Haardt and Nikolai Plotnikov. Vienna and Berlin: Lit Verlag, 2011. 63–74.

Hansen-Löve, Aage. "Karnevalisierung der Literatur. Zur Romantheorie Michael Bachtins." *Wort und Wahrheit* 6 (1972): 522–531.

Hansen-Löve, Aage. *Russischer Formalismus: Methodologische Rekonstruktion seiner Entwicklung aus dem Prinzip der Verfremdung*. Vienna: Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1978.

Hermans, H. J. M. "The construction and reconstruction of dialogical self." *Journal of Constructivist Psychology* 16.2 (2003): 89–130.

Hirschkop, Ken. *Mikhail Bakhtin: An Aesthetic for Democracy*. New York, NY, and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Hirschkop, Ken. "Bakhtin in the sober light of day (an introduction to the second edition)." *Bakhtin and cultural theory*. Eds. Ken Hirschkop and David Shepherd. 2nd edition. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002. 1–25.

Huntington, Samuel P. "The Clash of Civilizations?" *Foreign Affairs* 72.3 (1993): 22–49.

Isupov, K. G. "O filosofskoi antropologii M.M Bakhtina." *Bakhtinskij sbornik* 1. Moscow: Labirint, 1990. 30–47.

Ivanov, Vjacheslav V. *Očerki po istorii semiotiki v SSSR*. Moscow: Nauka, 1976.

Jones, Malcolm V. *Dostoevsky after Bakhtin: Reading in Dostoevsky Fantastic Realism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Kagan, Matvei I. *O khode istorii*. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskoi kul'tury, 2004.

Kenarov, Dimiter. "Was the Philosopher Julia Kristeva a Cold War Collaborator?" *The New Yorker* (5 September 2018). https://www.newyorker.com/news/dispatch/was-the-philosopher-julia-kristeva-a-cold-war-collaborator (22 February 2022).

Kleberg, Lars. *Stjärnfall: En triptyk*. Stockholm and Lund: Brutus Östlings bokf Symposion, 1988.

Klöpfer, Rolf. "Intertextualität und Intermedialität oder die Rückkehr zum dialogischen Prinzip. Bachtins Theoreme als Grundlage für Literatur- und Filmtheorie." *Kino-/(Ro)Mania: Intermedialität zwischen Film- und Literatur*. Eds. Jochen Mecke and Volker Roloff. Tübingen: Stauffenberg, 1999. 23–46.

Koraev, German T. "Filosofiia M. M. Bakhtina: Mezhdu filosofiei religii i religioznoi filosofii." *Problemy sovremennogo obrazovaniia* 5 (2018). https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/filosofiya-m-m-bahtina-mezhdu-filosofiey-religii-i-religioznoy-filosofiey (22 February 2022).

Korovashko, A. N. *Mikhail Bakhtin*. Moscow: Molodaja gvardiia, 2017.

Korovashko, A. N., and L. Vasil'ev. "Mikhail Mikhaylovich Bakhtin i fenomen 'Kruga Bakhtina': V poiskakh utrachennogo vremeni. Rekonstruktsii i dekonstruktsii. Kvadratura kruga." *Voprosy literatury* 1 (2015): 394–397.

Kovács, Árpád. "Personalizm literaturnoi antropologii Mikhaila Bakhtina. Ot fenomenologicheskoi éstetiki k poetike prozy." *Russian Literature.* 72.1 (2012): 1–44.

Kowalski, Edward. "Bachtins langer Weg zum deutschen Leser." Michail Bachtin, *Autor und Held in der ästhetischen Tätigkeit*. Eds. Rainer Grübel, Edward Kowalski, and Ulrich Schmid. Trans. by Rainer Grübel, Alexander Haardt, and Ulrich Schmid. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 2008. 353–356.

Kristeva, Julia. *Semeiotiké. Recherches pour une sémanalyse*. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1969.

Kristeva, Julia. "Une poétique ruinée." Mikhail Bakhtine, *La poétique de Dostoievski*. Trans. by Isabelle Kolitscheff. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1970. 5–27.

Kristeva, Julia. "It's Just Not My Life. Julia Kristeva Responds." *Los Angeles Review of Books* (1 November 2018). https://blog.lareviewofbooks.org/essays/just-life-julia-kristeva-responds/ (22 February 2022).

Kudinova, Anna. "Bakhtin v Mordovii." *Sut' vremeni* 24 (17 April 2013). https://rossaprimavera.ru/article/bahtin-v-mordovii (22 February 2022).

Kulikov, V. "Politicheskii diskurs v fokuse tekstovoi dialogichnosti." *Vestnik Leningradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta imeni A. S. Pushkina* 1.3 (2012): 185–194.

Kurginian, Sergei. "M. M. Bakhtin i podryv kommunizma." *Zavtra* 42 (14 October 2009): 36.

Lachmann, Renate. "Versöhnung von Leben und Tod im Lachen: Der russische Theoretiker Michail Bachtin läßt die Stimmen der Texte laut werden." *Frankfurter Rundschau* (10 April 1990).

Lachmann, Renate. "Vorwort." Michail M. Bachtin, *Rabelais und seine Welt: Volkskultur als Gegenkultur*. Ed. Renate Lachmann. Trans. by Gabriele Leupold. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1995.

Lachmann, Renate. "Die Rhetorik im dialogischen Denken Michail Bachtins." *Dialogue and Rhetoric: Comunication Strategies in Russian Text and Theory*. Ed. Ingunn Lunde. Bergen: University of Bergen, 1999. 102–123.

Lachmann, Renate, and Sylvia Sasse. "Dialogische Obertöne." Michail Bachtin, *Sprechgattungen*. Eds. Sylvia Sasse, Renate Lachmann, and Rainer Grübel. Berlin: Matthes & Seitz, 2017. 173–207.

Lehmann, Jürgen. "Ambivalenz und Dialogizität. Zur Theorie der Rede bei Michail Bachtin." *Urszenen: Literaturwissenschaft als Diskursanalyse und Diskurskritik*. Eds. Friedrich A. Kittler and Horst Turk. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1977. 355–380.

Lévinas, Emmanuel. *Entre nous : Essais sur le penser-à-l'autre*. Paris: Grasset, 1991.

Linetskii, Vladimir. *Anti-Bakhtin — luchshaia kniga o Vladimire Nabokove*. St. Petersburg: Tipografija imeni Kotljakova, 1994.

Lipovetskii, Mark, and Irina Sandomirskaia. "Kak ne 'zavershit'' Bakhtina." *NLO* 79 (2012): 7–38.

Lukács, Georg. "Es geht um den Realismus." *Das Wort* 6 (1938): 112–138.

Makhlin, Vitalii L. "Iz revoliutsii vychodiashchii: programma." *Bakhtinskii sbornik III*. Ed. Vitalii L. Makhlin. Moscow: Labirint, 1997. 198–248.

Makhlin, Vitalii L. "Nezasluzhennyi sobesednik." *Bakhtinskii sbornik 5*. Ed. Vitalii L. Makhlin. Moscow: Labirint, 2004. 41–74.

Makhlin, Vitalii. *Bolshoe vremia: Podstupy k myshleniiu M. M. Bakhtina*. Siedlce: Uniwersytet przyrodniczo-humanistyczny w Siedlcach, 2015.

Makhlin, Vitalij L. "'Uchastnoe myshlenie'. Filosofskii proekt M. M. Bakhtina v kontekste ontologicheskogo povorota v nachale XX veka." *Istoriko-filosofskii ezhegodnik* 33 (2018): 267–292.

Makhlin, Vitalii [Makhlin, Vitaly]. "A belated conversation." *Philosophical Thought in Russia in The Second Half of The Twentieth Century: A Contemporary View from Russia and Abroad*. Ed. Vl. Lektorsky and M. Bykova. New York, NY, and London: Bloomsbury, 2019. 277–284.

Matijašević, Radovan. "Bahtinova teorija govora." M. Bahtin, *Marksizam i filosofija jezika*. Belgrade: Nolit, 1980, IX–XL.

Miller, Romana. "Zespolenie człowieka ze światem jako problem edukacji przyszłości." *Rocznik Pedagogiczny* 9 (1984): 187–199.

Morson, Gary S. "The Bakhtin Industry." *Slavic and East European Journal* 30.1 (1986): 81–90.

Mudrik, A. V. *Sotsial'naia pedagogika*. Moscow: Akademiia, 2003.

Nikiforov, Valdimir. *The Collapse of Philosophy and its Rebirth: An Intellectual History With Special Attention to Husserl, Rickert and Bakhtin*. Ontario: The Edwin Mellen Press, 2006.

Osovskii, E. G., and F. A. Fradkin. "M.M. Bakhtin i problemy razvitiia pedagogicheskoi nauki." *M.M. Bakhtin i perspektivy gumanitarnykh nauk*. Ed. Vitalii Makhlin. Vitebsk: N. A. Pan'kov, 1994. 76–82.

Pan'kov, Aleksandr Viktorovich. "'Roman kak naibolee podlinnyi ėpicheskii zhanr…'. Dva doklada M.M. Bakhtina po teorii romana (IMLI 1940, 1941)." *Dialog. Karnaval. Chronotop*, 1 (2009): 64–169.

Pape, Carina. *Autonome Teilhaftigkeit und teilhaftige Autonomie: Der Andere in Michail Bachtins Frühwerk*. Munich: Fink, 2015.

Pape, Carina. "Husserl, Bakhtin, and the Other I. Or: Mikhail Bakhtin – a Husserlian?" *Horizon* 5.2 (2016): 271–289.

Piatigorskii, Aleksandr. "'Drugoi' i 'svoe' kak poniatiia literaturnoi filosofii." *Sbornik stat'ei k 70letie prof. Ju. M. Lotmana*. Ed. A. Mal'te. Tartu: Tartuskii universitet, 1992. 3–9.

Polouboiarinova, Larissa. "'Bachtinologie' in der westlichen (insbesondere deutschen) Literaturwissenschaft und in Postsowjetrußland." *Literaturwissenschaft und Wissen-schaftsforschung: DFG-Symposion 1989*. Ed. G. Schönert. Stuttgart and Weimar: Metzler, 2000. 382–398.

Ponzio, Augusto (ed.). *Michail Bachtin: Semiotica, teoria della letteratura e marxismo*. Bari: Dedalo, 1977.

Ponzio, Augusto. *Michail Bachtin: Alle origini della semiotica sovietica*. Bari: Dedalo, 1980.

Ponzio, Augusto. *Tra semiotica e letteratura: Introduzione a Bachtin*. Milan: Bompiani, 1992.

Popova, I. L. "O soderzhanii i strukture chetvertogo toma sobraniia sochinenii M. M. Bakhtina." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 4.1. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kultur, 2008a. 11–505.

Popova, I. L. "Istoriia 'Rable': 1930–1950-e gody." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 4.1. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kultur, 2008b. 841–924.

Popova, I. L. "Kommentarii i prilozhenie." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 4.2. Ed. I. L. Popova. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kultur, 2010. 523–696.

Roberts, John. "Discourse or Dialogue: Habermas, the Bakhtin Circle, and the Question of Concrete Utterances." *Theory and Society* 41 (2012): 395–419.

Rolet, Serge. "Intertekstual'nost'. Nasledie Bakhtina vo Frantsii." *Blickwechsel: Perspektiven der slawischen Moderne.* (Wiener Slawistischer Almanach, Sonderband 78). Ed. Gun-Britt Kohler. Vienna: Peter Lang, 2010. 71–82.

Sadeckij, A. "Dialogicheskoe stanovlenie. (Slovo Bakhtina v originale i v perevode: problemy diskursivnoi aksiologii)." *Bakhtinskii tezaurus.* Ed. A. Tamarchenko. Moscow: RGGU, 1997. 17–133.

Samokhvalova, V. I. "Soznanie kak dialogicheskoe otnoshenie." *Bakhtin kak filosof.* Eds. L. A. Gogotoshvili and I. S. Gurevich. Moscow: Nauka, 1992. 190–205.

Sandomirskaia, Irina. "Bakhtin in Bits and Pieces: Poetic Scholarship, Exilic Theory, And a Close Reading of the Disaster." *Slavic and East European Journal* 61.2 (2017): 278–298.

Sasse, Sylvia. "Das Verschwinden des Adressaten. Zur Säkularisierung der Beicht-kommunikation bei Dostoevskij und Bachtin." *Nachleben der Religionen in der Moderne: Kulturwissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zur Dialektik der Säkularisierung.* Daniel Weidner and Martin Treml. Munich: Fink, 2007. 255–268.

Sasse, Sylvia. "Hintertüren: Dostoevskij, Nietzsche, Bachtin." *Die Welt der Slaven: Halbjahresschrift für Slavistik.* LVIII 2 (2013): 209–231.

Schmid, Ulrich. "Der philosophischen Kontext von Bachtins Frühwerk." Michail Bachtin, *Autor und Held in der ästhetischen Tätigkeit.* Eds. Rainer Grübel, Edward Kowalski, and Ulrich Schmid. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 2008. 7–32.

Schmid, Ulrich. "Sein und Schicksalsbewusstsein. Marxistische Denkfiguren in Michail Bachtins früher Subjektkonzeption." *Das normative Menschenbild in der russischen Philosophie.* Eds. Alexander Haardt and Nikolaj Plotnikov. Berlin: LIT-Verlag, 2011. 75–92.

Seduro, V. I. "Dostoevskii kak sozdatel' polifonnogo romana (M.M. Bakhtin o forme romana u Dostoevskogo." *Novyi zhurnal* 52 (1958): 71–93.

Segal, Dmitrii. *Puti i vekhi. Russkoe literaturovedenie v dvadtsatom veke.* Moscow: Vodolei, 2011.

Sériot, Patrick. "Vološinov, la philosophie du langage et le marxisme" *Langages* 2.182 (2011): 83–96.

Shchitcova, Tatiana V. *Sobytie v filosofii Bakhtina.* Minsk: Longvinov, 2002.

Smirnov, Igor'. *Bytie i tvorchestvo.* Sankt Peterburg: Kanun, 1996.

Städtke, Klaus. "Interkulturelle Mystifikation von Theorie. Michail Bachtin und die Bachti-nologie." *Theorie als kulturelles Ereignis.* Eds. K. Ludwig Pfeiffer, Ralph Kray, and Klaus Städtke. Berlin and Boston, MA: De Gruyter, 2001. 131–154.

Strada, Vittorio. ["Pochta 'BS'"] *Bakhtinskii sbornik* III. Ed. V. Makhlin. Moscow: Labirint, 1997. 373–379.

Sukhikh, Igor' Nikolaevich. "Filosofiia literatury M. M. Bakhtina." *Vestnik Leningradskogo universiteta*: *Serija. Istorija. Jazyk. Literatura* 1.2 (1982): 45–52.

Tamarchenko, Natan. *'Ėstetika slovesnogo tvorchestva' M. M. Bakhtin i russkaia filosofsko-filo-logicheskaia traditsiia.* Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Kolaginoi, 2001.

Tamarchenko, Natan. "M. Bakhtin i P. Medvedev: sud'ba 'Vvedeniia v poėtiku'." *Voprosy literatury* 5 (2008): 160–184.

Tamarchenko, Natan D. "Osnovaniia poėtiki Bakhtina i ee sovremennaia retseptsiia." *Blickwechsel: Perspektiven der slawischen Moderne. Wiener Slawistischer Almanach. Sonderbd.* 78. Ed. Gun-Britt Kohler. Vienna, Munich, and Berlin: Peter Lang, 2010. 57–70.

Tihanov, Galin. *The Master and the Slave: Lukács, Bakhtin, and the Ideas of Their Time.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.

Todorov, Tzvetan. *Mikhaïl Bakhtine – Le principe dialogique suivi de Écrits du Cercle de Bakhtine*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1981.

Turbin, V. N. "Karnaval: religiia, politika, teosofiia," *Bakhtinskii sbornik*. Vol. 1. Eds. D. Kujundzic and V. L. Makhlin. Moscow: Prometei, 1990. 6–29.

Ulicka, Danuta. "Bachtiniada (polsko- i anglojęzyczna recepcja Bachtina w trzech anegdotach)." *Dzieła – języki – tradycje*. Eds. Włodzimierz Bolecki and Ryszard Nycz. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo IBL, 2006. 172–200.

Ulicka, Danuta. "Some gloss to heteroglossia or a short heteroglossary." *Literature, Culture, Tolerance*, Eds. A. Murphy, Ch. Russell, J. Pluciennik, and I. Huebner. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2009. 197–223.

Vasil'ev, Nikolaj L. *Mikhail Mikhailovich Bakhtin i fenomen "Kruga Bakhtina": V poiskakh utrachennogo vremeni. Rekonstruktsii i dekonstruktsii. Kvadratura kruga*. Moscow: Lobrokom, 2013.

Vauthier, Bénédicte. "Preface." Mikhaïl Bakhtine, *Valentin Volochinov et Pavel Medvedev dans les contextes européen et russe*. Ed. Bénédicte Vauthier. Toulouse: Département de slavistique de l'université de Toulouse-Le-Mirail, 2007. 9–43.

Volek, Emil (ed.). *Antología del formalismo ruso y el grupo de Bajtin*. Madrid: Fundamentos, 1992.

Voloshinov, Valentin V. *Frojdizam: Kritički prikaz*. Trans. by Vladimir Fabijančić. Belgrade: Knjižara Svetlost, 1937.

Voloshinov, Valentin. *Marxisme et philosophie du langage: Les problèmes fondamentaux de la méthode sociologique dans la science du langage*. Trans. by Patrick Sériot and Inna Tylkowski-Ageeva. Limoges: Lambert-Lucas, 2010.

White, E. Jayne (ed.). *Bakhtinian pedagogy: Opportunities and Challenges for Research, Policy and Practice in Education*. New York, NY: Peter Lang, 2011.

Wutsdorff, Irina. *Bachtin und der Prager Strukturalismus: Modelle poetischer Offenheit am Beispiel der tschechischen Avantgarde*. Munich: Fink, 2006.

Zbinden, Karin. *Bakhtin between East and West: Cross-Cultural Transmissions*. Oxford: Routledge, 2006a.

Zbinden, Karin. "The Bakhtin Circle and Translation." *The Yearbook of English Studies* 36.1 'Translation' (2006b): 157–167.

Zima, Peter. *Theorie des Subjekts: Subjektivität und Identität zwischen Moderne und Postmoderne*. Tübingen and Basel: Francke, 2000.

Zima, Peter. "Bachtins 'junghegelianische' Ästhetik." [1991] Peter Zima, *Literarische Ästhetik: Methoden und Modelle der Literaturwissenschaft*. Tübingen: Francke, 2020. 100–129.

Zinchenko, Vladimir. *Soznanie i tvorcheskii akt*. Moscow: Jazyki slavianskoi kul'tury, 2010.

Ken Hirschkop

The (Re)discovery of Bakhtin in Anglophone Criticism

1 Strange encounters

In a clever and well-known sonnet, John Keats compared the reading of Chapman's translation of Homer to the European 'discovery' of the New World. "On First Looking into Chapman's Homer" (1816) describes Chapman's translation as geographical revelation, the opening of "one wide expanse" that "deep brow'd Homer ruled as his demesne". Upon reading the translation, the poem's speaker feels like an astronomer when "a new planet swims into his ken" or like the Spanish explorer Cortez and his crew, when, having crossed Central America, they stare into the Pacific and look at one another "with a wild surmise" (Keats 1905, 36). It's a beautifully executed simile that effectively renders the awe we experience when reading a strange but wonderful new text.

The simile is striking, and it will survive the fact that we no longer think of people like Cortez (or the actual explorer who stared at the Pacific, Balboa) as merely awestruck explorers. We think of them today as the advance guard of colonialism, who may well be awestruck at what they see, but who have interest in the landscape only in so far as they may profit from it and who are interested in the peoples who inhabit that land only so far as they can pass on useful knowledge – if the latter have their own point of view, this is a problem, not an opportunity for the explorer. For better or worse, when we encounter translations of foreign texts we often have a similar range of mixed motives and interests. Such motives and interests help explain the curious encounter between the Anglophone world and the work, original and translated, of M. M. Bakhtin.

The encounter itself has not been straightforward: for one thing, it has depended on a great many middle-men, mediators who made it possible for the once repressed Bakhtin to republish his one book (*Problemy tvorchestva Dostoevskogo* from 1929 [*Problems of Dostoevskii's Art*]) and publish some of his remaining work in the 1960s and 70s. There were, it's true, a few early scattered references to Bakhtin's 1929 book in English, probably inspired by Vladimir Seduro's glowing summary of it in a study of Russian Dostoevskii criticism in 1957 (Seduro 1957, 202–232). But it was the publication of the revised version of his Dostoevskii book in 1963 and of his book on Rabelais in 1965 that gained Bakhtin attention, first in the Soviet Union itself and then in the world beyond (Bakhtin 1963; Bakhtin 1965). Slavists began to cite Bakhtin as a major 'formalist' critic of Dostoevskii, and some

of them made efforts to extend the notion of the polyphonic novel to other writers, such as Solzhenitsyn (Koehler 1969; Krasnov 1980). The new interest in formalism itself, spurred by Victor Erlich's book (Erlich 1955) on the one hand, and the emergence of the Lotman-Uspenskii school on the other, drew attention to Bakhtin as a sort of formalist fellow-traveller. The approach was appreciative – Bakhtin was considered a significant, important writer – but at the same time muted, in the sense that he was considered just one contributor to an established school of Russian criticism. It seemed entirely appropriate, therefore, that an extract from Bakhtin's *Problemy poėtiki Dostoevskogo* (*Problems of Dostoevskii's Poetics*) (as well as a Voloshinov excerpt) was included in Matejka and Pomorska's excellent collection of translations of Russian formalist articles (Matejka and Pomorska 1971). In this respect it's worth comparing Bakhtin's reception in North America and Britain to the interpretation he received in France, which depended on the offices of two Bulgarian émigrés, Tzvetan Todorov and Julia Kristeva. In Kristeva's eyes, it was Bakhtin's break with the project of formalism that made his work valuable and interesting: her preface to the French translation of the Dostoevskii book celebrated his work as "the ruin of a poetics" by which she meant the destruction of the formalist-structuralist concept of a closed linguistic system (Kristeva 1970).

The Dostoevskii book remained the concern of Slavists until 1973, when it was translated for Ardis Press (Bakhtin 1973); the Rabelais book followed an entirely different trajectory. A mere three years after its publication in Moscow it appeared in English translation for MIT Press (Bakhtin 1968). Unsurprisingly, its extravagant and unorthodox claims for medieval popular culture provoked sharp reactions: a famously dismissive review by Frances Yates (1969), genuine enthusiasm from scholars beginning to work out the details and method of social history. It became, for all intents and purposes, part of the academic literature on Rabelais, cited by Rabelais scholars, and a provocation in the field of social history, where it provided both methodology and inspiration for the new "history from below" (in, for example, Natalie Zemon Davis [1971] and Carlo Ginzburg [1980]). The preface to the Rabelais book, however, written by Krystyna Pomorska, continued in the earlier vein, describing his Dostoevskii book as belonging "to the second phase in the development of the Russian Formalist school, the structuralist phase" (Pomorska 1968, viii).

2 The Bakhtin canon is shaped

But while American and UK Slavists were carefully assimilating Bakhtin into a recognizable, if evolving tradition of Slavic formalist-structuralist criticism, his

champions in the Soviet Union were busy establishing as much distance as they could between him and that very same tradition. Sergei Bocharov and Vadim Kozhinov valiantly fought to have more of his work published in book form: in 1975 – the year of Bakhtin's death – a collection of his essays on the novel from the 1930s and 1940s, and in 1979 a kind of miscellany, that threw together abandoned philosophical manuscripts from the 1920s, more work on the novel from the 1930s, essays on linguistics from the 1950s, and a series of philosophical notes from the 1970s, artfully arranged in two collections. These two books would, in combination with the existing Dostoevskii and Rabelais texts, eventually constitute the Bakhtin oeuvre for the Anglophone world. The editorial decisions that moulded them were therefore crucial. The 1975 collection *Voprosy literatury i éstetiki* (*Questions of Literature and Aesthetics*) included two long essays on the novel, destined to be mainstays of Bakhtin's critical influence ("Slovo v romane" ["Discourse in the Novel"] and the "chronotope" essay), two transcripts of lectures on the novel, and a fifth piece that seemed wholly out of place, a philosophical critique of formalism from 1924, which had hardly anything to say about the novel at all. The 1979 *Ėstetika slovesnogo tvorchestva* (*The Aesthetics of Verbal Creation*) collection looks at first glance innocent enough: early philosophy, more material on the novel, and a mix of later work. But that later postwar material, varied as it might be, is unified by a consistent polemic with Soviet structuralism as represented by Vinogradov in the 1940s and Lotman later on.

At the time, this slant may have looked like a mere byproduct of the attempt to get as much Bakhtin out into the world as possible; in retrospect, we can appreciate how much effort went into selecting and shaping the material that appeared. One of the sharpest articulations of Bakhtin's distance from structuralism in the collection was a 1959–1961 piece on the philosophy of language titled "The Problem of the Text in Linguistics, Philology and the Other Human Sciences: A Work of Philosophical Analysis", which systematically distinguished the object of scientific linguistics, language, from the object of the human sciences, the concrete and dialogical utterance. When this work was republished in 1996, we learned that it was in fact something of a composite: the editors had attached half the contents of one Bakhtin notebook, dedicated to the reworking of the Dostoevskii book, to the contents of a slightly earlier notebook, in order to create one 'work' defining Bakhtin's position on language. Similarly, the two powerful collections of philosophical notes that concluded the 1979 book, "K metodologii gumanitarnykh nauk" ("Towards a Methodology of the Human Sciences") and the "Notes from 1970–71" turned out – this time when the work was republished in 2002 – to be editorial creations (probably the work of Kozhinov) that lifted fragments from a series of notebooks covering a decade and cleverly blended them to create two new 'works' defining the distinctive tasks of the human sciences.

Bakhtin had died, and his editors wanted to make sure his position was clear and his originality not in doubt.

Editorial work, however, was only one front in this battle. Bakhtin's defenders in the Soviet Union had begun to create – and create is a fair word – a biography for him (which would turn out to be thoroughly unreliable). They made sure that the rumour that Bakhtin had written texts published under the names of Voloshinov and Medvedev was widely spread and communicated to American scholars. The claim had first been made public by V. V. Ivanov at a 1970 meeting celebrating Bakhtin's seventy-fifth birthday; it was later included in a footnote to Ivanov (1973, 44; in translation: Ivanov 1976, 366 n101). It would spread by means of conversation and not so subtle hints. So, for instance, the translator of Pavel Medvedev's book, Albert J. Wehrle, reported information passed on to him from the Russian academic V. N. Turbin (whom he met in 1976 on a research visit to Moscow and whose own evidence was recollections of conversations) (Wehrle 1985, xvi). Medvedev's son Iurii caustically described how these claims, which lacked any written backing, gained authority:

> Passed onto the West as rumour, as the opinion of an authoritative person which it would be awkward for a courteous foreigner to dispute, it then returns to us as something having currency in the competent circles of judgment, to which those who launched it can refer and on which they can rely. (Medvedev 1992, 98)

Just as importantly, they began to propagate an interpretation of Bakhtin's life that would explain the evolution of his work. According to that interpretation, the abandoned manuscripts of the 1920s represented a truer, more philosophical Bakhtin, who wanted to compose an ethical theory grounded in both neo-Kantianism and Russian religious philosophy. The encroachments of Stalinism on culture had, the argument went, forced him to write for the rest of his life "in a mask," in a field – literary criticism – that would not have been his first choice and with a terminology, borrowed from linguistics and sociology, that was alien to his innermost convictions (see Bocharov 1993 for an exposition of this argument).

When, in the late 1970s, Michael Holquist and Katerina Clark set to work on a biography, they had to depend substantially on the oral testimony of Bakhtin's camp in Russia (Clark and Holquist 1984). When Holquist and Caryl Emerson started to translate the essays on the novel from the 1975 volume (sensibly excluding the odd man out, the critique of formalism), they had to work with the edited Russian texts rather than manuscript originals, which lay in a private archive. The translations came out as *The Dialogic Imagination* in 1981. In one sense, it's fair to say the Russian slant prevailed, for these two texts ensured that, from that point onwards, Bakhtin would cease to be part of a formalist-cum-structuralist tradition and would instead be regarded as an original master thinker. The encounters of

the 1960s and 1970s had been earnest and respectful: now theorists read Bakhtin and looked at one another "with a wild surmise".

3 Early enthusiasms

The Cortezes of literary theory thought that the object of their awe was a new continent and not just an interesting outcropping of an older one. Bakhtin was not like structuralism: he saw language as 'discourse', perpetually 'becoming' and dynamic. But he was not like deconstruction, either, because the slipperiness of discourse seemed to depend on the slipperiness and ambiguity of context and the social dynamism of 'heteroglossia'. Bakhtin had, it seemed, taken several of the leading melodies of Theory – the fact that we draw on an inherited linguistic system, the semiotic nature of all our ideas, the undecidability of linguistic utterance – and set them in a major key, so that they sounded like ringing humanist declarations rather than a resigned acknowledgement that intentions were futile and history inaccessible. In fact, for a brief moment it looked like the continent Bakhtin had discovered would combine the new language-modelled theories with the Old World of historical and ideological criticism. An early review by David Carroll in *Diacritics* – the Talmud, if not the Bible of post-structuralism – claimed that "[w]hat is most clear and forceful in Bakhtin is the way his work opens 'the prison-house of language' that most structuralist-formalist approaches have tended to construct without imprisoning us in turn in dialectics, in a history or metahistory" (Caroll 1983, 68). The neo-Aristotelian Wayne Booth would enthuse about how Bakhtin neatly combined interest in form with interest in textual ideology (Booth 1984). Terry Eagleton would join in the enthusiastic chorus with the claim that "Bakhtin recapitulates *avant la lettre* many of the leading motifs of contemporary deconstructionism, and does so, scandalously, in a firmly social context" (Eagleton 1981, 150).

Clark and Holquist's biography, published in 1984, seemed to follow the Russian interpretative line faithfully: they described his early philosophical works – which they called ''The Architectonics of Answerability'' – as the core of Bakhtin's program, setting out "an agenda of topics so basal and complex that even a lifetime would not suffice to think them through" (Clark and Holquist 1984, 64). They explained Bakhtin's shift from philosophy to literary criticism – and his supposed authorship of the 'disputed texts'– as in part a response to his belief that "he was not going to be able to publish under his own name" (Clark and Holquist 1984, 117). Finally, they described P. N. Medvedev as a "Soviet careerist" (Clark and Holquist 1984, 114) and "Soviet establishment figure" (Clark and

Holquist 1984, 111), reinforcing the attacks being made on him by Bakhtin's Russian devotées. The biography was supported by a mass of contextual sources and the authors confessed to the difficulty of tracking down reliable documentary sources in their preface. Their reliance on unattributed oral testimony (in, for instance, the characterization of Medvedev) was striking, but, for scholarship on Bakhtin, unexceptional and understandable.

The apparent indebtedness to the Russian account, however, could not hide their indifference to many of its fundamental interests. Clark and Holquist were Slavists, but they had no deep commitment to the Russian religious tradition, nor did they have any particular attachment to phenomenology or neo-Kantianism (Bakhtin's main philosophical sources). Their interpretative frame for Bakhtin was accordingly secular and in many respects recognizably North American. In retrospect, the biography is deceptively structured: the bulk of it is devoted to Bakhtin's life and work until 1929, as if this were its formative period (no doubt, because this is the period about which the most information was available). But their understanding of Bakhtin's work is largely derived from the work following, not preceding, Bakhtin's linguistic turn (which they believe begins with the 'disputed texts' of Voloshinov, allegedly authored by Bakhtin). They acknowledged "the centrality of the self/other distinction in all of Bakhtin's work," (Clark and Holquist 1984, 94) but interpreted it as a piece of secular philosophical anthropology. It's characteristic that when introducing the distinction, they grounded it in what they call "an everyday, garden-variety fact [...]: if, as everyone would admit, no two bodies can occupy the same space at the same time, then my place in existence is unique" (Clark and Holquist 1984, 68). By contrast, for Bakhtin's Russian religious interpreters, the self/other distinction is grounded not in the intuitive truths of space and bodies, but in the relationship between God (the ultimate 'author') and the creatures he has created. As a result, in Clark and Holquist Bakhtin appears as a secular philosopher of language.

That philosophy promised to reconcile the systematic, semiotic aspect of language with the social relationships in which discourse always operated: whether it actually did so was another matter. To a certain degree Clark and Holquist, as well as Carroll, Booth, and Eagleton, were simply taking Bakhtin at his word. In the preface to the Dostoevskii book he had insisted that "a purely formal analysis", such as he was engaged in, "must grasp every element of artistic structure as a point at which living social forces are refracted", thereby overcoming the limitations of the "narrowly formalist approach" and "equally narrow ideologism" (Bakhtin 1929, 4). A few years later he would reiterate this methodological ambition in the opening pages of "Slovo v romane" ("Discourse in the Novel"):

> The leading idea of this book is the overcoming of the split between abstract "formalism" and equally abstract "ideologism" in the study of artistic discourse, an overcoming on the ground of *sociological stylistics*, in which form and content are united in discourse, understood as a social phenomenon [...]. (Bakhtin 2012 [1930–1936], 10)

Of course, everything would then depend on what one meant by "discourse, understood as a social phenomenon". At the minimum, it meant that every line of discourse, every utterance, displayed what Bakhtin would call 'addressivity': discourse didn't signify directly, but was always framed and shaped by a situation or respondent. For the Russian religious camp, that respondent was God: the speaker or 'hero' of a discourse can never be understood on its own because it *needs* an author who can make up for its limitedness and mere worldliness (see Gogotishvili 1992; Bonetskaia 1993, 1998; Bocharov 1995). For liberal interpreters of Bakhtin, the 'other' addressed was other people: discourse was social or dialogical in the sense that it was always conversational, no matter how mediated and distant one's conversational partner was. As one drifted further Left on the spectrum of Bakhtin criticism, the addressee appeared less and less like a *person*, and more and more like a structure or social situation which framed and re-voiced every instance of speech.

One could therefore believe that Bakhtin had made a decisive break with formalism and structuralism while holding an understanding of him wholly at odds with other equally unformalist interpretations. In the 1980s and 1990s a hundred flowers of Bakhtin interpretation bloomed, and they were wildly different in colour and shape. The Russian religious interpretation of Bakhtin, in which every interpersonal 'dialogical' encounter echoed the relationship of God to human, found sympathetic exponents in the work of Ruth Coates (1998) and Alexandar Mihailovic (1997). In the liberal tradition, exemplified by the critical work of Holquist, Gary Saul Morson, and Caryl Emerson, Bakhtin's dicta on the 'unrepeatability' and uniqueness of the utterance, his insistence on the perpetual possibility of radical transformation, were understood not in religious terms, but as reworkings of a familiar emphasis on the need to attend to the particulars. In a detailed study of Bakhtin published in 1990, Morson and Emerson claimed Bakhtin provided new reasons for accepting that novels were "powerful tools for enriching our moral sense of particular situations" (Morson and Emerson 1990, 27). Dialogue itself was understood as an interaction between individual speakers, though these speakers might represent broader social languages. Its virtues were traditional liberal ones: novels staged "a complex play of values and tones, as discourses and their speakers orient themselves to each other" (Morson and Emerson 1990, 326) – they instantiated the kind of self-reflexiveness that was the hallmark of liberal tolerance. The concreteness of the utterance was assimilated to its everyday, ordinary quality.

The Left thought 'concreteness' meant something quite different. As early as 1974, Fredric Jameson, the controlling presence in American Marxist criticism, had seen in Voloshinov a theoretically sophisticated antidote to the abstractions of structuralism. It was in England and Scotland, however, that Bakhtin found his most dedicated left-wing audience. The Rabelais book had, as I mentioned above, offered a theoretical resource for the burgeoning interest in popular culture and it was enthusiastically taken up by Tony Bennett (1979), and by Allon White and Peter Stallybrass (1986). It was, however, the essays on the novel, with their talk of official monologism and dialogical-novelistic subversion, that ultimately drew the most attention. Critics like David Shepherd, Craig Brandist, Alastair Renfrew, Graham Pechey, Galin Tihanov, and the author of the present chapter, to the consternation of their Russian colleagues, took Bakhtin's promise of a sociological stylistics seriously. Whereas the dominant Russian interpretation wanted to distance Bakhtin as much as possible from his surroundings, to position him above the fray, his socialist and Marxist enthusiasts understood him as a man of his time, deeply entrenched in the ideas and arguments that criss-crossed Russia and Europe in the 1920s and 1930s. As a consequence, if one wanted the kind of thick, contextual analysis traditionally associated with historicism, one turned not to liberal writers on Bakhtin, but to Tihanov (2000) and Brandist (2002).

That Bakhtin's writings could inspire fervour based on strikingly different construals of what he actually said naturally raised some eyebrows. Edward Said confessed that he wanted to avoid using the term "dialogical" on account of "the cult of Bakhtin" (Williams and Said 1989, 181). Paul de Man admired and was intrigued by Bakhtin, but nevertheless wondered "why the notion of dialogism can be so enthusiastically received by theoreticians of very diverse persuasion" (de Man 1986, 107). Robert Young would coolly observe how Bakhtin worked, for liberal and for Marxist critics, as a kind of antidote to post-structuralism:

> Rather than offering an alternative to Derrida in the sense of an oppositional position, Bakhtin seemed to allow the assimilation of some of the more compelling aspects of his thought while placing them within a more acceptable sociohistorical framework. Derrida himself could then be more or less indifferently rejected altogether. (Young 1996, 38)

Bakhtin, then, may not have been the critic who drew history and textuality into a perfect braid, but someone who allowed admirers to cut a few corners. Was the "wild surmise" of his supporters a matter of projection and wish-fulfilment? Did they simply find the solutions they wanted to find? In fairness, Bakhtin's work invited the kind of ambiguities one finds in the wide range of Bakhtin criticism. The New Worlds they glimpsed reflected the ideologies they brought with them, but they were not mere imaginings.

4 Bakhtin's ambiguities

In part, the ambiguities of Bakhtin interpretation stem from the changes that characterized the development of Bakhtin's work itself. Religious interpretations of his work used the philosophical fragments of the 1920s, the Dostoevskii book, and various philosophical titbits from later years as the frame for their discussion of the literary and cultural theory. Liberal criticism was most comfortable with the Dostoevskii book, where dialogism is a matter of one voice confronting and provoking another. Marxist and socialist criticism, unsurprisingly, wanted the militant Bakhtin of the 1930s to do the heavy lifting. But there were persistent, structural ambiguities in Bakhtin's writing, and these made his dissonant and heterogeneous reception possible.

One, which we could call the question of the 'ontology' of the author, was particularly significant. Clark and Holquist had called *self* and *other* the primary categories in Bakhtin's thought, but that was not entirely accurate – Bakhtin preferred, even in the early work, to talk of *I* and *other* and, more tellingly, *author* and *hero*. The advantage of the latter terms was that they made clear the asymmetry of the relationship, the different roles played by each element of the dyad. Bakhtin had, indeed, used the model of one person looking at another, seeing the outside of that person (or that person as 'outside', as expression) to describe the author/hero relationship. But this was just one model, for in the very same essay he argued that author/hero relationships ultimately depended on faith in an ultimate or supreme outsidedness, that is, on God as an author transcending and ontologically distinct from his creaturely heroes. And, of course, Bakhtin also used *author* to mean the author of texts: not the physical human being who composed a text, but the presence of an overarching consciousness in the text itself, a presence which would be more or less identical with the form or structure of the text.

This ambiguity, present in the initial formulation of "author and hero" (Bakhtin 2003 [1920–1924]), was made more insistent as Bakhtin swung towards literary theory and criticism. *Problems of Dostoevskii's Art* (1929) describes the author as a conversational partner to heroes, while continually reminding us that the author is, in fact, not a speaker at all: "The author speaks through the construction of his novel not *about* the hero, but *with* the hero" (Bakhtin 1929, 70). "Through the construction of his novel": which is to say that we are not talking about actual speech at all, but the way in which the form of a novel frames and shapes speech within it. The author is a silent partner, whose contribution is the provision of a context that colours or gives tonal nuance to the actual speech of heroes. "Discourse in the Novel" exacerbates the confusion yet further, by replacing the dyad of author and hero with that of the 'novel' and the 'languages' rep-

resented within it, while at the same time describing the intersection of these two dimensions as 'double-voicing'.

It was not, therefore, outlandish for Morson and Emerson, or Clark and Holquist, to think of dialogue as an interaction between individualized speakers. Nor was it outlandish for the present author and his comrades to think of authorship in broader, sociological terms. In the writing, Bakhtin presented novelistic structures as if they were voices and voices as if they were structures: which is to say that he, in effect, elaborated on a fundamental intuition – that novelistic frames and structures shaped the intentionality or directedness of the speech within them – but never clarified it theoretically. That was the task bequeathed to his interpreters (to recur to the ultimate authorship of God would not settle the questions, insofar as the divine is neither a person nor a structure).

5 Feminist and postcolonial voices

The individualist proclivity of American culture inclined its Bakhtin interpreters to reduce structures and languages to 'voices'. In that sense, Bakhtin did, indeed, provide critics hostile to structuralism with a way to discuss novels as complex structures while imagining them as conversations. But the priority of 'voice' was not merely a feature of liberal individualism: it was characteristic of a different kind of Bakhtin criticism as well, which had emerged in parallel with so-called high theory. Feminist criticism and what would eventually be called postcolonial criticism were rapidly gathering momentum through the 1970s and 1980s and the publication of *The Dialogic Imagination* came at just the right time. In this case, however, the starting point was not individual dialogue but Bakhtin's claim in "Discourse in the Novel" that in novels "double-voicedness extends its roots deep into an essential heteroglossia and multi-languagedness" (Bakhtin 2012 [1930–1936], 79).

In the case of feminist criticism, the timing of Bakhtin's translation could not have been more fortuitous. In the 1980s Dale Spender's *Man-made Language* and the translation of work by Hélène Cixous and other 'French feminists' had sparked a vigorous debate over whether and how the experience of women could be articulated, given the sexism built into the common language (see Cameron 1992). The idea that intentions might be 'refracted' in an inherited language, that a writer at odds with the linguistic resources available could appropriate them and use them 'against the grain', seemed to offer a middle way between dreams of a pure women's language and resignation before 'man-made language'. From the 1980s onwards feminist critics used Bakhtin to describe and explain how female authors

turned masculinist linguistic form to their own purposes (summarized very well in Pearce 1994, 100–111). Typical would be Patricia Yaeger's description of what Eudora Welty did with phrases and figures drawn from Yeats's poetry: "By 'stylizing' an alien text, by assimilating, that is, the other's word into her own heteroglossic style, Welty establishes a distance between the incorporated text and its initial meaning; she opens this text to another point of view" (Yaeger 1984, 962).

The idea that men and women spoke different languages, though powerful, was at least, to some degree, metaphorical. For postcolonial critics there was not the slightest need for metaphor: multi-languagedness, in the perfectly ordinary sense, was the normal situation for nations that had been colonies. When Bakhtin staged a confrontation between a unified, centripetal language and the centrifugal world of popular heteroglossia in the early pages of "Discourse in the Novel" he had been thinking of how Latin related to the emerging European vernaculars; postcolonial critics had only to put those vernaculars, now the standard languages of powerful European states, in the place of Latin to create a useful model for postcolonial analysis. The question of which language to use, and whether the language of the colonizer could be and should be adapted for postcolonial or revolutionary purposes had been a pressing issue amongst colonial writers: Bakhtin could not have landed on more fertile ground (see Crowley 1989, for example).

Where postcolonial writers wanted to 'refract' their intentions through an imposed colonial language, Bakhtin's claim that novelists express their intentions through indirect double-voicing was a valuable resource. But there was a deeper affinity available between Bakhtin and postcolonial theory. In criticizing the very idea of 'race' and racial difference, postcolonial theorists emphasized the ubiquity, the normalcy of ethnic hybridity (as well as the fear and anxiety its possibility awakened in racists). In his *Colonial Desire*, Robert Young saw the analogy with Bakhtin's theory and moved to exploit it (Young 1995, 18–22). Bakhtin's discussion of hybridization in "Discourse in the Novel" suggested that impurity was the rule in language as in biology. Furthermore, the distinction between organic and intentional hybrid utterances suggested that just as ethnic hybridity was a rebuke to purist theories of race, so discursive hybridity undermined the purity required by authoritarian discourse. To close the loop Young needed only to point out that colonial authority itself required a monological singular language, untainted by the discourse of the colonized. But, of course, just as even the most ostensibly monological utterance is, at some level, a dialogical response to the discourse around it, so, Young observes (citing Homi Bhabha) "the single voice of colonial authority undermines the operation of colonial power by inscribing and disclosing the trace of the other so that it reveals itself as double-voiced" (Young 1995, 21). Despite its best efforts, colonial discourse ends up producing the very discursive hybridity it needs to repress.

In the United States, the postcolonial appropriation of Bakhtin moved along similar lines. DuBois's claim that black Americans were afflicted with a "double consciousness, this sense of always looking at oneself through the eyes of others" (DuBois 1965 [1903], 2) uncannily mirrored Bakhtin's notion of a discourse directed "both at the referent of the speech, as in ordinary discourse, and at *the discourse of an other*, at *an alien form of speech*" (Bakhtin 1929, 105). Henry Louis Gates, Jr. would secure the alignment in his *The Signifying Monkey*, the opening chapters of which were prefaced with quotations from Frederick Douglass and Bakhtin. Gates shrewdly recognized the closeness between the American black vernacular tradition of 'signifyin(g)' – a tradition of rhetorical excess, parody and irony – and Bakhtin's theory of double-voiced prose (Gates 1988).

Bakhtin had argued, from "Discourse in the Novel" onwards, that the "double-voicedness" typical of novelistic prose derived its breadth and energy from popular genres and discourse:

> It is precisely here, on a local scale, in the minor 'low' genres, on the popular stages, in the fairground squares, in street songs and anecdotes, that techniques were devised for the construction of images of language, for combining discourse with the image of a speaking person, for the objective display of discourse together with a person [...]. (Bakhtin 2012 [1930–1936], 156)

But Bakhtin did not follow the claim with detailed evidence for it: even the Rabelais study is more about Rabelais than the popular culture of the Middle Ages. Gates – although this was not his principal aim – makes good on the claim, albeit in an American rather than European context, by showing in detail how black vernacular traditions find themselves translated into African-American literary techniques. The association of double-voicing with black double consciousness and postcolonial hybridity set the stage for one of the most productive appropriations of Bakhtin's work (see Hale 1994).

Was the appropriation appropriate? Was the match between 1930s Bakhtin and postcolonial theory in the 1980s and 1990s as neat as it looked? As before, it would be wrong to say that postcolonial theorists were misinterpreting Bakhtin but fair to say they took advantage of a significant ambiguity in his work. And once again, the issue was the nature of the 'author' and the authorial position. When Bakhtin first delved into the novel – in the 1929 study of Dostoevskii – he went out of his way to point out that ideas in Dostoevskii's novels did not enter into dialogue in order to be tested for their truth-value, in the interest of what Habermas would call 'rational-critical debate'. Dostoevskii did not so much articulate ideas as represent them artistically and "[t]he artistic representation of an idea is possible only when it is posed beyond assertion or negation" (Bakhtin 1929, 76). The author in the Dostoevskian novel did not simply reproduce ideas or

ideologies, but aimed "to perceive every thought as an integrated personal posi-tion, to think in voices" (Bakhtin 1929, 85), which is to say that, as a dialogical partner, the author changed the form of ideas and ideologies, giving them the shape of 'voices'. As we learn elsewhere in the Dostoevskii book, the crux of this form is that heroes and their ideas appear endowed with "their unfinalizability, their open-endedness, and indeterminacy" (Bakhtin 1929, 63). A few years later, in "Discourse in the Novel", Bakhtin would make an analogous but expanded claim for what novels did to the languages within them: "the central problem of a novelistic stylistics can be formulated as *the problem of the artistic representation of language, the problem of the image of a language*" (Bakhtin 2012 [1930–1936], 90). The image of a language was not a mere sample of it but an artistic elabo-ration, which could even include "the free creation of moments that are in the spirit of a given language but empirically alien to it" (Bakhtin 2012 [1930–1936], 90–91). What characterizes the form of images of language is a version of indeter-minacy and open-endedness that Bakhtin calls language's "heteroglot becoming" (Bakhtin 2012 [1930–1936], 111).

The author's ability to endow ideas and languages with "becoming" echoed the claims Bakhtin had made for the author in the 1920s, where the author was a redeeming, religious figure, whose love of the hero made it possible for the latter to attain some state of grace. 'Becoming' and 'unfinalizability' were not meant to signify mere historical change, but the possibility of a dramatic, quasi-redemptive transformation. When a feminist or postcolonial critic uses the idea of dialogism to explain how one discourse relativizes another, how it undercuts its epistemo-logical authority and sure-footedness, this dimension of Bakhtin's argument is sidelined. In fairness, though, Bakhtin sidelined it, too. In the very same essay where he insists on the novelist's need to represent language artistically, to provide "an *image*, and not a positive empirical sample of a language" (Bakhtin 2012 [1930–1936], 110), he will also say that this artistic double-voicedness draws its strength from the "socially contradictory historical becoming of language" (Bakhtin 2012 [1930–1936], 84), as if the qualities bestowed on language by nov-elistic technique were actually already there to begin with. Sometimes literary representations are distinctive, remote from everyday practice; at other times they seem merely to reflect or intensify it.

Critics interested in how the novel undermines colonial or patriarchal author-ity by double-voicing or dialogized heteroglossia are therefore just playing varia-tions on a theme from Bakhtin. Writers like Young or Bhabha can move with ease from literary to non-literary texts in their discussions of race and hybridity in part because they don't draw a sharp line between the 'artistic' dialogism of the novel and the dialogism of ordinary language (a line Bakhtin himself smudges quite often). In fact, one could dispense with verbal art altogether, as in James Clifford's

influential critique of colonial authority in ethnographic writing (Clifford 1983), which borrows and develops Bakhtin's idea of polyphony. If critical writing of this type seems to transgress the boundary Bakhtin establishes between artistic and extra-artistic double-voicedness, one is tempted to think so much the worse for Bakhtin. Nor should we imagine that the application of Bakhtin to social phenomena like colonialism or patriarchy can at best *use* his theory: if one is interested in what the concept of dialogism means for subjectivity, one should look not only to the works of Bakhtin himself, but also to the interpretative work of Young and Bhabha in postcolonial theory, or at Julia Kristeva's discussions of Bakhtin from the 1960s and 1970s (Bhabha 2004; Kristeva 1969; Kristeva 1970).

It would, ironically, be political upheaval in the Soviet Union that finally separated Bakhtin in Russia from Bakhtin abroad. The liberalization of Soviet cultural life in the 1980s and the eventual implosion of the Soviet Union in 1991 led to the end of censorship, the opening of archives, and a new era in Bakhtin scholarship in the former Soviet Union. As a consequence, a serious and scholarly *Collected Works* was published in Russia in six volumes, featuring new texts, dramatically new versions of familiar texts, the revelation that some older texts were editorial concoctions, and a strikingly detailed and careful philological commentary, mostly aimed at securing the religious interpretation of Bakhtin's work (Bakhtin 1996–2012). The archives were also, however, used by secular-minded critics in Russia like the late Nikolai Pan'kov and by scholars from the UK and the United States.

The new sources strengthened the hand of Bakhtin scholars in England, Scotland, and America who had kept a distance from the religious perspective. The general shift in opinion is exemplified by the change in attitudes to the so-called 'disputed texts' of Voloshinov and Medvedev. In the 1980s the common assumption in American circles was that these works belonged to Bakhtin, and when Harvard University Press re-issued Medvedev's *Formal Method* in 1985 its author was "M. M. Bakhtin/P. N. Medvedev". Twenty years later opinion had drifted steadily to the belief in Voloshinov's and Medvedev's authorship (see Brandist 2002, 4–9; Tihanov 2000, 7–8; Erdinast-Vulcan 2013, 216–217n8).

These substantial developments in Russian Bakhtin scholarship came too late to have an impact on Anglophone criticism. The Bakhtin surge in the UK and America had taken place in the 1980s and 1990s and the established lines of interpretation were more or less set in place before the publication of the Russian *Collected Works*. The result is an odd asymmetry: the Bakhtin corpus in Russia is not the same as the one circulating in the Anglophone countries, because the latter is based on earlier (and faulty) Russian texts. The excellent Bakhtin scholarship of the last 20 years, conducted by philologists in Russia and Slavist Bakhtin scholars abroad, hasn't made much difference to the view of Bakhtin put in place over two

decades ago. Like the colonizers with whom I compared them in the beginning, Bakhtin enthusiasts in the English-speaking world have moved on, having taken what was useful for them from the continent they travelled over. Unlike the colonizers, however, they've made a lasting and just contribution to its development.

References

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. *Problemy tvorchestva Dostoevskogo*. Leningrad: Priboi, 1929.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. *Problemy poėtiki Dostoevskogo*. Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1963.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. *Tvorchestvo Fransua Rable i narodnaia kul'tura srednevekov'ia i Renessansa*. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1965.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. *Rabelais and His World*. Trans. by Hélène Iswolsky. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1968.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Trans. by R. William Rotsel. Ann Arbor, MI: Ardis, 1973.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. *The Dialogic Imagination*. Trans. by Michael Holquist and Caryl Emerson. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1981.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. *Sobranie sochinenii*. 6 Vols. Moscow: Russkie slovari, 1996–2012.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. "Avtor i geroi v ėsteticheskoi deiatel'nosti." [1979] *Sobranie sochinenii*. Vol. 1: *filosofskaia ėstetika (1920-x godov)*. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kul'tur, 2003. 69–263.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. "Slovo v romane." *Sobranie sochinenii*. Vol. 3: *teoriia romana (1930–1961 gg.)*. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kul'tur, 2012. 9–179.

Bennett, Tony. *Formalism and Marxism*. London: Methuen, 1979.

Bhabha, Homi K. "The Postcolonial and the Postmodern: The Question of Agency." Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, 2004. 245–282.

Bocharov, Sergei G. "Ob odnom razgovore i vokrug nego." *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* 2 (1993): 70–89. (Translation: "Around and About One Conversation." *Russian Studies in Literature* 31.4 (1995): 4–35)

Bocharov, Sergei G. "Sobytie bytiia: o Mikhaile Mikhailoviche Bakhtine." *Novyi mir* 11 (1995): 211–221.

Bonetskaia, Natal'ia A. "M. M. Bakhtin i traditsii russkoi filosofii." *Voprosy filosofii* 1 (1993): 83–93.

Bonetskaia, Natal'ia A. "Bakhtin's Aesthetics as a Logic of Form." *The Contexts of Bakhtin*. Ed. David Shepherd. New York, NY: Harwood Academic Press, 1998. 83–94.

Booth, Wayne. "Introduction." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Trans. by Caryl Emerson. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984. xiii–xxvii.

Brandist, Craig. *The Bakhtin Circle: Philosophy, Culture and Politics*. London: Pluto Press, 2002.

Cameron, Deborah. *Feminism and Linguistic Theory*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1992.

Carroll, David. "The Alterity of Discourse: Form, History and the Question of the Political in M. M. Bakhtin." *Diacritics* 13.2 (1983): 65–83.

Clark, Katerina, and Michael Holquist. *Mikhail Bakhtin*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984.

Clifford, James. "On Ethnographic Authority." *Representations* 2 (1983): 118–146.

Coates, Ruth. *Christianity in Bakhtin: God and the Exiled Author*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Crowley, Tony. "Bakhtin and the History of the Language." *Bakhtin and Cultural Theory*. Eds. Ken Hirschkop and David Shepherd. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989. 68–90.

de Man, Paul. "Dialogue and Dialogism." Paul de Man, *The Resistance to Theory*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1986. 106–114.

DuBois, W. E. B. *The Souls of Black Folk* [1903]. London: Longmans, 1965.

Eagleton, Terry. *Walter Benjamin or Towards a Revolutionary Criticism*. London: Verso, 1981.

Erdinast-Vulcan, Daphna. *Between Philosophy and Literature: Bakhtin and the Question of the Subject*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2013.

Erlich, Victor. *Russian Formalism: History – Doctrine*. The Hague: Mouton, 1955.

Gates, Henry Louis Jr. *The Signifying Monkey: A Theory of Afro-American Literary Criticism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Ginzburg, Carlo. *The Cheese and the Worms: The Cosmos of a Sixteenth-century Miller*. Trans. by John and Anne Tedeschi. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980.

Gogotishvili, Liudmila A. "Varianty i invarianty M. M. Bakhtina." *Voprosy filosofii* 1 (1992): 115–133.

Hale, Dorothy J. "Bakhtin in African American Literary Theory." *ELH* 61.2 (1994): 445–471.

Ivanov, Viacheslav V. "Znachenie idei M. M. Bakhtina o znake, vyskazyvanii i dialoge dlia sovremmenoi semiotiki." *Trudy po znakovym sistemam* 6 (1973): 5–44.

Ivanov, Viacheslav V. "The Significance of M. M. Bakhtin's Ideas on Sign, Utterance, and Dialogue for Modern Semiotics." *Semiotics and Structuralism*. Ed. Henryk Baran. White Plains, NY: International Arts and Sciences Press, 1976. 310–367.

Keats, John. "On First Looking into Chapman's Homer." *The Poems of John Keats*. Ed. Ernest de Sélincourt. New York, NY: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1905. 36. https://archive.org/details/poemsofjohnkeats00keat/page/36/mode/2up (31 July 2020).

Koehler, Ludmila. "Themes in Solzhenitsyn's *The Cancer Ward*." *Russian Review* 28.1 (1969): 53–65.

Krasnov, Vladislav. *Solzhenitsyn and Dostoevsky: A Study in the Polyphonic Novel*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1980.

Kristeva, Julia. "Le mot, le dialogue et le roman." Julia Kristeva, *Semeiotike: recherches pour une sémanalyse*. Paris: Seuil, 1969. 143–173.

Kristeva, Julia. "Une poétique ruinée." Mikhaïl Bakhtine, *La poetique du Dostoïevski*. Trans. by Isabelle Kolitcheff. Paris: Seuil, 1970. 5–27.

Matejka, Ladislav, and Krystyna Pomorska (eds.). *Readings in Russian Poetics: Formalist and Structuralist Views*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1971.

Medvedev, Iurii P. "'Nas bylo mnogo na chelne …'" *Dialog Karnaval Khronotop* 1 (1992): 89–108.

Mihailovic, Alexandar. *Corporeal Words: Mikhail Bakhtin's Theology of Discourse*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1997.

Morson, Gary Saul, and Caryl Emerson. *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a Prosaics*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1990.

Pearce, Lynn. *Reading Dialogics*. London: Edward Arnold, 1994.

Pomorska, Krystyna. "Foreword." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Rabelais and His World*. Trans. by Hélène Iswolsky. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1968. v–x.

Seduro, Vladimir. *Dostoyevski in Russian Literary Criticism, 1846–1956*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1957.

Stallybrass, Peter, and Allon White. *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression*. London: Methuen, 1986.

Tihanov, Galin. *The Master and the Slave: Lukács, Bakhtin and the Ideas of Their Time*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.

Wehrle, Albert J. "Introduction: Bakhtin/Medvedev." Mikhail M. Bakhtin and Pavel N. Medvedev, *The Formal Method in Literary Scholarship: A Critical Introduction to Sociological Poetics* [1928]. Trans. by Albert J. Wehrle. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985. xv–xxix.

Williams, Raymond and Edward Said. "Media, Margins and Modernity." Raymond Williams, *The Politics of Modernism*. Ed. Tony Pinkney. London: Verso, 1989. 177–197.

Yaeger, Patricia S. "'Because a Fire Was in My Head': Eudora Welty and the Dialogic Imagination." *PMLA* 99.5 (1984): 955–973.

Yates, Frances. "Review of *Rabelais and His World*." *The New York Review of Books* 13.6 (9 Oct. 1969): 16–21.

Young, Robert J. C. *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race*. London: Routledge, 1995.

Young, Robert J. C. "Back to Bakhtin." Robert J. C. Young, *Torn Halves: Political Conflict in Literary and Cultural Theory*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996. 33–66.

Zemon Davis, Natalie. "The Reasons of Misrule: Youth Groups and Charivari on Sixteenth-Century France." *Past and Present* 50 (1971): 41–75.

II.9 Structuralism and Semiotics

Tomáš Glanc

Transfer as the Key: Understanding the Intellectual History of the Relationship between Formalism and Structuralism from the Perspective of the Prague Linguistic Circle

Formalism became established in Russia in the second half of the 1910s as a branch of learning within the study of literature (partially overspilling into other kinds of art), but with no firm 'membership list'. It ran parallel to Avant-garde aesthetics and was associated institutionally with two societies committed to developing a philology critical of the methodology then employed in the humanities: the Moscow Linguistic Circle and The Society for the Study of Poetic Language (Obshchestvo izucheniia poėticheskogo iazyka, OPOIaZ) (for more on this see Glanc and Pil'shchikov 2017). Prague structuralism is examined in the context of the Prague Linguistic Circle (Pražský lingvistický kroužek, PLK), founded in 1926 (a fine assemblage of archive materials has become available in the outstanding compilation by Čermák et al., 2012). At issue is the extent to which these two intellectual formations were connected.

1 Cross-regional reception and appropriation

Key to the *transfer* of ideas is the individual input by the participants in the process; in the case in question one quite remarkable contributor was the distinctive personality of Roman Jakobson, who played a major part in both the above societies and in the theoretical debates that went on within them. In pre-revolutionary Russia he had acquired an elite education and had, from an early age, engaged in the artistic and intellectual life of the times as a follower of the latest trends in scholarship and aesthetics (occasionally in the role of a Futurist poet under the pseudonym 'Aliagrov' [see, for example, Kruchenykh and Aliagrov 1915–1916]), and between 1920 and 1939 he lived in Czechoslovakia. There he attended university, engaged in research on the language of poetry and theorised on linguistics – notable are his theories on the Russian verb and the case system of Russian (Jakobson 1932), he was employed at the Soviet diplomatic mission, and in the 1930s became a professor at the University of Brno. In the late 1930s, because of the persecution of Jews, he emigrated via Scandinavia to

the United States, where he held positions at both Columbia and Harvard, and, in his declining years, also at MIT. With his career at prominent, world-renowned universities, the keen insights and cogency of his philological thinking, and his ambitions relating to social policy (without regard to politics as such, on which he never offered any opinion), Jakobson was the very man to 'transfer' many ideas and stimuli of East-European provenance into the context of 'worldwide literary scholarship'. Obviously, any construct of the cross-regional reception and appropriation of intellectual ideas or theses is controversial, or dependent on sundry assumptions and patterns of interpretation, and it invariably calls for additional substantiation and verification against period sources and interpretational intentions.

In the case of Jakobson (as with such other 'prime movers' behind the Prague Linguistic Circle as Jan Mukařovský or the Circle's founder, Vilém Mathesius), the sheer breadth, scope, of their role in 'intellectual transfer' was extraordinary, impacting on a whole range of disciplines within the arts and humanities, including philosophy. However, it was linguistics which stood at the forefront of his research and which he viewed as, in a sense, a 'universal science'. The concepts that he adapted and updated to meet the demands of his own scholarly discourse in the interwar period were coloured by a wide range of disparate synchronic and diachronic influences, whether he construed them critically or with approval, ranging from (to mention but some of them) Baudouin de Courtenay, Alexander Potebnia, Mikołaj Kruszewski, Alexander Veselovskii, Johann Friedrich Herbart, George Vernadsky, Nikolai Trubetzkoi, Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk and Gustav Shpet through Viktor Shklovski, Iurii Tynianov, Boris Èikhenbaum, the poetics of Vladimir Maiakovskii and Velimir Khlebnikov all the way to the psychologist and logician Georgii Chelpanov or the phenomenology of Edmund Husserl.

After Jakobson emigrated to the USA, this unique intellectual base widened to include the structuralism of Lévi-Strauss, while later on he gradually took into his philological concept, *inter alia*, also Bakhtin (Voloshinov 1973), Einstein (Jakobson 1982, 129–144) and Jan Patočka (Jakobson 1977, 26–28).

2 The relationship between formalist and structuralist theses

Our present purpose, however, is not to glamorize this impressive panoply, but to take a close, critical look at the phenomenon of transfer and seek out, via the attributes or manifest tokens of transfer, those aspects that might otherwise not be immediately apparent.

Every textbook on literary theory and criticism has, for the past hundred years – actually slightly fewer in the case of formalism and structuralism – sought to define both these theoretical concepts, naming their major exponents and listing the most influential texts in which they formulated the foundations of their methodologies and the specific ways in which they handled the object of their enquiry. Especially the last half-century has seen the emergence of various strategies that have developed sequels to both trends (perhaps best-known has been new criticism, on which see Ewa Thompson's classic work [Thompson 1971]). With that has come, understandably, a string of polemical commentaries on both, whether from a post-structuralist standpoint – such tendencies as new historicism and cultural materialism – or from various positions that erect, on new foundations that take criticism of positivist determinism into account, a concept of *authorship* that has been attacked, or rather called into question, often one-sidedly, within both Modernist lines of enquiry.

Attempting to summarise the definitions, characteristics and interrelations of formalism and structuralism may appear unrealistic given the countless existing works on the subject, with some overlapping and each one setting out from its own author's specific assumptions and objectives depending on who that was, when or on what occasion it was, and what they had in mind as they were formulating it.

With respect to the central theme of the present volume, the challenge, the spur to further enquiry, and the suggestion of how issues that have never gone away (because both movements have left indelible imprints throughout the humanities) might be approached, arise from just how questions as to the relationship between formalist and structuralist theses, terms and propositions should be put.

What has taken root as absolutely standard is a phenomenon deemed universally valid and simply not requiring any critical reflection, namely *influence* (see, for example, Karstens 2019, 115–139). Influence is, of course, a heterogeneous set of processes and effects – not inspiration, quotation or polemic, but the simple assertion of a correlation with no further instantiation. Influence is mediated by texts and personalities. The thinking and the articulation of it by some influences others. Of the justifiability and power of this concept there can be no doubt. All ideas are, whether affirmatively, critically, comparatively or in some other way, influenced by other ideas.

A certain constraint or disquieting doubt is contained in the very etymology of the word: what it amounts to is a one-way, irreversible process that also, if handled without due consideration, often tends towards simplification. *Influentia* (Lat.) – *influence* (Eng.) – *Einfluss* (Ger.) – *влияние* (Rus.) – *vliv* (Cze.) literally means that a 'transmitting element' brings about an alteration, that's to say, has an influence on, a target element, inflowing, debouching, into it. The nature of the image has, then, to do with a liquid or fluid. One water source pours into another, a stream

into a river, a river into the sea. There it influences the target liquid and by some means or other dissolves within it. The dictionary ("Influence", *Oxfordify Dictionary*) advises that, as used originally, the word had a specific application, in astrology, to ethereal fluids that somehow affected human destiny. An echo of the powerful hand of destiny remains in 'influence' to this day; it provides a format and is in a sense a fateful and irrevocable invasion. Influence may be treated as a special example of the continuity of power. A phenomenon persists, influenced by something external to it, whether on the plane of 'synchrony' (the influence of a neighbouring phenomenon) or of 'diachrony' (influence of a phenomenon from the past). The 'influencing element' is manifested by the power that informs it. In the target environment it is accepted, evinces its agency and continues to modify (Karcz 2002). Within historiography, the theory of influence has, from as far back as the 1980s, evoked doubts (see, for example, Werner and Zimmermann 2002) that have been critical to the study of formalism, structuralism and their reception.

No less influential than the theory of influence is the model of 'confrontation', 'difference', 'exclusion', or 'surpassing': basically, these are various nuances of contrasting, whether on the synchronic or diachronic plane. In the given instance, structuralism cancels out or devalues formalism as a higher stage in the evolution of knowledge, battling against it and winning that battle: it overcomes its weaker, less developed forerunner. Such patterns of thought format not only the strands of our own thinking, but also the material that we study through their medium but which we could obviously tackle in any number of other ways. A further determiner of how we handle our intellectual heritage and the ways in which we are driven by it is the actual manner in which those people thought whose thinking we are seeking to map and gain an adequate hold on. The language of the object is projected into the language of the subject. In this regard, Jakobson maintained that formalism, in the 'history' of which he himself played a part, preceded structuralism as a lower, 'mechanical' stage in the latter's development. There is even a clue to the terms in which he expressed himself, in an allusion to a famous paper by Lenin (1920), to the effect that formalism was an 'infantile disorder' of structuralism (Pomorska 1985, 169).

3 'Transfer' as an alternative to 'influence'

We may take 'transfer' as an alternative to 'influence'. It is a 'transferring' that describes a linkage which indeed exists unequivocally, but is defined in less insistent terms as regards its nature and outcomes. Even with regard to its etymological connotations it is a less 'fateful' process: these are not about the permanent

penetration of some irrevocable force, but simply about a 'transfer of property'. After all, "[t]he earliest use of the noun, late 17th century, was as a legal term in the sense 'conveyance of property'" ("transfer", *Oxfordify Dictionary*). As yet, such shifts say nothing about the 'influence' of this or that operation. In economics, transfer means a payment which, according to one dictionary of economics, the payer (e. g. a government) makes "without goods or services being received in return" (Lampman 1987, 1). This is the case of, for example, the payment of pensions or unemployment benefit. It is not 'something for something' (an exchange), 'something into something' (influence) or 'something against something' (opposition), but a redistribution, a kind of looser contractual relocation of something to somewhere different with results that can be many and various and have no clear-cut vector. It is more a 'metaphorical' transfer akin to that made by a traveller if such is required by his train or plane timetable.

In the 1980s, Michel Espagne and Michael Werner (Espagne and Werner 1985) used the term 'transfer' to refer to processes of a shifting of cultural and intellectual phenomena, knowledge and expository procedures which are not primarily colonisational and which initiate, as they proceed, significant transformations (Bal 2002). The assets of meanings that are projected into the concept of transfer reside in how they operate with the phenomenon known as *permeability*. That is also how 'transfer' works in the humanities, in part through 'permeation', in part through 'resistance', according to the particular constellation of politics and scholarship under which it comes about. Phenomena that spring from transfer are ultimately 'hybrid' and lack any solid framework, but are more a kind of 'modus operandi', a way of proceeding.

Doubtless any speaker of certain languages, e. g. Czech, will spot a link between *trans-* and *trans* = 'trance'. However, let's leave this pleasing word-play aside and be content with the matter-of-fact semantic assertion that *trans-* implies movement across something and *-fer* is from the Latin verb *ferre* meaning to convey, bear, carry.

With regard to the present topic, the transporting-conveying phenomenon has a specific feature that concerns time, territorial destinations, selection and manipulation.

4 'One's own – alien'

The relationship between Russian formalism and the intellectual milieu of Prague structuralism has something of the organic and authentic about it, because it was played out as a single thread in time from the mid-1910s to the mid-1940s

(after 1948 the Prague Linguistic Circle essentially dissolved itself under pressure from the new regime and its ideology), and the 1920s in particular stand out as idyllic. Both adherents and informed critics of formalism (Viktor Shklovskii, Iurii Tynianov, Viktor Vinogradov) met with understanding and interest on the part of their Prague colleagues, the more so that many were colleagues, or even friends of Roman Jakobson, who was a Prague resident and personification of the phenomenon known in the theory of transfer as an 'intermediary', in German *Vermittlungsinstanz* (Jakobson 1996, 17). Some came to Prague in person.

Added to this, the reception of formalism had begun to be politicised, and so radicalised, since the first half of the 1920s. Above all, attacks on formalism grew in strength and extent, and, basically, no one had a programme by which to stave them off; the formalists themselves began to relativise formalism or even forswear it altogether (for negative [self-]reflections on formalism penned by such of its representatives as Boris Èikhenbaum or Viktor Zhirmunskii, see Glanc and Pil'shchikov 2017, 87–100), while its opponents attacked it from various ideological angles – one obvious basis of criticism was Czech Marxism (Konrad, Václavek, Mencák; see, for example, Mencák 1934); a creditable account of these polemics is to be found in Kříž's monograph (2012). One influential polemic was the remarkable discussion led by Bakhtin from the point of view of general systematic aesthetics, as he explains in the introduction to his treatise entitled "The Problem of Content, Material and Form in Verbal Art" (Bakhtin 1975), though in the context of the transnational transfer of ideas this only began to circulate when Bakhtin was beginning to be 'rediscovered' after World War II.

With the passage of time, however, the impact of this criticism changed, especially in the Soviet Union. Initially, the relations among formalism, Marxism and psychoanalysis were not yet damaged by fear, censorship or persecution. While the 1920s were marked by open political polemics on an intellectual plane, despite being shaped in part by such a powerful politician as Leon Trotsky (Trotskii 1923; 1991), the People's Commissar for the Army and Navy and, at the time, one of the most influential Bolsheviks in the Soviet state, by the 1930s any charge of formalism became a signal for persecution and sometimes liquidation, which was tantamount to a legal sentence (with no chance of defence). It was particularly after the first congress of Soviet writers, at which Socialist Realism was declared the Soviet state's official aesthetic programme, formalism became, in the USSR, a sweepingly pejorative label with potentially negative consequences for expressions of it and subscribers to it (*Protiv formalizma i naturalizma v iskusstve*, 1937). Participants in the crusade to liquidate it were not only Party censors, but even such influential writers as Maksim Gor'kii (Gor'kii 1936).

With this diversification of forces it is unsurprising that the transfer of formalism to the environment of the Prague Linguistic Circle, however critical or scep-

tical or even rejectionist its reception, was a one-way matter, given that perhaps the first public discussion of the Prague Linguistic Circle within the USSR did not come until the 1960s, at the Tartu School; it was then that a group of scholars, with Juri Lotman at their centre, emerged in Estonia (though many of them were based primarily in Moscow or Leningrad), engaging in semiotics and a motley of versions of late structuralism.

Although from the start of his life abroad Jakobson had sought to preserve and cultivate relations with his Soviet colleagues, indeed right after Stalin's death he was able to make regular trips to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, one can speak of any transfer of Prague structuralist ideas to Russia – and so of a Russian reflexion of any connection between the two research frameworks – only after a considerable lapse of time.

Apart from some individuals and solitary and fragmentary channels, the intellectual heritage of the Prague Linguistic Circle was probably relevant only to the generation of Soviet scholars in the humanities who had been born in the 1920s (Iurii Lotman, Viacheslav Ivanov, Alexandr Piatigorskii and others).

The transfer of formalism beyond Russia's frontiers, presented here through the example of Czechoslovakia, unfolded in the spirit of the opposition 'one's own – alien'. Thus, Jan Mukařovský required that the roots and wellsprings of structuralism be appraised with prime regard to its 'native' origins. In his 1940 genealogy of structuralism, the overall account accords Russian formalism a place if not marginal, then certainly in no way pivotal. Above all, he states that this 'contact' was surpassed (overstepped), and he orders it only after Durdík, Hostinský and Zich, listing it alongside modern German aesthetics and a string of linguistic, artistic and philosophical insights headed by Hegel and Husserl. The summary winds up quite categorically: "Structuralist aesthetics is a phenomenon of Czech scholarship" and the formalist concept is but one of its numerous "stimulants" (Mukařovský 2007, 21; see also Peter Steiner's polemical view of the subject in that same volume).

5 A proper telling of the story

The reception of formalism, its prehistory and connections with later theoretical concepts only comes after several decades have elapsed, basically not until the mid-1950s, which saw the appearance of Victor Erlich's respectable monograph and the clearer idea it afforded of the authors considered to be 'formalists' (Erlich 1955).

Erlich was born into an important Jewish family in Petrograd in 1914, just a few years before the 1917 October Revolution. He grew up in Poland and Lithuania

and in the early 1940s made his way, like Jakobson, to New York, where, shortly after the war, he studied under Jakobson at Columbia University.

For another ten years or so there is little to warrant reference to any 'mass reception' or canonisation of formalism. Those processes can first be dated to the second half of the 1960s following certain translations into French and German, which caused quite a stir in academic circles. A wide-ranging anthology of texts selected and translated by Tzvetan Todorov was published in France, with a preface by Roman Jakobson (Todorov 1965), and in English as *Russian Formalist Criticism* (Lemon and Reis 1965). Shklovskii was the first to be published in Germany (1964, 1965, 1966), quickly followed by Boris Èikhenbaum in 1965 (Èikhenbaum 1965) and Iurii Tynianov in 1967 (Tynianov 1967), but most important for the German-speaking and -reading audience were the two volumes by Jurij Striedter (1971).

It is worth noting that it was just at this time that the chief Czechoslovak dogmatist of Socialist Realism published his version of a critique of both formalism and structuralism (Štoll 1966). This composite critical analysis and interpretation of the evolution of the Russian formalist school and of the Czech structural theory of literature is, on the one hand, a polemic against Victor Erlich's book and the approach taken by René Wellek, and on the other, a historical analysis of the failure of Czech structuralist thinking (Kříž 2012, 130).

What may be deemed a specific instance of what the appropriation of formalism by Western literary theory might lead to is a project that attempted a thorough reconstruction of the terminology employed in formalist circles, but including conjectures as to those parts of the theory that had been left unelaborated by the theorists of formalism themselves. This was the voluminous work by Aage A. Hansen-Löve (1978).

It is, then, fair to say that formalism enjoyed something of a 'boom' only as late as the 1960s, a period when texts of the kind deemed poststructuralist were already taking shape. Derrida published his crucial *L'écriture et la différence* (1967a, *Writing and Difference*) and *De la grammatologie* (1967b, *Of Grammatology*) in 1967, while it was only then that the translations of the formalists into French and German were appearing.

Seriously relevant to the situation in the USA was obviously the presence there of Roman Jakobson and another émigré from Czechoslovakia, René Wellek, co-author of the most influential academic textbook of literary theory in the USA (Wellek and Warren 1949). Twenty years later, Jakobson's wife Krystyna Pomorska published a book on formalism (Pomorska 1968), and Wellek himself returned to the subject of the Prague school with a separate monograph (Wellek 1969).

Such a time lag is not merely a fact of political and intellectual history, but also a factor that affects how connections are perceived. It obviously calls for a generalisation *and* proper telling of the story of how theoretical ideas evolve. Our

own case involves the array of 'influences' leading from Russian formalism via the Prague school to French structuralism, which is becoming canonical in Western intellectual practice. One part of this grand narrative is 'invalid transfer' – the underappreciated role and the shortfall in the reception of the Prague Linguistic Circle and its contribution to theory (see Irina Wutsdorff's chapter in this volume). This lingered in the shadows of reception because of the marginalisation or even elimination of structural methodology in Czechoslovak and Soviet scholarship after World War II and also because of the language barrier – most notably the absence of any decent translations of works by Jan Mukařovský (on 'invalid transfer' see Volek 2006; Matějka 2014).

6 Macrotransfer and microtransfer

Thus far our subject has been 'transfer' as a type of 'transmission' and 'mediation'. It is no coincidence that 'transfer' finds itself in terminological proximity to 'translation', the rudimentary form of transfer as a carrying-over from one (linguistic and cultural) context into another. In this respect, translation is a telling example of the 'transcribing' of a text from the sphere of one set of users onto the account of the sphere of different users. It is the 'transposition' of a feature of one language community into another with *no* implications to do with power or hierarchy (unlike the case of 'influence').

We also need to distinguish what is actually the 'subject' of the operation and so, too, its 'content'. To give the matter a schema and dichotomy, we might, within the framework of a but crudely conceived working division, think in terms of *macrotransfer* and *microtransfer* as two drifts that are similar, but differ in their scope.

Under 'macrotransfer' we might subsume the treatment of such concepts as formalism and structuralism (and countless other analogous phenomena such as positivism, psychologism or, say, phenomenology, Marxism or psychoanalysis). These are 'frames of reference' that provide a multiplicity of authorial viewpoints or heterogeneous texts with a common denominator, a group identity within the context of science.

No less important, though of a different order, is the plane of 'microtransfer', which applies not to a school of thought, a programme or scholarly creed, but to 'individual' components and manifestations of such, different authors' theses, individual conceptions or particular acts of interpretation. This focus on single entities is on the one hand 'complementary' to macrotransfer, while, on the other hand, it may call those entities into question or even 'undermine' them. A good instance of this is provided by the core differences in the approaches taken by two

influential literary scholars who had been part of the Russian formalist circuit, Viktor Shklovskii and Roman Jakobson.

If in the macrostory of formalism they are complementary actors within the same programme, in the microperspective they personify divergent, if not opposite standpoints: the almost anarchically frivolous intuitions of Shklovskii's essays are a counterpoint to Jakobson's systematic scientism.

If we set about an elementary microanalysis of the connection between formalism and (Prague) structuralism as a kind of macrotransfer, it will transpire that continuity, worship of the heritage, and influence were certainly not the main thread of the story – nor was it a case of structuralism's merely refining, 'improving' formalism or 'following it through'.

A great opportunity to recapitulate the first decade of structuralist scholarship came with the tenth anniversary of the Prague Linguistic Circle in 1936. The humanities have no great tradition of celebrating anniversaries of such groupings; that kind of attention is more reserved for universities, their constituent parts, and other academic institutions or individuals on the occasion of their round-number anniversaries. It is distinctly unusual to celebrate the first ten years of a learned society that had begun quite informally: it originally used to meet in members' offices at the university or in coffee houses, and up until 1930 it had been just a 'loose assemblage', and it was only on the first of December in that year that it met to constitute itself formally as a 'society' (see Čermák 2012). Six years later, the Circle's leadership initiated a show of their achievements in the style of a self-celebratory recapitulation of all the good work done. A whole succession of well-wishers from many countries sent – clearly pre-arranged – expressions of support and commendation. The Circle's journal, *Slovo a slovesnost*, published a detailed essay by the chairman, Vilém Mathesius (Mathesius 1936), and numerous other contributions. Arrangements for the anniversary dinners are unknown, but their splendour should by no means suggest that the influential, and in many respects trailblazing, works by the Circle's members do not deserve attention, recognition and celebration. Nevertheless, the ideologisation of their own work and the results it had produced and the theatrical nature of their public display is evidence that the Circle's members were keen not only to advertise their work in linguistics, literary studies and other branches of the humanities, but reflectively to put it into context both synchronically and diachronically. This fact also has a bearing on questions of transfer: things said regarding connections with previous or competing methodologies were integral to the deliberate self-definition by means of which the Circle meant to spell out what made them different and identify the specifics. The 'synchronic' angle may have had most to do with the period linguistic debates which were being played out within Czechoslovakia, though their reach in terms of methodology went further afield. The main issue was 'the

debate on language correctness', in which connection the Prague Linguistic Circle instituted a 'commission for matters of language teaching and culture' in 1931. The 'diachronic' angle related, *inter alia*, precisely to the transfer of ideas and conceptions, including those of Russian provenance. In his 1936 annual report, Mathesius described the preparations that had preceded the founding of the Prague Linguistic Circle and had taken eighteen months – from the spring of 1925 to the autumn of 1926; besides the Czech membership there were also two Russians: Roman Jakobson and Sergei Kartsevski. Mathesius put "new currents" at the heart of his strategy, the setting-up of a centre:

> My notes remind me that on 13 March 1925 I invited Jakobson and Trnka to come and see me along with Kartsevski, who later became Reader in Russian at the University of Geneva, but at the time was still teaching at the Russian grammar school in Prague, and that on 14 October in that same year I summoned Jakobson, Trnka and Kartsevski again, and also Bohuslav Havránek, who was about to complete his higher doctorate in Slavonic Studies. Those present recall the agenda of that second meeting: I had produced a paper on the new currents and latest trends in linguistic research, which I later, on 9 November 1925, delivered as a lecture at the Royal Bohemian Learned Society, eventually publishing it in 1926, in English, in a special volume dedicated to Prof. [Josef] Zubatý. We had a thorough discussion of the central theses of the paper, which effectively constituted a programme of the new linguistics, taking them as the ideological foundation of the centre for linguistics that we were by then fully determined to set up in Prague by our own devices. (Mathesius 1936, 138)

The international character of the Prague Linguistic Circle as constituted in its first period, and as emphasised by the strong Russian component, was even quantified in Mathesius's report, including a list of names:

> From October 1926 to June 1928 lectures were given (in some cases two or even three) by eight Czechs (Havránek, Ilek, Trnka, Oberpfalcer, Mukařovský, Mathesius, Rypka, Buben), five Russians (Jakobson, Kartsevski, Trubetzkoi, Tomashevski, Bogatyrev), two Frenchmen (Tesnière and Brun) and one German (Becker). (Mathesius 1936, 139)

The report is interesting for not emphasising structuralism as a doctrine, mentioning it only once: "the functional and structural analysis of the phonic aspect of speech" (Mathesius 1936, 141). And the anniversary résumé says not one single word on the Russian participants' attitude to formalism or even on the idea of continuity (but then no one could describe the semiotically minded Bogatyrev or the phonologist Trubetzkoi as formalists).

It might even be said that the opposite is true: the 'continuity' thesis was ascribed by Mathesius to hostile elements, "foes" (Mathesius 1936, 145; referring in all likelihood to attacks on the Prague Linguistic Circle in the 1930s by the linguist, literary historian and byzantologist Miloš Weingart, who left the Prague Linguistic Circle in 1934, or the philologist Jan Vojtěch Sedlák):

> Our working symbiosis with the young Russian scholars is sometimes held up, by those who have a grudge against us, as evidence for the assertion that what we are doing is merely a Czech application of Russian trends in linguistic and literary research. (Mathesius 1936, 145)

With his narrower pejorative name for it – "merely a Czech application" – 'transfer' is rejected in his version of things with a reference to the dumbed-down formulation, "a simple process of bringing-over" (Mathesius 1936, 145), so offensive to the Prague Linguistic Circle (Mathesius doesn't identify the sources of such disparaging comments): "[...] our foes' assertion of the simple bringing of Russian models over to us is not right" (Mathesius 1936, 145).

If not from Russian models, whence, then, did the inspiration come? Mathesius does not call into question the actual idea of takeover and amplification. However, the models he deems positive, as opposed to the Russian, are 'native' to us:

> Long before I met the young Russians, I had been sailing staunchly against the Neogrammarian tide, and as for literary studies, Mukařovský's *A Contribution on the Aesthetics of Czech Verse* (1923) suffices to provide assurance that there, too, the roots of the new scholarship spring from our native soil. (Mathesius 1936, 145)

This might seem at variance with the Circle's avowed international character, given all its foreign members and guests. But it was precisely this 'native soil' that was attractive as transfer terrain, a point frequently stressed. And then what may seem even more remarkable than Mathesius's formulations is the vehement stress on this 'native', that is, Czech, soil that recurs in the thinking of Roman Jakobson, whose biography might have led us to expect an indulgent attitude to the link between formalism and the Prague Linguistic Circle, which, after all, he himself personified. Yet it is he who ardently emphasises the influence of Durdík, Hostinský, Zich or Masaryk (see, for example, Jakobson 1931).

In his lectures on the formal school in the mid-1930s Jakobson never placed any emphasis on the tie between Prague structuralism and Russian formalism (Jakobson 1935; 2005; 2011), presenting his subject in fairly critical terms – as something *passé*, while proceeding exactly like Mathesius *vis-à-vis* the Prague Linguistic Circle, pursuing furiously the search for 'native roots' and leaving right at the margins the German analogues picked up by the Russian Rosalia Shor (1927) in her appraisal of formalism, or by the Czech Karel Svoboda (1934).

Karel Svododa was taken to task on the pages of *Slovo a slovesnost* by Frank Wollman, for whom the power of the 'native tradition' was also irrefutable:

> West-European works that affected, or might have affected, the emergence of Russian Formalism were grouped together by Karel Svoboda, in considerable detail in his article 'On the so-called formal method in literary scholarship' (Svoboda 1934, 37). Yet Svoboda does

not substantiate these influences (I doubt the young Formalists would have known about it all anyway), and quite underestimates the significance of earlier Russian scholarship, most notably the titanic presence of Veselovskii, but also [Alexandr] Potebnia, [Volodimir Mykolaiovych] Perets, [Fedor Yevgen'evich] Korsh and others. He omitted Jiří Polívka, so the beginnings of Czech Structuralism and its relationship to Russian scholarship also fell by the wayside, which is the best evidence of his failure to appreciate the growth of the most important Slavonic tradition in the scholarly treatment of literature. (Wollman 1935, 202)

Jakobson's fervency is all the more remarkable for how it reaches back to mediaeval literary landmarks while also embracing the most canonical representatives of the Russian literary canon such as Pushkin or Tolstoi. It is as if by some particular axiological value transfer was marked out as immanent, whether Russian in the case of formalism or Czech in the case of the Prague Linguistic Circle. In a lecture he gave at the Prague Linguistic Circle on 30 March 1935 (published that same year in *Slovo a slovesnost*) Wollmann also stressed 'native sources': "that foreign influences also made themselves felt is only natural, yet Russian Formalism grows out of the native scholarly tradition" (Wollmann 1935, 197) – and at the same time he uses two remarkable metaphors to define the tie between the two trends: first there is 'bridge', the bridge to the Russian tradition constructed by Alexandr Veselovskii's disciple Polívka. As a thesis it matches the genealogy of formalism as conceived by Jakobson – in his history of the formalist method he likewise ascribes a major role both to the folklorist Polívka (1858–1933) and to Veselovskii, who counts as a forerunner or prophet (he died in 1906). The second term is 'offshoot', which is a powerful botanical metaphor that assumes a very direct and predetermined connection, an offshoot being an element of vegetative propagation, part of a plant growing from a so-called parent plant before separating from it in due course and continuing to grow alone, producing in time its own offshoots, and so on and on.

Wollman's sentence using 'bridge' and 'offshoot' reads as follows:

It is that tradition to which a bridge was put in place for the benefit of Czechoslovakian scholarship by Veselovskii's oldest disciple, only recently deceased, Jiří Polívka. The offshoot of Russian Formalism on Czech soil had found the soil prepared by Polívka, for some of his students had already worked their way towards a structuralist method. (Wollmann 1935, 197)

The 'bridge' and 'offshoot' conceit thus constructs a connection – transfer – that mentions none of the active formalists or structuralists, but only their forerunners, who, while playing no explicit part in the Prague Linguistic Circle's agenda, do figure in Jakobson's thinking on formalist methodology:

> [I]t was Viktor Shklovskii's thinking about folklore (Shklovskii 1929) and that of other Russian Formalists that led to the studies of the form of Russian folk tales in which Polívka engaged (Polívka 1932, see also Jakobson 2005, 14), or: and insofar as Veselovskii is given among the pioneers of the Formalist school, the assumptions underlying this pioneering role in his case are completely different from those that apply in Potebnia's [...]. (Jakobson 2005, 46)

Perhaps the most telling terms in which the later construct of formalism–structuralism macrotransfer was, as it were, anticipated, came in Jan Mukařovský's response, on 10 December 1934, to the discussion of the methodological issues arising from his study "Polákova Vznešenost přírody" (1934, "Polák's The Nobility of Nature"). It is symptomatic that Mukařovský's formulation came not in an article or programmatic statement, but in an oral and apparently off-the-cuff contribution to a discussion which was documented internally by the Prague Linguistic Circle and published only much later:

> The term 'formalism' applies historically. It is the name given to that school of Russian scholarship which for the first time in modern literary studies focussed its research on questions of the artistic structuring of a work of poetry and made an estimable job of it. In matters of literary scholarship, the trend represented by the Prague Linguistic Circle sprang, on the one hand, from native sources and, on the other, from stimuli originating in Formalism; it itself gave itself the label of structuralism, its core concept being structure, a dynamic entity. (Mukařovský 1935, 190)

The wording "sprang [...] from stimuli originating in Formalism" clearly suggests a strong link, formalism standing here for the starting point, foundation, basis, of the speaker's own scholarly leanings. However, at the same time in 1934, Mukařovský could be quite harsh on formalism, not, though, in some impromptu comment within a debate, but in the published foreword to the thoroughly programmatic work that Shklovskii's *Theory of Prose* undeniably was; it came out in a Czech translation by Bohumil Mathesius (Shklovskii 1933) – with Mukařovský's foreword. Mukařovský (2007, 501) speaks of the "considerable delay" in the translation's appearance, which was exactly nine years, though in Western Europe Shklovskii had to wait several decades longer for a thoroughgoing reception.

In his foreword the author, paradoxically as it might seem, but typically in terms of the discourse of the period, strips Shklovskii of his formalist identity, or, more precisely, asserts that formalism was not his method, but merely the run-up to his thinking:

> However, the chief principle presently blocking our way to a proper appreciation of Shklovskii's book is its 'formalism', or, rather, its phantom formalism. We cannot forget that this label had been the battle cry when the group to which Shklovskii belonged was on

the rise and that it therefore merits the respect accorded to battalions who have seen action. But if its one-sidedness does an injustice to the cause itself – especially in the eyes of our [Czech] public, for whom the association of the word 'formalism' with Herbartian aesthetics is still alive – it has to be unmasked as a mere word: it has to be demonstrated that even at the time of its reception it did not tally with the reality. (Mukařovský 2007, 503)

Besides the main provocation – that of ridding the Shklovskii of the 1910s and 1920s of any close association with formalism – two other symptomatic facts stand out here: for one, Mukařovský links 'formalism' primarily with Herbart, hence with 'native roots', and, for the other, this identification is an injustice and also something false, something masked by a 'mere word' that should be 'unmasked'. If we do strip the 'mask' of formalism from Shklovskii's exposition, if we clear away this 'phantom' (i. e., delusion, apparition, vision, fantasy, a semblance or artificial creation of something real, a morbid figment of the imagination), which is even in Mukařovský's words "vulgarised" and a little further on described as a "superstitition" (Mukařovský 2007, 504 – be it recalled that a 'superstition' is a 'false' faith that is inconsistent with rational thought, meaning that, without rhyme or reason, it ascribes to phenomena and actions a supernatural ability to influence reality), it will be seen that Shklovskii does have something to say. According to Mukařovský, he represents "the first step in the natural progression towards overcoming the opposition between form and content as bases for understanding art" (Mukařovský 2007, 505). Then the author continues with his plea on behalf of structuralism.

7 Transmission, diffusion

A few insights in fine: the methodology of transfer is found to be appropriate at the very least because 'influence' had become, in particular, a simplifying and retrospectively constructed doctrine which even those involved in the process were at pains to deny.

A readily digestible thesis on import and export, influence and heritage gained world-wide popularity thanks to Terry Eagleton, whose book *Literary Theory: An Introduction* (1983), sold in excess of three quarters of a million copies and was translated into dozens of languages, including Arabic and Sanskrit. At the start of the 1980s, the Irish neo-Marxist, frustrated by the needless complexity of the humanities, decided to deal with literary theory in an easily accessible way and enjoyed phenomenal success with his project. When Lubomír Doležel came later to appraise Eagleton's conception of the Prague school as a period of transition, a kind of footbridge from Russian formalism to structuralism, a conception that

was ignorant of subject and was based on de Saussure, his assessment contained the phrase "ludicrous blindness" (Doležel 2006).

A second merit of transfer as the key to understanding the process we have been describing is that it is well suited to describing processes that are not entirely unidirectional and unequivocal, but ambivalent and multilateral. Macrotransfer emphasises discontinuity — the discontinuity formulated by Jakobson, Mukařovský, and Wollmann. In 1935 the latter even produced a charming instance of formulation transfer, turning Jakobson's Leninist rhetoric of 'infantile disorder' into the poetic 'baby clothes':

> [...] the Czech (or rather Czecho-Russian) Structuralists, ex-Formalists, looked upon the original Formalism as an evolutionary phase that was now passé, as 'baby clothes that they had outgrown' (Jakobson), and so did the Russian Formalists themselves, not one of whom was still flying their original colours [...] (Wollman 1935, 197)

Microtransfer simultaneously makes possible an unlimited amount of relevant, mostly explicitly named lines of transfer that get composed into a kind of – productively cacophonic – symphony of manifold theoretical inspirations and irritations. This would embrace all Russian and Czech native 'roots' – and a vast range of non-native impulses — German researchers into form (Heymann Steinthal, Eduard Sievers and many others), French theorists (such as Ferdinand Brunetière's *Évolution des genres dans l'histoire de la littérature*, *1890*, *Evolution of genres in the history of literature* [Wollman 1935, 196]), de Saussure of course, phenomenologists (Holenstein 1975) and others.

Transfer as a transmission or diffusion, in our case of values, says nothing as to either the outcome or the quality and intensity of the process that it describes. And therein lies its challenge.

Translated from Czech by David Short

References

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. "Problema soderzhaniia, materiala i formy v slovesnom khudozhestvennom tvorchestve." [1924] Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *Voprosy literatury i estetiki*. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia Literatura, 1975. 6–71.

Bal, Mieke. *Travelling Concepts in the Humanities: A Rough Guide*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002.

Čermák, Jan, Petr Čermák, and Claudio Poeta (eds.). *Pražský lingvistický kroužek v dokumentech*. Prague: Academia, 2012.

Derrida, Jacques. *L'écriture et la différence*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1967a.

Derrida, Jacques. *De la grammatologie*. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit, 1967b.

Doležel, Lubomír. "Zahájení kolokvia." *Český strukturalismus po poststrukturalismu*. Ed. Ondřej Sládek. Prague: Host, 2006. 23–24.

Eagleton, Terry. *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1983.

Ėikhenbaum, Boris (Boris Eichenbaum). *Aufsätze zur Theorie und Geschichte der Literatur*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1965.

Erlich, Victor. *Russian Formalism: History, Doctrine*. The Hague: Mouton, 1955.

Espagne, Michel, and Michael Werner. "Deutsch-französischer Kulturtransfer im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert: Zu einem neuen interdisziplinären Forschungsprogramm des C.N.R.S." *Francia* 13 (1985): 502–510.

Glanc, Tomáš, and Igor' Pil'shchikov. "Russkie formalisty kak nauchnoe soobshchestvo." *'Ėpokha ostraneniia': Russkii formalizm i sovremennoe gumanitarnoe znanie*. Eds. Jan Levchenko and Igor' Pil'shchikov. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2017. 87–100.

Gor'kii, Maksim [Gorky, Maksim]. "O formalizme." *Pravda* 99 (9 April 1936). http://gorkiy-lit.ru/gorkiy/articles/article-86.htm (22 February 2022).

Hansen-Löve, Aage A. *Der russische Formalismus: Methodologische Rekonstruktion seiner Entwicklung aus dem Prinzip der Verfremdung*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1978.

Holenstein, Elmar. *Roman Jakobsons phänomenologischer Strukturalismus*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1975.

"Influence." *Oxfordify Dictionary*. https://www.oxfordify.com/meaning/influence (22 February 2022).

Jakobson, Roman. "Jazykové problémy v Masarykově díle." *Masaryk a řeč*. Ed. Pražský lingvistický kroužek. Prague, 1931. 29–47.

Jakobson, Roman. "Zur Struktur des russischen Verbums." *Charisteria Guilelemo Mathesio quinquagenario: a discipulis et Circuli Linguistici Pragiensis*. Ed. Pražský lingvistický kroužek. Prague, 1932. 74–84.

Jakobson, Roman. "Jan Patočka: From the Curriculum Vitae of a Czech Philosopher." *The New Republic* 126.19 (1977): 26–28.

Jakobson, Roman. "Einstein and the Science of Language." *Einstein and Humanism: A Selection of Six Papers from the Jerusalem Einstein Centennial Symposium*. New York, NY: Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies, 1982. 129–144.

Jakobson, Roman. "Přípitek." [1969] Roman Jakobson, *Poetická funkce*. Prague: H+H, 1996.

Jakobson, Roman. *Formalistická škola a dnešní literární věda ruská* [1935]. Prague: Academia, 2005.

Jakobson, Roman. *Formal'naia shkola i sovremennoe russkoe literaturovedenie*. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kul'tur, 2011.

Karcz, Andrzej. *The Polish Formalist School and Russian Formalism*. New York, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2002.

Karstens, Bart. "The impact of Russian formalism on linguistic structuralism." *Form and formalism in linguistics*. Ed. James McElvenny. Berlin: Language Science Press, 2019. 115–139.

Kruchenykh, A., and R. Aliagrov (Roman Jakobson). *Zaumnaia gniga* [Tsvetnye linograviury O. Rozanovoi]. Moscow: Tip. I. Rabotnova, 1915–1916.

Kříž, Michal. *Boj o strukturalismus: Archeologie českého literárněvědného strukturalismu*. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého, 2012.

Lampman, R. J. "Transfer Payments." *The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1987. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-349-95121-5_1755-1 (22 February 2022).

Lemon, Lee T. and Marion J. Reis (eds.). *Russian Formalist Criticism: Four Essays*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1965.

Lenin, V. I. *Detskaia bolezn' 'levizny' v kommunizme*. Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo, 1920.

Matějka, Ladislav. "Sociologické zájmy Pražské školy." *Český strukturalismus v diskusi*. Ed. Ondřej Sládek. Brno: Host, 2014. 13–22.

Mathesius, Vilém. "Deset let Pražského linguistického kroužku." *Slovo a slovesnost* 2.3 (1936): 137–145.

Mencák, Břetislav. "O sporu dvou estetik." Týdeník *Čin* VI. 1934. 1058–1061.

Mukařovský Jan. "Polákova Vznešenost přírody." *Sborník filologický* X.1 (1934): 68.

Mukařovský, Jan. "Strukturalismus v estetice a ve vědě o literatuře" [1940–1941]. Jan Mukařovský, *Studie I*. Eds. Miroslav Červenka and Milan Jankovič. Brno: Host, 2007.

Mukařovský, Jan. "Přednášky v Praž. ling. kroužku v listopadu a v prosinci 1934." *Slovo a slovesnost* 1.3 (1935): 190.

Polívka, Jiří. *Slovanské pohádky I*. Prague: Slovanský ústav, 1932.

Pomorska, Krystyna. "Poetics of Prose." *Verbal Art, Verbal Sign, Verbal Time*. Eds. Roman Jakobson, Krystyna Pomorska, and Stephen Rudy. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1985. 169.

Pomorska, Krystyna. *Russian Formalist Theory and Its Poetic Ambiance*. The Hague: Mouton, 1968.

Protiv formalizma i naturalizma v iskusstve: *Sbornik statei*. Moscow: OGIZ – IZOGIZ, 1937.

Shklovskii, Viktor B. *Sentimentale Reise*. Trans. by Ruth-Elisabeth Riedt and Gisela Drohla. Frankfurt/M.: Insel Verlag, 1964.

Shklovskii, Viktor B. *Zoo oder Briefe nicht über die Liebe*. Trans. by Alexander Kaempfe. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1965.

Shklovskii, Viktor B. *Schriften zum Film*. Trans. by Alexander Kaempfe. Frankfurt/M.: Fischer, 1966.

Shklovskii, Viktor B. *Theorie der Prosa*. Trans. by Gisela Drohla. Frankfurt/M.: Fischer, 1966.

Shklovskii, Viktor B. *O teorii prozy*. Moscow: Federaciia, 1929.

Shklovskii [Šklovskij], Viktor B. *Teorie prózy*. Trans. by Bohumil Mathesius. Prague: Melantrich, 1933.

Shor, Rosalia: "Formal'nyi metod na zapade: shkola Zeiferta i 'ritoricheskoe napravlenie'." *Ars Poetica: Sborniki podsektsii teoreticheskoi poètiki. Sbornik nauchnykh trudov*. Moscow: Gos. akademiia khudozhestvennykh nauk, 1927. 127–143.

Štoll, Ladislav. *O tvar a strukturu v slovesném umění*. Prague: Academia, 1966.

Striedter, Jurij (ed.). *Russischer Formalismus*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1971.

Svoboda, Karel. "O tak zvané formální metodě v literární vědě." *Naše Věda* XV (1934): 37–45.

Thompson, Ewa. *Russian Formalism and Anglo-American New Criticism*. The Hague: Mouton, 1971.

Todorov, Tzvetan (ed.). *Théorie de la littérature: Textes des formalistes russes réunis, présentés et traduits par Tzvetan Todorov*. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1965.

"Transfer." *Oxfordify Dictionary*. https://www.oxfordify.com/meaning/transfer (22 February 2022).

Trotskii, Lev. "Formal'naia shkola poèzii i marksizm." *Pravda* 166 (26 July 1923).

Trotskii, Lev. "Formal'naia shkola poèzii i marksizm." Lev Trotskii, *Literatura i revoliutsiia* [1923]. Moscow: Politizdat, 1991. 130–145.

Tynianov, Iurii [Jurij Tynjanov]. *Die literarischen Kunstmittel und die Evolution in der Literatur*. Ed. Alexander Kaempfe. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1967.

Volek, Emil. "Jan Mukařovský redivivus: Co zůstalo z tradice a dědictví pražské školy?" *Český strukturalismus po poststrukturalismu*. Ed. Ondřej Sládek. Brno: Host, 2006. 32–41.

Voloshinov, V. N. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. Trans. Ladislav Matejka and I. R. Titunik. Cambridge, MA, and London: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Wellek, René, and Austin Warren. *Theory of Literature*. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1949.

Wellek, René. *The Literary Theory and Aesthetics of the Prague School*. Ann Arbor, MI: Department of Slavic Languages and Literature of the University of Michigan, 1969.

Werner, Michael, and Bénédicte Zimmermann. "Vergleich, Transfer, Verflechtung: Der Ansatz der Histoire croisée und die Herausforderung des Transnationalen." *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 28 (2002): 607–636.

Wollman, Frank. "Věda o slovesnosti: Její vývoj a poměr k sousedním vědám." *Slovo a slovesnost* 1.4 (1935): 197–202.

Irina Wutsdorff

Approaches to an Anthropologically-Oriented Theory of Literature and Culture in the Czech Avant-Garde and the Aesthetics of Prague Structuralism

1 The development of the concept of function in the Avant-Garde context

Function is one of the central concepts of the Czech Avant-Garde of the 1920s, 1930s and 1940s. On the one hand, it was discussed in the context of functionalist architecture (theory), while on the other hand the concept became first a linguistic and then later a largely anthropological model in the works of Prague structuralism. Particularly in the works of Jan Mukařovský, the close connection between general functional thinking, theory and criticism of (functionalist) architecture and the development of a functional aesthetics becomes clear. All three areas are subject to Mukařovský's basic assumption of a polyfunctionality inherent to man; he postulates that man always realises himself vis-à-vis his environment in several respects and not only with a single purpose, that is, in monofunctional fashion. It was not only Mukařovský who thought about function, functionality and hence concrete architectural functionalism by taking man as his point of departure; the anthropological concept of function was a specific feature of the Czech discussions on a concept that was of great importance in all European Avant-Gardes of art theory and practice (cf. Günther 1989, who compares the aesthetic-philosophical treatment of the concept of function in Mukařovský and the linguistic theory of the Formalist School and Iurii Tynianov's terminology in the field of literary studies).

The intellectual achievement of the mature Prague structuralism (cf. Mukařovský 1978c [1946]), building on the premise of the anthropologically-rooted concept of constantly reciprocal functions, was to think of structure also as a system of reciprocal influences and, moreover, as a process of dynamic development. With the concept of function, the representatives of Prague structuralism worked not only in the fields of linguistics and literary studies, but also in what today we would call cultural studies: for instance, Roman Jakobson and Petr Bogatyrev (1966 [1929]) used the concept in the field of ethnology. Prague structuralism was thus part of the scholarly discourse of the age in which function was a leading concept in such diverse disciplines as mathematics, (neo-Kantian)

philosophy, functional psychology and sociology (cf. Steiner et al. 1972). In the field of philosophy, mention must be made of the Marburg School; the works of Ernst Cassirer on *Substanzbegriff und Funktionsbegriff* (1910, *The Concepts of Substance and Function*) and the *Philosophie der symbolischen Formen* 1–3 (1923, 1925, 1929, *Philosophy of Symbolic Forms* 1–3) were of particular importance. With their search for laws behind human actions and creation, both the Czech Structural School and (architectural) functionalism are also part of a tendency characteristic of the humanities and the social sciences in the first third of the twentieth century to follow the model of the natural sciences with its concepts of testability (e. g. the verification or falsification of hypotheses). It is particularly in this respect that Prague structuralism follows on from Russian formalism. A characteristic feature of the Czech variant is, however, that in searching for basic laws it stresses their systematic character and that the focal point of these reflections is man. In this sense, function is no longer merely an object's purpose determined by abstraction from unnecessary clutter – the Czech representatives of both the artistic and the architectural Avant-Garde were quick to oppose this monofunctionalist idea. Rather, it is man's constant manifold reference to his environment. Function, writes Mukařovský (2000 [1946]), is not to be thought of in terms of the object, but in terms of man. For Mukařovský, this anthropological foundation to the system of functions also provides the basis for considering art as an autonomous aesthetic phenomenon *and* as a social factor: art is not the reflection of societal conditions, nor does it directly influence them. Indeed, for Mukařovský the trademark of aesthetic function is that it directly refers not to a slice of reality, but to man's attitude to reality as a whole; if, however, the polyfunctionality inherent to man is thereby to become the yardstick, the very autonomy of the aesthetic sign guarantees its social potential. Both the focus on man's basic anthropological constants and the ostensibly paradoxical connection between the autonomy and the emancipatory effect of art are central points of the debate both in the nascent literary and cultural theory of Prague structuralism and in (Avant-Garde) artistic and architectural practice. These discussions are combined and concentrated in the concept of function.

For instance, the main theorist of the Czech Avant-Garde, Karel Teige, (especially in his manifesto *Poetismus* [1924, *Poetism*, 2002a]) uses the complementary principles of contructivism and poetism to develop a complementary model of culture that embraces the rational and functional conditions of modern civilisation (constructivism) while at the same time emphasising its need to be complemented by non-rational, creative, imaginative moments (poetism); a dignified life is to be made possible by equal consideration of both aspects.

Teige also seeks to preserve the parallel observation of the principles of poetism and constructivism with respect to functionality or utility. He defines

both areas in reference to man: functional is defined as whatever corresponds to man's needs. In architecture, the field Teige uses to illustrate the principle of constructivism (cf. Teige 2000), "*man is the measure for tailors*. He is, then, the stylistic principle that underlies all architecture" (Teige 2002b [1925], 586). In art, the core area for the application of the poetistic principle, the functionality of a work of art can be judged on the basis of the degree to which it is able to stimulate people's sensibilities.

The emancipatory function that the aesthetic function fulfils precisely due its purposelessness – as in Mukařovský's (later) conception – when it confronts man with his inherent polyfunctionality is already evident in Teige's rejection of proletarian tendentious art. For Teige, purposeful art is precisely that art that is without purpose, that without any revolutionary content is able to appeal to man's creative side and thereby liberate more than merely his senses (cf. Teige 1972 [1925], 195).

Admittedly, Teige's intellectual development from advocating proletarian tendentious art prior to 1922, that is, his defining avant-gardism in terms of art's social commitment, towards the poetist call for art whose avant-gardism lies in its following its own laws, is not without its contradictions (cf. Zusi 2008). Before writing his "Poetism" manifesto (1924), Teige had already rejected proletarian art by using the concept of function to justify his idea of art that derives its revolutionary potential from its very avoidance of ideological content, from its concentration on its own laws. This is the only way art can make its specific contribution to a comprehensive liberation of man; it is only as autonomous art that it can fulfil its emancipatory function, namely stimulating man's sensibility with specifically artistic devices, a process of sensory stimulation Teige increasingly thinks of in physiological categories. The only art he considers purposeful in this sense is "pure" art in its diverse manifestations, and hence he devotes much thought to the individual genres and their specific and hence "pure" means of expression, proclaiming for all genres the ideal of "pure poetry" (Teige 2002a [1924], 581). This term does not refer to the literary genre, but to the poetic or poetist mode he demands of modern art: the stimulation of the senses (including physiological stimulation) by the appropriate technical mastery of the respective material. The purist tendency evident in Teige's search for the specific means of expression inherent to each genre is also characteristic of his observations on architecture.

Even if Teige becomes entangled in aporias due to the sheer range of his conceptional terms and his tendency for puristic thinking in antinomies, his terminology often becoming imprecise, much of his thinking anticipates the intellectual movements Mukařovský was later able to capture systematically with his functional anthropology and aesthetics. For instance, Mukařovský also contests the artistic character of architecture because it can never permit the aesthetic

function to dominate (since this, he observes, echoing Teige, would transform an architectural creation into a sculpture; cf. Mukařovský 1978c [1937], 246), but he rejects the idea of architecture as a science. In this respect, it is certainly no coincidence that Mukařovský's statement on this subject, his study "Člověk ve světě funkcí" (1946, "Man in the World of Functions"), forms the preface to Karel Honzík's late avant-gardist book project *Tvorba životního slohu* (1946, *The Creation of a Lifestyle*). In this work, which offers a comprehensive blueprint of a lifestyle that does justice to 'modern' man and his 'real' needs, the original idea of functionalism reaches what Mukařovský calls a "consistent and developmentally inevitable conclusion" (Mukařovský 2000 [1946], 59).

In his study *K problému funkcí v architektuře* (1937, *On the Problem of Functions in Architecture*, 1978d), Mukařovský had warned against deriving the function of a building from a single given purpose. He recognises an association between the problem of function and the problem of the sign in the fact that a thing not only serves to fulfil certain functions with which it is applied to reality, but also determines these functions. As in the case of the sign, a distinction must be made between a structure of functions rooted in the collective conscious and a structure of functions given new and diverging shape by the actions of the individual. Here we can recognise the critical connection between Prague structuralism and de Saussure's distinction between *langue* and *parole*, since in relation to the historical transformations in the formation of structures, Mukařovský accentuates not the abstract rulebook, but the dynamics of their application: "Hence we have arrived at a view of functions as a historically changeable structure of forces governing man's entire attitude toward reality" (Mukařovský 1978d [1937], 237–238).

For Mukařovský, the analogous observation of function and sign leads to the realisation that the functions the producer and user of a product of human activity ascribe to it can differ due to the fact that every action contains several and potentially even all of the functions rooted in man's anthropological nature (cf. Mukařovský 1978d [1937], 237–238). Architecture in particular is a prime example of such multifunctional production, and Mukařovský concludes his analysis with the observation that it "always appeals to man in his entirety, to all the components of his existence" (Mukařovský 1978d [1937], 243). This becomes apparent in the aesthetic function, which always steps in whenever practical functions retreat. As the dialectical negation of functionality par excellence and unlike the other, always purposeful functions, it is autotelic insofar as it renders the thing in which it is manifested a purpose in itself. Mukařovský provides the example of ruins which, having lost their practical function, are frequently considered beautiful.

Mukařovský develops the anthropological basis of his functional model with even greater clarity with respect to "The Place of the Aesthetic Function among the

Other Functions" (1978 f [1942], "Místo estetické funkce mezi ostatními"; on the status of the concept of aesthetic functions within Mukařovský's structural aesthetics, cf. also the foundational study by Chvatík 2001, especially pages 65–73). Here, he again explicitly distinguishes between his concept of function from that of "original [...] architectural functionalism" (Mukařovský 1978 f [1942], 37), which he claims is based on the false assumption "that a building has a single, precisely delimited function given by the purpose for which it is built" (Mukařovský 1978 f [1942], 37). Mukařovský now calls for the perspective to be reversed: functions are to be determined not by looking at the object, but from the viewpoint of the subject. It will then become clear, he argues, that monofunctionality cannot exist: "No sphere of human action or human creation is limited to a single function. There is always a greater number of functions, and there are tensions, variances, and balancing among them" (Mukařovský 1978 f [1942], 37).

Here, Mukařovský defines function thus: "A function is the mode of a subject's self-realisation vis-à-vis the external world" (Mukařovský 1978 f [1942], 40). This definition is phenomenological insofar as it refers to man's conscious attitude. Moreover, it also contains the thesis that the ways in which man influences his environment are always forms of self-realisation too. This gives rise to an ideal yardstick: man is by his very nature polyfunctional, able to realise himself vis-à-vis the world around him in different ways. Historically speaking, the different functions only became differentiated in the course of cultural development; Mukařovský sees the tendency for monofunctionalism in the technology of the machine, which amounts to a deforming reduction of human nature.

For Mukařovský, however, one can assume a "basic polyfunctionality of human activity and the basic omnipresence of functions" (Mukařovský 1978 f [1942], 37). In his model, the aesthetic function is assigned the role of constantly reacquainting man with his (actual) polyfunctional nature. It is able to do this because, unlike the other functions, it does not refer directly to an excerpt of reality but points to reality as a whole via the aesthetic sign:

> For the aesthetic function, reality is not an immediate object but a mediated one. Its immediate object (hence not an instrument at all) is an aesthetic sign which projects onto reality as a general law the subject's attitude realized in the structure of this sign that nevertheless does not lose its independence. The aesthetic sign manifests its independence by always referring to reality as a whole, never to one of its individual segments. (Mukařovský 1978 f [1942], 43)

The reference to reality as a whole is bound up with man's self-realisation insofar as reflection of this reality as a whole is "organized in an aesthetic sign according to the image of the subject's organization" (Mukařovský 1978 f [1942], 42). However, it is via the aesthetic sign-ness of the artwork that man is made aware of

his participation in universal human existence. The ideal of man's polyfunctional self-realisation thus becomes the yardstick of his individual attitude towards reality.

Scholarship has often emphasised that by combining the artwork's autonomous and anthropological-social dimensions, Mukařovský essentially sought to connect the 'formal' Kantian and the 'content-based' Hegelian tradition of aesthetics (see for instance Günther 1973, 11; cf. also Zima 1995, 173–201). His form-oriented analyses, drawing on Russian formalism and Czech formism (herbatism), are an attempt to explain both the general specifics of the aesthetic and the historical and social transformation to which the idea of the aesthetic is subject.

Regarding the latter issue, Mukařovský was able to draw conceptually on the observations of the Russian formalists: in the course of his focus on problems of literary evolution, Tynianov (1967 [1927], 8) had distinguished between the synfunction of an element within the construction of its respective synchronous system and the autofunction as its correlation to a series of analogous elements of other systems, and hence with respect to diachronic series of developments; in the *Theses* he created together with Roman Jakobson during his stay in Prague in 1928, he had called for consideration to be given to the reciprocal relationship between systems and their evolutions and – in analogy to Saussure's distinction between *langue* and *parole* – between (literary) utterances and existing norm complexes, and ultimately demanded examination of the structural laws governing the correlation between literary and other historical series (cf. Jakobson and Tynianov 1995 [1928]). Mukařovský's observations on sociohistorical transformation underpinning the assessments of aesthetic function (cf. Mukařovský 1970 [1936], 1978a [1939], 1978e [1937]), aesthetic norms and aesthetic value were able to take up this approach.

However, the functional concept proves central not only to Mukařovský's consideration of sociohistorical processes within the system of structural thinking, but also to his integration of a dialectical element in his thought. For unlike the formalists, Mukařovský did not just consider the specificity of poetic language merely in opposition to everyday language, from which it is distinguished by the "set toward" expression, as Jakobson succinctly put it; first, in Russian as "ustanovka na vyrazhenie" (Jakobson 1979 [1919], 305), then later in English as "set [*Einstellung*] toward the MESSAGE as such" (Jakobson 1981 [1958], 25). Drawing on Bühler's communications scheme, with which he supplements aesthetic function in order to apply it to the situation of aesthetic communication, Mukařovský lends Jakobson's theory of the self-referentiality of the aesthetic sign a dialectical foundation:

> The aesthetic function which is the cause of this reflexiveness of linguistic activity has appeared in our analysis as the omnipresent dialectic negation of the three basic communicative functions of language, and thereby as a necessary addition to Bühler's scheme. (Mukařovský 1977 [1936], 71)

Mukařovský also retains the concept of the aesthetic function's dialectical negation of the other functions in the later model of functions he further developed into an anthropology. The crucial element is that the aesthetic function is not restricted to the field of art, but is potentially omnipresent, while, conversely, in the work of art the other and hence also the practical functions are also present in addition to the aesthetic function, which by definition dominates. That those functions that always refer directly and functionally to a certain excerpt of reality are dialectically negated by the aesthetic function, which, in contrast, is without purpose, does not mean that they are suppressed or overcome; rather, their diversity is accentuated:

> If the aesthetic function does not tend to any practical aim, this does not mean that it will obstruct the contact of art with the vital interests of man. Precisely because it lacks unequivocal "content," the aesthetic function becomes "transparent" and does not act inimically to the other functions but helps them. If other "practical" functions compete with one another when they are juxtaposed and strive to dominate one another, exhibiting a tendency toward functional specialization (toward monofunctionality, which culminates in the machine), then it is precisely because of the aesthetic function that art tends toward as rich and as many-sided a poly-functionality as possible, without, at the same time, preventing the work of art from having a social effect. (Mukařovský 1978c [1946], 12)

Hans Günther has fittingly summarised this position as the "idea of the humanising polyfunctionality of the aesthetic function" (Günther 1973, 30). The emancipatory potential of the works and their holistic reference to life is thus rooted in the complex structure with which they unite the reference to diverse practical functions to an entirely contradictory whole, a whole that is always in a dynamic process due to its inherent tensions and thus demands an active stance on the part of the recipient.

2 On the reception and non-reception of Prague literary-theoretical structuralism

The reception history of the model of a literary theory rooted in anthropology proposed principally by Jan Mukařovský has remained a history of non-reception for a remarkably long time. There are various reasons for this, largely connected

to the political situation and the related publishing restrictions, but also to what sometimes appears to be the unsystematic nature of Mukařovský's writing on the matter. Both factors particularly apply to the essay that might have provided the most points of contact and the greatest stimulus for literary-theoretical developments in Western academia, namely reception theory, but also post-structuralism: Mukařovský's treatise on "Záměrnost a nezáměrnost v umění" (1943, "Intentionality and Unintentionality in Art", 1978b). Written as early as 1943, a paper for the Prague Linguistic Circle (given on 26 May 1943), it is thus from the time Oleg Sus (1997 [1971]) looks back on as the most open phase in Mukařovský's thinking, when he practised "Otevírání struktur" (1971, "Opening of the Structures"). However, the essay was not published until 1966, in *Studie z estetiky* (*Studies in Aesthetics*), a volume that was able to appear under the then loosened (cultural-) political conditions of the Prague Spring. It was by no means a matter of course that Mukařovský published this collection of studies clearly belonging to the structuralist paradigm, which he had thitherto kept at home and only some of which had appeared previously. For after the communists took power in 1948, Mukařovský had renounced the structuralist positions officially reviled as 'formalistic' and switched to a Marxist interpretation he attempted to justify using his earlier positions. Paradoxically, it was 1948 of all years that presented him with the opportunity to do this when he wrote a new foreword to the second edition of his collection of essays that had originally appeared in 1941 under the title *Kapitoly z české poetiky* (*Chapters in Czech Poetics*). Here he supplemented the description of his own scholarly development provided in the foreword to the first edition with a "convergence towards dialectical materialism" (Mukařovský 1948, Vol. 1, 12) that had taken place earlier but which he had not been able to mention under national socialist occupation. In fact, Mukařovský had strikingly contextualised the ideas of the aesthetic subject to historical transformations in the collective conscious of their respective eras in his 1936 monograph *Estetická funkce, norma a hodnota jako sociální fakty* (*Aesthetic Function, Norm and Value as Social Facts*, 1970), thereby associating questions of general aesthetics with those of sociology. Moreover, the studies collected in *Chapters in Czech Poetics* that Mukařovský republished in 1948 can by and large be attributed to the phase in his "creative process" predating what Oleg Sus identifies as a "transition from more or less closed to open research on structure" (Sus 1997 [1971], 121). However, in the period between the end of World War II and the communist takeover in 1948, Mukařovský then returned to the more closed conception of structure which includes the relationist understanding of aesthetic function as dependent on respective social contexts published in 1936 (cf. Sus 1997 [1971], 124) – perhaps also because such a conception seemed more compatible with the Marxist ideas towards which he was increasingly leaning.

Mukařovský's increasing gravitation towards Marxist positions finally culminated in his renouncing his earlier positions in the prevailing Stalinist spirit of 1951. In a retrospective, Miroslav Červenka, a proponent of what is generally known as the third generation of Prague structuralism, clearly articulated the traumatic consequences this had for Mukařovský's disciples (cf. Červenka 1999, 313). Paradoxically however, this break with structuralism created a secure space under the safety of his institutional leadership within which this generation of scholars was able to produce the work that could bring about a structuralist revival in the 1960s – until the defeat of the Prague Spring put an end to it:

> By renouncing his former opinions in the early 1950s, Mukařovský retained in various institutions his prominent position, justified, paradoxically, by the very work he himself had rejected. The internal contradiction for us is that Mukařovský's self-denial became one of the factors enabling the existence of a scholarly enclave in which part of our generation of literary scholars grew up. (Červenka 1999, 313)

For Červenka, that this generation "revived Structuralism in the 1960s", with the effect that it "became a theoretical basis for the then ongoing self-liberation of culture, independent of the narrow anti-dogmatism and the Reform Communism permeated with ideologies", was in part due to Mukařovský's "publishing his significant, previously unpublished, earlier works whose existence we did not even suspect" (Červenka 1999, 313–314).

Beyond all the upheavals caused by Mukařovský's officious departure from structuralism in the early 1950s, it led to a belated, or indeed obstructed reception of the structuralist works he had written in his 'open' phase of the first half of the 1940s. This initially applies to domestic reception, these works only becoming available to his disciples twenty years later, in the 1960s. For instance, Milan Jankovič was not able to tap the potential of Mukařovský's observations on the intentional and the unintentional, on the work of art as a sign and as a thing before 1968, in his study *Dílo jako dění smyslu* (*The Work as a Semantic Process*). However, while this study was ready to go to print in 1969, it was no longer able to appear after the defeat of the Prague Spring. These circumstances too distorted the reception of what was probably the most innovative phase in Mukařovský's thinking, since Jankovič's study could only be published officially in 1992. Milan Jankovič later observed the extent to which domestic reception and discussion was subsequently inhibited by the political repressions by pointing out that questions "remained without answers, since there was nowhere to make them public". The "foreign context" was a "certain substitute", but was not able to replace the "lively exchange of thoughts" of "the sixties" (Jankovič 2005d [1993], 319).

Jankovič made these remarks – again with a delay of over twenty years, due to the political circumstances – in reaction to Oleg Sus's extremely critical assess-

ment marking the eightieth birthday of Academy Member Jan Mukařovský that had been able to appear in 1971, in the journal *Slovenská literatúra* (*Slovak literature*). Sus examined the various phases in Mukařovský's thought in terms of their respective conceptions of the category of structure, placing particular emphasis on those very phases in the first half of the 1940s concerned with "Opening of the Structures" in which he claimed Mukařovský had sought to "penetrate the boundaries of the relativism and sociologism of aesthetic value that still existed then and, indirectly, function too, by pointing to its anthropological constitution." (Sus 1997 [1971], 122)

> Thus the category of structure also becomes a kind of focus collecting and concentrating the shifts in Jan Mukařovský's thinking – in his poetics, in universal literary theory and in aesthetics. The differentiating potential of this noetic fulcrum is itself subject to transformations or fluctuations, new adaptations and recourse to original points of departure. And it is here that we can find the striking traits characteristic of theory itself, of its 'energetic' plasticity, of that opening and filling of the structures with which the internal characteristics of Jan Mukařovský's work is almost essentially connected via its intersections. (Sus 1997 [1971], 117)

In this overview of Mukařovský's works, Sus criticised with remarkable clarity the fact that after 1945, in his later structuralist works already displaying Marxist leanings, he withdrew behind the anthropologically-oriented ideas and problematisations of the early forties instead of pursuing them further in order to later conceptually expand them.

> However, as his essays, articles and treatises published after 1945 and together with them the second edition of Chapters of Czech Poetics (1948) demonstrate, Mukařovský did not undertake systematic reconstruction of the conceptual system, and some intersections of his universal conception in which he had actually already prepared certain premises lacked the development of an intellectual concept. [...] Hence a few years later, the preceding insights gained from a certain anthropologisation of Structuralism were not always employed where they could have come into their own. It would appear that between 1945 and 1948 Mukařovský's concepts and his methodology become stabilised, roughly in the sense that the final phase of his structural aesthetics also immediately reproduces his original theoretical premises in concentrated form, premises that were deepened and had undergone development [...]. (Sus 1997 [1971], 124–125)

Sus had thus recognised the shifts in the phases of Mukařovský's thought early on and very perceptively – albeit in an essay that remained isolated within the Czech- and Slovak-speaking world. It was not until 1997 that both Sus' essay (of 1971) and Jankovič's belated response to it (of 1993) appeared in German translation in the volume *Prager Schule: Kontinuität und Wandel* (1997, *The Prague School: Continuity and Transformation*) edited by Wolfgang Schwarz in collaboration with

Jiří Holý and Milan Jankovič – a volume intended to introduce the Prague School as a "source of inspiration [...], a legacy that is certainly not uniform and at times even displays contradictions" (Schwarz et al. 1997, vii). If the domestic reception of Mukařovský's structuralist positions 'open' to an anthropological dimension were limited due to their delayed publication, but also due to their renouncement in the essays he produced later (but before turning to Marxism), this applies even more so to perceptions abroad.

A telling example is provided by Konstanz aesthetics of reception: although the focus on questions of literature and anthropology and the approaches towards reception theory would have offered them plenty of connections, this was not recognised until much later, essentially not until Milan Jankovič's studies in the 2000s (collected and republished in Jankovič 2015), in which he compared his model of *Dílo jako dění smyslu* (1992, *The Work as a Process of Meaning*), which he had developed as a continuation of Mukařovský's thought on 'open' structures, with more recent models of different provenance, such as Konstanz reception theory (but also that of Paul Ricoeur). The publication of Mukařovský's *Studies in Aesthetics* roughly coincided with the development of reception theory in Konstanz. And it occurred during a time of intensive translation work: German Mukařovský anthologies appeared 1967, 1970 and 1974, although only the volume from 1974 included his essay on the intentional and the unintentional in art, which is so central to the phase in his thinking extended to questions of anthropology and the status of reception.

An important step in this process was the translation of a selection of Felix Vodička's works from his volume *Struktura vývoje* (1969, *The Structure of Development*), which were published in 1976 under the title *Die Struktur der Literarischen Entwicklung* (1976, *The Structure of Literary Development*) by the Research Group for Structural Methods in Linguistics and Literature Studies at the University of Konstanz. The essays are prefaced by an extensive, heavy introduction by Jurij Striedter running to almost 100 pages, first containing his observations "Zum Verhältnis von tschechischem Struktralismus zu russischem Formalismus" followed by "Zu Felix Vodičkas Theorie der 'Konkretisation' als Teil einer strukturalistischen Literaturgeschichte" (both of which he later integrates as the individual chapters "From Russian Formalism to Czech Structuralism" and "Felix Vodička's Theory of Reception and Structuralist Literary History" in the book *Literary Structure, Evolution and Value. Russian Formalism and Czech Structuralism Reconsidered*, already written in America in 1989). Striedter explicitly points out the "proximity to the contemporary historico-hermeneutic theory of reception and to the contemporary branch of literary history oriented to the aesthetics of reception" (Striedter 1989, 144), first discussed in Konstanz, which had however been "conceived [...] without knowledge of the Czech Structuralism theory of reception"

(Striedter 1989, 144–145). Beyond the "extensive systematic analogies", he finds it worth noting that "Jauss, like the Prague Structuralists, developed his conception of literary perception and evolution while working directly with tenets and theorems [...] of both Russian Formalism and Marxist literary theory and criticism" (Striedter 1989, 145). Striedter thereby takes up Vodička's version of the "Development of Theoretical Thinking in the Work of Jan Mukařovský" in the very same book (Vodička 1976) to which Striedter is writing his introduction. In this chapter, written in 1966, Vodička certainly does discuss Mukařovský's recently published studies on aesthetics, unlike Striedter referring explicitly to those which Sus later described as 'open'. He nevertheless reads them – in the publishing context of the time in Czechoslovakia – with a focus emphasising their compatability with Marxist positions:

> Mukařovský, who had been finding common ground with Marxism through his conception of aesthetics as a social fact, was now further reconciling with it on the basis of his anthropological premise when examining the forms of objectification to which man was subject, while asserting his entire human versatility to the world. (Vodička 1998, 479)

The anthropological dimension in Mukařovský's thought of the early 1940s thus appears as an accessory or precursor to his Marxist ideas – whereby the stimulus it might have offered Konstanz's then nascent field of research on literature and anthropology was not so much stated as hidden.

In discussions in Konstanz, however, Striedter clearly made Iser and Jauss aware of the parallels between their approaches and those of Prague structuralism. Of course, further 'analogies' consisted in the modification of Ingarden's concept of indefiniteness by both Vodička and Iser in their work on reception theory. In Jauss, many footnotes express thanks to Striedter for his pointers. However, both authors only explicitly cite Mukařovský's earlier essays, especially the study on aesthetic function, norm and aesthetic value as social facts (from 1936). Another factor was probably that René Wellek – enjoying the authority of a former member of the Prague Linguistic Circle, albeit with clearly critical undertones – had also claimed that this "pamphlet [...] provides the best statement of the theory" (Wellek 1970, 290). He had added the criticism that in concluding that "The work of art [...] is ultimately an assembly of extra-aesthetic values and nothing but such an assembly", Mukařovský had reached a point where "aesthetics is asked to commit suicide" (Wellek 1970, 290). In a critical response in 1935, Wellek had already pointed to the limitations of an approach that failed to consider the "relation to the personality of the artist [...] and the question of a world view implied in works of art which is not a mere intellectual doctrine or statement" (Wellek 1970, 291–292). His own stance, as expressed in the *Theory of Literature* he wrote with Austin Warren in 1949, was characterised by the attempt

"to bring together the insights I had required as a junior member of the Circle with my new knowledge of American criticism" (Wellek 1970, 276). In his notes on "The Literary Theory and Aesthetics of the Prague School" in his survey *Discriminations* (which he includes largely unchanged as a subchapter on "Czechoslovakia" in Wellek 1991), Wellek does mention *Studies in Aesthetics*, published in 1966, as "a considerable surprise [...], which [...] adds unpublished papers written during the war years, before his conversion to Marxism" (Wellek 1970, 294). However, the first selection of Mukařovský's works in English translation edited by John Burbank and Peter Steiner 1977, which Wellek furnished with an introduction, does not contain any of the essays from the volume of 1966. Wellek underestimated these studies when he observed that "Nothing new is added" (Wellek 1970, 294) and concluded by explicitly referring to Mukařovský's "early work" as an "excellently thought-out, coherent scheme of literary theory" (Wellek 1970, 295):

> The emphasis on the work of art as a totality which is conceived as a dynamic dialectical process rather than an organic body, the ideal, however difficult to realize, of an internal history of the art of poetry, the view of literature as part of a general theory of signs in which function, norm, and value interlock seem to me substantially valid conceptions even today. (Wellek 1970, 295)

He thereby points to "Aesthetic Function, Norm and Value as Social Facts", the study whose German translation is indeed the most-cited in Jauss and Iser, who repeatedly refer to Wellek's survey (cf. Iser 1976, 115, 142, 280). Scholarship may have repeatedly focussed on this study because it presented a coherent model – unlike Mukařovský's very tentative explorations from the early 1940s. Jurij Striedter, the mediator of Prague structuralism for Konstanz aesthetics of reception, summarises retrospectively:

> Mukařovský's and Vodička's focus on the ways in which works of literature have to be concretized by readers under changing historical conditions, together with Vodička's investigations in the theory and history of literary reception, dovetailed with our attempts in Konstanz to elaborate different versions of the aesthetics of reception and the history of reception. It was only fair to acknowledge the ground-breaking work undertaken in Prague decades earlier, which was interrupted by political developments and remained scarcely known abroad because of the language barrier. Moreover, it was helpful and challenging to compare that early semiotic approach with our own approaches, which were rooted in the German tradition of historical hermeneutics or based on phenomenology (which also had played an important role in the discussions of the Prague Circle and in the formation of Russian Formalism). (Striedter 1989, 8–9)

But with the passing of time, he too is forced to recognise what scant traces ultimately remained of the reception of Prague structuralism's concepts despite the proximity to its problems. One reason for this might be the very "tentative char-

acter" (Striedter 1989, 228) of Mukařovský's ideas during the open phase of his thinking on structure: "[T]hroughout his life he continuously elaborated and modified his definition or descriptions of the aesthetic function and its place among other functions, keeping it open for further specifications and additions." (Striedter 1989, 228)

It is mainly the dynamic concepts of the semantic gesture and the unintentionality or the idea of the work of art as a sign *and* a thing that would have offered points of contact not only for the aesthetics of reception – which, as Striedter notes, is ultimately hermeneutic – but also for a literary theory that, like French post-structuralism, departed from a static concept of structure. It may have been irritating for Western academia, which associated this with a clear break with classical structuralism, that Czech structuralism did not have to undergo this break with the previous generation. This becomes particularly clear in the works of Milan Jankovič, who with his concept of "open meaning", of *The Work as a Process of Meaning*, repeatedly referred to Mukařovský's work of the early 1940s as his "inspiration" (for instance in the essay "Inspirace nezáměrnosti" [1999, "Unintentionality as Inspiration"; Jankovič 2015, 42–55]).

3 Concepts of the 'open' phase in Mukařovský's thought: The semantic gesture and the relationship between intentionality and unintentionality

Mukařovský's concept of the *semantic gesture* has led to very different connections and repeatedly to irritations in the research discourse (cf. Červenka 1973; Schmid 1982; Schwarz 1997; Jankovič 1965, 1972 [1970], 2005c [1992], 2005d [1993]). The term combines the physical and the semiotic in paradoxical fashion. That Mukařovský very consciously uses the term *gesture* becomes clear in its terminological precursor, *motoric gesture*, in his stylistic analyses of the 1920s. Jankovič stressed this connection in his observations summarising the concept of the semantic gesture: in these early studies we already see Mukařovský's "original understanding of individual style" (Jankovič 2005c [1992], 274; on the conceptualisation of individual style in Prague Structuralism, see also the study that appeared in German translation early on, Jankovič 1976, and Schmid 1997). Mukařovský, he writes, was interested in "a certain mode of arrangement that can apply to the organisation of the phonetic components or the syntactic structure that say something about the complex aspect of the view of the world that appears

everywhere in the mode of arrangement directly, i. e. not just by virtue of their mediation via the topic and the idea" (Jankovič 2005c [1992], 274). In his early study "O motorickém dění v poezii" (1927, "On Motoric Processes in Poetry"), published posthumously, Mukařovský based "his understanding of the poetic work on such contemporaneous French and German theories emphasising the dynamic character of psychic or associated physical phenomena (Janet, Paulhan, Ribot, Groos, Sievers)" and was inspired by Bremond's term *le courant* (the current) (Jankovič 2005c [1992], 275). Jankovič summarises:

> Here we can already see the actual orientation of Mukařovský's interest: it isn't the uniqueness of the poet's personality, but the dynamic character of the unity of the work that attracts him. The term "gesture" is also connected to the idea of the energetic unification of the work: a movement that via the eloquence of its arrangement – here especially the phonetic arrangement, which however already implies the necessity of a complex approach – directly, physically suggests conscious content otherwise considered incommunicable. (Jankovič 2005c [1992], 275)

While Mukařovský did not publish his observation on the 'motoric gesture' or the 'motoric processes', he often used and specified the term 'semantic gesture' in his published studies of the early 1940s, with various accents.

In his study "On Poetic Language" (Mukařovský 1976 [1940]), he describes "the determination of the 'formal' but nevertheless concrete 'semantic gesture' by which the work is organized as a dynamic unity" as the aim of literary-theoretical composition analysis; "it is a semantic fact, a semantic intention, though qualitatively undetermined" (Mukařovský 1976 [1940], 57). This combination of concreteness on the one hand and dynamics and indefiniteness on the other has of course been the source of some irritation in the research debate. Milan Jankovič identifies in Mukařovský's shifting definitions of the semantic gesture a growing tendency to interpret the 'unity of the work' as dynamic instead of static (cf. Jankovič 2005c [1992], 277). In the studies on aesthetics from the early 1940s, he also increasingly dynamised the relationship between definiteness and indefiniteness, between unification of meaning and opposing aspects or, as he put it, "Intentionality and Unintentionality in Art" (Mukařovský 1978b [1943]).

Here one must also think of Mukařovský's idea of the humanising potential of a work of art, which he sees rooted in the dialectical tension between the aesthetic function that is always dominant in the artwork and the other (practical) functions that are also present: function, he says, is not to be thought of as emanating from the object, but as from man (cf. Mukařovský 2000 [1946]). Mukařovský's system of functions thus relates not to language alone, but has an anthropological dimension, whereby he assumes a polyfunctionality inherent to man, that is, man's multifaceted self-realisation. Now, for Mukařovský it is characteristic

of the aesthetic function that it does not refer directly to a part of reality, but to man's attitude to reality as a whole; if, however, man's inherent polyfunctionality becomes the yardstick, it is the very autonomy of the aesthetic sign, its 'perceptible' quality of "being its own ultimate purpose" (Mukařovský 1978 f [1942], 42) that contains its potential to have a humanising effect.

In his pioneering study on "Intentionality and Unintentionality in Art" (Mukařovský 1978b), the idea of the work as a sign, albeit of a very specific, namely aesthetic nature, goes hand in hand with the perspectivisation of the work as a thing. Mukařovský links the pairing of the work as a sign and as a thing with the terminological pairing of the intentional and the unintentional: "Intentionality allows the work to be perceived as a sign, unintentionality as a thing" (Mukařovský 1978b [1943], 128); the work always contains something that eludes a perception unifying meaning, which makes it appear to us as a thing that is not characterised by intentionality and is thus perceived as unintentional. The difference between intentionality and unintentionality cannot be explained by the work's genesis (it is, then, not a matter of discovering a work's underlying intention or distinguishing between its components the author intended and those that were included unintentionally). Rather, Mukařovský sees "the opposition of intentionality and unintentionality [as] the basic antinomy of art" (Mukařovský 1978b [1943], 128), which is not created by the producer, but is realised ever anew in the process of reception. The two poles of intentionality and unintentionality are subject to change in the course of reception history, their constant tension guaranteeing a work's sustained vitality. For it is the very sensation of unintentionality that repeatedly lends a work urgency, that makes it a "matter of vital import" (Mukařovský 1978b [1943], 122). And: "It is precisely as a *thing* that the work is capable of affecting what is universally human in man, whereas in its semiotic aspect the work always appeals eventually to what is socially and temporally determined in him" (Mukařovský 1978b [1943], 128).

If we combine Mukařovský's observations on the extensive effectiveness of the aesthetic function rooted in the autonomy of the aesthetic sign with his ideas on intentional, sign aspects and unintentional, thing aspects of the artwork, we arrive at the following model: due to the artwork's urgency, which resists attempts to unify its meaning and hence perceive it as a normal informative sign, man – not only as a rationally conscious being, but also in his physical corporality and his levels of unconsciousness – is always addressed anew. In this respect, Mukařovský's idea of the work as both a sign and a thing is concentrated in the concept of the semantic gesture.

This is the notion Milan Jankovič took up with his model of open meaning that cannot be taken for granted (cf. Jankovič 2005a [1991]), that is only grasped and indeed can only be grasped in the context of its process (cf. Jankovič 2005b

[1992]). In his interpretation, the semantic gesture is the basis of a complex reciprocal relationship between the work and the recipient, in the course of which new potential meanings constantly emerge. In stressing those aspects with which Prague structuralism takes up the theoretical thrust of the aesthetics of the *gestalt*, Jankovič sharpens the problem of the relationship between form and content that has always played a role in discussions about the semantic gesture thus:

> Contained within the composition of the work is an important, perhaps the most important piece of information: [the work] actualizes formative aspects within which all meanings concretized by us are displayed; it actualizes the tension between its being and our "sense". And this tension, this act of sense-making that emerges every time, and each time differently from the being of the work, from its very premises that create meaning, this process does not end with a single act of understanding, of grasping the meaning, but with each concretization returns to the work as the source – this being the actual, inevitably elusive content of the artistic work. (Jankovič 2005b [1992], 33)

Here, the ever-new encounter with the work as a source is certainly 'moving' for Jankovič, since the physicality implied by the concept of the semantic gesture is imagined as dynamic action, as the transfer of energy – ultimately that energy underlying life itself.

> Here it is always about a formational process, whose purpose is not to reach a final form, but to pass on the formative energy, to turn man towards the world as well as towards the work of art in its processual state. The vitality of the work is provided inter alia by the extent to which it is able to retain said energy in its composition and to pass it on in changed external contexts. (Jankovič 2005b [1992], 85)

In summary, Milan Jankovič took up and elaborated central concepts and tendencies of Prague structuralism, especially the aesthetics of Jan Mukařovský. In doing so, he remained – quite in the spirit of Prague structuralism – a representative of an emphatic aesthetics of the artwork. However, as a consequence of this approach he also further pursued and honed those elements of Mukařovský's later structuralist phase in which the processes of creating meaning both triggered by and occurring in the work of art are understood as a dynamic process involving both the creator and the recipient, a process whose result is not preordained but is constantly realised anew in ever-new encounters with the work, thereby releasing an energy that is not of a semantic nature, but is palpable (in the sense in which Jakobson (1981 [1958], 25) characterised the poetic function as "promoting the palpability of signs"). In many respects, Jankovič's continued development of the approaches of Prague structuralism towards a dynamic conception of the artwork displays parallels to post-structuralism. And hence Mukařovský's terms and concepts of his 'open' phase in the early 1940s were

already related in a variety of ways to developments in French post-structuralism and deconstruction: while Miroslav Petříček rather emphasised the parallels between Prague structuralism and deconstruction (cf. Petříček 1991), Herta Schmid examined not only "convergences" but also "divergences between Czech Structuralism and post-modern thinking" (Schmid 1992). Schwarz et al. saw a "complementary model [or alternative model?]" emerge "from the system-based thinking of Prague Structuralism" "[v]is-à-vis the post-modern and deconstructionist theory of the dissolution of meaning" – a model that "interprets polysemy, variation in meaning, semantic oscillations, antinomic tensions not as deficits, but as *constructive* factors in dynamic, holistic-organic 'open' structures" (Schwarz et al. 1997, ix).

While French post-structuralism felt compelled to distance itself from classical structuralism's static, binary conception of structure, the Prague variant had already replaced it with a dynamic understanding of structure as a system of various reciprocal relationships relatively early on. In this respect, Milan Jankovič developed a similarly open concept of the artistic text around the same time – but, unlike Western European post-structuralism, as a continuation of the work of his predecessor Mukařovský. Unlike the French post-structuralists, Jankovič adopted a gesture not of overcoming his predecessors, of breaking with them, but of productively taking up what had gone before him. It was only after the political revolution that Jankovič could discuss the parallels between such an approach and those writings that had emerged concurrently in Western academia.

Translated by John Heath
Translations of Czech quotations by Anna Conant

References

Cassirer, Ernst. *Substanzbegriff und Funktionsbegriff: Untersuchungen über die Grundfragen der Erkenntniskritik* [1910]. *Gesammelte Werke. Hamburger Ausgabe*. Vol. 6. Ed. Birgit Recki. Hamburg: Meiner, 2000.

Cassirer, Ernst. *Philosophie der symbolischen Formen* [1923, 1925, 1929]. *Gesammelte Werke. Hamburger Ausgabe*. Vol. 11–13. Ed. Birgit Recki. Hamburg: Meiner, 2001–2002.

Červenka, Miroslav. "Die Grundkategorien des Prager literaturwissenschaftlichen Strukturalismus." *Zur Kritik literaturwissenschaftlicher Methodologie*. Eds. Viktor Žmegač and Zdenko Škreb. Frankfurt/M.: Athenäum, 1973. 137–168.

Červenka, Miroslav. "Mukařovský's Break with Structuralism." *Jan Mukařovský and the Prague School / und die Prager Schule*. Eds. Vladimír Macura and Herta Schmid. Potsdam and Prague: Universität Potsdam/ČAV, 1999. 313–324.

Chvatík, Květoslav. *Strukturální estetika*. Brno: Host, 2001.

Günther, Hans. "Die Funktionen des Funktionslosen: Das Ästhetische und seine gesellschaftlichen Aspekte." Hans Günther, *Struktur als Prozess*. Munich: Fink, 1973. 11–36.

Günther, Hans. "Funktion." *Glossarium der russischen Avantgarde*. Ed. Aleksandar Flaker. Graz and Vienna: Droschl, 1989. 235–242.

Honzík, Karel. *Tvorba životního slohu*. Prague: Václav Petr, 1946.

Iser, Wolfgang. *Der Akt des Lesens*: *Theorie ästhetischer Wirkung*. Munich: Fink, 1976.

Jakobson, Roman, and Petr Bogatyrev. "Die Folklore als eine besondere Form des Schaffens." [1929] Roman Jakobson, *Selected Writings*. Vol. 4. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1966. 1–15.

Jakobson, Roman. "Noveishaia russkaia poèziia: Nabrosok pervyi. Podstupy k Khlebnikovu." [1919] Roman Jakobson, *Selected Writings*. Vol. 5. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1979. 299–354.

Jakobson, Roman. "Linguistics and Poetics." [1958] Roman Jakobson, *Selected Writings*. Vol. 3. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1981. 18–51.

Jakobson, Roman, and Iurii Tynianov [Jurij Tynjanov]. "Problémy zkoumání literatury a jazyka." [1928] Roman Jakobson, *Poetická funkce*. Jinčany: H&H, 1995. 34–36.

Jankovič, Milan. "K pojetí sémantického gesta." *Česká literatura* 13.4 (1965): 319–326.

Jankovič, Milan. "Perspectives of Semantic Gesture." [1970] *Poetics: International Review for the Theory of Literature* 4 (1972): 16–27.

Jankovič, Milan. "Der Individualstil und die Problematik des 'Sinnes' im Wortkunstwerk." Miroslav Červenka and Milan Jankovič, "Zwei Beiträge zum Gegenstand der Individualstylistik in der Literatur." *Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik* 6.22 (1976): 101–115.

Jankovič, Milan. "Nesamozřejmost smyslu." [1991] Milan Jankovič, *Cesty za smyslem literárního díla*. Prague: Karolinum, 2005a. 101–185.

Jankovič, Milan. "Dílo jako dění smyslu." [1992] Milan Jankovič, *Cesty za smyslem literárního díla*. Prague: Karolinum, 2005b. 9–100.

Jankovič, Milan. "Ještě k pojmu 'semantické gesto'." [1992] Milan Jankovič, *Cesty za smyslem literárního díla*. Prague: Karolinum, 2005c. 273–279.

Jankovič, Milan. "Susovo otvírání struktur." [1993] Milan Jankovič, *Cesty za smyslem literárního díla*. Prague: Karolinum, 2005d. 317–324.

Jankovič, Milan. *Cesty za smyslem literárního díla II*. Prague: Ústav pro českou literaturu AV ČR, 2015.

Mukařovský, Jan. *Kapitoly z české poetiky*. Vols. 1–3. 2nd edition. Prague: Svoboda, 1948.

Mukařovský, Jan. *Aesthetic function, norm and value as social facts* [1936]. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, 1970.

Mukařovský, Jan. *On Poetic Language* [1940]. Ed. and trans. by John Burbank and Peter Steiner. Lisse: Peter de Ridder Press, 1976.

Mukařovský, Jan. "Poetic Designation and the Aesthetic Function of Language." [1936] Jan Mukařovský, *The Word and Verbal Art: Selected Essays by Jan Mukařovský*. Ed. and trans. by John Burbank and Peter Steiner. Foreword by René Wellek. New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 1977. 65–73.

Mukařovský, Jan. "Can There Be a Universal Aesthetic Value in Art?" [1939] Jan Mukařovský, *Structure, Sign and Function: Selected Essays by Jan Mukařovský*. Ed. and trans. by John Burbank and Peter Steiner. New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 1978a. 57–69.

Mukařovský, Jan. "Intentionality and Unintentionality in Art." [1943] Jan Mukařovský, *Structure, Sign and Function: Selected Essays by Jan Mukařovský*. Ed. and trans. by John Burbank and Peter Steiner. New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 1978b. 89–128.

Mukařovský, Jan. "On Structuralism." [1946] Jan Mukařovský, *Structure, Sign and Function: Selected Essays by Jan Mukařovský*. Ed. and trans. by John Burbank and Peter Steiner. New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 1978c. 3–16.

Mukařovský, Jan. "On the Problem of Functions in Architecture." [1937] Jan Mukařovský, *Structure, Sign and Function: Selected Essays by Jan Mukařovský*. Ed. and trans. by John Burbank and Peter Steiner. New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 1978d. 236–250.

Mukařovský, Jan. "The Aesthetic Norm." [1937] Jan Mukařovský, *Structure, Sign and Function: Selected Essays by Jan Mukařovský*. Ed. and trans. by John Burbank and Peter Steiner. New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 1978e. 49–56.

Mukařovský, Jan. "The Place of the Aesthetic Function among the Other Functions." [1942] Jan Mukařovský, *Structure, Sign and Function: Selected Essays by Jan Mukařovský*. Ed. and trans. by John Burbank and Peter Steiner. New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 1978 f. 31–48.

Mukařovský, Jan. "Člověk ve světě funkcí." [1946] Jan Mukařovský, *Studie I*. Brno: Host, 2000. 50–59.

Petříček, Miroslav. "Die Kunstauffassung des Prager Strukturalismus und die Dekonstruktion." *Mesotes: Jahrbuch für philosophischen Ost-West-Dialog* 3 (1991): 23–27.

Schmid, Herta. "Die 'semantische Geste' als Schlüsselbegriff des Prager literaturwissen-schaftlichen Strukturalismus." *Schwerpunkte der Literaturwissenschaft außerhalb des deutschen Sprachraums*. Ed. Elrud Ibsch. Amsterdam: Brill, 1982. 209–259.

Schmid, Herta. "Übereinstimmungen und Abweichungen zwischen tschechischem Strukturalismus und postmodernem Denken." *Československý štrukturalizmus a viedenský scientizmus*. Eds. Ján Bakoš and Peter Michalovič. Bratislava: Stimul, 1992. 205–233.

Schmid, Herta. "Das Problem des Individuums im tschechischen Strukturalismus." *Prager Schule: Kontinuität und Wandel. Arbeiten zur Literaturästhetik und Poetik der Narration*. Ed. Wolfgang F. Schwarz. Frankfurt/M.: Iberoamericana Vervuert, 1997. 265–303.

Schwarz, Wolfgang F., Jiří Holý, and Milan Jankovič. "Vorbemerkung der Herausgeber." *Prager Schule: Kontinuität und Wandel. Arbeiten zur Literaturästhetik und Poetik der Narration*. Ed. Wolfgang F. Schwarz. Frankfurt/M.: Iberoamericana Vervuert, 1997. vii–x.

Schwarz, Wolfgang F. "Die 'semantische Geste' – ein brauchbares analytisches Instrument? Zur Entwicklung und Kritik eines Kernbegriffs in Mukařovskýs Literaturästhetik." *Prager Schule: Kontinuität und Wandel. Arbeiten zur Literaturästhetik und Poetik der Narration*. Ed. Wolfgang F. Schwarz. Frankfurt/M.: Iberoamericana Vervuert, 1997. 197–222.

Steiner, Hans Georg, Hermann Noack, Reinhard Heede, and Niklas Luhmann. "Funktion." *Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie*. Vol. 2. Ed. Joachim Ritter. Basel: Schwabe Verlag, 1972. 1138–1143.

Striedter, Jurij. *Literary Structure, Evolution and Value: Russian Formalism and Czech Structuralism Reconsidered*. Cambridge, MA, and London: Harvard University Press, 1989.

Sus, Oleg. "Das Öffnen der Strukturen." [1971] *Prager Schule: Kontinuität und Wandel. Arbeiten zur Literaturästhetik und Poetik der Narration*. Ed. Wolfgang F. Schwarz. Frankfurt/M.: Iberoamericana Vervuert, 1997. 113–127.

Teige, Karel. "Poetismus." [1924] Karel Teige, *Výbor z díla I: Svět stavby a básně. Studie z dvacátých let*. Prague: Československý spisovatel, 1966. 121–128.

Teige, Karel. "Poezie pro pět smyslů." [1925] *Avantgarda známá a neznámá II. Vrchol a krize poetismu 1925–1928*. Ed. Štěpán Vlašín. Prague: Svoboda, 1972. 191–196.

Teige, Karel. "Toward a Theory of Constructivism." Karel Teige, *Modern Architecture in Czecho-slovakia and Other Writings*. Introd. by Jean-Louis Cohen. Trans. by Irena Žantovská Murray and David Britt. Los Angeles, CA: Getty Research Institute, 2000. 287–300.

Teige, Karel. "Poetism." [1924] *Between Two Worlds: A Sourcebook of Central European Avant-Gardes, 1910–1930*. Eds. Timothy O. Benson and Éva Forgács. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2002a. 579–582.

Teige, Karel. "Constructivism and the Liquidation of 'Art'." [1925] *Between Two Worlds: A Sourcebook of Central European Avant-Gardes, 1910–1930*. Trans. by Alexandra Büchler. Eds. Timothy O. Benson and Éva Forgács. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2002b. 583–589.

Tynianov, Iurii. "O literaturnoi èvoliutsii." [1927] Iurii Tynianov, *Arkhaisty i novatory*. Munich: Fink, 1967. 30–47.

Vodička, Felix. *Die Struktur der Literarischen Entwicklung*. Ed. by the Forschungsgruppe für strukturale Methoden in der Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft an der Universität Konstanz, with an introduction by Jurij Striedter. Munich: Fink, 1976.

Vodička, Felix. *Struktura vývoje: Studie literárněhistorické*. 2nd edition. Prague: Dauphin, 1998.

Wellek, René. "The literary Theory and Aesthetics of the Prague School." René Wellek, *Discriminations: Further Concepts of Criticism*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1970. 275–303.

Wellek, René. "Czechoslovakia." René Wellek, *A History of Modern Criticism: 1750–1950*. *German, Russian, and Eastern European Criticism, 1900–1950*. Vol. 7. New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 1991. 399–425.

Zima, Peter. V. *Literarische Ästhetik*. 2nd edition. Tübingen and Basel: Francke, 1995.

Zusi, Peter. "Karel Teige's Path to Functionalism." *Slavic Review* 67.3 (2008): 821–839.

Veronika Ambros

Semiotics of Drama and Theatre: The Prague School Model

The Prague School's writings on drama and theatre are based "on the semiotic approach and endeavour to analyze the work of dramatic art in its complex unity" (Veltruský 2012, 14). Scholars of drama and theatre in Prague were acutely aware of the diverse aspects of performance, its intricacy and "transformability" (Elam 2002, 11) and also added various aspects of dramatic text and performance to the initial focus of the Prague School (also known as the Prague Linguistic Circle, PLC, founded in 1926) on linguistics, literature, and aesthetics. Keir Elam emphasizes that the school created "the richest corpus of theatrical and dramatic theory produced in modern times, namely the body of books and articles produced in the 1930s and 1940s" (Elam 2002, 5). Moreover, their work can be regarded as "a direct precursor of cultural studies" (Drozd and Kačer 2016, 24).

Surprisingly, except for Miroslav Procházka's *Znaky dramatu a divadla: studie k teorii a metateorii dramatu a divadla* (1988, *Signs of Theatre and Drama: A Study of the Theory and Metatheory of Drama and Theatre*), Michael Quinn's *The Semiotic Stage* (1995) and Jiří Veltruský's posthumously published *An Approach to the Semiotics of Theatre* (1992), there are no other historical or theoretical book-length studies on the Prague School semiotics of drama and theatre.

The primary texts available in English were mostly scattered, as were several articles by Czech and international scholars describing, analyzing, or applying them. It is only now that even Otakar Zich's ground-breaking work *Estetika dramatického umění: Teoretická dramaturgie* (1931, *Aesthetics of the Art of Drama: Theoretical Dramaturgy)* is about to become available to foreign readers. Translations of this work into German and English will no doubt confirm Elam's assertion concerning Zich's seminal role in the semiotics of drama and theatre and, as Herta Schmid (2019, 24) suggests, for the avant-garde stage too. In effect, this innovative book might be considered a 'precursor' of modern performance studies (cf. Ambros 2020).

For Otakar Zich (1879–1934), professor of aesthetics at Charles University in Prague and composer, "the dramatic art is theatre performance" (Zich 1931, 16) that entails two types of perceptions: "technical and pictorial" (*představa technická a obrazová,* Zich 1931, 53). The 'technical' type is based on our knowledge of the theatre and its practices, while the 'pictorial' abandons the notion of representation of what is but focuses on what it "presents or depicts" (Zich 1931, 53) instead.

Inspired by Zich's *Aesthetics*, the Prague School scholars Jan Mukařovský, Petr Bogatyrev, Karel Brušák, Jindřich Honzl, Roman Jakobson and Jiří Veltruský

were informed by domestic and German aesthetic tradition, contemporary phenomenology, Russian formalists, and Saussurean semiotics. Unlike the Russian formalists, who paid attention to fiction, poetry, and film, Prague School inquiries into theatre and drama included in their purview fine arts, film, culture, philosophy, architecture, history, and general aesthetics. According to Veltruský (1918–1994), a second-generation Prague School scholar of drama and theatre:

> The different members of the Prague Linguistic Circle never conceived their writings about the theatre as organic parts of a single, gradually constructed doctrine. In fact, although they all belonged [...] to the same school of thought, they held widely differing views. It is only in retrospect that the sum of their writings can be perceived as a theory. (Veltruský 1981, 227)

Conversely, American theatre scholar Michael Quinn (1995, 2–3) sees "an ongoing, original approach to theatre study [...] shaping the emerging discipline of theatre theory to a much greater extent than the Prague School has influenced the broader fields of literary theory and aesthetics". Quinn examined the thought of the circle in his *The Semiotic Stage*, a book about the Prague School, but, most importantly, by applying his theoretical knowledge to text and performance analysis. In several studies, he demonstrated the range of subjects which Prague School theories help elucidate (from the *commedia dell'arte*, the figure on the stage, celebrity, Bertolt Brecht, Jiří Voskovec and Jan Werich to Václav Havel).

As the *Theatre Theory Reader* (Drozd et al. 2016) edited by David Drozd, Tomáš Kacer, Don Sparling, and other collaborators demonstrates, the circle's designation is not a mere metaphor but a model of collaboration, since the members of the school, whether they were scientists or stage practitioners, their origins and ranks notwithstanding showed how to share and develop their diverse research, mutually stimulating their observations and ideas. Most contributions were part of a collective effort; they complemented and informed each other, often by expanding or altering each other's arguments. Well-acquainted with the current and historical development of Czech and international theatre (e. g., Chinese, Russian, and Czech folk theatre), the scholars and their work also encouraged contemporary stage experiments. They left behind a "living realm of problems and questions" (Honzl 1940, 109) as well as various approaches to responding to them. Most importantly, they all provide a rich source of inspiration for a wide range of performance analyses, as they illuminate numerous theatrical signs and their various functions. Besides, as Mukařovský (1982, 72) suggested, "[i]nstead of the duality of content and form, structural esthetics chooses the opposition of material to the artistic device (i. e., the material versus its artistic exploitation)".

Their most significant contributions explored various aspects of general aesthetics, semiotics, phenomenology, and linguistics applied to performance

theory, acting, dramatic texts, including dialogue and monologue, relationships between 'man' and 'object', and strategies used to 'activate' the audience.

The innovative point of view on drama and its structure encapsulates some of the elements of the "protean, fluid process that consists in a constant regrouping of components, in the restless replacement of the dominant element in the obliteration of the boundaries between drama and kindred forms (the revue, dance, acrobatics etc.)" (Mukařovský 2016b, 213).

For Elam, Zich's *Aesthetics* (1931) and Mukařovský's article on Chaplin's *City Lights* (Mukařovský 2016a), both originally published in 1931, "radically changed the prospects for the scientific analysis of theatre and drama" (Elam 2002, IX). Mukařovský's article on Chaplin introduces several concepts of the film, theatre and literary analysis highlighted here:

> Today the conception of a work of art as a *structure* – that is, a system of components aesthetically *deautomatized* and organized into a complex *hierarchy* that is unified by the *prevalence* of one component over the others – is accepted in the theory of several arts. (Mukařovský 2016a, 192 [emphasis mine])

The highlighted terms respond to the *transformability* (cf. Elam 2002) of both the 'structure' and its 'aesthetic perception' as inherent to the Prague School's understanding of "dramatic work". Replacing the expression system of the Russian formalists (Tynianov 1978, 78), the term 'structure' generated the description of Prague structuralism as "something highly organized yet dynamic, full of inner tension yet unified, energy-charged, yet organized" (Drozd and Kačer 2016, 15). Analyzing Chaplin's acting in the 1931 film *City Lights,* Mukařovský (2016a, 197) distinguishes between Chaplin's social and individually expressive gestures and suggests that "the interference of the two levels of gestures is the axis of Chaplin's acting". They semantically unify his actor's figure, which "embraces as the dominant of his structure one that usually occupies (in film) an ancillary position: gestures in the broad sense of the term (facial expressions, gestures proper, carriage)" (Mukařovský 2016a, 197–198).

1 Drama as literature

Towards the end of the 1930s, the Prague School theorists turned their attention to the dramatic text in general and dialogue in particular. Veltruský's "Drama jako básnické dílo" (1931, "Drama as Poetic Work") first appeared under the German 'Protectorate' in a collection of articles entitled *Čtení o jazyce a poesii* (*Readings about Language and Poetry*, Havránek and Mukařovský 1942) edited by the lin-

guist Bohuslav Havránek and Mukařovský, Zich's successor as professor of aesthetics. The original text, however, was censored and revised in 1999 on the basis of the original manuscript and some revisions for the English version of *Drama as Literature* (Veltruský 1977).

The title implies a polemic with Zich's *Aesthetics* that set the performance apart from the dramatic text. Veltruský (1977, 9) contends that "[t]heatre is not another literary genre but another art. It uses language as one of its materials while for all the literary genres, including drama, language is the only material – though each organizes it in a different fashion". He examined 'drama' as a literary genre "belonging entirely to the art of literature [...] separated from those components that are added in theatrical performance" (Veltruský 1977, 8). Veltruský (1977, 7) specifies that genre is "'timeless' not because it does not change but because it preserves its identity through all the changes it undergoes". For instance, the graphic division of the dialogic text where the notes mark a 'separate' discourse is one of the established characteristics of a dramatic text. The author's notes serve

> [...] the semantic unification of the dialogue [...]. It is not the direct speeches themselves nor any of their components that indicate which speech is allotted to whom, so providing information without which the reader could not follow the thread of the dialogue, but the speaker's name which the author puts before the speeches." (Veltruský 1977, 41)

In a theatrical performance, however, the notes are eliminated, and the resulting gaps in the unity of the text are filled by extra-linguistic signs. This is not an arbitrary process but a matter of transposing linguistic means onto other semiotic systems.

Veltruský devoted a considerable part of his study to various aspects of dramatic discourse, to 'dialogue'. According to Mukařovský, there are three fundamental aspects of the dialogue:

> 1. [...] fixed by the relationship between the two participants, which from the standpoint of the person speaking can be designated as the relationship between 'I' and 'you'. (Mukařovský 2016c, 224)
> 2. The speaking subjects' relation to the actual situation in which the speech takes place, to the 'here and now', finds its linguistic expression through spatial and temporal deixis, represented by demonstrative pronouns (this, that, and so forth), adverbs and adverbials of place and time (here, there, now, in the morning, in the evening, today, tomorrow, and so forth) and verbal tenses (the present in opposition to the past and the future). (Mukařovský 2016c, 226)
> 3. Unlike monologic speech, which has a single and continuous context, several or at least two contexts interpenetrate and alternate in dialogic speech. Not even dialogue, of course, can do without semantic unity, but this is furnished primarily by the subject of the conversation, the theme, which at any given moment must be the same for all the participants. Dialogue is impossible without unity of theme. (Mukařovský 2016c, 225)

The distribution of these elements characterizes different types of dialogue such as the argument (collision between 'I' and 'you'), a talk about a situation, and a conversation focusing on the exchange between the interlocutors about a common topic. Veltruský supplemented Mukařovský's theory by adding the following:

> Dialogue is a verbal utterance delivered by two or more alternating speakers who, as a rule, address their speeches to each other. Dialogue, therefore, differs from a monologue in that it unfolds not only in time but also in space. Every single unit of dialogue is situated at a unique intersection of the continuum of time and the continuum of space or, to put it differently in a specific 'here and now.' This 'here and now' keeps changing, just as in every discourse the present continuously turns into the past and the future into the present. (Veltruský 1977, 10)

Besides, for Veltruský 'dramatic dialogue' is "both a sequence of utterances made by two or several alternating speakers and an utterance of a single speaker, the author" (Veltruský 1977, 12).

Examining Karel Čapek's prose and drama, Mukařovský (1964, 133–149) pointed out that Čapek's 'graphic organization', his use of dashes, indicates the intonation of their speech and therefore the characters' relationship to one another. In some cases, however, the same grapheme may emphasize the underlying lyrical tendency of the utterances.

Expanding upon Karl Bühler's 1934 *Theory of Language*, especially his model of communication and the three functions of language ('expressive', 'conative', and 'referential'), Mukařovský added the 'aesthetic function'. He also included the category of *deixis* as the language of 'pointing'. Theatre and film director Honzl noted in the ancient drama the function of the deixis in the notes or stage directions that conjure the dramatic and theatrical fictional world:

> The dramatist's verbal deixis [...] is a semantic filter that enables the dramatist to create an image of the world and people [...]. This semantic filter, which blocks the emergence of images the dramatist considers undesirable, transforms the contours of this reality, thus creating the image of the individual and his deeds in the play. (Honzl 2016b, 159–160)

Different types and functions of deixis including 'phantasmatic deixis' introduced by Bühler and mentioned by Honzl are among the various means of semantic connections within the dramatic work. Others are inherent in the so-called 'synonymic' and 'homonymic' series explained by Russian scholar Sergei Kartsevskii (1929). Using Ibsen to illustrate Kartsevskii's division for his analysis of dialogue, Veltruský reveals the semantic diversity of the denomination generated by either synonyms or homonyms in the dialogue:

> In dialogue, the balance is upset as soon as the word, or the group of words, enters another context – that is, when it is perceived by the addressee or when the addressee either uses the same word or refers to the same thing in his reply. Every unit of meaning is somewhat different for each participant. As it appears in different contexts, it keeps shifting – now in the homonymic, now in the synonymic series, now in both. (Veltruský 1977, 17)

The semantic shifts that occur when the words uttered "refer to entirely different realities for each of the participants" (Veltruský 1977, 17) can achieve a 'comic' effect or expose a 'tension' between the interlocutors who follow their subjective understanding of a certain expression.

Veltruský illustrates the first case by referring to the misunderstandings from Nikolai V. Gogol's comedy *Revizor* (1836, *The Inspector General*), where Khlestakov and the mayor each fear the other and imminent punishment. Based on the difference between 'everyday' dialogue and 'dramatic' dialogue, the misunderstanding in the latter produces a surplus knowledge on the part of the audience, achieving a 'comic' effect by drawing on the fact that "the speeches attributed to each character are constructed in such a way as to be intelligible not only to the other characters but also to the reader" (Veltruský 1977, 13), thus creating 'dramatic irony'.

Veltruský exemplifies the other type of 'tension' between two interlocutors using Ibsen's *John Gabriel Borkman:*

> 'You betrayed the woman you loved! Me, me, me!' cannot be created by intensity, since the loudest point is reached at the end of the triple exclamation that follows. The meaning of the graphic sign will almost automatically be transposed into a gesture. (Veltruský 2016a, 254)

2 Theatrical signs

Although Zich did not use the word 'sign', his ideas laid the groundwork for the semiotics of theatre (Procházka 1980, 117). The semiotic approach is inherent in Zich's (1931, 56) distinction between "the presented and the presenting", which he considers "homogeneous" because "the matter of the actor's work is a living human being (namely the actor) and the dramatic character […] is also a living creature, *as a rule* [emphasis mine], also a human being". Here Zich concedes the possibility of actors other than humans, for instance 'animated' objects or puppets, which he examined in a study written as early as 1923 (Zich 2015).

As the aforementioned *Literary Theory Reader* asserts, "the Prague School formulated its own dynamic system of terminology of the sign, drawing heavily on contemporary phenomenology" (Drozd and Kačer 2016, 25). In addition, ethnography helps to illuminate theatrical conventions. According to Keir Elam (2002, 7)

"[i]t was above all the folklorist Bogatyrev [...] who undertook to chart the elementary principles of theatrical semiosis". Petr Bogatyrev (1893–1971), the Russian "forerunner of structural ethnography" (Součková 1976, 4) and a member of both the Moscow and the Prague Linguistic Circle, examined the 'nature' of signs in folk customs, folk songs, film and theatre. He accepted Zich's notion of the theatrical and functional 'double role' of objects, which portray characters *and* participate in the theatrical action. Furthermore, he addressed the issue of 'plurisignation' on stage, since a "theatrical verbal expression is a structure of signs, composed not only of linguistic signs but also of other signs" (Bogatyrev 1976, 41). Besides, the theatrical sign is based on the fact that "the theatrical costume does not, nor does the house set or the gestures of the actors, have as many constitutive signs as a real house or real dress would have" (Bogatyrev 1976, 33).

While Veltruský (2016b, 148) declared that "all that is on the stage is a sign", Jindřich Honzl, himself a theorist of the Prague School and theatre, begins his article "On the Mobility of Theatrical Sign" by stating that "[t]he whole of stage reality – the dramatist's words, the actor's performances, the stage lighting – all these represent [*zastoupit* in the original could also mean *present* or *stand for*] other realities. The theatre performance is a set of signs" (Honzl 2016a, 129). Honzl showed how the stage and other elements of the theatre performance such as an actor can be transformed or substituted:

> [...] once he [Zich] has relieved us of the limitation that restricted the stage to architecture, then all the other elements of the theatre performance jostle their way forward to freedom. The character, heretofore closely associated with the human actor, is liberated, the playwright's message, hitherto the *word*, is liberated, other devices are liberated. Much to our amazement, we discover that the stage space need not always be a space, but that sound can be a stage, music can be an event, scenery can be a message. (Honzl 2016b, 157–168)

Bogatyrev also distinguishes between 'sign' and 'object', pointing to two properties of a stone as a sign of a border *and* as an object:

> An item of clothing is simultaneously a thing and a sign – more exactly, it is the vehicle of a structure of signs. An item of clothing characterizes membership in a certain class, nationality, religion, and so on; it indicates the wearer's financial situation, age, and so on. Similarly, a house is not only a thing, but also a sign of its owner's nationality, financial circumstances, religion, and so on. (Bogatyrev 2016a, 99)

3 The 'actor's figure'

Quinn sees the concept of the so-called 'stage figure', as he dubbed Zich's *actor's figure* (*herecká postava,* Zich 1986, 45), as "a seminal and truly revolutionary contribution of the Prague School to theatre theory" (Quinn 1989, 75).

Zich differentiates between the 'figure of the actor' who appears on the stage and the 'dramatic character' that exists not on the stage but in our consciousness: "The figure is what the actor makes the character is what the audience sees and hears" (Zich 1986, 92). While stressing the visual part of the dramatic art, Zich alludes to fine arts to describe the actor's figure:

> As much as the marble is not a sculpture, but only formed marble, so is [...] the "figure" only the "formed actor," with one difference however – that this formation [shaping] is performed by the actor himself, the same actor who is being formed [shaped]. (Zich 1931, 56)

Zich's editors, Procházka and Osolsobě, refer to the actor's figure as the 'signifier' while they consider the dramatic character the 'signified' (Zich 1986, 341). Quinn, however, adjusted Karl Bühler's organon model to "[t]he tripartite structure of the acting sign: actor, stage figure and character" (Quinn 1995, 85). He included the three functions: 'expressive' – relating to the actor him/herself, 'conative' – relating to the audience's perception constituting the mental aesthetic object, and 'referential' – in Bühler's terminology *darstellen* (to present), which corresponds with Zich's notion of the actor being 'shaped/formed'. Quinn also applied Mukařovský's idea of the aesthetic function that refers to the work itself.

Veltruský (2016c, 378) includes Zich's stage figure as "distinct from both actor and character", seeing the 'acting sign' consisting of actor, character, and stage figure (e. g., Laurence Olivier as an actor presents Shakespeare's character of Hamlet while a spectator creates, i. e., sees and hears an actor's figure of the Hamlet presented before him/her). Besides, for Veltruský (2016b, 148), "[t]he stage figure is the dynamic unity of a whole set of signs, whose vehicle may be the actor's body, voice, movements, but also various things, from parts of the costume to the set".

4 Puppets, objects, statues

Authors of the Prague School discussed the relationship between "People and Things in the Theatre", to cite the title of Veltruský's (2016b) groundbreaking article in which he focusses on several types of transition "between the sphere of

man and the sphere of an object", including that observed by Honzl (2016a, 136) when "the scenic image became an actor". By contrast:

> The action may fall to 'zero level'; the figure then becomes a part of the *set*. Soldiers flanking the entrance to a building, for instance, are examples of this. [...] Naturally, humans as parts of the set can no longer in any way be considered active performers. (Veltruský 2016b, 150)

By including contemporary, medieval, and Baroque traditions in his study of art and popular culture, Bogatyrev (1971, 8) applied synchrony and diachrony to his ethnographic inquiry into puppet and folk theatre and explored all his material as a source for his research on the repertoire of artistic *means* (*sredstva*) of contemporary dramatists and directors. The "strongly codified" nature of the analyzed material allowed Bogatyrev to "carry over the concept of language and speech from the field of language phenomena to art" (Deák 1976, 90). Furthermore, puppet theatre was for Bogatyrev (2016b, 91) "one of the forms of theatre that are most strongly based on certain conventions". He criticized Zich for supposedly disregarding the specificity of the puppet theatre and comparing it with the theatre of live actors. Zich's observation leads Bogatyrev to the following conclusion:

> When it comes to the perception of puppet theatre, it is with its children's audiences that its signs predominate, and therefore puppet theatre achieves maximum expressiveness with this audience. When adult audiences perceive puppet theatre, not infrequently the signs of the theatre of live actors dominate. (Bogatyrev 2016b, 98)

Zich's study of puppets, which first appeared in 1923 – that is, in the same year as Bogatyrev's first treatment of the topic – distinguishes between the "comical or *grotesque*" or 'terrifying' effect of the puppets, depending on whether we stress their "un-live qualities and their materiality" or put emphasis on their apparent manifestations of life (their movements and speech) (Zich 2015, 506–507). "In such a perceptive mode, the awareness of the factual un-liveness of puppets moves to the background and it is apparent merely as a sensation of something inexplicable, a certain mystery that raises a sense of amazement. In this case, puppets have an *uncanny* effect on us" (Zich quoted in Bogatyrev 2016b, 92). Zich mentions "puppets brought to life in legends and literature: such as the Commendatore statue (in Don Juan) or the Golem" (Zich quoted in Bogatyrev 2016b, 92). Either effect appears in the puppet Olimpia, in E.T.A. Hoffmann's *Der Sandmann* (1816, *The Sandman*), a story which was used by Freud as an example of what he calls *das Unheimliche* (where he explains the multiple meanings of the word commonly translated as 'the uncanny'), and as an eponymous comic character, the doll Olympia in Jacques Offenbach's opera *The Tales of Hoffmann*.

Honzl's and Veltruský's reactions to Bogatyrev's 1940 book *Lidové divadlo české a slovenské* (*Czech and Slovak Folk Theatre*), which includes a chapter on puppets, illustrate the ongoing discussion among the Prague School scholars and the effects of World War II on the circle. Veltruský's response – originally intended to be published in Czech in 1940 – appeared only in English in 1987. There he asserts that "inanimate objects cannot act physically. They signify action only when that signification is bestowed on them by human beings; even a marionette cannot act unless its strings or wires are pulled by the puppeteer" (Veltruský 1987, 153).

Following Zich's observation about the actor's figure, Mukařovský points to the inherent 'static' and 'dynamic' quality of statues on stage, which are perceived as constantly present even if they do not move. He notes that "[t]he immobility of a statue and the mobility of a live person is a constant antinomy between the poles of which the actor's presence oscillates on stage. [...] What is usually called 'a pose' is clearly a sculptural effect" (Mukařovský 2016d, 63). Mukařovský (2016d, 63) further points out that Gordon Craig's exploration of the *über-marionette* drew "attention to this hidden but always present antinomy of the art of acting".

The mobility of signs and the diverse functions of the relationship between man and object also appear in Roman Jakobson's (1975) study commemorating the centenary of Pushkin's death, where he examines statues in the 'little tragedy' *Kamennyi gost'* (1830, *The Stone Guest*), *Skazka o zolotom petushke* (1835, *The Tale of the Golden Cockerel*), and the Petersburg tale *Mednyi vsadnik* (1839, *The Bronze Horseman*).

Jakobson's observation based on different genres is relevant for the distinction between 'people' and 'things' in the theatre:

> In the drama, in the epic poem, and in the fairy tale, the image of the animated statue evokes the opposite images of rigidified people, whether it involves a mere comparison of them to a statue, an accidental situation or actual dying and death. Here the boundary between life and the immobile dead matter is deliberately obliterated. (Jakobson 1975, 8)

5 Audience – perception – reception

Emil František Burian, musician and director of the avant-garde, who closely collaborated with Bogatyrev, with whom he shared a keen interest in folklore, asserted: "To perceive theatre is the same complex process as that of creating theatre" (Burian 1981, 84). He appealed to the spectators' imagination acoustically with his music and the so-called 'voiceband' (a vocal ensemble often reciting well-known texts) and visually by projecting film images, employing lights and

mirrors that subverted the semiotic stability of the space and the characters and enriched the ambiguity of the textual component. The effect achieved was like that which the linguists called *aktualizace* (topicalization or *updating*), referring to the notion of the 'de-automatization' of automatized words, devices (e. g., faded metaphor), or genres by 'reintroducing' archaisms as well as long-forgotten styles, drawing attention to the expression itself. While the meaning of the original denotes a temporal concept, for Elam, who considers *foregrounding* a significant contribution of the Prague Linguistic Circle, it is "a spatial metaphor and thus well adapted to the theatrical text" (Elam 2002, 18).

Originally introduced by Havránek, the term *aktualizace* first appeared as a linguistic phenomenon described by the Prague linguists as "the use of the devices of language in such a way that this use itself attracts attention and is perceived as uncommon, as deprived of automatization, as deautomatized, such as [a] live poetic metaphor (as opposed to a lexicalized one, which is automatized)" (Havránek 1964, 10). Mukařovský (1983, 169) applied it to 'poetic language', which "is not used in the services of communication, but in order to place into the foreground the act of expression, the act of speech itself". Elsewhere, he states that "for poetry, the standard language is the background against which is reflected the esthetically intentional distortion of the linguistic components of the work, in other words, the intentional violation of the norm of the standard" (Mukařovský 1983, 166).

Aktualizace, like *ostranenie* (defamiliarization), is a phenomenon of making the familiar 'strange', a distancing, defamiliarization or estrangement that Shklovskii described as follows:

> The purpose of the image is not to draw our understanding closer to that which this image stands for, but rather to allow us to perceive the object in a special way [...] to lead us to 'vision' of this object rather than mere 'recognition'. (Shklovskii 1990, 13)

Roman Jakobson paraphrased this in his description of 'fun': "Fun in the theatre interferes with the automatism of habit and teaches us anew how to touch, and grasp, and evaluate a thing and a sign" (Jakobson 1987, 162).

Ostranenie entered the vocabulary of literary theory as a distancing device used to impede habitual perception, thus making the audience/recipient see things anew. Incidentally, Shklovskii bases his explanation of *ostranenie* on the way the character Natasha Rostova watches the theatre performance in Tolstoi's *War and Peace*, flouting the 'contract' between the audience and the stage, or in the words of Silvija Jestrović (2006, 28): "Theatrical illusion is based on the spectator's 'willing suspension of disbelief' (Coleridge), on his/her acceptance of the rules of the game". Tolstoi, by contrast, shows Natasha's perspective, her disbelief

as she does not perceive the fictional world of the opera but sees the real world of the stage. Hence the reader of the novel is made aware of this defamiliarization or distancing of the performed action.

In his essay on the anatomy of the gag, Václav Havel (1984, 17) adapts the thoughts of Jakobson, Mukařovský and Shklovskii to the modern theatre: "The real subject of defamiliarization is [...] in the end the automatism of reality. The gag defamiliarizes one automatism by another". The relevant aspect for theatre is, as Quinn shows, the idea of *concretization* (e. g., by staging), inspired by the phenomenologist Roman Ingarden, which Felix Vodička turned from an 'individual act' to the 'perception of the audience' and the 'reception of works of art' that later morphed into reception theory. Akin to Honzl, Bogatyrev (2016c, 171) pointed out that "[i]n ritual performances [...] almost all of those present are usually participants", as opposed to the audience in a theatre.

6 Space

Veltruský (2016a, 250) refers to Zich's assumption that "all the relationships between stage figures and characters are projected into space". He quotes Zich, who considers dramatic space to be "a set of immaterial relations that constantly changes in time as these relations themselves change" (Veltruský 2016a, 250). Unlike Zich, for whom the stage is the place "where plays and operas are performed" (Zich 1931, 15), Honzl (2016a, 131) proposes that "the stage can be represented by any kind of spatial reality". Moreover, alluding to Brušák's concept, Honzl introduces the sound of axes cutting down the cherry orchard as an example of an acoustic, non-spatial denotation of the "imaginary action space" (Honzl 2016a, 131). Brušák considers the "imaginary action space" to be "actualized either directly by auditory or visual signs coming from the outside, or by signs originated by the actors", for instance, "in Čapek's R.U.R., where the sudden failure of the electric light suggests that the robots have taken over the power station" (Brušák 2016a, 308). To indicate what is *not* on stage Honzl uses Bühler's concept of *Deixis am Phantasma* (deixis at/on/to the phantasm): "The poet's reference to what is not on the stage can be called phantasm-oriented deixis since it refers to a stage action that is realized solely in the audience's imagination" (Honzl 2016b, 162).

Karel Brušák (1913–2004) expanded the scope of the Prague School's interests by discussing Chinese theatre, where the text is of "little significance" (Brušák 2016b, 115) but space plays an important role:

[In his article "Imaginary Action Space in Drama" (Brušák 2016a),] Brušák employs the following three terms: *stage – scene – imaginary action space*. He understands as 'stage' only the static, physical architecture of a performance space. 'Scene' is a variable space, formed by the actual scenery, stage equipment, and so on. Brušák defines "imaginary action space" as "a space where action indispensable for the development of drama takes place," which lies beyond the physical limitations of the stage and is only fully formed in the mind's eye of the spectator. (Editor's note to Brušák 2016a, 303–304)

The *action space* is "a non-material and transitory fictitious space, conjured up by the movement of actors, by the movements and color changes of light, by the moving images of film" (Brušák 2016b, 116). The *dramatic space* is "[t]he visual aspect of any dramatic performance experienced by the spectator" (Brušák 2016b, 116).

7 Performance analysis 'Prague style'

As the above-mentioned introduction to the *Theatre Theory Reader* suggests, "[w]hen Veltruský wrote an essay on Burian's production of *Alladine and Palomides* in 1939 he provided an analysis of an actual theatre event – in fact, what we would today call a performance analysis" (Drozd and Kačer 2016, 24). In "Theatre in the Corridor", Veltruský (1979) expresses his intention to analyze Burian's staging of Maurice Maeterlinck's *The Marionette Plays* (1894) from a theoretical point of view that shows the benefits of the Prague School's semiotic approach applied to a highly experimental performance in an unconventional space, the corridor of the title. In this study of a symbolist play performed by the avant-garde theatre for a very small audience of 120 (360 people saw 3 performances), Veltruský (1979, 80) discusses "the extension of the dramatic space into the auditorium". In contrast to Brušák's (2016a, 309) claim that "the imaginary action space cannot arise [...] in the auditorium", the corridor turns into the setting of the action where lights, the speech of the actors, or their movements signify the imaginary action space, which is a space that "only exists in the imagination of the spectator, and it does not possess all the elements of the dramatic space" (Brušák 2016a, 306). As the editors of the *Theatre Theory Reader* volume conclude with respect to Burian's staging of Maeterlinck: "Reading the essay makes this clear: theory follows the material that is to be analyzed, not the other way round" (Drozd and Kačer 2016, 24). Moreover, Veltruský's article applied what Wilhelm von Humboldt termed a 'zig-zag' method "whereby the researcher proceeds by switching from universal categories to concrete descriptions and back again [...] thus bridging the gap between [the] theory of literature and text analysis" (Doležel 1990, 67).

8 The Prague School semiotics of drama and theatre today?

The joint efforts of the Prague School semiotics of theatre and drama are still highly relevant and serve as a model of a constant dialogue based on common topics, linking complex cultural contexts and advancing stimuli for artistic experiments. As Martin Revermann (2019, 7–8) writes, "They wanted to understand art – any art from any period and cultural sphere – in better and deeper ways".

The collaboration of scholars with artists has inspired the development of the stage beyond local border lines (e. g., Otomar Krejča, Alfred Radok, and Josef Svoboda). Confronted with new tasks, open to a variety of performance styles and trends, their thoughts were dynamic, never dogmatic, but subject to constant re-visions and pursuit of new theoretical stimuli. Hence their oeuvre is relevant not only for current stage experiments but also for those theatre scholars ready to engage with a "living realm of problems and questions" (Honzl 1940, 109) and on a quest for approaches to their analysis.

References

Ambros, Veronika. "Prague's Experimental Stage: Laboratory of Theatre and Semiotics." *Semiotica: Journal of the International Association for Semiotic Studies* 168.1–4 (2008): 45–65.

Ambros, Veronika. "Otakar Zich and Prague's 'Semiotic Stage': Reading Performance Avant la Letter." *Theatralia* 23.1 (2020): 13–29.

Bogatyrev Petr. *Voprosy teorii narodnogo iskusstva*. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1971.

Bogatyrev, Petr. "Semiotics in the folk theatre." *Semiotics of Art*. Eds. Ladislav Matejka and Irwin Titunik. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1976. 33–50.

Bogatyrev, Petr. "Theatrical Signs." [1938] *Theatre Theory Reader: Prague School Writings*. Eds. David Drozd, Tomáš Kačer, and Don Sparling. Prague: Karolinum Press, Charles University in Prague, 2016a. 99–114.

Bogatyrev, Petr. "A Contribution to the Study of Theatrical Signs." *Theatre Theory Reader: Prague School Writings*. Eds. David Drozd, Tomáš Kačer, and Don Sparling. Prague: Karolinum Press, Charles University in Prague, 2016b. 91–99.

Bogatyrev, Petr. "Playing and the Theatre." *Theatre Theory Reader: Prague School Writings*. Eds. David Drozd, Tomáš Kačer, and Don Sparling. Prague: Karolinum Press, Charles University in Prague, 2016c. 168–174.

Brušák, Karel. "Imaginary Action Space in Drama." *Theatre Theory Reader: Prague School Writings*. Eds. David Drozd, Tomáš Kačer, and Don Sparling. Prague: Karolinum Press, Charles University in Prague, 2016a. 303–320.

Brušák, Karel. "Signs in the Chinese Theatre." *Theatre Theory Reader: Prague School Writings*. Eds. David Drozd, Tomáš Kačer, and Don Sparling. Prague: Karolinum Press, Charles University in Prague, 2016b. 115–128.

Burian, E. F. "O úkolech nového obecenstva." *Emil František Burian a jeho program poetického divadla*. Ed. B. Srba. Prague: Divadelní ústav, 1981.

Deák, František. "Structuralism in Theatre: The Prague School Contribution." *The Drama Review* 20.4 (1976): 83–94.

Doležel, L. *Occidental Poetics: Tradition and Progress*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1990.

Drozd, David, Tomáš Kačer, and Don Sparling (eds.). *Theatre Theory Reader: Prague School Writings*. Prague: Karolinum Press, Charles University in Prague, 2016.

Drozd, David and Tomáš Kačer. "Introduction." *Theatre Theory Reader: Prague School Writings*. Eds. David Drozd, Tomáš Kačer, and Don Sparling. Prague: Karolinum Press, Charles University in Prague, 2016. 13–27.

Elam, Keir. *The Semiotics of Theatre and Drama* [1980]. London and New York, NY: Routledge, 2002.

Havel, Václav. "The anatomy of the gag." *Modern Drama* 23.1 (1984), 13–24.

Havránek, Bohuslav. "The Functional Differentiation of the Standard Language." *A Prague School Reader on Esthetics, Literary Structure, and Style*. Ed. Paul L. Garvin. Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press, 1964. 3–16.

Havránek, Bohuslav and Jan Mukařovský (eds.). *Čtení o jazyce a poesii*. Prague: Družstevní práce, 1942.

Honzl, Jindřich. "Objevené divadlo v lidovém divadle českém a slovenském." *Slovo a slovesnost* 6.2 (1940): 107–111.

Honzl, Jindřich. "The Mobility of the Theatrical Sign." *Theatre Theory Reader: Prague School Writings*. Eds. David Drozd, Tomáš Kačer, and Don Sparling. Prague: Karolinum Press, Charles University in Prague, 2016a. 129–146.

Honzl, Jindřich. "The Hierarchy of Theatrical Devices." *Theatre Theory Reader: Prague School Writings*. Eds. David Drozd, Tomáš Kačer, and Don Sparling. Prague: Karolinum Press, Charles University in Prague, 2016b, 157–64.

Jakobson, Roman. *Puškin and his Sculptural Myth*. Trans. and ed. John Burbank. The Hague: Mouton, Open Humanities Press, 1975. 1–45.

Jakobson, Roman. "An Open Letter from Roman Jakobson to Jiří Voskovec and Jan Werich on the Epistemology and Semantics of Fun." *Stanford Slavic Studies*. Eds. Lazar Fleishman and Gregory Freidin. Stanford, CA, Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, Stanford University and Berlin: Peter Lang, 1987. 155–162.

Jestrović, Silvija. *Theatre of Estrangement: Theory, Practice, Ideology*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006.

Kartsevski, Sergei [Karcevskii, Sergei]. "Du dualisme asymetrique du signe linguistique." *Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Prague* I, 1929.

Mukařovský, Jan. "Karel Čapek's Prose as Lyrical Melody and as Dialogue." *A Prague School Reader on Esthetics, Literary Structure, and Style*. Ed. Paul L. Garvin. Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press, 1964.

Mukařovský, Jan. "Structuralism in esthetics and in literary studies." *The Prague School: Selected Writings 1929–1946*. Ed. Peter Steiner. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1982. 65–82.

Mukařovský, Jan. "Standard Language and Poetic Language." *Praguiana: Some Basic and Less Known Aspects of the Prague Linguistic School*. Eds. J. Vachek and Libuše Dušková. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: Benjamins, 1983. 165–185.

Mukařovský, Jan. "An Attempt at a Structural Analysis of an Actor's Figure (Chaplin in *City Lights*)." *Theatre Theory Reader: Prague School Writings*. Eds. David Drozd, Tomáš Kačer, and Don Sparling. Prague: Karolinum Press, Charles University in Prague, 2016a. 192–198.

Mukařovský, Jan. "On Stage Dialogue." *Theatre Theory Reader: Prague School Writings*. Eds. David Drozd, Tomáš Kačer, and Don Sparling. Prague: Karolinum Press, Charles University in Prague, 2016b. 212–215.

Mukařovský, Jan. "Dialogue and Monologue." *Theatre Theory Reader: Prague School Writings*. Eds. David Drozd, Tomáš Kačer, and Don Sparling. Prague: Karolinum Press, Charles University in Prague, 2016c. 220–246.

Mukařovský, Jan. "On the current state of the theory of theatre." *Theatre Theory Reader: Prague School Writings*. Eds. David Drozd, Tomáš Kačer, and Don Sparling. Prague: Karolinum Press, Charles University in Prague, 2016d. 59–75.

Procházka, M. "U základů semiotiky divadla, II. Sémiotická témata v české meziválečné teatrologii." *Wiener Slawistischer Almanach* 5 (1980): 117–144.

Quinn, M. "The Prague School Concept of Stage Figure." *The Semiotic Bridge: Trends from California*. Eds. Gerald F. Carr and Irmengard Rauch. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter, 1989. 75–86.

Quinn, Michael L. *The Semiotic Stage: Prague School Theatre Theory*. New York, NY: Peter Lang, 1995.

Revermann, Martin. "Editorial note." *Theatralia* 22.2, Supplementum (2019): 7–8.

Shklovskii, Viktor. "Art as device." Victor Shklovskii, *Theory of Prose*. Trans. Benjamin Sher. Elmwood Park, IL: Dalkey Archive Press, 1990. 1–14.

Součková, Milada. "The Prague Linguistic Circle: A collage." *Sound, Sign, and Meaning*. Ed. Ladislav Matejka. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, 1976. 1–5.

Schmid, Herta. "Realism and abstractionism in Otakar Zich's Theory of dramatic art and Samuel Beckett's experimental dramatics." *Theatralia* 22.2, Supplementum (2019): 23–38.

Tynianov, Iurii. "On literary evolution." *Readings in Russian Poetics: Formalist and Structuralist Views*. Eds. Ladislav Matejka and Krystyna Pomorska. Ann Arbor, MI: MIT Press, 1978. 66–78.

Veltruský, Jiří. "Drama jako básnické dílo." *Čtení o jazyce a poesii*. Eds. Boh. Havránek and Jan Mukarovský. Prague: Družstevní práce, 1942. 401–502.

Veltruský, Jiří. *Drama as Literature*. The Peter De Ridder Press, *Press Publications in Semiotics of Literature*. Vol. 1. Lisse, the Netherlands: The Peter De Ridder Press, 1977.

Veltruský, Jiří. "Theatre in the Corridor." *The Drama Review* 23.4 (1979): 67–80.

Veltruský, Jiří. "The Prague School Theory of Theatre." *Poetics Today* 2.3 (1981): 225 – 235.

Veltruský, Jiří. "Structure in Folk Theatre: Notes regarding Bogatyrev's Book on Czech and Slovak Folk Theatre." *Poetics Today* 8.1 (1987). 141–161.

Veltruský, Jiří. *An Approach to the Semiotics of Art*. Brno: Masaryk University, 2012.

Veltruský, Jiří. "Dramatic Text as a Component of Theatre." *Theatre Theory Reader: Prague School Writings*. Eds. David Drozd, Tomáš Kačer, and Don Sparling. Prague: Karolinum Press, Charles University in Prague, 2016a. 247–268.

Veltruský, Jiří. "People and Things in the Theatre." *Theatre Theory Reader: Prague School Writings*. Eds. David Drozd, Tomáš Kačer, and Don Sparling. Prague: Karolinum Press, Charles University in Prague, 2016b. 147–156.

Veltruský, Jiří. "A Contribution to the Semiotics of Acting." *Theatre Theory Reader: Prague School Writings*. Eds. David Drozd, Tomáš Kačer, and Don Sparling. Prague: Karolinum Press, Charles University in Prague, 2016c. 376–442.

Zich, Otakar. *Estetika dramatického umění: teoretická dramaturgie*. Prague: Melantrich, 1931.

Zich, Otakar. *Estetika dramatického umění: teoretická dramaturgie*. 2nd edition. Prague: Panorama, 1986.

Zich, Otakar. "Puppet Theatre." *Theatralia* 18.2 (2015): 505–513.

Michał Mrugalski
Structuralism and Semiotics in Poland

1 What is structuralism (in Poland)? Regimes of eclecticism

A seminal figure of Polish structuralism, Janusz Sławiński (Roney 1981; Januszek 2012; Kluba forthcoming), took part in a 2001 survey entitled "What has remained of...", in which the legacy of the most authoritative and influential theoretical schools of the twentieth century was scrutinized. Sławiński's allotted topic was literary structuralism, which – he asserted – remains the last word on stylistics and verse theory (Sławiński 2001a, 15). One can add to that post-classical narratology as a superstructure building upon structuralism. Rather than merely listing structuralism's achievements, more importantly, Sławiński takes it upon himself to outline "the basic *theoretical principles* and issues" (Sławiński 2001a, 15) which defined the movement. These principles and issues are, of course, of a methodological rather than a thematic nature, as structuralism operated across sub-disciplines and encompassed a variety of issues, from poetic language to literary history, from verse theory to writers' biographies. The "*doctrinal minimum*, both necessary and sufficient" (Sławiński 2001a, 17) advocated the notion of

> the work of literary art as a highly organized word product (*twór słowny*), i. e. an utterance or a text. Such a product arises as a result of a double operation: the selection and the combination of signs belonging to two systems – one linguistic and one literary (literary tradition). These two systems demarcate the range of the work's potentiality or the repository of its possibilities. The elements of the work refer not only to each other and to the whole they make up, but also to the corresponding sets of elements that amount to its systemic backdrop. (Sławiński 2001a, 17)

Aside from these demarcations, the Polish structuralists freely chose their methods, approaches, and topics. Hence sturcturalism's protean nature in its glory days in the 1960s and 1970s and its "dispersed presence" (*obecność rozproszona*, Sławiński 2001a, 17) in contemporary literary studies.

In 1973, Edward Balcerzan even went as far as to deny the existence of a structuralist idiom and a structuralist method, and instead expanded on the structuralist "communicative situation" (*sytuacja komunikacyjna*, Balcerzan 1973, 4), which is typical of all Avant-Gardes.

Not only does a structuralist try to be constantly up-to-date and in league with historical Avant-Gardes' explicit and implicit poetics, not only does he or she project onto literature at large Avant-Garde values (as was the case with Tyni-

anov's and Mukařovský's notion of evolution and evolutionary aesthetic value, cf. Tynianov 2000 [1924], 1971 [1927]; Mukařovský 1970 [1936]), but he or she also uses Avant-Garde devices of parody and self-ridicule to render models of literary phenomena while transgressing the limits of the humanities towards the sciences and literature (Balcerzan 1973, 4; Balcerzan 1972). Polish structuralism – both in its prime and in hindsight – seemed to take great pride in its syncretic, eclectic, and open character (Sławiński 1980; 1981).

As I will demonstrate below, interwar Polish structuralism – by which I mean mostly the core members of the Warsaw Circle (cf. my chapter on Polish formalism in this volume): Stefan Żółkiewski, Kazimierz Budzyk, Dawid Hopensztand, and Franciszek Siedlecki – placed so much stress on methodology in order to ensure literary and cultural theory's infallible access to all areas of human activity. In the wake of the rebirth of structuralism in Poland after 1958, the young Sławiński and Aleksandra Okopień-Sławińska, at the threshold of their careers, highlighted the qualitative difference between the Vilnius and the Warsaw "Formalist" schools while subscribing to the legacy of the latter current (Okopień and Sławiński 1960, 94), which placed emphasis on methodological stringency (Mrugalski 2018). However, as Bartosz Ryż (2013, 66–83) points out, only the early and fairly short period of structuralism's coming of age was characterized by a striving for methodological purity, as is documented by four "manifestos" of structuralism (Krasuski 1992, 62; Ryż 2013, 66), all of which were PhD theses written under the supervision of Kazmierz Budzyk – alongside Maria Renata Mayenowa and Stefan Żółkiewski one of the survivors of Polish interwar structuralism. These founding works of postwar structuralism include Michał Głowiński's *Poetyka Tuwima a polska tradycja literacka* (1962, *Tuwim's Poetics and the Polish Literary Tradition*), Teresa Kostkiewiczowa's *Model liryki sentymentalnej w twórczości F. Karpińskiego* (1964, *A Model of Sentimentalist Lyrical Poetry in the Oeuvre of Franciszek Karpiński*); Aleksandra Okopień-Sławińska's *Wiersz nieregularny Mickiewicza, Słowackiego i Norwida* (1964, *The Irregular Verse of Mickiewicz, Słowacki, and Norwid*) and Janusz Sławiński's *Koncepcja języka poetyckiego awangardy krakowskiej* (1965, *The Cracow Avant-garde's Concept of Poetic Language*). The range of issues is ostensibly wide, reaching from the Enlightenment to what was then an extended contemporaneity, and encompassing both intrinsic (work-oriented) and extrinsic (context-oriented) issues of literary tradition, genre, verse, and poetic language. Nevertheless, there is an order to this gaudy miscellany. Regarding Sławiński's insistence on a literary utterance's participation in two orders – linguistic and literary-historical – it strikes the observer that, while Głowiński devoted his first monograph to the systemic and historical role of literary tradition in the work of a poet who rejected Avant-Garde extremism and explored the historical dimension of art, Sławiński presented the Cracow Avant-Garde as a current that opposed language to literary tradition:

> Every speech act of poetry renews, sharpens, and resolves the opposition. The direction of such resolutions appeared clearly: a work's relation to tradition should be the inverse of its relation to language. While manifesting its rootedness in a linguistic consciousness, the work should at the same time communicate its independence from norms and habits established by previously existing poetical conventions of genres, style, verse, etc. The poeticity of an utterance [...] may appear insofar as concurrently it does not recognise the previous achievements of poetry. (Sławiński 1998a [1965], 245)

In sum, Głowiński and Kostkiewiczowa and Sławiński and Okopień-Sławińska approach the same central issue of the relationship between literature's two main systems of reference, language and tradition or structure and composition, from two different sides.

The ample range of structuralist interests did not rigidify the doctrine, nor did it homogenize its methodology (Sławiński 2001a, 15–16). On the contrary, once the four launching monographs were published, structuralism swiftly entered a phase of dispersion or expansion, a hallmark of which is the *tour de force* by the four structuralists: *Słownik terminów literackich* (1976, Dictionary of Literary Terms). In this work, whose impact on literary studies in Poland has remained evident to this day, the structuralist idiom was presented as an unmarked, general language of literary studies (Czaplejewicz 1977; Lewiński 2004, 100–113, cf. below in section 3.2). This 'naturalization' of structuralist poetics and theory was enhanced by the fact that Głowiński and the Sławińskis penned the first and still unparalleled textbook of poetics for university students (Głowiński et al. 1957 and a new, revised version of 1962). The supervisor of the Warsaw troika (*trojaczki*), Budzyk, entrusted his students in their twenties with the task of preparing the reference work for generations of prospective literary scholars. A collateral result of this unheard-of example of learning by teaching was the propagation of structuralism among teachers and pupils. Such adaptability or, if you will, rapacity would not have been possible had it not been for the syncretic and pragmatic character of Polish structuralism.

This character seems to have been preprogrammed from the outset. The Polish forerunners of linguistic structuralism worldwide, Jan N. Baudouin de Courtenay and Mikołaj Kruszewski, supported by a local champion in Karol Appel, perceived language as ineluctably heterogeneous. While Ferdinand de Saussure, whose exchanges with Baudouin de Courtenay and Kruszewski enabled structuralism's emergence (Koerner 1973, 133–162; 1978, 107–152; Adamska-Sałaciak 2001; Berazin 2001), regarded linguistic signs either as a purely psychological entity (*signifiant* is also a representation, *l'image*) or belonging to a separate uniform realm of the semiotic, for Kruszewski language is a combination of physical (physiological, acoustic) and psychological, unconscious aspects (Kruszewski 1995 [1881], 1995 [1883], 7–9). Karol Appel (1910, 15) called attention to the paradoxical fact that

there is nothing in language that would be of language, just as white light is composed of all colors, i. e. of obscuration (in this way, Appel crassly occupies the antipode of Noam Chomsky's position, whose point of departure is the existence of the specific language faculty, cf. Hauser et al. 2002).

Baudouin de Courtenay also believed in methodological pluralism, which, he argued, allowed a kind of perspectivism or manifold approaches to the object of study:

> the method of present-day linguistics is the same as that of the natural sciences – rigorous, inductive. From this perspective, linguistics is, then, a natural science. However, if we consider the nature of the object in question, that is, the nature of language as a phenomenon of the – for the most part – unconscious activity of man, linguistics must be considered one of the historico-pychological or "sociological" sciences. If one rejects this traditional dualism, then the question of linguistics' affiliation proves futile because, firstly, all present-day sciences appear to be natural, since they study nature in the amplest meaning of the term and their pretensions to possess a scientific character depend on whether they use inductive and then deductive methods. Secondly, all sciences are but parts of one general science: they are nothing but separate tasks taken upon by separate groups of researchers, whose ultimate goal is the cognition of reality in all its aspects. The task of all sciences consists in cleansing the object of study of all "contingency" and arbitrariness so as to find "regularities" and "laws." From this point of view, all sciences that enage in comparision and generalisation of details are natural if they foreground the coordination and regularity hidden in phenomena; if they, instead, content themselves with contigencies and particularities – they are historical. (Baudouin de Courtenay 1882, 10)

The legacy of methodological pluralism proved to be significant and long-lasting, as the first wave of Polish structuralism – predominantly the members of the interwar Warsaw Circle – not only considered the neo-Kantian principle of the priority of method over object the cultural prerequisite of Cubism in the visual arts, Russian Cubo-Futurism in poetry, and Russian formalism in literary studies (Hopensztand 1938, 134), but they also posited that the methodology of the new humanities takes on the form of a transcendentalism describing how theories combine networks of notions with empirical evidence. The multiplicity of theories, postulated in accordance with the 'principle of tolerance' (Carnap 1937), was supposed to be governed by methodology, which limited itself to the scrutiny of purely formal ('syntactical') features of theories (Żółkiewski 1937a, 1937b, 1938a, 1938b). The postwar structuralism of the 1960s and 1970s sought to avoid both naïve realism and naïve conventionalism, of which the methodology of the interwar structuralism was considered to be an example (Okopień and Sławiński 1960): both extreme stances – Sławiński says (1998a [1965], 280–281) – treat the object as something finished, either given in advance or constructed in the course of research, whereas "literary-historical structure" (*struktura historyczn-*

oliteracka) results from a never-ending dialog between the conventional method and that which is actually given. As such, a structure is always regarded as one of many possible models of cultural phenomena.

The influence of linguistics and the philosophy of science on the process of forming the pluralistic or eclectic character of Polish literary structuralism was, of course, reinforced by the local tradition of literary studies, especially Kazimierz Wóycicki's studies on poetics and the unity of the literary work, which I recapitulate in the chapter on Polish formalism (Wóycicki 1914a, 1914b). In Wóycicki (1914a), the methodology of literary studies carries the task of coordinating intrinsic and extrinsic literary history (evolution and genesis), as well as intrinsic and extrinsic poetics, i. e. the psychology of creation and literary theory. In this way, the ideal of the 'integral method' of literary studies, which would later be able to embrace the heterogeneous and incongruent elements of the literary, was inoculated in the Polish formalist-structuralist school; its metamorphosis is one of the leitmotivs of the present chapter. In interwar Poland, the specter of an integral method assumed the shape of Manfred Kridl's method (Mrugalski 2017) and, alternatively, Żółkiewski's and the Warsaw Circle's notion of methodology, as it was concurrently counterpointed on the part of the literary Avant-Garde by Jan Brzękowski's idea of 'integral poetry' (Brzękowski 1933). After the war, the integral method morphed first into Marxism, which explained everything, and semiotics, both of which were predestined to integrate literary studies (Żółkiewski 1967 [1960], 1960), and finally, as we shall see in section 3.2, into the theory of literary communication, which emerged from attempts to combine Marxism with semiotics (Budzyk 1966 [1958]).

Of course, structuralism was by no means an aboriginal affair. On the contrary, its great local origins were correlated with an appreciation for creolization, heteroglossia (Baudouin de Courtenay 1963 [1901]; Rozwadowski 1960 [1913]; Mrugalski 2020), and eclecticism. In his 2001 inventory of Polish structuralism, Sławiński correlates the main fields of Polish structuralist interest with its relationships with other scholarly cultures. The output of the Prague School laid foundations for literary history. The Moscow-Tartu School placed literary semiotics in the broad context of cultural semiotics. In addition, finally, French structuralism, although dogmatic, helped develop the generative aspects of literary, typically narrative texts. All three schools harkened back – each in its own way – to the common legacy of Russian formalism (Sławiński 2001a, 15). International entanglements are thus as constitutive for structuralist literary studies in Poland as its inherited methodological syncretism or pluralism are.

To a degree unprecedented elsewhere, anthologies of foreign literary studies were instrumental in the 'crystallisation' of Polish literary studies and especially structuralism. Before World War II, the core activity of Polish 'formalists'

revolved around the publication series *Archive of Translations in Literary Theory and the Methology of Literary Studies* (*Archiwum tłumaczeń z zakresu teorii literatury i metodologii badań literackich*). As I will demonstrate in the final subchapter, the effects of the series – especially of Viktor Vinogradov's essays on artistic prose and, generally, of Russian formalism – were discernible throughout the history of Polish structuralism, even though all exemplars of the anthology of Russian formalism – the world's first – burnt during World War II. After the war, the process of the consolidation of local theory around translations was sustained by multivolume anthologies edited by Stefania Skwarczyńska (1965, 1966, 1974, 1981, 1986) and Henryk Markiewicz (1970, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1992; Markiewicz and Walas 2011). Even though the anthologists were not structuralists themselves and might have been intended as a remedy to the supremacy of structuralism, the latter's protean nature easily assimilated seemingly alien content.

In the following, I will expand, first, on the extrinsic history (genesis) and only then, second, on the evolution of Polish structuralism, as it mixed with, and set itself apart from, phenomenology and Marxism. I will then focus on two cases of the intercultural entanglement of Polish structuralism, first with Russian and Bohemian scholarly cultures and, subsequently, with two individual foreign predecessors, Sergei Karcevskii and Viktor Vinogradov. These two main sponsors of Polish structuralism were not the most obvious choices, but perhaps originality means simply copying different models. Or – as the case of Viktor Vinogradov, whose reception in Poland began in the mid-1930s, suggests – copying them before they become popular.

1 Extrinsic history: Institutions and people

In his eulogy to Umberto Eco, Aleksandr Zholkovskii, captured the peak and turning point of the institutional history of Polish structuralism:

> We first met at a symposium on semiotics in Warsaw [the proceedings were published in Greimas et al. 1970; Rey-Debove 1973], in 1968, in August – that is, literally in the fatal minutes, at the time of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia. Eco was going to drive through Czechoslovakia, but he was stopped at the border and forced to fly by plane. At the symposium in Warsaw, the upper crust of the European semiotic intelligentsia [*semioticheskaia intelligenciia*] gathered. Among them, I remember the beautiful poststructuralist Julia Kristeva, the film critic Christian Metz, of the older scholars – the great linguist Émile Benveniste. Roman Jakobson cancelled his visit at the last minute – Soviet tanks in Prague were an unpleasant reminder of the German tanks he saw there in 1938. He soon flew from Prague, it seems, to Paris. They were almost all leftists, all on first-name terms while speaking in languages in which there is a difference between singular and plural forms of the second

person: German, French, Italian. I, an apologist for the American aggression in Vietnam, which they all denounced, also became "tu." They understood what I was going through, but remained silent on the Soviet aggression on Czechoslovakia. They, as leftists, didn't know what to make of it. And then Anna Wierzbicka – then a Polish, now an Australian linguist – demonstratively dressed for her talk in the colours of the Czech flag. (Zholkovskii 2016)

The ambition of the Polish structuralists in the first half of the 1960s was for Warsaw to become *the* meeting place of the Eastern and Western humanities. When history put that ambition to the test, misunderstandings between the East and the West came to the fore and the plans foundered under the pressure of political circumstances. The 1968 congress was supposed to be the crowning moment of endeavors undertaken during the decade after 1958 by Roman Jakobson and Maria Renata Mayenowa to make post-1956 Poland "a land relatively open both to the East and the West", a central place for the emergence of the structural humanities and a venue for the "semiotic intelligentsia". The breakdown of these hopes in 1968 marked a severe blow to Mayenowa and Polish and East European structuralism in general (Dobrzyńska 1990, 152).

Roman Jakobson's contribution to the emergence of Polish structuralism can hardly be overestimated. He played the role of its midwife, so to speak, twice – once at the birth of structuralism in interwar Poland and again when he assisted its re-emergence after the period of the Stalinisation of culture, which came to an end after the October of 1956, when the Polish thaw set in. In 1934, the young Polish student of literature, Franciszek Siedlecki, published in the popular literary weekly magazine *Wiadomości Literackie* (*Literary News*) an article entitled "Roman Jakobson i nowa lingwistyka" ("Roman Jakobson and New Linguistics"), which instigated a collaboration between the Prague Linguistic Circle and the Polish formalists (Siedlecki 1934; Gierowski 2013, 79–85). Siedlecki's article did not fall on deaf ears in Prague, as Jakobson's radar had been set on Poland.

Jakobson's interest in collaboration with Polish colleagues may have been enhanced by his perception of Poland as an 'intermediary' between the East and West, Eurasia (or the "Russian linguistic world", *russkii lingvisticheskii mir*) and Europe, as can be inferred from his writings in the spirit of eurasianism roughly from that period (cf. Savickii and Jakobson 1931, 9; Jakobson 1962 [1931], 161–164, 183). In those writings, he extensively cites Polish linguists such as Baudoin de Courtenay, Stanisław Szober, Kazimierz Nycz, and Tadeusz Lehr-Spławiński. No wonder, then, that in the 1930s he was inclined to attribute to Poland an important role in the transfer of formalist-structuralist thought from Russian to Western European culture. Later, in altered circumstances, after the war and the Stalinist period, Poland had all that it took to become an intermediary in a truly multilateral exchange within the framework of the transatlantic semiotic intelligentsia.

In Mayenowa he found a willing partner for realizing this idea in the form of a series of international congresses and joint projects. Jakobson first visited Poland in 1958, promoting his understanding of structuralism while on his grand tour (Rudy 1999, 88; Głowiński 1999):

> Over the course of the year, Jakobson attended fifteen conferences in six different countries. He delivered eighteen papers on twelve distinct topics and participated in three discussion panels. 1958 was the year of one of Jakobson's most famous conference presentations, his closing remarks at the Conference on Poetic Language at Indiana University in April [i.e. Jakobson 1987 [1960]]. That same year he attended the IXth International Congress of Papyrologists in Oslo and the Conference on Yiddish Studies at Columbia University. 1958 was also the year that the International Congress of Slavists was reconvened in Moscow, where Jakobson delivered three papers, one on Slavic morphology and declension, one on problems of translation, and one survey of the linguistic scholarly landscape in the U.S. This was a typical year for Jakobson in the 1950s and 1960s. (Brinley 2017)

It was during the Moscow Congress of Slavists that Jakobson received an official invitation to Poland. The forthcoming leading structuralists, Aleksandra Okopieniowa (after marrying Janusz Sławiński she used the name Aleksandra Okopień-Sławińska) and Michał Głowiński prepared a résumé of the workshop for Polish scholars, which took place at the mountain resort of Krynica Górska in October 1958. Jakobson delivered two lectures, *Linguistics and Poetics* and *Verse and Linguistics* (Okopieniowa and Głowiński 1959, 315). The former, probably the most influential among Jakobson's articles, appeared two years later in a distinct version translated by Jakobson's wife-to-be Krystyna Pomorska, his universal theory illustrated with examples from Polish poetry (Jakobson 1960). The young Polish scholars perceived both lectures as situated in a borderland between linguistics and literary studies, at the place where earlier "Chinese walls" between the two disciplines stood (Okopieniowa and Głowiński 1959, 315).

However, in his lectures Jakobson did not ignore the second system of reference – tradition. He apparently believed that the Poles could be seduced by his ultra-modern approach if he presented it as part of their own history. Starting before World War II, when he wrote a eulogy to Baudouin de Courtenay, or during the war, when he spoke before the members of the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences of America in NYC about "Polish-Russian Cooperation in the Science of Language", Jakobson made sure that structuralism was perceived in Poland firstly as a native Polish school of thought deriving, inter alia, from Baudouin de Courtenay's and Kruszewski's linguistics (Jakobson 1971b [1929], 1971c [1960], 1971d [1966], 1971e [1943]), and secondly as an Avant-Garde discipline drawing its premises not only from two major European phenomenologists, Hegel and Husserl, but also from the Futurist poets Vladimir Maiakovskii and Velimir Khlebnikov. Jakobson also emphasized these points during his Polish workshop (Okopieniowa and

Głowiński 1959, 315). That Russian formalism was "the theoretical wing of Russian futurism" had already been stated by Dawid Hopensztand (1938, 183); phenomenology and Marxism, as an heir to Hegelian dialectics, were two polar points of reference for Polish structuralism throughout its history, both in the interwar and in the postwar periods (see section 3).

The year of Jakobson's visit to Poland, 1958, was marked by another important meeting. The National Congress of Polish Philologists initiated two major processes. On the one hand, the reckoning with Stalinism and the liberalisation of methodological tendencies began, while on the other hand, communicationism arose in attempts to make Marxism more flexible by means of taking literary structures into account. I will expand on these Marxist operations in section 3.2 while dealing with the relationship between structuralism and Marxism.

The years 1958–1968 in Poland were a decade of international congresses. In 1960, the International Conference of Poetics was held in Warsaw, attended by more than fifty students of language, literature, and folklore from twelve countries (Davie et al. 1962). "This was probably a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity" – recalls Michał Głowiński – "to witness a discussion between Roman Jakobson and Roman Ingarden" (Głowiński 2005, 89). The discussion was fundamental, as it concerned the place of poetics in the edifice of modern science – whether poetics should be regarded as a part of linguistics or philosophical aesthetics. A series of subsequent conferences saw the participation of a number of world-leading scholars, including Iurii Apresian, Roland Barthes, Émile Benveniste, Lubomir Doležel, Oswald Ducrot, Umberto Eco, Algirdas Julien Greimas, Pierre Guiraud, Viacheslav Ivanov, Dmitrii Likhachev, Jan Mukařovský, Meyer Shapiro, Vladimir Toporov, Boris Uspenskii, and Viktor Zhirmunskii (Jakobson et al. 1966; Greimas et al. 1970; Rey-Debove 1973; Dobrzyńska 1990; Głowiński 2005).

The great international congresses were counterpointed and capitalized on by a series of national conferences (Sławiński 1986; Lewiński 2004, 72–90), organized from 1963 on by the Institute of Literary Study of the Polish Academy of Sciences, the stronghold of structuralism, in cooperation with regional universities throughout Poland. These conferences, located in secluded venues, aimed for the integration of the milieu and the intensive propagation of structuralism's tenets. Their workshop-like character was pronounced, in that they were designed as conferences of junior scientific staff (equivalent to graduate students or assistant professors) held under the auspices of experienced researchers. Guests from Czechoslovakia (Miroslav Červenka, Milan Jankovič, Mojmir Grygar, Lubomir Doležel, and Anton Popovič) also took part in the discussions. In time, however, young researchers became mainstays of Polish literary studies, and so the conferences changed their formula, but not in such a way that they lost their give-and-take character. Just as structuralism was disseminated in different locations and

different local universities, so the theory itself was exposed to different stimuli, which accelerated its coming to terms with its own nature as prone to eclecticism. Sławiński goes as far as to state in his recollections that by the 1970s, Polish literary studies, after a phase of desperately chasing the West, had reached a phase of maturity, i. e. eclecticism, which expressed itself in the form of the conferences. This kind of eclecticism rested on a belief in the object of study as a thing in itself, endowed with an endless number of attributes and, as such, susceptible to an endless number of approaches and languages (Sławiński 1986, 18–24).

This eclectic nature of Polish structuralism was similarly expressed in the character of the magazine *Teksty* (*Texts*) published in the years 1972–1981 with Janusz Sławiński as editor in chief. *Texts* was apparently open to all impulses (except for those stemming from institutions on which a social anathema had been laid, such as the Faculty of Polish Studies at the University of Warsaw; see below in section 3.2; Sławiński 1981; Grochowski 2016). The magazine patterned itself on the French *Communications*, which was perceived as a wide-ranging and open-minded institution of heterogeneity. After a period of suspension enforced by the imposition of martial law in Poland in 1981, the magazine was resuscitated as *Teksty Drugie* (*Second Texts*). Ryszard Nycz, whom it would be problematic to call a 'structuralist', became the new editor in chief, but the eclectic character of the publication persisted or deepened.

All these events and institutions of transfer were at least partly organized and hosted by the Institute of Literary Studies (Instytut Badań Literackich, IBL), affiliated with the Polish Academy of Sciences. The Institute itself has a rich and fascinating history, which has been elaborated on in a great detail in a three-volume publication (Kiślak 2016). In the context of the present chapter, for which structuralism's entanglement with Marxism is of vital importance (see section 3.2), it suffices to recall that the Institute was established right at the beginning of the Stalinist period by the ex-structuralist Żółkiewski with the task of disseminating Stalinist-Marxist literary studies in schools and universities. After the war, the interwar structuralist Żółkiewski became a prominent political figure and remained a potentate until 1968, when he supported students in their conflict with the regime. After 1956, in the thaw period, the Institute gradually became a sanctuary for the structuralists, especially after 1968, when they were removed from universities lest they spoil the young minds of students. At that time, as a pure research institution the Institute had at its disposal the best library from West Berlin to Vladivostok, which attracted scholars from Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union, who were able to acquaint themselves with Western innovations.

Two projects, tackling entangled, transcultural phenomena arose out of collaboration with East and Central European colleagues. First, there was an attempt,

undertaken under the influence of and in cooperation with Bohemian colleagues, to implement the notions of the then emergent textual linguistics on literary utterances. Texts (*utterances*) were treated as wholistic events (*performances*), enclosed in a situation of communicating; given that their limits or frames constitute their most vital elements, the theory of text foregrounds certainly verbal, but also gestural and phatic signals of taking up and breaking off contact. The collaborative work on the text resulted in a number of collective studies (Mayenowa 1971, 1974, 1976, 1978; Dobrzyńska 1986, 2008). While in respect of the theory of the text, Polish structuralism was on the receiving end of theory transfer, accepting Bohemian impulses (Dobrzyńska 2012, 255 lists Fratišek Daneš, Jan Firbas, Petr Sgall, Miroslav Červenka, and Jana Hoffmannowa), the Institute of Literary Studies also hosted the project *Porównawcza metryka słowiańska* (*Comparative Studies in Slavic Meter*), one of the most formidable projects in structuralist literary studies worldwide.

The project of *Comparative Studies in Slavic Meter* (Pszczołowska 2012; Dobrzyńska 2012) developed during Jakobson's stays in Poland and took recourse to his interwar ideas concerning comparative studies of Russian meters and rhythms, some aspects of which Jakobson paralleled with elements of the Czech and the Bulgarian systems (Jakobson 1969 [1923], 1933). The general idea behind Jakobson's and Mayenowa's project consisted in creating the 'rhythmic dictionary of a language', which would contain a list of rhythmical types of words according to the number of syllables, syllable weight, and the position of the accent. These entries were to be ordered by their frequency in a meter, an epoch, a poet's oeuvre, and by combinations they were part of (Pszczołowska 2012, 162). Jakobson and Mayenowa could win over the experienced student of verse Maria Dłuska along with Mayenowa's pupils Zdzisława Koczyńska and Lucylla Pszczołowska. Jan Mukařovský's two apprentices, Kveta Sgallová and Miroslav Červenka, joined the project's inner circle. Soon the group was completed by the Bulgarian Atanas Slavov, the Slovene Tone Pretnar, and the Russians Mikhail Gasparov, Dina Gelukh, and, at a later stage, Mikhail Lotman. A nine-volume collective monograph, which developed the original idea of the rhythmical dictionary, came to fruition as a result of their collective efforts.

The project commenced with a collective volume titled *Słownik rytmiczny i sposoby jego wykorzystania* (*Rhythmical Dictionary and its Usage*; Kopczyńska and Pszczołowska 1979) comparing the linguistic forms of prose and verse in the Slavic languages. It was shown that verse language generally prefers shorter words that allow for more frequent accents and that languages with fixed accent, such as Polish or Czech, tend to be less diverse with respect to the repertoire of rhythmical forms than, say, the Russian language. However, fixed accent languages make up for their scarcity of forms by providing a more clear-cut hierarchy of verse types,

with those least resembling prose at the top (Pszczołowska 2012, 163). Regarding the entangled history of literary theory, the most instructive work on comparative metrics seems to be Pszczołowska's project on the semantics of verse forms contained in volume 3 of *Comparative Studies in Slavic Meter* (Pszczołowska 1988). As is typical of structural semantics accounting for the generation of complex meaning by way of combining smaller units, the most salient notions of verse semantics are *distinction* and *hierarchy*. In this framework, Mikhail Lotman, for example, synchronically compared the verse forms of Afanasii Fet and Nikolai Nekrasov, while Pszczołowska and Dorota Urbańska narrated the shifts in the valuation of verse types in the history of Polish poetry. What appears to pertain to all Slavic cultures is a strict distinction between 'home-grown' and 'quasi-natural' forms on the one hand and 'alien' and 'artificial' ones on the other, iambic verse being especially marked: "its sign function is an orientation towards generally accepted values of European humanism or of high-brow world poetry. The opposite of iambs is trochaic verse – considered to be natural, which has often been explained with reference to the prosodic organisation of language" (Pszczołowska 2012, 167). Of course, meters alter their significance along the entangled lines of literary evolution, and so over time iambic verse began to indicate an automatization of perception which needs to be shifted or destroyed. Volume 6 (Červenka et al. 1995) is devoted to the translation of verse and introduces the notion of the functional metric equivalent. This feature is not taken into consideration in cultures and epochs that do not pay attention to the metric conventions of a source literature and solely follow the habits of a target culture. But rendering a metric equivalent does not boil down to forcing the patterns pertaining to a source language upon the prosody of a target language. The equivalent is instead functional, i. e. it emulates the functions fulfilled by verse forms in a source system. Within this frame of reference, the Russian four-stress iamb is not an equivalent of the Polish four-stress, but of Polish eleven-syllable syllabic verse. This transcultural and methodologically heterogeneous project mirrored, then, both the institutional makeup and the most durable characteristics of Polish structuralism.

2 Between phenomenology and Marxism (methodology, verse semantics, and communication)

2.1 Phenomenology

The continuity of Polish structuralism marked by a hiatus of two decades (1939–58) hinged on its entanglements – both transcultural and with other disciplines. The two generations of the Polish structuralists – one born around 1910 with Kazimierz Budzyk, Dawid Hopensztand, Maria Renata Mayenowa, Franciszek Siedlecki, and Stefan Żółkiewski – and another – about 20 years younger and including Edward Balcerzan, Michał Głowiński, Aleksandra Okopień-Sławińska, and Janusz Sławiński – relate to, and differ from one another in terms of their respective relationships with phenomenology and Marxism. These relationships do not boil down to a simple acceptance or rebuttal, while personal and political motivations overlapped with theoretical ones. For the postwar generation of structuralists, it seemed unbecoming to attack 'idealist' and 'bourgeois' phenomenology and its epitome, Roman Ingarden, and thus to form a common front with the Marxists, while – as I will demonstrate shortly – phenomenology was the 'whipping boy' of interwar structuralism. Conversely, the structuralists of the second generation paid respect to Ingarden's work as a historical achievement and were ready to accept his position to no less a degree than the Prague School, predominantly Felix Vodička, did (Głowiński 1977); this would obviously have been too much for the previous generation.

As for Marxism, the structuralists of the second generation, disapproving of Marxism themselves both for political and theoretical reasons (the latter related to standard Marxism's geneticism and ontological essentialism), made a sharp distinction between despicable desk jockeys and propagandists, customarily employees of the Institute of Polish Literature at the University of Warsaw, and decent Marxists and socialists, such as Maria Janion and Henryk Markiewicz or, for that matter, their forerunners, teachers, and superiors, Budzyk and Żółkiewski, who before and after the War – albeit in different ways according to circumstances – tried to reconcile structuralism and Marxism. Indeed, around 1958–1960, Budzyk, Żółkiewski, and Maria Janion planned to combine Marxism with elements of structuralism, the latter two patterning their theories after György Lukács and Lucien Goldmann respectively. I will discuss this topic in greater detail in the second part of this chapter.

Let us consider, in the first instance, the negotiations with phenomenology before expanding on the more sensitive case of Marxism. In a nutshell: while interwar structuralism rejected phenomenology outright due to the latter's claim to lay the groundwork for the humanities or sciences in general – a role which was reserved for purely formal methodology, independent of any original experiences and other legitimisations – postwar structuralism 'historicized' phenomenology in a dual meaning of the term. In the *Dictionary of Literary Terms* (1976), postwar structuralism presented the phenomenological method as a current of historical interest, i. e. as no longer topical. Whatever remained relevant from the phenomenological tradition was historicized, just as the Prague structuralist Vodička had placed Ingarden's aesthetic object, the result of the process of the work's *objectification* and *concretisation* by the receiver, against the ever-changing backdrop of the literary tradition while also locating the places of indeterminacy in all strata of the literary work of art (Vodička 1982 [1941]; Herman 1997). One should recall that a structuralist distinguishes different strata in the literary work to those that Ingarden does, for whom only two basic strata are of a linguistic nature, and that a structuralist accordingly posits the notion of concretisation differently. This would be brought out by the discussion in the 1960s between Ingarden and Jakobson.

The interwar structuralists were called 'formalists', to which label they provide an ironic undertone, as in their works on methodology and the history of then recent Russian literary theory they alluded to formalism as a stance in the foundations of mathematics and the philosophy of science. The Warsaw 'formalists' gave a decidedly nominalist twist to the content and models they adopted from Russia and Czechoslovakia while also referring to the work of Bertrand Russell (*type theory*), Rudolf Carnap and the Vienna Circle, Alfred Tarski, Kazimierz Ajdukiewicz, Dina Sztejnbarg, and the Polish-Jewish-born French epistemologist Émile Meyerson (Żółkiewski 1937a, 1937b, 1938a, 1938b). In other scholarly cultures, the influence of the Vienna scholars on structuralism was rather tacit than avowed (Albrecht 2000, 17; Stegmüller 1986), with the exception of Germany, where the impactful issue of the magazine *Kursbuch* 1966, No. 5, which introduced European structuralism to the German public, contained paragraphs 14–16 from Carnap's 1928 study *Der logische Aufbau der Welt* (*The Logical Structure of the World*; Carnap 1966), alongside contributions by Saussure, Jakobson and Tynianov, Barthes, Bierwisch, Fodor and Katz, and Levi-Strauss.

Hence to the Warsaw researchers operating in the 1930s, formalism meant not only allegiance to their Russian precursors, but also something akin to mathematical formalism, as in David Hilbert. The formalists, in opposition to the Platonic realists or intuitionists, conceive of the statements of mathematics (or logic) as a consequence of construction based on axioms or atomic signs and conducted

using self-referential symbols in a finite number of steps. If the operations with formal symbols are correct, the system is valid (truth corresponds to non-contradiction). The Warsaw scholars, who were fully-fledged structuralists, accepted the label *formalista* in view of this meaning of formalism. They were in fact, to use the more popular terminology, conventionalists. Whatever the label, their positions could not be reconciled with phenomenology's legitimizing its method by reference to an original experience.

For the interwar structuralists, experience was derivative, or the meaning of the notion of experience resembled that which Hermann Cohen described in Kant's theory of experience, i. e. a general body of knowledge on laws governing a chunk of reality (Cohen 1902). The pivotal feature of Warsaw nominalist formalism was the strict distinction between methodology and theory. Theory, according to Stefan Żółkiewski, is always an interpretation of positive data, whereas methodology – a truly formalist discipline – examines the conditions of the formal validity (correctness) of class notions pertaining to any given branch of science. Validity in the realm of methodology is purely formal in the sense that it is verifiable without reference to the meaning (*Bedeutung*) of the sentences analysed (Żółkiewski 1937b, 36–37, 41). Meaning pertains to theory just as theory correlates sensory data with interpretative categories in judgements (sentences). Conventionalism, however, excludes the possibility that in any given area of research there can be only one theory satisfying some *a priori* conditions of truth (cf. Rudolf Carnap's principle of tolerance formulated in § 17 of *The Logical Syntax of Language* [1937]; cf. Stadler 2015, 53–68, 207–211). Methodology should thus pattern itself on Alfred Tarski's conception of metalanguage as a way to mediate between different possible object-languages (Żółkiewski 1937b, 43; Tarski 1956 [1933], 1956 [1936]). Methodological metalanguage investigates the validity of definitions and classifications, as between poetic and scholarly language, between poetic and practical language, and between the language of prose and verse (Budzyk 1937b, 428).

The Warsaw formalists projected their formalism retroactively onto Russian formalism, distinguishing between the methodological formalism of Vinogradov, Jakobson, and Iakubinskii and the naïve formalism of Shklovskii and Èikhenbaum (Hopensztand 1938; Budzyk 1937a). In their eyes, the most progressive Russian formalists pointed towards methodological formalism because, as a general principle, the structural humanities called for a pure formal, conventionalist methodology able to move across different aspects of reality (Siedlecki 1937, v–xi). This is because language (according to Baudouin de Courtenay, Kruszewski, Appel) and man (according to Kant) exist in various dimensions: physiological, psychological, ethical, historical, etc., and nevertheless exhibit a unity. Methodology establishes opportunities for comparison or exchange between the 'realities' we live in and 'experience' while securing their autonomy and specificity.

Let us now expand on the difference between methodology and theory, using an example taken from Jakobson's writings. When reconstructing Jakobson's "Phenomenological Structuralism", Elmar Holenstein (1975, 42) claimed that the most obvious form of the systemic phonetic shift (*Lautwandlung*) is the restitution of balance within a system. Although a tendency towards equilibrium has been the subject of scientific explanations since time immemorial, Jakobson's phenomenological teleology, according to Holenstein, differs from metaphysical explanations (as in Aristotle), as well as from the economic notion of equilibrium characteristic of the nineteenth-century *Naturwissenschaften* (natural sciences). Jakobson's kind of equilibrium is purely systemic or even aesthetically motivated: when a shift in one segment of the system occurs, the system makes up for it in one of its other segments (subsystems) for the sake of maintaining its own *Gestalt*. Whereas Holenstein's Jakobson takes a clear position on the ontology of linguistic sounds, methodology, as the Warsaw formalists understood it, seeks to compare the three ways of conceiving of a system's orientation towards equilibrium – metaphysical, physical, or phenomenological – and then states similarities or homologies or differences between these theories without committing to any of them. From the methodological standpoint, these theories do not exclude one another. This is one of the main reasons why the Warsaw formalist Franciszek Siedlecki scolded Jakobson in a letter written in 1943 for the latter's attempts to found the new humanities upon phenomenology. Phenomenology is only a theoretical option, rather 'idealist' and 'backward', in his eyes, and in no way is it intended to be the foundation of the new humanities (Jakobson 1968). The humanities, contends Siedlecki, can be renewed only by the inclusion of metalevels, which makes it possible to accommodate both formalist and social perspectives on literary works and artefacts of culture. The science of literature ought to be a

> discipline based on the principles of the axiomatization of theory, on the verifiability (i. e. the reduction to patterns of axioms) of all its non-primary sentences, on the differentiation between practical and scientific realities, on the assumption of the priority of the latter, which means that the classification assumed in a theory is not derived from an "experience" of a modality of historical reality, but it is appointed by the internal structure of the theory, the rules of the syntax of its language, etc. This characteristic needs to be understood in unison with the postulate of empiricism. It is not contradictory to contemporary empiricism (Wittgenstein, Carnap, Ness), according to which all knowledge is based on protocol sentences, because, as the latest research (Popper) shows, protocol sentences are never given as abstract and separated, but always in the framework of a holistic theory. (Jakobson 1968, 669)

All these fundamentals are alien to phenomenology, whose rigor was not self-sufficient, as in the 'structural humanities', but underpinned by a living experience and thus exclusive and essentialist. In order for several theories to thrive next to

one another, a thin but nonetheless cohesive layer of methodology is required. It is very characteristic of Polish literary theory in general (as an expression of Polish self-appraisal) that it should have understood itself as an 'in-between' phenomenon. By adopting this principle, the Warsaw scholars sought to shape this 'in-betweenness' as an unshakeable foundation for the new humanities.

Żółkiewski's notion of methodology apparently provided a basis for the "idolaters of science" from the Warsaw Circle, as Budzyk recalled, while remembering directly after the war the late Siedlecki (Budzyk 1946, 377). Żółkiewski "handed over to each us an infallible tool of critique, grounded on the output of contemporary Western methodology" (Budzyk 1946, 378). While Żółkiewski speculated about the future humanities, his colleagues endeavored to implement his visions in their research. For example, Hopensztand, when confronted with a problem, first deployed all logically correct solutions to it and only then referred to external (mostly social and historical) factors in order to elucidate why one solution or another was chosen by a given author. Consequently, he initially dealt with pure syntax (the possible combinations of elements), as in methodology, and then interpreted the data in view of empirical factors so as to establish a theory. These factors are highlighted by the technique of free indirect speech. This device, according to Hopensztand, may appear in a narrative either as an attempt to move from the author's perspective to the hero's or the other way around. Now, the hero can either introspect, "extrospect" (observe), or speak. These distinctions result in six types of free indirect speech, three of which are centripetal (assuming that the hero is at the centre of the structure) and three centrifugal (Hopensztand 1937, 379; on analogous operation in Siedlecki, see Siedlecki 1937, vol. 1 ix, 125 and vol. 2, 2–7, 25–75, 49, 213). In Hopenztand's theory, the 'form' of the novel becomes its significance. The significance of form operates via four analogies that relate the morphology of the novel to the forms of government, policymaking, ideology, and idiolect.

While Hopenszand attempted to render a structural sociology of literature, supported by formalist methodology, Budzyk proceeded in similar fashion in the field of stylistics when he enumerated all possible combinations of dialog, monolog, and description in works of novelistic prose, overlapping with the distinction between formal and structural features (Budzyk 1937b). The latter opposition corresponds to two systems, to which structuralism relates linguistic utterances: the structure of language and literary and extra-literary tradition, or culture.

What nevertheless distinguishes these studies from the output of Russian formalism and Prague structuralism is the complete absence of aesthetic experience and its pretext/product, the aesthetic object, which was the main interest of phenomenology from the outset in the works of Conrad (1908, 1909). (Even

Vinogradov, whom Budzyk [1937a] perceived as the precursor of methodological formalism in literary studies, took general cues in aesthetics from the Russian student of Husserl Gustav Špet, cf. Vinogradov 1930, 29; Hansen-Löve 2012, 235–237.) Shklovskii's *ostranenie* (estrangement), Tynianov's literary evolution, Mukařovský's semantic aesthetics and literary history – all these theories are as 'receiver-oriented' as Ingarden's description of the literary work, and they equally assume that the literary fact emerges in the confrontation of the work with the receiver, the difference being that the formalists and structuralists, in contradistinction to Ingarden, do not assume the existence of intentional objects, which are of an extralinguistic or, indeed, asemantic character. Siedlecki shows himself defiant to such approaches in his *Studia z metryki polskiej* (1937, *Studies in Polish Metrics*): "while my study completely disregards '*artistic*' analysis and does not use literary material for the purposes of linguistics 'proper', it aims to shed some light on a couple of issues concerning one 'aspect' or 'stratum' of the literary work, i.e. its phonetic structure" (Siedlecki 1937 vol 1., XI). Note the double emphasis on 'artistic': one cannot distance oneself any more than that in writing. Siedlecki's structuralism rather foreshadowed French structural poetics of the 1960s, which – to paraphrase Tzvetan Todorov – determined possibilities of composition, but was not interested in the makeup of singular works, leaving the issue to its complementary discipline, interpretation (Todorov 1973 [1968], 19–20). The postwar structuralism of the Sławińskis or Michał Głowiński belonged to a greater degree within the Slavic paradigm of formalism, Prague structuralism, and the Moscow-Tartu School.

In other words, interwar structuralism disregarded, in contradistinction to the postwar generation, the aesthetic object and experience, a major part of which is concretisation, the motor of literary and cultural evolution.

The second generation of the Polish structuralists relinquished methodologism, whose spirit abandoned literary studies and migrated to the area of the social sciences and historiography, where the so-called Poznan School set forth the premises of conventionalism (cf. Gedymin 1964, 1982; Kmita 1967, 1974, 1976, 1982, 1985, 1998; Kmita and Nowak 1968). Only sporadically did the members of the Poznan School contribute to the methodology of literary studies (Kmita 1967, 1980; Kmita and Ławniczak 1973 – the later manifesto of conventionalist semantics entitled "Signe – symbole – allégorie" was presented at the 1968 semiotics congress in Warsaw).

Lewiński (2004, 102–130) ingeniously analysed the inconsistencies in the *Dictionary of Literary Terms* (Głowiński et al. 1976), the magnum opus of the second-generation structuralists (Głowiński, Kostkiewiczowa, Okopień-Sławińska, Sławiński), with regard to methodology, which disappears and appears, changes places with theory in the hierarchy of the disciplines, etc. All in all, a 'revolu-

tion' takes place so that theory gains the upper hand over methodology (Lewiński 2004, 128), which is reduced to either a history of doctrines or various sets of postulates and instructions, relative to successive theories they constitute part of (Lewiński 2004, 104). Methodology – writes Lewiński (2004, 103) – "provided the literary theoreticians with legitimacy; by way of mixing in their works the orders of 'methodology' and 'theory', they gained discursive authority over [literary] history as well". On a less suspicious or Foucaultian note, I believe that the problematic status of methodology stemmed from the interference of a strong, albeit covert, influence of interwar indigenous methodologism, which endowed methodology with an authoritative aura, with a new and loose approach to metalanguage, or rather to the meta-levels in language. This new attitude originated in Jakobson's writings on translation (1971a [1959]) and poetics (1960) and was fully developed in French poststructuralism and Moscow-Tartu School semiotics. According to the Moscow-Tartu semioticians (see Rainer Grübel's chapter on Russian structuralism and semiotics in this volume), any given text of culture may become a metatext in the light of which culture or its areas could be interpreted (Balcerzan 1978, 14; on the Tartu School's manifesto delivered at the fateful congress in Warsaw in August 1968, see Ivanov et al. 1973, 34). Semiotics is not located above culture, in an abstract realm of science, but rather posited as a reflexive part of culture so that, consequently, any reflexive text of culture, for instance a poem devoted to a painting, may be regarded as a semiotic model of its object. This approach fits well with the eclecticism of mature structuralism in Poland: a celebrated example of this kind of approach is Balcerzan's description of poems devoted to works of different arts as utterances, whose *langue* of tradition, poetry, is also the metalanguage of art (Balcerzan 1978). Earlier, in the formative period of the second wave of structuralism, the young Aleksandra Okopień-Sławińska and Janusz Sławiński, overtly dismissed the primacy of methodology, or a network of notions, over empirical material, at least in the extreme variety they found in Franciszek Siedlecki's writings on verse theory (Okopień and Sławiński 1960). On the one hand, the young scholars were under the influence of Jakobson, while on the other hand they found themselves in a situation in which their teachers, Budzyk and Żółkiewski, opted for ontological Marxism rather than methodologism. Under the new circumstances, they were unable to comprehend the priority of methodology over theory in philosophical terms, but rather saw in it a mere defence against or defiance of all-threatening positivism. As the discussion of Marxism will reveal, their ambition was to sublate the difference between the levels of possibility and of historical actuality, system, and alteration, in order to arrive at historical structures.

On no account does this mean that the second generation of structuralists accepted phenomenology as a philosophical foundation of the humani-

ties or a stance attuned to their own, for that matter. In point of fact, Ingarden also insisted – as early as 1938 – on the separation when he severely criticized Manfred Kridl's attempt to establish a minimum platform for any scientific literary research which would combine elements of phenomenology and formalism (Kridl 1936; Ingarden 1938).

Ingarden's 1960 discussion with Jakobson in Warsaw, where Jakobson presented *Poetics and Linguistics*, has been documented in a manner reflecting the structuralists' attitude towards the phenomenologists, one of respect and scepticism. On the one hand, Ingarden's lecture "Poetik und Sprachwissenschaft" (1962, "Poetics and Linguistics") opens the conference proceedings, but, on the other, one cannot overlook the fact that he stands isolated as the only author critical of structural linguistics and poetics. As he made clear in his talk, poetics is not a part of linguistics, as Jakobson claims, but of aesthetics. The lines between the two disciplines are not to be blurred (Ingarden 1962, 3), as the aim of the work of literary art amounts to enabling the experience of aesthetic values, and not, say, making us aware of mechanisms of language and tradition, as the structuralists tend to read poetic utterances, whereby language and forms of utterances are deemed to be the central element of culture and the human world. For Ingarden, conversely, there is more to – and in – the work of literary art than language, which he understands as "meaningful sentences, dressed in a certain linguistic garb or guise [*Gewand*]" (Ingarden 1962, 3), namely literary art itself. Its dwells first and foremost in the realm of "represented objectivities" (*dargestellte Gegenständlichkeite*n), which are certain intentional constructs (*Gebilde*) (Ingarden 1962, 5). Linguists and linguistically-minded students of literature fail – Ingarden insists – to acknowledge the existence of such elements of literary works as intentional objects, even though the same students assume the existence of word sounds and meanings of sentences, both of which are also, he asserts, of an intentional nature (Ingarden 1962, 5).

In an earlier critique of structuralist linguistics (or, *pars pro toto*, "phonology", Ingarden 1972 [1948]), Ingarden accuses Saussure of psychologism (arguably rightly, as he spoke about "mental images" stored in "brains"). However, Ingarden levels the same accusation against his followers, specifically Trubeckoi (a clear case of guilt by association). In opposition to structuralism, Husserl, in *Formale und transzendentale Logik* (1929, *Formal and Transcendental Logic*), Twardowski, and Ingarden himself posit elements of language as neither psychological nor ideal, but intentional. The elements of language are, strictly speaking, intersubjective, which is to say that they are accessible to all minds engaged in the process of actualizing them. The intentional character pertains both to linguistic meanings and sounds, which remain identical with their respective selves regardless of the actual pronunciation of an utterance. When a subject recognises a

stable, intersubjective sound pattern, he or she repeats the intentional act of associating meanings with elements of language (Ingarden 1972 [1948], 21). Understandably, given Ingarden acknowledges exclusively meaningful entities of intentional and intersubjective language ("words, groups of words, sentences, groups of sentences", Ingarden 1972 [1948], 20), he must reject *double articulation*, which according to the structuralist theory of language (the term itself was introduced by André Martinet 1949) designates the general feature of linguistic utterances, i. e. their twofold divisibility, the first articulation consisting in distinguishing units encompassing both formal and significative facets (*significant* and *signifié* in Saussure's terminology). Roughly speaking, it is on this level of words, phrases, sentences, and groups of sentences that Ingarden's theory of language operates. The second articulation, however, divides these units into even smaller segments, which, devoid of meaning themselves, partake in the differentiation of meanings of the first-order entities, as the sounds /k/ and /g/ set apart 'cod' from 'God'. Combination of meaningless units into meaningful wholes is the core procedure of structuralist semantics and literary studies, as seen above in the example of different meanings which various renditions of free indirect speech, assembled from purely formal elements, acquire in various cultural contexts. The same holds, for example, for Siedlecki's stance in the controversy over the meaningfulness of the accent before the caesura in Polish syllabic verse. While Wóycicki (1960 [1912], 74–88) argued that the transaccentuation always introduces a surplus of meaning and Zawodziński (1936, 14–15) claimed that it never does, in Siedlecki's theory the meaning of the accent is dependent on the poem's relation to the historically stabilized system of verse and the system of language, against which one can assign to a trans-accentuation an additional semantic value. Clearly, this theory depends on double articulation. In this way, Ingarden's methodological position is *irreconcilable* with the distinction between purely formal ('syntactic') methodology and theory, which combines formal and significative elements – a distinction characteristic of interwar structuralism. It is also diametrically opposed to the postwar approach. The latter postulates, so to speak, momentary models, which are even more context-dependent than Siedlecki's vision of the accent, i. e. they gain and lose meaning with respect to an observer. Thus, this apparently specific linguistic concern – whether phonology with its double articulation is legitimate – bears on central issues of theory of methodology and discloses the dimensions of phonology's influence on the structural humanities as a whole.

Moreover, in his "Poetics and Linguistics", directly polemical towards Jakobson's, Ingarden refutes not only the existence of purely formal elements in language, but also the linguistic nature of the proper object of poetics. Intentional objects in literary works – Ingarden stresses in his "Poetics and Linguistics" – are not made of language; they are made with the help of language by means of

intentional mental acts and endowed with special aesthetic qualities (Ingarden 1962, 5) that make them interesting for aesthetics. From the standpoint of poetics, language is just a "tool" (Ingarden 1962, 6) or a means of transportation into a state which today we call "immersion" in the presented word (Ingarden 1962, 7).

Such theory did not meet even the minimal criteria of lenient Polish structuralism formulated *post festum* by Sławiński (literary works are not made of language, according to Ingarden). Central European structuralism, starting with Felix Vodička (1982 [1941]), admittedly adopted Ingarden's term of concretisation along with concretisation's function of setting the material artefact apart from the aesthetic object. However, it dropped the process of "objectification" (Ingarden 1973 [1968], 41–50), as a result of which the active reader passes from semantic information, carried by language, to super-semantic objects to be concretized and aesthetically admired. As a result, if, in Ingarden, predominantly extra-linguistic strata of the work (objects and aspects) were subjected to concretisation, for the structuralists, who disregarded any extra-linguistic elements in the literary work and, as a result, the process of objectification altogether, all strata of a work as a meaningful utterance were context-dependant and thus inherently indeterminate and hence demanding concretisation.

Another example of historicizing Ingarden is Michał Głowiński's theory of the novelistic truth (Głowiński 1971). Głowiński vehemently rejects Ingarden's notion of quasi-judgement, as it is predicated on the distinction between the linguistic sentence and judgement (proposition) which, as an intentional object, is of an extra-linguistic nature. Nevertheless, two or three pages later, he accepts one of various meanings of the term "truth" listed by Ingarden (Głowiński 1971, 186–187). Among numerous notions of the literary truth, Głowiński focuses on the "truth", understood as the similarity between a subjective vision of reality and the represented world (Głowiński 1971, 189–190). "Truth in the literary work is understood", Michał Głowiński writes, "above all *as an utterance's relation to an actual or potential utterance*. Truth [...] is a constant appealing to the social consciousness and its norms, the consciousness which, even if it has not been explicitly expressed in a complex of various texts, may be formulated at any moment" (Głowiński 1971, 199). Such truth is a sociolinguist construct; its borders shift constantly.

In sum, Ingarden was either rejected as a whole – and as such, he served as a point of departure for interwar theories which rejected (aesthetic) experience as legitimisation and an object of study – or he was treated by the postwar structuralists as an honourable relic or, finally, adapted in a way which made his thought lose its essential features.

2.2 Marxism

Marxism, too, helped generate the central theories and models of Polish structuralism. Structuralism's relationship with Marxism can be defined as symetrically mirroring its relationship with phenomenology.

While assessing structuralism's negotiations with Marxism, i.e. the negotiations of evolutionary (systemic) with genetic (context-related) approaches to literary history, the researcher is transported to a meta-level on which the evolutionary perspective on the history of Polish structuralism overlaps with the genetic perspective. The two central theoretical problems of second-generation Polish structuralism stemmed from the Stalinist period (1949–1956), when a peculiar interpretation of Marxism was imposed on intellectual life. The first dominant issue was the sociological semantics of verse (see in Section 2 passages devoted to comparative Slavic meter and the semantics of verse forms, Pszczołowska 1988). The second concern related to literary communication, after which the Polish chapter of structuralism came to be called 'communicationism' (cf. Dąbrowski 1987; Bartoszyński 2007).

The first generation of structuralists – Hopensztand, Żółkiewski, Siedlecki, and Budzyk – were Marxists or plain communists, which had been an illegal status in interwar Poland.

The relationship between structuralism and Marxism in the interwar period was interpreted by intellectual historians in two opposing ways. Either structuralism and Marxism were two parallel views, one entertained professionally and one maintained as an empathetic or naïve or defiant citizen (Weintraub 1985; Kola and Ulicka 2015, 73; Ulicka 2017, 150), or Polish interwar structuralism was an attempt to perpetuate the Polish tradition of Marxism (Ulicka 2017, 291–292), specifically the social Kantianism of Ludwik Krzywicki, Stanisław Brzozowski, and Kazimierz Kellez-Kraus, which combined Marxist social thought with nominalist and formalist methodology (Mrugalski 2019). The evidence attests rather to the latter interpretation. When writing his letter to Jakobson in 1943, which in the light of his subsequent death appeared to be his will, and the death knell for methodological structuralism, Siedlecki clearly had in mind a combination of formalism and Marxism, which was allegedly espoused and propagated by Żółkiewski, whose methodological ideas were generally accepted in the Warsaw Circle. Although the postwar structuralists of the Sławiński generation – a generation coming of age in Stalinist Poland – dismissed Marxism as a worldview, they still regarded the work of the chief "social Kantian", Stanisław Brzozowski, as the main positive tradition of anti-Romanticism, to which both the literary Avant-Garde and structuralism belonged (Sławiński 1998a [1965], 208, 210, 268–269; Głowiński 1984, 1991, 1997). The most conspicuous features of Polish postwar communicationism – as

seen against the backdrop of international structuralism – that is, a sociologizing and performance-oriented approach to morphology (above all the morphology of the verse) and literary semantics, were preprogrammed by the members of the interwar generation, Żółkiewski and Budzyk. Even though after World War II they pleaded allegiance to orthodox, ontologically essentialist Marxism, they nonetheless sought to enrich it, during and immediately after the Stalinist period, with elements of structuralist output. These structuralist elements were supposed to supplement, specify, and professionalize Marxism in literary studies, which was declared to determine the general character and direction of research. In this endeavor, they were supported by Maria Janion, then a young Marxist and a peer of the second-generation structuralists.

Before I describe the birth of communicationism and verse sociology out of and in opposition to the spirit of Stalinism, I will attempt to exemplify how non-Marxist scholars were compelled to prevaricate in order to avoid taking sides on Marxism. Under the circumstances of the Poland of the time, open defiance was unwelcome, to say the least. One could however, ignore Marxism under the cover of an individual science, not touching upon the societal groundwork. Scholars were successful in doing so in the case of various case studies and detailed works in literary history. However, when the structuralists ventured to create a summa of literary studies, the *Dictionary of Literary Terms* (1976), isolating Marxism became an intricate and even desperate task, bearing in mind its major contribution to literary studies. In the midst of such a complex situation, the criticism of the dictionary from Marxist positions – such as that expressed in the series of articles contained in an issue of *Przegląd Humanitsyczny* (1977 [issue 11], *Humanitst Review*) – seemed to the dictionary's authors and their like-minded colleagues to amount to denunciation, regardless of the critics' real motivation, who, it seems, frankly identified with Marxian philosophy and believed the socialist state allowed relative freedom of discussion.

The impression of actually being indicted in a scholarly discussion was reinforced by the fact that most of the Marxist critics were based at Warsaw University, from which the core structuralists were removed as teachers in the wake of the 1968 purge. A popular saying among literary scholars declared that the borderline between Asia and Europe ran across Nowy Świat, the street on the two opposite sides of which Warsaw University and the Academy of Sciences (including the Institute of Literary Research) were based. This impression of denunciation was, moreover, so prevalent that it first suppressed all other points of criticism, however legitimate they might have been, such as the claim that hardly any tradition in Polish literary studies other than the structural one was considered worthy of being presented in the dictionary (Czaplejewicz 1977), erroneous literary affiliations ascribed to the Russian formalists (Semczuk 1977, 193), and abun-

dant factual errors (Żurowski 1977). Secondly, a mere reconstruction of the structuralists' guerilla tactic against Marxism (and phenomenology, for that matter), conducted as late as 2005, enraged Głowiński, invoking the discussion with the Marxists of almost thirty years earlier (Głowiński 2005, 87, cf. Głowiński 2010, 391–393). Both camps resorted to the hermeneutics of suspicion: the Marxists, for their part, tracked down hidden judgements in the selection, size, specificity, and form of their "own" and "alien" entries (Kasperski 1977, 165). The devices of isolating Marxism allegedly consisted in condemning Socialist Realism as opportunistic, as well as in describing genetic methods hailing from nineteenth-century positivism as unscientific.

It seems, on the one hand, that the dictionary's Marxist critics intended to create a simulacrum of an open intellectual discussion, one which would contribute to normalizing the Polish version of real socialism, but, on the other hand, the rhetoric, especially the hostile tone employed by Edward Kasperski, recalled the conspiracy theories of the Stalinist era. His review was tellingly entitled "False Conception and Harmful Effects" – effects, it should be noted, on young people, novices in literary studies confronted with jargon, trying to be smart, obscure language, and narrow horizons (Kasperski 1977, 163). Kasperski accused not only the authors, but also the publishing house (Kasperski 1977, 164), of marginalizing Marxism and the kind of *littérature engagée* which had developed under real socialism, but which was looked down upon in the dictionary as "opportunistic literature" subjected to the interests of the Party (Kasperski 1977, 1966–167). "The entry on *littérature engagée* is but one of many examples of 'imposing views' and, in the spirit of hostility, turning the reader – student, teacher, adept researcher – against the conception of engagement, which advocates the identification of a writer with socialist (or patriotic) ideals" (Kasperski 1977, 167). The combination of socialism with patriotism was a trademark of the anti-intellectual and anti-semitic campaign of 1968. (Here, it is worth mentioning that Głowiński was not only a critical intellectual but also a Holocaust survivor, saved as a child by Irena Sendlerowa.) An analogous charge of aggression disguised as learning was advanced against the entries on realism (Owczarek 1977) and Socialist Realism (Semczuk 1977, 194).

These charges were raised against mature, eclectic, and anti-Marxist structuralism. However, in order to better understand the ambivalent nature of the relationship between postwar structuralism and Marxism – it must have been ambivalent, since the authors of the dictionary bore a grudge against their Marxist critics for decades – one has to step back to the 1950s, when the two theoretical stances were yet to be separated.

Back then, the representatives of two different generations, Stefan Żółkiewski and Maria Janion, postulated a fusion of Marxism and structuralism, but no longer

as equal partners kept in check by the arbiter of formalist methodology. Marxism had gained the upper hand as a holistic and essentialist worldview. Janion upholds Siedlecki's and the Warsaw Circle's position that there is no contradiction between Marxism and structuralism, just as there definitely is one between Marxism and "intuitionism" (Janion 1960, 229), that is to say phenomenology. Marxism and structuralism share a rationalist approach; their dialectic thinking is interested in dynamic aspects of phenomena, which they interpret historically, while at the same time looking for regularities rather than uniqueness (Janion 1960, 240). Janion (1960, 241) agrees with Żółkiewski (1946) as to the pioneering character of Mukřovský's claim that language is the liaison between literature and society. Such a higher form of Marxism, capable, according to Żółkiewski, of harboring structuralist positions was represented in Lukács' *History and Class Consciousness* (Żółkiewski 1970), while for Janion, who, incidentaly, distinguished between phonological and existential structuralism (Heidegger, Spoerri, Steiger, Kayser; cf. Janion 1960, 179), the prototype of such a synthesis was found in Lucien Goldmann's *The Hidden God* (Janion 1960, 232–234), Goldman being an avid reader of Lukács.

The choice of idols clearly shows that Żółkiewski – in this respect he was in agreement with the stance of the other survivor of interwar structuralism, Kazimierz Budzyk (Budzyk 1960, 1966 [1958]) – had abandoned the vision of a purely syntactic methodology that would mediate between Marxism and structuralism as a sponsor of the new humanities. Żółkiewski clearly chose Marxism as their 'integral' method (Żółkiewski 1967 [1960]) encapsulating, among other things, structuralism. This Marxism was obviously not purely syntactical or formalist, but a fully-fledged ontological approach, as it represented certain views on the make-up of the human world (and of nature too). During the Stalinist period, Żółkiewski condemned the currents to which the interwar Warsaw Circle with its methodologism adhered: conventionalism (Żółkiewski 1950, 6) and specifically the Polish tradition of social Kantianism (Żółkiewski 1950, 6–7; Wołowiec 2016, 30). Both stances, according to Żółkiewski, are illegitimate, as they call into question Engels' basic dichotomy of ideological life, one between idealism and materialism (Żółkiewski 1950, 9). In, inter alia, Prague structuralism (Żółkiewski remains tactically silent about Warsaw), "the typology of methods replaced the classification of the modalities of existence" (Żółkiewski 1950, 10). However, this apparent suppression of ontology was supposed to obscure the fact that the conventionalist method emerged from subjective idealism (Żółkiewski 1950, 11). The only properly scientific method is the Marxian-Leninist-Stalinist dialectic of the concrete, which discovers that the entire structure of society is reflected in an everyday phenomenon, as commercial exchange (Żółkiewski 1950, 11). Even after 1956, Budzyk condemned Siedlecki, interwar methodologism, and structuralism in general as a school of thought that gave answers to ontological and artistic, in short – sub-

stantial – questions (Budzyk 1966 [1958]). Even though Siedlecki stressed the fact that his statistical distributive study of Polish verse does not pertain to artistic, i. e. individual, uses of poetic language (see above section 3.1), Budzyk accuses him of not being interested in individual poems and what makes them aesthetically appealing or of historical impact. Siedlecki does not see the trees for the wood of the metric system and its structure (Budzyk 1966 [1958], 191; 1960, 136–137). The composition of a poem should, therefore, be studied from the ontological, i. e. Marxist, point of view, which is able to mediate between the general and the individual, between structure and composition (Budzyk 1966 [1958], 195–199). Budzyk trumps Żółkiewski in that he accuses Marxism of containing too few ontological views. In this respect, Marxism should pattern itself on phenomenology (Budzyk 1966 [1958], 199).

Janion too, in 1958, renews the ideal of the integral method, set out in 1914 by Wóycicki. Marxism can open the perspective of the

> abolition of [...] the division of methods into 'intrinsic' and 'extrinsic.' No stance other than Marxism would be able to construct a totality of the method in which genetic explanation of the influence of the 'intermediary zone' between literature and life is combined with the historicized description of the structure of the literary work. (Janion 1960, 244)

Janion's work (2000 [1969]) on the Romantic poet Zygmunt Krasiński's oriental novel conforms with the ideal of mingling the sociologically-underpinned history of ideas with structuralist poetics (cf. Czermińska 2016, 243–244).

This kind of fusion of evolution and genesis became a commonsensical stance in Polish literary studies. "It is commonly accepted today", wrote Henryk Markiewicz, a scholar associated with Marxism, in "Dylematy historyka literatury" (1986, "The Literary Historian's Dilemmas"),

> that the metamorphoses of every social system, including obviously literature, are conditioned both internally, i. e. via the influences of the earlier states of this system, as well as externally, i. e. by stimuli coming from other systems. At the junction of Marxism and Czechoslovak structuralism, a group of the most general beliefs emerged among literature researchers – beliefs which manifest themselves in specific attempts to explain the conditions of literary transformations. In the most careful wording, it can be said that the automatization (becoming ordinary) of the creation and the reception of literary arrangements induces a counteraction consisting in the intensifying and complicating of devices, and after the possibilities of such an escalation have been exhausted a certain dispersion of literary innovations ensues, characterized by varying degrees of perpetuation and negation of the previous state of the system. Of these varied inventions, some are accepted by the social milieu as functional in relation to the needs of the society in question and thus gain popularity and permanence. (Markiewicz 1986, 18)

This paraphrasing or rather Marxian appropriation of point 8 of Jakobson's and Tynianov's 1928 manifesto "Problems of Literary and Linguistic Studies" (Jakobson and Tynianov 1980 [1928], 30–31) proclaims a kind of Darwinism in which the socio-economic milieu, conceived of in Marxian terms, determines the chances of survival and success which the literary "organisms" possess, having evolved in the process of formalist-structural mutations.

The deep involvement of Polish literary theoreticians in Slavic structuralism notwithstanding, during and directly after the Stalinist period there emerged two approaches that were deemed typically Polish and, as such, attracted partners from other chapters of Slavic structuralism. Not surprisingly, they also aimed to combine the intrinsic and the extrinsic aspects of the literary. These were comparative verse studies, including the sociological semantics of the verse, and communicationism. I will now expand on them in that order.

In 1951, Żółkiewski published the article "Tezy Stalina o języku a metodologia badań literackich" ("Stalin's Theses on Language and the Methodology of Literary Studies"), which opened an issue of *Pamiętnik Literacki* (*Literary Memoir*) devoted exclusively to Stalin's views on linguistics and their impact on literary studies. In this article, Żółkiewski ventures an extraordinary ploy intended to secure relative autonomy for literary studies by means of displaying unwavering faithfulness to Stalin's genius. His point of departure being "Stalin's basic thesis that language is not the superstructure of the basis", Żółkiewski points to "the permanent values of the literary work" and "language" as the "elements" of national consciousness, which according to Stalin are more resilient and unwavering than the ever-changing base of the relations of production and its reflexes in ideology (Żółkiewski 1951, 246). Drawing on Victor Vinogradov's comparative studies of poetic and communicative language (Żółkiewski 1951, 349–351), Żółkiewski states that the revolutionary character of poetic forms is brought to the fore only in the context of literary material, i. e. language (the schema of figure and background). The study of the specificity and the socio-political charge of literary language and literary forms should set out from "verse forms, metric systems of a given literature. One ought to establish the laws of changeability of verse forms dependent on social and inter-textual (e. g. prosodic) factors" (Żółkiewski 1951, 351).

The comparative social history of verse, comprising the sociological semantics of verse forms, as it materialized in *Comparative Slavic Metrics*, was just a logical step in the direction of generalizing results and pinpointing the specificity of a given literature. Neither Jakobson's idea of the rhythmic dictionary nor Polish interwar structuralist verse studies, epitomized by the works of Siedlecki, were interested in the semantics of verse forms: such interest would have been dismissed as Expressionistic. In the new sociological setting, research on verse semantics, in which social stratifications correspond with the hierarchical char-

acter pertaining to any system, including the system of verse and verse language, was conducted till the 2000s (Kopczyńska and Pszczołowska 1969; Pszczołowska 2007 [2004]; Kopczyńska 1970; et al. 1986), including a volume of verse semantics in the *Slavic Comparative Verse Studies*, expanded on in section 2. Now, to move on to communicationism:

During the trailblazing polonists' congress of 1958 (see section 1), when literary studies sought to come to terms with the experience of Stalinism and Socialist Realism, Budzyk criticized, in the spirit of an integral ideal, all attempts to rescue the unity of literary studies that ignored the heterogeneous character of cultural reality – attempts for which the point of departure was the primacy of either form or content (Budzyk 1960, 127), attempts such as formalism and sociologism. Moreover, the categories of morphological description and the description of content remain mutually untranslatable, despite the undeniable relationship between the formal-artistic and the social-ideological features of the work (Budzyk 1960, 127). However, everyday experience or phenomenological observation – Budzyk does not explain in which way he denounces inter-war methodologism – suggests that the most important aspect for literature is contact with the reader, without whom the literary work withers. "The essence of the literary work needs to be looked for in the social contact established between the writer and the reader" (Budzyk 1960, 127). And it is this lived communication – literature's social life – that encapsulates the formal and the social-ideological aspects of the work, not a metalanguage, even if literary communication takes on the most vital function of metalanguage, as a medium of comparison enabling arbitration. That is, when literary communication becomes the point of departure

> we no longer have to answer the question of the relationships between form and content, which vary from case to case, but the question of the function of these mutual relationships in the realization of the social and cultural tasks which literature actually takes up. In the framework of the new question, the relationship between form and content disappears as a central issue and the specific object of study. The object of scholarly investigation now becomes the role of literary elements in what determines the emergence and the cultural significance of literary works. [...] The elements of content and form become singular facts, which by themselves are not and cannot be an object of study in their own right. Historical research always aims to present the relations between facts. A self-sufficient description of facts does not amount to a scientific issue. This is why in the new situation one does not have to worry when categories of content turn out to be untranslatable into formal categories. (Budzyk 1960, 131)

This social meta-level of communication offers us another version of eclecticism – one that does not contradict the demand for the unity of science while not denying the multifariousness of the phenomena at hand. This plural unity of

various dimensions of the literary – homogenous to the point of ultrastability – operates within the framework of communicationism.

Hence, in Aleksandra Okopień-Sławińska's model of personal relations in literary communication (Okopień-Sławińska 1971), the formal (the carrier of implicit information) and the semantic elements, the later conveying explicit information, remain distinct from one another, while adding up to the overall sense of a 'poetic utterance'. Okopień-Sławińska distinguishes between implicit and explicit information items, the first set being inferred by the reader from a text's formal (stylistic) features. Implicit information takes priority over explicit information, and hence it may reduce the credibility and position of any explicit characterisation of persons, events, or states of affairs. The division of information items into implicit (implied by form) and explicit, which introduces a hierarchy to information, overlaps with another hierarchical formula of communication as a process consisting of three parts: someone communicates something to someone. The object of communication may also communicate and so on *ad infinitum* – levels of communication emerge resembling Gérard Genette's *meta-récits* contained in a *récit* (Genette 1972, 239). Occupying the highest-level and thus the most reliable instance of communication is the subject of the work – a silent possessor of literary norms and devices who, only implicitly traceable, gives the floor to all subjects of utterances (narrators, lyrical subjects, speaking personages) constituting a literary utterance. The subject of the work equals the intention of the work. The work's subject is even credited for its physical form, given that this form implicitly contributes to the general meaning.

Budzyk's 1958 paper, in which he paved the way towards communicationism, which his student Głowiński, Okopień-Sławiński, and Sławiński would develop alongside Balcerzan and Kazimierz Bartoszyński, testified to the interwar structuralists' turn to ontological Marxisim (a variety of Marxism that acknowledges some essentialist views of reality). In the language of the interwar period: theory, precisely Marxian theory, gained the upper hand over methodology. The sociology of communication fused incommensurable problems of forms and ideas. Even though the communicationists of the younger generation were sceptical towards Marxism, certainly too sceptical for mainstream Marxists, they nevertheless reflexively accepted the basic Marxist tenet of the supremacy of theories over methodologies. Lukács' work on class consciousness, which Żółkiewski (1970) named during the 1968 congress as an exemplary case of Marxism engulfing structuralism, states perhaps most poignantly that not only vague ideologies but also the sciences and their purportedly objective methods express nothing other than class ideologies, i. e. theories prompted by historical relations of production. The abstraction and atomism of modern sciences thus reflect bourgeois individualism as a strategy of success in capitalist society. If Marxism recognises the primacy

of theories, which express class interests over methodology supposed to secure the supremacy of classes as represented by theories, then the communicationism of Budzyk's students was a peculiar Marxism without class consciousness, a self-loathing Marxism that accepted only its structuralist aspect.

Communicationist structuralism perceived itself as the best-founded and potentially most heterogeneous (all-encompassing) stance. Thus as late as in 1987, Michał Głowiński repeated with reference to the latest developments in linguistics and sociolinguistics the basic theses of Budzyk's 1958 lecture: literary communication bridges the gap between the heterogeneous realm of intrinsic and extrinsic approaches, he writes in the article "Od metod zewnętrznych i wewnętrznych do komunikacji literackiej" ("From Extrinsic and Intrinsic Methods to Literary Communication", Głowiński 1992 [1987]). Therefore, methods are merely partial aspects of the social functioning of literature, relative to heterogeneous aspects of the polyphonic communication process.

As a specimen of the mature period of Polish communicationist structuralism, Głowiński's *Powieść Młodopolska* (1969, *The Novel of Young Poland*) seeks to transfer the quality of potentiality from the level of methodology to that of actual literary history; literary theory positions itself so that it assumes an angle from which literary history appears as a network of possible (and barred) creative decisions. In the title of his work, Głowiński metonymically names the occurrences that bear this historical and at once potential character: genre and the literary-historical current.

Both determine what can and cannot be expressed at a given historical moment in the literary and cultural system. Genre and the current are concurrently both historical and systemic; they belong to the orders of historical facts and historiographical description, and they bear the character of the social consciousness and habitual, i. e. unconscious rules (Głowiński 1969, 37). At both the sending and the receiving poles of literary communication, the two designate the expressible and the comprehensible (Głowiński 1969, 48). They create the literary *langue* of a period (Głowiński 1969, 49), not to be mistaken with standard language, since they also contain strictly literary, compositional elements, having been accumulated and endowed with meaning in the historical process of the production of literary utterances. Moreover, the development of a genre consists in realizing possibilities concealed in its previous gestalts, such as the transformation of the narrator from the auctorial to the personal position (Głowiński 1969, 83; cf. Stanzel 1971 [1955]). In the spirit of *eclecticism*, Głowiński concedes that his approach, concentrating on possibilities, remains one of many possible approaches to the unfathomable historical material (Głowiński 1969, 9).

Incidentally, the main tenet of Lewiński's critical assessment of the *Dictionary of Literary Terms*, which enraged Głowiński (2005), was to show how sub-

suming methodology under theory generates inaccuracies, especially in entries touching upon phenomenology and Marxism. The thorn in Głowiński's side must have been not so much the display of inconsistencies but their assumed motivation – the structuralists' move for power and dominance over the literary field. In brief, Lewiński described the Marxian motivations of the apparently anti-Marxian stance and its ensuing slips.

3 Russian and Czechoslovakian entanglements

The most *prima facie* conspicuous difference between the period in which structuralism dominated in Polish literary theory and the heterogeneity supervened upon it in the wake of Polish socioeconomic transformation after 1989 was that the former's self-identity was local rather than global. For the structuralists, the way to the universal led through native authors, and not through translating French and American ones. They drew predominantly on the East and Central European tradition, even though they supplemented home-grown fundamentals with French, Anglophone, and German concepts and models, provided they did not transcend the loose limits of structuralist eclecticism, marked out by the East and Central European conventions.

Czech and Russian tenets provoked creative, not reactive, answers on the part of the Polish structuralists. This applies to a lesser degree to the Prague Linguistic Circle, the achievements of which were generally recognized and accepted, so much so that Głowiński (1977) accepted Ingarden's central concept of *concretization* in a version filtered by Vodička's (1982 [1941]) premises of literary history: no process of objectification precedes concretization, as the extra-linguistic strata of the work are disregarded, and, as a result, concretization pertains not to the objects presented but to signs, the exclusive fabric of the text.

A good example of the Polish structuralists' attitude towards their Czech predecessor is offered by Głowiński's article "Świadectwa i style odbioru" (1975, "Testimonies and Styles of Reception"). While for Felix Vodička, the most reliable testimonies to the historically changing style of aesthetic concretization are given by literary critics, Głowiński expands both the scope of testimonies and the styles of reception. The former class now includes, alongside literary critical assessments, parodies, stylizations, translations, intertextual references, intersemiotic translations, etc. Furthermore, Głowiński supplements the aesthetic reception, which was the main concern for the Prague structuralists, with symbolic, allegoric, referential, and other styles. It is only by virtue of being internally differentiated and diverse that reception obtains the quality of style. In sum, Głowiński

supplements Vodička's positions to the point where new perspectives open up for literary studies. Such self-positioning is usually called 'standing on the shoulders of giants'. (For more details on Polish-Czech relations, in which the Czechs mostly played the active role, cf. Baluch 1998; Gierowski 2013.)

In the case of the Russian scholarly tradition, broadly understood, the situation is more intricate and thus even more intriguing. There are two layers to Polish-Russian entanglements. Alongside direct Russian precursors – chiefly Roman Jakobson, Sergei Karcevskii, and Viktor Vinogradov – there were Polish scholars working in Russia, including Jakobson's and Trubetskoi's professor from Moscow University, Jan Wiktor Porzeziński (Jakobson 2013 [1929]), a direct pupil and continuator of the work of Filipp F. Fortunatov (Leont'ev 1990; Alpatov 2005, 38–45). St Petersburg was the home of the Classicist Tadeusz Zieliński (Faddei Zelinskii) and the linguist Jan Niecisław Baudouin de Courtenay (Ivan Boduen de Kurtene), the teacher of Mikołaj Kruszewski (Nikolai Krushevskii), with whom he established the Kazan School of linguistics, leading to the emergence of phonology and structural linguistics in general. I would like to call Zieliński, Baudouin, and Kruszewski 'precursors of the precursors', since they were harbingers of the formalist and structural approaches in Russia and globally, and in this way indirectly influenced those Polish scholars who set forth the same tradition, which, to a degree, determined the starting positions of Zieliński's philology and Baudouin's and Kruszewski's linguistics.

Zieliński, who advocated a Dionysian position with a stress on the actor and acting (Zieliński (1995 [1901], 2008 [1911], 1918 § 17; Sirotkina 2014, 11–15, 30–35), may be regarded as the patron of Polish communicationism, since communicationism referred mostly to the theatre when modelling the situation or the "spectacle" of communication (Bartoszyński 1971, 127). The metaphors of masks, acting, and mimicking were common ground for Zieliński's philology and the Polish theory of the literary utterance, beginning with Dawid Hopensztand's stylistics. Hopensztand himself worked under the prevailing influence of Viktor Vinogradov, whom he eventually asked to supervise his PhD thesis (Ulicka 2017, 287–288). The theatrical approach to literary communication combines Zieliński's Dionysian vision of culture with Vinogradov's basic assumption of the iconic nature of artistic prose, i.e. the fact that artistic utterances mimic everyday genres of communicating (see below).

And so literary communcationism studies "the spectacle of literary communication" (*widowisko komunikacji literackiej*, Bartoszyński 1971, 127) and the reading as a "staging" or "performance" (*przedstawienie*) played for the other reader-actors (Sławiński 1982, 79). Reading amounts to plying the virtual reader intended by the work, as

the virtual recipient has a dual nature. He or she is always a role for every actual reader. And sometimes he or she is also a sign, a semantic figure. [...] [T]he task [for the reader] becomes a sign, and the sign has the character of a task. [...] [The reader's] gestures enter the structure of the work as elements of its semantics [...] The entries in the lexicon of the descriptive theory of a literary work become [...] the names of tasks for the recipient. (Balczerzan 1971, 90–91)

Okopień-Sławińska (1981, 43) describes the theatrical communication, while focusing on the sender: "Language, and poetic language in particular, appears as a theater where the individual, by removing subsequent masks, cannot reveal his bare face, and where, by applying masks, he can never completely hide his face, where the viewer is not sure if he sees the face or the mask and which of them is truer."

Zieliński's bodily, Dionysian semantics, typical of that period – to mention only Ludwig Noiré, Karl Bücher, William James, Wilhelm Wundt, Eduard Sievers, Vsevolod Meierhol'd, Sergei Eisenstein – shaped the discourse of the early Society for the Study of Poetic Language (Obshchestvo izucheniia peticheskogo iazyka, OPOIaZ), above all Shklovskii and Iakubinskii, who explicitly based their attempts to develop a semantics of poetry on Zieliński's appropriation of Wilhelm Wundt's *Völkerpsychologie* (Zieliński (1995 [1901]; Shklovskii 1919 [1916], 16–19; Iakubinskii 1919 [1916], 46–47). In addition, Zieliński managed – in the short period between the October Revolution and his resettling to Poland – to become a "co-founder" (Sirotkina 2015, 117; Brandist 2016, 93) of the Institute of the Living Word in Petrograd, where the prominent students of Baudouin de Courtenay, Lev Iakubinskii, and Lev Shcherba worked together with the OPOIaZ formalists, Boris *Ėikhenbaum*, Viktor Shklovskii, and Iurii Tynianov. Besides formalism's early carnal-Dionysian-anti-Apollonian semantics of the living word, verse, and film, Zieliński influenced their theory of the "everyday" (*byt*, cf. Maiakovskii's "O driani", "IV international", "Pro eto", "budushchii byt", ect.; Jakobson 1975 [1930]; Ėikhenbaum 1987 [1927], 1929 [1927]), which was to a large degree derivative of Zieliński's commentaries on his own translations of Sophocles (Zieliński 1915). In addition, Zieliński was a seminal figure in the cultural movement of *svobodnoe dvizhenie* (free movment), as well as being responsible for a fascination with Menippean satire and the carnivalistic way of life – observable, for example, in Balcerzan's depiction of structuralism quoted at the beginning of this chapter.

These interests were related to his interest in the living, i. e. embodied, word and the situation of communicating. Zieliński's massive influence on Russian culture may well have been the path by which he penetrated Polish modern literary studies. However, at its foundations one finds native versions of physiological semantics: Julisz Tenner's *Estetyka żywego słowa* (1904, *Aesthetics of Living*

Word) and Kazimierz Wóycicki's *Forma dźwiękowa prozy polskiej i wiersza polsk-iego* (1960 [1912], *Sound Form of Polish Prose and Polish Poetry*). Earlier, in 1910, Karol Appel held a lecture *Język i sztuka. Lingwistyka i estetyka* (*Language and Art: Linguistics and Aesthetics*) at the Warsaw Society for Scientific Courses. Appel's theses may serve as a typical example of bodily semantics. Drawing on the French aestheticians Felix Le Dantec and Jean d'Udine, Appel claimed language and art have a common basis in "the law of rhythmic resonance and the transposition of rhythms" in the body: "If you can say about language that it is only an accompa-niment of gesticulation, facial expressions, and postures, we should say the same about art" (Appel 1910, 8). Speaking and the creative process both consist in the transposition of the rhythmic impulse into bodily actions, whereby stylistic inno-vation arises as a result of synesthesia, understood as the physiologically condi-tioned transposition of the non-language rhythm to the linguistic rhythm (Appel 1910, 9, 12). All these traditions, under the lodestar of Zieliński the Dionysian and Vinogradov, contributed to the use of the notion of *mimesis* in Polish communi-cationism; the notion of mimesis etymologically suggesting direct participation and a mimic, theatrical element. Głowiński distinguished a subclass of works to which a mimetic trait could be attributed due to their imitating well-established models of literary and, first and foremost, extra-literary utterances. Such works implement *formal mimesis*, *language mimesis* (Głowiński 1969, 1980), and *con-structive parody* (Głowiński [1973] 2014). Other researchers distinguished analo-gous phenomena, such as the *critical representation* of a representational patter (Nycz 1986) or *critical mimesis* (Mitosek 1988); Kazimierz Bartoszyński grounded all these diverse devices in *communication mimeticism* (Bartoszyński 1982).

Baudouin and Kruszewski, next to Saussure, have generally been regarded as the patron saints of structural linguistics and formalist-structural poetics (in a Polish context: Siedlecki 1938). Prominent Russians were even more gener-ous to Polish-Russian scholars: "Polivanov and Shcherba asserted that Russian science inspired by Baudouin had nothing to learn from F. de Saussure's *Cours de linguistique générale*", wrote Jakobson (1971e [1943], 454). Baudouin was a pre-cursor of structuralism on a most elementary level: Jakobson observes, "[f]rom the very outset of his scholarly activities, Baudouin (1845–1929) was attracted to the question of the relationship between sound and meaning" (Jakobson 1971c [1960], 397). Such an attraction was vital to establishing phonology as a discipline researching the dialectical relationship between the meaning and distinctive fea-tures of sound. Phonology, for its part, was prototypical for structural disciplines which, according to Hopensztand's description, undertake research into culture as a field in which shapes negotiate with meanings (Hopensztand 1946, 337).

Baudouin's linguistics was crucial for Jakobson's ideological and methodo-logical choices, as, for example, Baudoin's notion of language union (*iazykovoi*

soiuz, Baudouin de Courtenay 1904, 31; Chirikba 2008) enabled Jakobson's access to eurasianism as a theory which developed in the milieu of Russian émigrés and which postulated the separate character of the culture of the former Russian Empire, belonging neither to Asia nor to Europe. Besides reinforcing this theory – suspiciously handy for imperialist dreams – with the tools of linguistics, the interest in eurasianism helped develop structuralism's historical consciousness. The Baudounian notion of language union dissociated the problems of linguistic similarity and linguistic kinship: thanks to the idea of language union, one could investigate the history of languages without falling into the geneticism character- istic of nineteenth-century historical linguistics, for which similarity amounted to common descent. Eurasia constituted such a union of peoples, unrelated but similar by virtue of the geographical space and history they shared. Convergence replaces kinship as the main spring of language development, which appears to consist mostly of the blending of different languages and not of the mutations of a primal language. The Polish structuralists devoted a lot of effort to studying the internal differentiation of language in that they regarded poetic language as one displaying the natural heterogeneity that communicative language conceals for the sake of effective interacting. The mixed character of language was the foun- dation of their interest in different kinds of language mimesis (communicational, formal, critical), as well as in stylisation as an apparatus of literary history (Balbus 1993), and in literary works as testimonies of inter-language contacts (Dobrzyńska 2006). Generally speaking, the interwar and postwar structuralists shared with Baudouin conventionalism and a multidimensional vision of language as a phe- nomenon that belongs to different realms (social, psychological, physiological, etc.).

The new humanities were to be strictly function-oriented and thus in another way were indebted to, or heralded by the Baudouin School (Jakobson 1971b [1929], 390; 1971c [1960], 416), renowned for introducing the functional approach to language, which was then further developed in the first formalist issue of the OPOIaZ almanac by Baudouin's student Lev Iakubinskii (1919 [1916]), and which eventually, in the Prague Linguistic Circle, became substantially equivalent to the essence of structuralism. The functional approach derived from the consistency with which Baudouin perceived language as a human, i.e. purposeful, activity. To a large degree, functionalism boils down to this orientation toward the goal: diverse teleologies differentiate language into various functional styles depend- ing on the purpose an utterance is supposed to serve – into, for example, the poetical and the communicative styles. Hopensztand and other Warsaw 'formal- ists' perceived themselves as followers of Iakubinskii's functionalism rather than Shklovskii's Expressionism. Hopensztand began his reconstruction of Russian formalist theory, which initially was nothing but an apology for Futurist poetry,

by setting the poet Velimir Khlebnikov – the proto-structuralist conventionalist who modelled morphologies in order to achieve inventive semantic effects – in opposition to the Expressionist Aleksei Kruchenykh; their respective theoretical spokesmen were Iakubinskii and Shklovskii (Hopensztand 1938).

Evidently, Jakobson had the longest-standing effect on Polish structuralism with his functional approach to language and his definition of poetic function as "the projection of the principle of equivalence from the axis of selection into the axis of combination" (Waugh 1985, 150–151). Mikołaj Kruszewski's achievement was to transfer into the field of linguistics cognitive association by likeness and association by proximity, proposed in empiricist terms by David Hume and thriving in the psychology of the day (for example that of his Russian teacher at Warsaw University Matvei Troitskii, cf. Berazin 2001, 19–20; Svetlikova 2005, 78–95). He also ascribed the feature of creativity to association by likeness opposed to mechanical association by proximity (Baudouin de Courtenay 1974b [1889], 149–151; Jakobson 1971d [1966], 436–437). Whereas Kruszewski contributed to the definition of the poetic function by pinpointing the two axes of language in a gesture toward phenomenological research into the essence of language as a system and not an aggregate of facts, Baudouin's input consisted, in this case, in drafting a dynamic model of language which continuously re-shapes itself by way of allround projections of different grammatical categories onto one another: semantic categories are projected onto phonemes, morphemes onto semes, etc. In particular, his booklet on the psychology of the Polish language, containing a lecture he gave in Petrograd in 1915 to the members of a Polish association and eagerly read by Hopensztand, abounds in descriptions of such projections (Baudouin de Courtenay 1983 [1915], 51–99; 1974b [1889], 111).

It is precisely within the framework of vitalism and associationism, characteristic of Baudouin and Kruszewski's linguistics, that the device of estrangement may be theoretically grounded and related to the theory of poetic as opposed to communicative language. Associationism operated within the economic categories of the expenditure or the saving of (vital) energy by an organism tending towards equilibrium (Barewicz 1905, 110): Potebnia, Spencer or Avenarius (Shumeiko 2014; Blinova 2008, 63–67; Avenarius 1876, § 7, 14) claimed that those images which by frequent association have become habitual facilitate cognition and, thus, bring about a boost of energy and joy. The opposite stance, praising those literary devices that disrupt habit to make their perception difficult and palpable, likewise becomes plausible in this very frame of thought – and has been represented by Shklovskii and his followers to this day.

Baudouin's theory, predating Shklovskii by at least a decade, operates more dialectically. Baudouin assumes that there are two "currents" in language – one which manifests itself in metaphors and paranomastic figures and thus, while

facilitating poetic creativity, counterpoints another one tending towards abstraction and the forgetting of etymologies and formal properties of linguistic forms (Baudouin de Courtenay 1974a [1904], 83). In Baudouin, the principle of economy manifests itself both in a striving for the unity of the phonological and semantic aspects of language, a unity secured by the automatized character of their mutual association, and in poetic inventiveness, without which language would lack any cognitive and adaptive qualities in the dynamic reality. The examples provided by Baudouin in his 1888 lecture on general causes of linguistic changes prefigure the early works of Shklovskii and Jakobson's 1921 essay on Khlebnikov (Jakobson 1979 [1921]), as the Polish linguist speaks of the deautomatization of etymologies and dead (frozen) metaphors with a view to regaining the elasticity of language towards an ever-changing reality. To support his point, he quotes the great poets of Polish Romanticism, first and foremost Juliusz Słowacki (Baudouin de Courtenay 1974a [1904], 79–83).

Because of the entanglement of estrangement in the elementary cognitive procedures that consist of association and dissociation, Dawid Hopensztand protested against limiting the scope of this device's activity to poetry or art, and called it "the general morphological category of the world of culture, the consequence of dialectically conceived cognitive activity" (Hopensztand 1946, 383).

More locally, but perhaps more importantly in the perspective of the history of the humanities, Baudouin's dialectical vision of the relationship between naturalisation and estrangement helps to link the two greatest landmark discoveries of Russian formalism – estrangement and poetic language – which are usually considered separately and even opposed to one another, as Jakobson did in his preface to Todorov's anthology of Russian formalism (1966). Baudouin seems to reconcile both Expressionist and linguistic formalism, as in his writings estrangement reveals his linguistic essence hidden behind his status as a merely epistemological or aesthetic principle.

However, the Polish structuralists of the second generation, while tackling the estrangement or the alienation of language in poetic utterances, referred mostly to Sergei Karcevskii, a Russian active in Geneva and then Prague (cf. Sławiński 2001b [1968], 15–16; Okopień-Sławińska 1980, 7–11). Specifically, Karcevskii's essay "Le dualisme asymétrique du sign linguistique" (1929, "The Asymmetric Dualism of the Linguistic Sign", 1982) inspired the most interesting Polish observations on the poetic function, just as it had been adopted by Mukařovský and other Prague literary scholars (Mukařovský 1940). The dual and asymmetric nature of the linguistic sign reveals itself in the moment of transition from *langue* to *parole*, i. e. from language *in potentia* to language *in actu*. A sign *in potentia* is just an intersection of two asymmetric axes – a homonymic and a synonymic one: "every sign is potentially a homonym and a synonym at the same time. It belongs

simultaneously to a series of transposed values of a single sign and to a series of analogous values expressed by different signs" (Karcevskii 1982 [1929], 51).

For the Polish communicationists, the great thing about the Karcevskii model was that it fundamentally assumed that the form and the content of the sign do not completely agree with one another. This basic claim thus opened up a vista on studying literary communication that would reconcile the untranslatable realms of culture, gestalts and meanings. "A sign and its signification do not form a perfect fit" – Karcevskii writes (Karcevskii 1982 [1929], 49). "Their extensions do not coincide point for point, for a single sign always has several semantic functions and a single signification is always expressed by several signs. Every sign is potentially a 'homonym' and a 'synonym' at the same time – that is, it is constituted by the intersection of these two conceptual series" (Karcevskii 1982 [1929], 49). Moreover, while the meaning of the formal values of a word (gender, number, case, aspect, tense) is rigid, iterative, and "represents aspects of significations known to every speaking subject which are more or less safe from any subjective interpretation on the part of interlocutors" (Karcevskii 1982 [1929], 52), the semantic part of the words is, in contrast, a residue resistant to any attempt to decompose it into elements as "objective" as formal values. "The exact semantic value of a word can be adequately established only as a function of the concrete situation" (Karcevskii 1982 [1929], 52). This vision clearly opposes Saussure's vision of the *signifiant* and the *signifié* as two sides of one piece of paper and takes up Baudouin's vision of language as an arena of negotiations limited by the poles of the general and the individual, the abstract and the concrete, the communicativeness and the expression of an individual (Karcevskii 1982 [1929], 49). In language, static and dynamic at the same time, preservation and innovation coincide (Karcevskii 1982 [1929], 50), just as in Baudouin's language oscillating between estrangement and naturalisation.

The poetic language of the Avant-Garde, as the Polish structuralists Janusz Sławiński and Aleksandra Okopień-Sławińska assert, estranges language by means of demonstrating in an actual utterance (*parole*) the asymmetric dualism of the linguistic sign, characteristic of its potential state in language (*langue*). This is how the Avant-Gardists relate their utterances directly to the system of language, while trying to avoid any connotations with literary tradition. The description of Avant-Garde poetic language is another instance of the second-generation structuralists' fondness for discovering areas of potentiality in actual literary and cultural phenomena (see section 3.1). According to the Sławińskis' analyses of Avant-Garde poetry, its uses of language – while bracketing out literary tradition, or at least the most recent – refer directly to the make-up of *langue*. Poetry's syntactic structures – both sentences and verses, whose structures are mutually translatable (Sławiński 1998a [1965], 136) – are generated in a way that by no means

reduces, as in non-poetic utterances, but instead highlights and even enhances the homonymic-synonymic entanglement of every sign. The following words of the 'pope of the Avant-Garde', Tadeusz Peiper, uttered in the 1920s, quoted by Aleksandra Okopień-Sławińska, and paraphrased by Janusz Sławiński (1998a [1965], 94), comply with both Karcevskii and information theory with respect to communicative, prosaic language:

> In prosaic language, each incoming word tightens the conceptual scope of the previous word [...] [T]he arrival of words merely adds details to the initial vision, which changes only insomuch as it completes itself. [...] [In contrast:] The movement of the visions that comes from the metaphorical work [of poetry] cannot ensue from this type of complements. [In poetic language], the vision takes place in a flash. Under the influence of the arriving visions, previous visions will undergo immediate reductions, partitions, slips or deletions, and all this will become an invasion area for arriving visions that move on as invaders gallop. (Quoted in Okopień-Sławińska 1965, 436)

Now, Sławiński (probably inspired by Mukařovský 1977 [1940]) translates the Avant-Garde juxtaposition of prosaic and poetic language, in which the prosaic variety functions roughly according to Karcevskii's and information theory's models, into the idiom of the structuralism of the time (Sławiński 1998b [1961]). In this idiom, expressed eloquently in Jakobson's definition of poetic function, the poetic utterance reveals the functioning of language, in that it brings to the fore the potentiality of words in a dictionary, as well as syntax's involvement in semantic operations (e. g. disambiguation). As Sławiński claims:

> the poetic sentence combines in a peculiar way two contradictory modalities of the word – dictionary and contextual. There is a projection of dictionary potentiality onto syntactic actualisation. What is only an ensemble [*zespół*] of possibilities within a lexical resource is liberated and realized here – as a complex. (Sławiński 1998a [1965], 94)

Okopień-Sławińska assumed that the interplay of forms and meanings in the poetic sentence is relative to the communicative situation – the receiver has to recognise an utterance as an unusual, festive, offbeat one so as to realise that she or he is dealing with a poem: "recognisability of the verse form can be not only based on the phonic tissue, but largely depends on other (primarily stylistic) properties of expression, identified as poetical" (Okopień-Sławińska 1965, 426). Heterogeneous phenomena of style and phonetics are now encapsulated in a larger whole of communicating in verse language, conveying implicit information in its form.

Beside Jakobson and Karcevskii, Viktor Vinogradov helped Polish structuralism become what it was. Specifically, Vinogradov's two essays on artistic prose (1930) and *skaz* (1978 [1925]) contained in the Warsaw Circle's anthology of modern stylistics (cf. Budzyk 1937b), were a *mise-en-abyme* of Polish structuralism-com-

municationism. The penetrating power of Vinogradov's ideas undoubtedly has a lot in common with the fact that his views emerged in the wake of Baudouin's activity in St Petersburg. For example, Vinogradov mapped out his basic distinction between monological and dialogical language harking back to Iakubinskii and Shczerba, two pupils of Baudouin (Vinogradov 1978 [1925]). Tellingly, Vinogradov also wrote the methodological introduction to Baudouin's *Selected Writings* (Vinogradov 1963). In this introduction, Vinogradov singles out the main topics in Baudouin's oeuvre, all of which also pertained to Vinogradov's scholarship and Polish structuralism: the multiplicity of realities and of languages; stress on living languages and the relation of language to communicating people, i. e. to society; synchrony and diachrony conceived of since the 1870s as two interplaying dimensions of language; the connection between language and worldview; the notion of the phoneme and phonology; the purely functional approach to language; and semantics and morphology as necessary characteristics of linguistic phenomena (Vinogradov 1963, 12–16).

Vinogradov's articles on stylistics, which appeared in Polish in 1937, expand on the theatricality of literary utterances, especially those implementing the dialogical forms of language, which carry with themselves rudiments of pantomimic, mimic-gestural forms of communicating (Vinogradov 1978 [1925]). Dawid Hopensztand intercepted and amplified this element in his theory of satiric discourse (Hopensztand 1946), thus paving the way for a typically Polish application of theatrical models and metaphors to literary communication. Vinogradov's notion of the image of the author invited Polish scholars to develop their theatre-oriented approaches because the image implies total control over language and artistic devices – total control, against the colourless backdrop of which more or less fallible, unreliable speakers appear (Vinogradov 1930, 41–42).

The younger generation of structuralists, who embraced the notion of communication, concentrated more on the fact that the situation of communication is inscribed in the work as the "seed of realisation" (Vinogradov 1930, 35). The communicationists would elevate the correspondence between the internal situation (inscribed in the work) and the external situation (into which the work is inscribed) of communication to the status of the signpost of literariness. The literary utterance – says Balcerzan – calls into question "the rules of human speech, the standard of colloquial literary communication" (Balcerzan, 1971, 81–82). The sender and the recipient exist not only outside the utterance, as in colloquial speech, but also become "the internal (semantic) structure of the work". In this way, the very signpost of literariness (the inscription of the communicative situation in the work) becomes, paradoxically, the bridge between intrinsic and extrinsic approaches: communication as (an aspect of) form and as the mode of the societal functioning of works. Intrinsic and extrinsic approaches are thus

distinguished and reconciled as Wóycicki and Budzyk suggested in 1914 and 1958, respectively.

Moreover, in Vinogradov the intellectual historian finds the source of Sław-iński's claim, quoted at the beginning of this article, that the literary utterance participates both in the internally differentiated system of language and in the system of artistic tradition (Vinogradov 1930, 29). This is why Vinogradov distinguishes between structure and composition, which would then be continued by Budzyk in his description of compositional forms interfering with structural linguistic features in modern prose (Budzyk 1937b, 430–446). The Polish structuralists also relied on Vinogradov's description of the internal stylistic diversity of language, containing various sub-codes: monologue vs. dialogue, spoken vs. written language (the former tending towards concreteness and motoric character, the latter towards abstraction and intellectual character), verse vs. prose (Vinogradov 1930, 33–34). Budzyk and Hopensztand recognized these oppositions as the basic distinctive features of the stylistics of literary texts.

These elements were then transmuted into a theory which was at once deeply embedded in the tradition of structuralist thought and original – Polish structuralism. To sum up with an example, the main goal of Sławiński's essay on the semantics of the narrative utterance (Sławiński 1998c [1967]) is to get rid of any notions that pertain to the description of narrative but do not correspond to or simply come from the dictionary of linguistic semantics. Everything in the literary work is composed of linguistic signs, even though some popular notions of narrative studies suggest otherwise and are thus symptoms of the "disease" of language, one such symptom, according to Wittgenstein, being metaphysics (cf. Wittgenstein 2009 [1953], § 133, 255). These notions suggest that the level of the told (the narrative world) differs substantially from the level of telling, the latter obviously being made of words and not extra-linguistic "objects" "designated" by propositions contained in literary works (Markiewicz 1965, 125). Drawing on Viktor Vinogradov and Sergei Karcevskii (along with Viktor Voloshinov, Jan Mukařovský, and Lubomír Doležel), Sławiński (1998c [1967], 115–117) sets out to demonstrate that laws analogous to those that govern the accumulation of the meaning of a sentence also apply to narrative. However, despite what the classical French narratologists might say (Todorov 1973 [1968], 77–84), there is no such thing as a narrative syntax which subjugates elements of narrative sequences by means of introducing hierarchical relations between them. In a tight spot like this, an East and Central European structuralist like Sławiński argues that works of literary art are products made of words that refer not to one system, that of language, but to at least two systems simultaneously: besides language they participate in the system of artistic tradition (that is, the structure of historically accumulated and culturally significant forms, cf. Sławiński 2001a, 16). The latter system produces

the narrative syntax. Thus, the role of the all-encompassing syntax of narrative is taken over by a specifically narrative convention – the hierarchical difference between the narrator and the hero as determined by literary tradition (Sławiński 1998c [1967], 117–121). The narrative levels usually differ through the language that their representatives, the narrator and the protagonist, speak and, through their perspective (internal/external), assume. External and internal perspectives resemble syntax by virtue of subjugating and distorting the dictionary meanings of language units. Similarly to the sound formation 'address', which signifies different things in different syntactic contexts ('my address is...', 'her address to the people...', 'let me address this issue...'), the meaning of all words and sentences of a narrative is relative to the narrative instance in which they are uttered. Just as in a grammatical sentence, there is an interplay occurs between syntax and the denotations of particular words, so in a narrative sequence there is a tension between perspectives (or levels) and denotations – between he or she who sees and describes and that which is spoken about. Points of view dovetail hierarchy, paradigm, non-linearity, and the stability of literary tradition, and are confronted with informational flux, innovation, and entropy. The paradigmatic order opposes the syntagmatic influx of ever-new information. Grand semantic figures that emerge from this interplay of synthetic points of view and meanings accumulating and shifting over time – narrator, plot, hero, and virtual reader (Sławiński 1998c [1967], 121) – are, moreover, nothing less than different perspectives on the entire narrative utterance, language, and literary tradition, since they are determined by the set of relations they maintain with other elements both inside and outside the work. The narrator is, for example, determined by his or her relations with the world presented (events and environment), the system of sociolects, the receiver, the author, literary tradition, traditional realisations of narration, and sanctioned narrative role models (Sławiński 1998c [1967], 124).

In this way, a literary utterance participates in the system of language and of tradition that together make it possible and understandable. A Polish structuralist bricoleur, working in accordance with the regimes of eclecticism, also participates in different orders to render fascinating theories. The tradition of East and Central European theory is the paradigm which he confronts with the stream of his or her ingenuity in order to render grand scholarly figures.

References

Adamska-Sałaciak, Arleta. "Jan Baudouin de Courtenay's Contribution to General Linguistics." *Towards a History of Linguistics in Poland: From the Early Beginnings to the End of the Twentieth Century*. Eds. Ernst F. Koerner and Aleksander Szwedek. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 2001. 175–208.

Albrecht, Jörn. *Europäischer Strukturalismus: Ein forschungsgeschichtlicher Überblick*. Tübingen: Francke, 2000.

Alpatov, Vladimir. *Voloshinov, Bakhtin i lingvistika*. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh klu'tur, 2005.

Appel, Karol. "Język i sztuka: Lingwistyka i estetyka. Streszczenie." *Sprawozdania Warszawskiego Towarzystwa Naukowego* 3 (1910): 7–15.

Avenarius, Richard. *Philosophie als Denken der Welt gemäss dem Princip des kleinsten Kraftmasses: Prolegomena zu einer Kritik der reinen Erfahrung*. Leipzig: Fues, 1876.

Balbus, Stanisław. *Między stylami*. Cracow: Universitas, 1993.

Balcerzan, Edward. "Perspektywy 'poetyki odbioru'." *Problemy socjologii literatury*. Ed. Janusz Sławiński. Wroclaw: Ossolineum, 1971. 79–95.

Balcerzan, Edward. "Badacz i jego prześmiewca." *Teksty* 3.1 (1972): 2–8.

Balcerzan, Edward. "I ty zostaniesz strukturalistą." *Teksty* 6.2 (1973): 1–8.

Balcerzan, Edward. "Poezja jako semiotyka sztuki." *Teksty* 41.5 (1978): 11–38.

Baluch, Jacek. "*Czeskie inspiracje polskiego literaturoznawstwa*." *Czechy i Polska na szlakach ich kulturalnego rozwoju*. Ed. Jerzy Wyrozumski. Cracow: Międzynarodowe Centrum Kultury, 1998. 207–213.

Barewicz, Witold. "Review of *Les Problèmes de l'Esthétique Contemporaine*, by Jean-Marie Guyau." *Pamiętnik Literacki*, 4.1–4 (1905): 110–113.

Bartoszyński, Kazimierz. "Zagadnienie komunikacji literackiej w utworach narracyjnych." *Problemy socjologii literatury*. Ed. Janusz Sławiński. Wroclaw: Ossolineum, 1971. 127–148.

Bartoszyński, Kazimierz. "Opowiadanie a deixis i presupozycja." *Studia o narracji*. Eds. Jan Błoński, Stanisław Jaworski, and Janusz Sławiński. Wroclaw: Ossolineum, 1982. 9–18.

Bartoszyński, Kazimierz. "O 'zwrotach', czyli kilka uwag o tak zwanej komunikacji literackiej." *Teksty Drugie* 18.3 (2007): 233–237.

Baudouin de Courtenay, Jan N. *Neskol'ko slov o sravnitel'noi grammatike indoevropeiskikh iazykov*. St. Petersburg: Balashev, 1882.

Baudouin de Courtenay, Jan N. "Iazykoznanie." *Ėntsiklopedicheskii slovar' Brokgauza i Ėfrona*. Vol. 81. Leipzig and St. Petersburg: Brockhaus and Efron, 1904. 520–526.

Baudouin de Courtenay. Jan N. "O smeshannom kharaktere vsekh iazykov." [1901] *Izbrannye trudy po obshchemu iazykoznaniiu v dvukh tomakh*. Vol. 1. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1963. 362–372.

Baudouin de Courtenay, Jan N. "O ogólnych przyczynach zmian językowych." [1904] Jan N. Baudouin de Courtenay, *Dzieła wybrane*. Vol. 1. Warsaw: PWN, 1974a. 202–247.

Baudouin de Courtenay, Jan N. "Mikołaj Kruszewski, jego życie i prace naukowe." [1889] Jan N. Baudouin de Courtenay, *Dzieła wybrane*. Vol. 1. Warsaw: PWN, 1974b. 248–327.

Baudouin de Courtenay, Jan N. "Charakterystyka psychologiczna języka polskiego." [1915] Jan N. Baudouin de Courtenay, *Dzieła wybrane*. Vol. 5. Warsaw: PWN, 1983. 51–99.

Berazin, Fedor M. "Mikołaj Kruszewski and 20th-Century Linguistics." *Towards a History of Linguistics in Poland: From the Early Beginnings to the End of the Twentieth Century*. Eds. Ernst F. K. Koerner and Aleksander Szwedek. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 2001. 209–231.

Blinova, Larisa. "Vzgliady D. N. Ovsianiko-Kulikovskogo na psikhologiiu khudozhestvennogo tvorchestva." *Izvestiia RGPU im. A. I. Gercena* 88 (2008): 63–67.

Brandist, Craig. *The Dimensions of Hegemony: Language, Culture and Politics in Revolutionary Russia*. Chicago, IL: Haymarket Books, 2016.

Brinley, Michel. *The Return of the Native: Roman Jakobson between East and West, 1956–1968*. 2017 / manuscript.

Brzękowski, Jan. *Poezja integralna: Elementy i struktura. Budowa. Poezja stosowana a poezja proletarjacka*. Warsaw: Biblioteka a. r., 1933.

Budzyk, Kazimierz. "Posłowie." *Z zagadnień stylistyki*. Eds. Leo Spitzer, Karl Vossler, and Viktor Vinogradov. Warsaw: Koło Polonistów Stud. U. J. P., 1937a. 149–159.

Budzyk, Kazimierz. "Z zagadnień stylistyki." *Prace ofiarowane Kazimierzowi Wóycickiemu*. Vilnius and Warsaw: Dom Książki Polskiej, 1937b. 407–446.

Budzyk, Kazimierz. "O Franciszku Siedleckim wspomnienie." *Pamiętnik Literacki* 36.3–4 (1946): 375–386.

Budzyk, Kazimierz. "O przedmiocie badań historycznoliterackich." *Zjazd Naukowy Polonistów 10–13 grudnia 1958*. Ed. Kazimierz Wyka. Wroclaw: Ossolineum, 1960. 125–147.

Budzyk, Kazimierz. "Główne problemy metodologiczne w badaniach lit." [1958] Kazimierz Budzyk, *Stylistyka poetyka, teoria literatury*. Wroclaw: Ossolineum, 1966. 176–206.

Carnap, Rudolf. *The Logical Syntax of Language*. London: K. Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., 1937.

Carnap, Rudolf. "Strukturbeschreibung." *Kursbuch* 5 (1966): 69–73.

Chirikba, Viacheslav. "The problem of the Caucasian *Sprachbund*." *From Linguistic Areas to Areal Linguistics*. Ed. Pieter Muysken. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, 2008. 25–94.

Cohen, Hermann. *System der Philosophie, Erster Teil: Logik der reinen Erkenntnis*. Berlin: Bruno Cassirer, 1902.

Conrad, Waldemar. "Der ästhetische Gegenstand: eine phänomenologische Studie." *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 3.1 (1908): 71–118; 3.4 (1908): 469–511; 4.3 (1909): 400–455.

Czaplejewicz, Eugeniusz. "Co to za Vademecum?" *Przegląd Humanistyczny* 21.11 (1977): 197–204.

Czermińska, Malgorzata. "Autor, literarisches Subjekt, Zeugenschaft und Raumerfahrung." *Die Welt der Slawen* 61.1 (2016): 236–265.

Červenka, Miroslav, Lucylla Pszczołowska, and Dorota Urbańska (eds.). *Europejskie wzorce metryczne w literaturach słowiańskich*. Warsaw: IBL. Wydaw., 1995.

Davie, Donald et al. (eds.). *Poetics = Poetyka = Poetika*. Vol. 1. Warsaw: PWN, 1962.

Dąbrowski, Stanisław. "W sprawie teoretycznej dezautonomizacji literatury: w kręgu wypowiedzi komunikacjonistów." *Pamiętnik Literacki* 78.2 (1987): 155–183.

Dobrzyńska, Teresa (ed.). *Teoria tekstu*. Wroclaw: Ossolineum, 1986.

Dobrzyńska, Teresa. "Maria Renata Mayenowa." *Teksty Drugie* 2.1 (1990): 149–159.

Dobrzyńska, Teresa. "Bohomaz i bachur: Z zagadnień stylistyki wypowiedzi w kontaktach środowisk różnojęzycznych." *Literatura, dziedzictwo, historia: Prace ofiarowane profesor Teresie Kostkiewiczowej*. Eds. Tomasz Chachulski and Anna Grześkowiak-Krwawicz. Warsaw: Instytut Badań Literackich PAN, 2006. 487–495.

Dobrzyńska, Teresa. "Teoria tekstu w Polsce." *Tekst i Dyskurs/Text und Diskurs* 1 (2008): 11–23.

Dobrzyńska, Teresa. "Czesi w Warszawie: Inspiracje oraz obszary wspólnych badań w zakresie stylistyki, wersologii i teorii tekstu." *Strukturalizm w Europie Środkowej i Wschodniej – wizje i rewizje*. Eds. Włodzimierz Bolecki and Danuta Ulicka. Warsaw: Instytut Badań Literackich PAN, 2012. 252–257.

Èikhenbaum, Boris. "Literatura i pisatel'." [1927] Boris Èikhenbaum, *Moi vremennik*. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo pisatelei, 1929. 59–81.

Èikhenbaum, Boris. "Literaturnyi byt." [1927] Boris Èikhenbaum, *O literature: raboty raznych let*. Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1987. 428–436.

Gedymin, Jerzy. *Problemy, założenia, rozstrzygnięcia: Studia nad logicznymi podstawami nauk społecznych*. Poznan: PWN, 1964.

Gedymin, Jerzy. *Science and Convention: Essays on Henri Poincaré's Philosophy of Science and the Conventionalist Tradition*. Oxford: Pergamon, 1982.

Genette, Gérarde. *Figures*. Vol. 3. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1972.

Gierowski, Piotr. *Struktury historii: O czeskim projekcie dziejów literatury na tle recepcji praskiego strukturalizmu w Polsce*. Cracow: Wydawnictwo UJ, 2013.

Głowiński, Michał. *Powieść młodopolska. Studium z poetyki historycznej*. Wroclaw, Warsaw, and Cracow: Ossolineum, 1969.

Głowiński, Michał. "Powieść i prawda." *Problemy socjologii literatury*. Ed. Janusz Sławiński. Wroclaw: Ossolineum, 1971. 185–203.

Głowiński, Michał. "Świadectwa i style odbioru." *Teksty* 6.3 (1975): 9–28.

Głowiński, Michał. "O konkretyzacji." Michał Głowiński, *Style odbioru: Szkice o komunikacji literackiej*. Cracow: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1977. 93–115.

Głowiński, Michał. "Mimesis językowa w wypowiedzi literackiej." *Pamiętnik Literacki* 71.4 (1980): 59–71.

Głowiński, Michał. "Próba opisu tekstu krytycznego." *Badania nad krytyką* literacką. Vol. 2. Eds. Michał Głowiński and Krzysztof Dybciak. Wroclaw: Ossolineum, 1984. 73–85.

Głowiński, Michał. "Od *metod zewnętrznych* i *wewnętrznych* do *komunikacji literackiej*." [1987] Michał Głowiński, *Poetyka i okolice*. Warsaw: PWN, 1992. 7–29.

Głowiński, Michał. "Wielka parataksa: o budowie dyskursu w 'Legendzie Młodej Polski' Stanisława Brzozowskiego." *Pamiętnik Literacki* 82.4 (1991): 43–70.

Głowiński, Michał. "Gombrowicz a Brzozowski." *Teksty Drugie* 8.1/2 (1997): 47–62.

Głowiński, Michał. "Roman Iakobson v Pol'she." *Roman Iakobson: Teksty, dokumenty, issledovaniia*. Eds. Henryk Baran and Sergei Gindin. Moscow: RGGU, 1999. 254–261.

Głowiński, Michał. "Gang strukturalistów." *Teksty Drugie* 16.1–2 (2005): 83–93.

Głowiński, Michał. *Kręgi obcości: Opowieść autobiograficzna*. Cracow: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 2010.

Głowiński, Michał. "Narration as Dramatic Monologue." [1973] Michał Głowiński, *Totalitarian Speech*. Trans. by Stanley Bill. Frankfurt/M.: Peter Lang, 2014. 13–40.

Głowiński, Michał, Aleksandra Okopień, and Janusz Sławiński. *Wiadomości z teorii literatury*. Ed. Kazimierz Budzyk. Warsaw: Państwowe Zakłady Wydawnictw Szkolnych, 1957.

Głowiński, Michał, Aleksandra Okopień-Sławińska, and Janusz Sławiński. *Zarys teorii literatury*. Warsaw: Państwowe Zakłady Wydawnictw Szkolnych, 1962.

Głowiński, Michał, Teresa Kostkiewiczowa, Aleksandra Okopień-Sławińska, and Janusz Sławiński. *Słownik terminów literackich*. Wroclaw: Ossolineum, 1976.

Greimas, Algirdas Julien et al. (eds.). *Sign, language, culture*. The Hague: Mouton, 1970.

Grochowski, Grzegorz. "'Teksty' – pismo warsztatowe." *IBL w PRL*. Vol. 1. Ed. Elżbieta Kiślak. Warsaw: Instytut Badań Literackich PAN, 2016. 507–520.

Hansen-Löve, Aage A. "Die 'formal-philosophische Schule' in der russischen Kunsttheorie der zwanziger Jahre: Ein Überblick." *Zwischen den Lebenswelten: Interkulturelle Profile der Phänomenologie*. Eds. Nikolaj Plotnikov, Meike Siegfried, and Jens Bonnemann. Berlin: Lit Verlag, 2012. 205–258.

Hauser, Marc D., Noam Chomsky, and Fitch. W. Tecumseh. "The Faculty of Language: What Is It, Who Has It, and How Did It Evolve?" *Science* 298.5598 (2002): 1569–1579.

Herman, David. "Ingarden and the Prague School." *Neophilologus* 81.4 (1997): 481–487.

Holenstein, Elmar. *Roman Jakobsons phänomenologischer Strukturalismus*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1975.

Hopensztand, Dawid. "Mowa pozornie zależna w kontekście 'Czarnych skrzydeł'." *Prace ofiarowane Kazimierzowi Wóycickiemu*. Vilnius and Warsaw: Dom Książki Polskiej, 1937. 371–406.

Hopensztand, Dawid. "Filozofia literatury formalistów wobec poetyki futuryzmu." *Życie Literackie* 2.5 (1938): 182–195.

Hopensztand, Dawid. "*Satyry* Krasickiego: próba morfologii i semantyki." *Stylistyka teoretyczna w Polsce*. Ed. Kazimierz Budzyk. Lodz: Książka, 1946. 331–396.

Iakubinskii, Lev. "O zvukakh stikhotvornogo iazyka." [1916] *Poetika: Sborniki po teorii poeticheskogo iazyka*. Petrograd: Gosudarstvennaia tipografiia, 1919. 37–49.

Ingarden, Roman. "Review of *Wstęp do badań nad dziełem literackim*, by M. Kridl." *Pamiętnik Literacki* 35.1/4 (1938): 265–271.

Ingarden, Roman. "Poetik und Sprachwissenschaft." *Poetics = Poetyka = Poetika*. Vol. 1. Eds. Donald Davie et al. Warsaw: PWN, 1962. 3–9.

Ingarden, Roman. "Krytyczne uwagi o poglądach fonologów." [1948] *Roman Ingarden, Z teorii języka i filozoficznych podstaw logiki: Dzieła filozoficzne*. Warsaw: PWN, 1972. 15–28.

Ingarden, Roman. *The Cognition of the Literary Work of Art* [1968]. Chicago, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973.

Ivanov, Viacheslav, Iurii Lotman, Aleksandr Piatigorskii, Vladimir Toporov, and Boris Uspenskii. "Tezisy k semioticheskomu izucheniiu kul'tur." *Semiotyka i struktura tekstu: Studia poświęcone V II Międzynarodowem u Kongresowi Slawistów*. Ed. Maria Renata Mayenowa. Wroclaw: Ossolineum, 1973. 9–32.

Jakobson, Roman, and Petr Savitskii. *Evraziia v svetle iazykoznaniia*. Prague: Izdanie evraziitsev, 1931.

Jakobson, Roman. "Piatistopnyi bolgarskii iamb v sopostavlenii s russkim." *Sbornik v chest' na prof. L. Miletich*. Sofia: Makedonski nauchen institut, 1933. 114–201.

Jakobson, Roman. "Poetyka w świetle językoznawstwa." Trans. by Krystyna Pomorska. *Pamiętnik Literacki* 51.2 (1960): 431–473.

Jakobson, Roman. "K kharakteristike evraziiskogo iazykovogo soiuza." [1931] *Roman Jakobson, Phonological Studies: Selected Writings*. Vol. 1. The Hague: Mouton, 1962. 114–201.

Jakobson, Roman et al. (eds.). *Poetics = Poetyka = Poetika*. Vol. 2. The Hague and Paris: Mouton; Warsaw: PWN Polish Scientific Publishers, 1966.

Jakobson, Roman. "List badacza polskiego." *Literatura, komparatystyka, folklor: Księga poświęcona Julianowi Krzyżanowskiemu*. Eds. Maria Bokszczanin, Stanisław Frybes, and Edmund Jankowski. Warsaw: PIW, 1968. 664–674.

Jakobson, Roman. "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation." [1959] *Roman Jakobson, Word and Language: Selected Writings*. Vol. 2. The Hague: Mouton, 1971a. 260–266.

Jakobson, Roman. "Jan Baudouin de Courtenay." [1929] *Roman Jakobson, Word and Language: Selected Writings*. Vol. 2. The Hague: Mouton, 1971b. 389–393.

Jakobson, Roman. "The Kazan School of Polish Linguistics and its Place in the International Development of Phonology." [1960] Roman Jakobson, *Word and Language*: *Selected Writings*. Vol. 2. The Hague: Mouton, 1971c. 394–428.

Jakobson, Roman. "Znachenie Krushevskogo dlia razvitia nauki o iazykie." [1966] Roman Jakobson, *Word and Language*: *Selected Writings*. Vol. 2. The Hague: Mouton, 1971d. 429–450.

Jakobson, Roman. "The Polish-Russian Collaboration in the 'Science of Language'." [1943] Roman Jakobson, *Word and Language: Selected Writings*. Vol. 2. The Hague: Mouton, 1971e. 451–455.

Jakobson, Roman. "O pokolenii, rastrativshem svoikh poetov." [1930] Roman Jakobson and Dmitrii Sviatopolk-Mirskii, *O pokolenii, rastrativshem svoikh poetov: Smert' Vladimira Maiakovskogo*. The Hague: Mouton, 1975. 8–34.

Jakobson, Roman. "Noveishaia russkaia poeziia – Nabrosok pervyi: Postupy k Khlebnikovu." [1921] Roman Jakobson, *On Verse, Its Masters and Explorers: Selected Writings*. Vol. 5. Eds. Stephen Rudy and Martha Taylor. The Hague: Mouton, 1979. 299–354.

Jakobson, Roman and Iurii Tynianov. "Problems in the Study of Language and Literature." [1928] Trans. by Helene Eagle. *Poetics Today* 2.1 (1980): 29–31.

Jakobson, Roman. "Linguistics and Poetics." [1960] *Language in Literature*. Eds. Krystyna Pomorska and Stephen Rudy. Cambridge, MA, and London: Harvard University Press, 1987. 62–94.

Jakobson, Roman. "Dem Gedächtnis Jan Wiktor Porzezińskis." [1929] Roman Jakobson, *Completion*. *Selected Writings*. Vol. 9.1. Eds. Jindrich Toman and Stephen Rudy. The Hague: Mouton, 2013. 199–201.

Janion, Maria. "Tradycje i perspektywy badań genetycznych w historii literatury." *Zjazd Naukowy Polonistów 10–13 grudnia 1958*. Ed. Kazimierz Wyka. Wroclaw: Ossolineum, 1960. 149–246.

Janion, Maria. "*Agaj-Han jako romantyczna powieść historyczna.*" [1969] Maria Janion, *Prace wybrane*. Vol. 2. Ed. Małgorzata Czerminska. Cracow: Universitas, 2000. 171–208.

Januszek, Emilia. *Dyskurs teoretycznoliteracki Janusza Sławińskiego*. Cracow: Wydawnictwo UJ, 2012.

Karcevskii, Sergei. "The Asymmetric Dualism of Sign." [1929] Trans. by Wendy Steiner. *The Prague School: Selected Writings*. Ed. Peter Steiner. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1982. 47–54.

Kasperski, Edward. "Błędna koncepcja i szkodliwe skutki." *Przegląd Humanistyczny* 11 (1977). 163–170.

Kiślak, Elżbieta (ed.). *IBL w PRL*. Vols. 1–3. Warsaw: Instytut Badań Literackich PAN, 2016.

Kluba, Agnieszka (ed.). *Pisma zebrane Janusza Sławińskiego*. Forthcoming.

Kmita, Jerzy. *Problematyka terminów teoretycznych w odniesieniu do pojęć literaturoznawczych*. Poznan: Wydawnictwo PTPN, 1967.

Kmita, Jerzy (ed.). *Metodologiczne aplikacje metodologii marksistowskiej*. Warsaw: PWN, 1974.

Kmita, Jerzy. *Szkice z teorii poznania naukowego*. Warsaw: PWN, 1976.

Kmita, Jerzy. *Z problemów epistemologii historycznej*. Warsaw: PWN, 1980.

Kmita, Jerzy. *O kulturze symbolicznej*. Warsaw: Centralny Ośrodek Metodyki Upowszechniania Kultury, 1982.

Kmita, Jerzy. *Kultura i poznanie*. Warsaw: PWN, 1985.

Kmita, Jerzy. *Jak słowa łączą się ze światem: Studium krytyczne neopragmatyzmu*. Poznan: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Adama Mickiewicza, 1998.

Kmita, Jerzy, and Wlodzimierz Ławniczak. "Signe, Symbole, Allégorie." *Recherches sur les systèmes signifiants: Symposium de Varsovie 1968*. Ed. Josette Rey-Debove. The Hague: Mouton, 1973. 21–31.

Kmita, Jerzy, and Andrzej Nowak. *Studia nad metodologicznymi podstawami humanistyki*. Poznan: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM, 1968.

Koerner, Ernst F. K. *Ferdinand de Saussure: Origin and Development of his Linguistic Thought in Western Studies of Language*. Braunschweig: Vieweg, 1973.

Koerner, Ernst F. K. *Toward a Historiography of Linguistics: Selected Essays*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 1978.

Kola, Adam, and Danuta Ulicka. "From Circles to the School (and Back Again): The Case of Polish Structuralism." *Theoretical Schools and Circles in the Twentieth-Century Humanities: Literary Theory, History, Philosophy*. Eds. Marina Grishakova and Silvi Salupere. New York, NY, and London: Routledge, 2015. 63–83.

Kopczyńska, Zdzisława. "Znaczenie wyboru formy wierszowej (na przykładzie polskiego 8-zgłoskowca)." *Pamiętnik Literacki* 61.4 (1970): 179–195.

Kopczyńska, Zdzisława, and Lucylla Pszczołowska. "Znaczenie i wartość form wierszowych w kontekście literackim epoki (poezja polskiego baroku)." *Pamiętnik Literacki* 60.3 (1969): 195–210.

Kopczyńska, Zdzisława, and Lucylla Pszczołowska. "Funkcje semantyczne form wierszowych w poezji polskiego romantyzmu: Mickiewicz – Słowacki – Zaleski." *Pamiętnik Literacki* 77.3 (1986): 143–156.

Kopczyńska, Zdzisława, and Lucylla Pszczołowska (eds.). *Słownik rytmiczny i sposoby jego wykorzystania*. Wroclaw: Ossolineum, 1979.

Krasuski, Krzysztof. *Główne tendencje współczesnej polonistyki literackiej*. Wroclaw: Silesia, 1992.

Kridl, Manfred. *Wstęp do badań nad dziełem literackim*. Vilnius: Dom Książki Polskiej, 1936.

Kruszewski, Mikołaj. *Writings in General Linguistics: On Sound Alternation (1881) and Outline of Linguistic Science (1883)*. Trans. by Robert Austerlitz and Gregory M. Eramian. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1995.

Leont'ev, Aleksei. "Peterburskaia (leningradskaia) shkola." *Lingvisticheskii enciklopedicheskii slovar'*. Ed. Ivan Iarcev. Moscow: Sovetskaia Enciklopediia, 1990. http://tapemark.narod.ru/les/373a.html (8 February 2022).

Lewiński, Dominik. *Strukturalistyczna wyobraźnia metateoretyczna: O procesach paradygmatyzacji w polskiej nauce o literaturze po 1958 roku*. Cracow: Universitas, 2004.

Markiewicz, Henryk. *Główne problemy wiedzy o literaturze*. Cracow: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1965.

Markiewicz, Henryk. "Dylematy historyka literatury." *Pamiętnik Literacki* 77.4 (1986): 5–21.

Markiewicz, Henryk (ed.). *Współczesna teoria badań literackich za granicą: antologia*. Vols. 1–4. Cracow: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1970–1992.

Markiewicz, Henryk (ed.). *Sztuka interpretacji*. Vols. 1–2. Wroclaw: Ossolineum, 1971–1972.

Markiewicz, Henryk and Teresa Walas (eds.). *Sztuka interpretacji w ostatnim półwieczu*. Cracow: Universitas, 2011.

Mayenowa, Maria Renata (ed.). *O spójności tekstu*. Wroclaw: Ossolineum, 1971.

Mayenowa, Maria Renata (ed.). *Tekst i język: problemy semantyczne*. Wroclaw: Ossolineum, 1974.

Mayenowa, Maria Renata (ed.). *Semantyka tekstu i języka*. Wroclaw: Ossolineum, 1976.

Mayenowa, Maria Renata (ed.). *Tekst, język, poetyka*. Wroclaw: Ossolineum, 1978.

Martinet, André: "La double articulation linguistique." *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Copenhague* 5 (1949): 30–37.

Mitosek, Zofia. "Mimesis krytyczna." *Pamiętnik Literacki* 79.3 (1988): 77–95.

Mrugalski, Michał. "The Polish Reception of Reception: The Transfer of *priem* within the Intellectual Morphic Field of Russian and Polish Formalisms." *Epokha 'ostraneniia': Russkii formalizm i sovremennoe humanitarnoe znanie*. Eds. Ian Levchenko and Igor' Pil'shchikov. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2017. 153–164.

Mrugalski, Michał. "Le 'formalisme' polonais et l'héritage du formalisme russe." Trans. by Jérémie Conan and Philippe Roussin. *Communications* 2 (2018): 225–243.

Mrugalski, Michał. "Stanisław Brzozowski as Harbinger and Enabler of Modern Literary Theory in Poland and in the West." *Stanisław Brzozowski and the Migration of Ideas Transnational Perspectives on the Intellectual Field in Twentieth-Century Poland and Beyond*. Eds. Jens Herlth, Edward Swiderski, and Dorota Kozicka. Bielefeld: transcript, 2019. 273–302.

Mrugalski, Michał. "Styl – semantyka – pragmatyka." *Monografia*. *Wiek teorii: Stulecie badań literackoteoretycznych w Polsce*. Vol. 1. Ed. Danuta Ulicka. Warsaw: IBL, 2020. 231–285.

Mukařovský, Jan. *Aesthetic Function, Norm and Value as Social Facts* [1936]. Trans. by Mark E. Suino. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications, 1970.

Mukařovský, Jan. "On Poetic Language." [1940] Jan Mukařovský, *The Word and Verbal Art: Selected Essays*. Trans. by John Burbank and Peter Steiner. New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 1977. 1–64.

Nycz, Ryszard. "Tezy o mimetyczności." *Teoretycznoliterackie tematy i problemy*. Ed. Janusz Sławiński. Warsaw: Instytut Badań Literackich PAN, 1986. 53–60.

Okopieniowa, Aleksandra and Michał Głowiński. "'Wykłady' prof. Romana Jakobsona w Krynicy." *Pamiętnik Literacki* 50.1 (1959): 315–320.

Okopień-Sławińska, Aleksandra. "Wiersz awangardowy dwudziestolecia międzywojennego (postawy, granice, możliwości)." *Pamiętnik Literacki* 56.2 (1965): 425–446.

Okopień-Sławińska, Aleksandra. "Relacje osobowe w literackiej komunikacji." *Problemy socjologii literatury*. Ed. Janusz Sławiński. Wroclaw: Ossolineum, 1971. 109–125.

Okopień-Sławińska, Aleksandra. "*Metafora bez granic*." *Teksty* 11.6 (1980): 3–35.

Okopień-Sławińska, Aleksandra. "Semantyka 'ja' literackiego ('ja' tekstowe wobec 'ja' twórcy)." *Teksty* 12.6 (1981): 115–135.

Okopień, Aleksandra, and Janusz Sławiński. "O Franciszku Siedleckim i 'polskim formalizmie'." *Twórczość* l6.10 (1960): 92–106.

Owczarek, Bogdan. "Słownik a literaturoznawstwo marksistowskie." *Przegląd Humanistyczny* 11 (1977): 177–179.

Pszczołowska, Lucylla (ed.). *Semantyka form wierszowych*. Wroclaw: Ossolineum, 1988.

Pszczołowska, Lucylla. "Dwie literatury i dwa modele wiersza." [2004] *Znaczenie wyboru formy wiersza: trzy studia*. Eds. Zdzisława Kopczyńska, Teresa Dobrzyńska, and Lucylla Pszczołowska. Warsaw: Instytut Badań Literackich PAN, 2007. 79–101.

Pszczołowska, Lucylla. "Słowiańska metryka porównawcza. Ewolucja celów i metod badawczych." *Strukturalizm w Europie Środkowej i Wschodniej – wizje i rewizje*. Eds. Włodzimierz Bolecki and Danuta Ulicka. Warsaw: Instytut Badań Literackich PAN, 2012. 161–170.

Rey-Debove, Josette (ed.). *Recherches sur les systèmes signifiants: Symposium de Varsovie 1968*. The Hague: Mouton, 1973.

Roney, James Norman. *Structuralism/Humanism: Janusz Slawinski and Polish Literary Methodology* [1981]. http://rave.ohiolink.edu/etdc/view?acc_num=osu1391699863 (8 February 2022).

Rozwadowski, Jan Michał. "Językoznawstwo a język literacki." [1913] Jan Michał Rozwadowski, *Wybór pism*. Vol. 3. Ed. Stanisław Urbańczyk. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1960. 123–137.

Rudy, Stephen. "Roman Jakobson: A Chronology." *Roman Iakobson: Teksty, dokumenty, issledovaniia*. Eds. Henryk Baran and Sergei Gindin. Moscow: RGGU, 1999. 83–103.

Ryż, Bartosz. *Koncepcja języka teoretycznoliterackiego strukturalistów polskich*. Wroclaw: Fundacja Projekt Nauka, 2013.

Semczuk, Antoni. "Kilka uwag krytycznych o 'Słowniku terminów literackich'." *Przegląd Humanistyczny* 11 (1977): 193–195.

Shklovskii, Viktor. "O poezii i zaumnom iazyke." [1916] *Poetika: Sborniki po teorii poeticheskogo iazyka*. Petrograd: Gosudarstvennaia tipografiia, 1919. 13–26.

Shumeiko, Iurii. "Teoriia 'nabliudatel'nogo' i 'éksperimental'nogo' metodov v iskusstve. D. N. Ovsianiko-Kulikovskogo kak ravitie idei khar'kovskoi lingvisticheskoi shkoly." *Gumanitarnye nauchnye issledovaniia* 11 (2014). http://human.snauka.ru/2014/11/7975 (8 February 2022).

Siedlecki, Franciszek. "Roman Jakobson i nowa lingwistyka." *Wiadomości Literackie* 43 (1934): 4.

Siedlecki, Franciszek. *Studia z metryki polskiej*. Vols. 1–2. Vilnius and Warsaw: DKP, 1937.

Siedlecki, Franciszek. "Studia Kazimierza Wóycickiego nad wierszem a nowe prądy badawcze." *Życie Literackie* 2.1 (1938): 6–12.

Sirotkina, Irina. *Svobodnoe dvizhenie i plasticheskii tenec v Rossii*. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2014.

Sirotkina, Irina. "T'fu, chert, opiat' oni tut plashchut. Plaska, ritmika i muzikal'noe divzhenie v Institute Zhivogo Slova." *Zhivoe slovo: logos – golos – dvizhenie – zhest*. Ed. by Vladimir Feshchenko. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2015. 115–127.

Skwarczyńska, Stefania. *Teoria badań literackich za granicą*. Vols. 1–4. Cracow: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1965–1986.

Sławiński, Janusz. "Wzmianka o eklektyzmie." *Teksty* 5.8 (1980): 1–8.

Sławiński, Janusz. "Historia *Tekstów* (krótki kurs): odcinek pierwszy." *Teksty* 6.9 (1981): 1–10.

Sławiński, Janusz. "Odbiór i odbiorca w procesie historycznoliterackim." *Publiczność literacka*. Eds. Żółkiewski Stefan and Hopfinger Maryla. Wroclaw: Ossolineum, 1982. 67–85.

Sławiński, Janusz. "Wprowadzenie do badań nad konferencjami teoretycznoliterackimi." *Teoretycznoliterackie tematy i problemy*. Ed. Janusz Sławiński. Wroclaw: Ossolineum, 1986. 9–24.

Sławiński, Janusz. *Koncepcja języka Awangardy Krakowskiej* [1965]. *Prace wybrane*. Vol. 1. Cracow: Universitas, 1998a.

Sławiński, Janusz. "Wokół teorii języka poetyckiego." [1961] Janusz Sławiński, *Dzieło – język – tradycja*. *Prace wybrane*. Vol. 2. Cracow: Universitas, 1998b. 74–96.

Sławiński, Janusz. "Semantyka wypowiedzi narracyjnej." [1967] Janusz Sławiński, *Dzieło – język – tradycja*. *Prace wybrane*. Vol. 2. Cracow: Universitas, 1998c. 107–200.

Sławiński, Janusz. "Co nam zostało ze strukturalizmu." *Teksty Drugie* 5.11 (2001a): 15–19.

Sławiński, Janusz. "Semantyka poetycka Leśmiana." [1968] Janusz Sławiński, *Przypadki poezji*: *Prace wybrane*. Vol. 5. Cracow: Universitas, 2001b. 9–38.

Stadler, Friedrich. *Der Wiener Kreis: Ursprung, Entwicklung und Wirkung des Logischen Empirismus im Kontext*. Wiesbaden: Springer, 2015.

Stanzel, Franz. *Narrative Situations in the Novel* [1955]. Trans. by James P. Pusack. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1971.

Stegmüller, Wolfgang. *Realismus und Strukturalismus: Anwendungen. Literaturtheorie. Tauschwirtschaft. Entscheidungstheorie. Neurosentheorie. Kapital- und Mehrwerttheorie*. Berlin and Heidelberg: Springer, 1986.

Svetlikova, Ilona. *Istoki russkogo formalizma: Traditsiia psikhologizma i formal'naia shkola*. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2005.

Tarski, Alfred. "The Concept of Truth in Formalized Languages." [1933] Alfred Tarski, *Logic, Semantics, Metamathematics*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956. 152–278.

Tarski, Alfred. "On the Concept of Logical Consequence." [1936] Alfred Tarski, *Logic, Semantics, Metamathematics*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956. *409–420*.

Tenner Juliusz. *Estetyka żywego słowa*. Lviv and Warsaw: Wende, 1904.

Todorov, Tzvetan (ed.). *Théorie de la littérature: Textes des formalistes russes*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1966.

Todorov, Tzvetan. *Poétique* [1968]. Paris: Seuil, 1973.

Tynianov, Iurii. "On Literary Evolution." [1927] *Readings in Russian Poetics*: *Formalist and Structuralist Views*. Eds. Vladislav Matejka and Krystyna Pomorska. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1971. 66–78.

Tynianov, Iurii. "The Literary Fact." [1924] *Modern Genre Theory*. Ed. David Duff. London: Longman, 2000. 30–46.

Ulicka, Danuta. "'Archiwum' i archiwum." *Teksty Drugie* 18.4 (2017): 273–302.

Vinogradov, Viktor. *O khudozhestvennoi proze*. Moscow and Leningrad: Nauka, 1930.

Vinogradov, Viktor. "I. A. Boduen de Kurtene." Baudouin de Courtenay, Jan N. [Boduen de Kurtene, Ivan], *Izbrannye trudy po obshchemu iazykoznaniiu v dvukh tomakh*. Vol. 1. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1963. 6–20.

Vinogradov, Viktor. "The Problem of Skaz in Stylistics." [1925] *Russian Literature Triquarterly* 12 (1978): 237–250.

Vodička, Felix. "The Concretization of the Literary Work: Problems of the Reception of Neruda's Works." [1941] *The Prague School: Selected Writings*. Ed. Peter Steiner. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1982. 103–134.

Waugh, Linda R. "The Poetic Function and the Nature of Language." Roman Jakobson, *Verbal Art, Verbal Sign, Verbal Time*. Eds. Krystyna Pomorska and Stephen Rudy. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1985. 143–168.

Weintraub, Wiktor. "A Political Gloss to the History of the Polish Formalist Movement." *Russian Formalism: A Retrospective Glance. A Festschrift in Honor of Victor Erlich*. Eds. Robert Louis Jackson and Stephen Rudy. New Haven, CT: Yale Center for International and Area Studies, 1985. 6–14.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *Philosophical Investigations* [1953]. Eds. and trans. by P. M. S. Hacker and Joachim Schulte. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.

Wołowiec, Grzegorz. "IBL – początki." *IBL w PRL*. Ed. Elżbieta Kiślak. Warsaw: Instytut Badań Literackich PAN, 2016. 17–38.

Wóycicki, Kazimierz. *Historia literatury i poetyka*. Warsaw: Towarzystwo Naukowe Warszawskie, 1914a.

Wóycicki, Kazimierz. *Jedność stylowa utworu poetyckiego*. Warsaw: Towarzystwa Naukowe Warszawskie, 1914b.

Wóycicki, Kazimierz. *Forma dźwiękowa prozy polskiej i wiersza polskiego* [1912]. Warsaw: PWN, 1960.

Zawodziński, Karol Wiktor. *Zarys wersyfikacji polskiej*. Vol. 1. Vilnius: Dom Książki Polskiej, 1936.

Zholkovskii, Aleksandr. "Otkrytaia sistema: Pamiati Umberto Eko." *Novaia Gazeta Baltiia*. www.novayagazeta.ee/articles/3776/ 23.02.2016 (8 February 2022).

Zieliński, Tadeusz [F. F. Zelinskii]. *Drevnegrecheskaia religiia*. Petrograd: Ogni, 1918.

Zieliński, Tadeusz [F. F. Zelinskii]. "Sofokl i geroicheskaia tragediia." Sophocles, *Dramy*. Vol. 2. Trans. by Tadeusz Zieliński. Moscow: N.p., 1915. VII–LXXVI.

Zieliński, Tadeusz. "Vilgel'm Vundt i psikhologiia iazyka." [1901] Tadeusz Zieliński [F. F. Zelinskii], *Iz zhyzni idiei*. Vol. 2. Moscow: Ladomir, 1995. 151–221.

Zieliński, Tadeusz. "Fridrikh Nicshe i antichnost'." [1911] Tadeusz Zieliński [F. F. Zelinskii], *Fridrikh Nicshe i antichnost'. Ideia nravstvennogo opravdaniia*. Moscow: Dispekt-Media, 2008.

Żółkiewski, Stefan. "O podstawach metodologii badan literackich." Parts 1–2. *Życie Literackie* 2.1 (1937a): 6–9; 2.2 (1937a): 49–52.

Żółkiewski, Stefan. "Charakter orzeczeń metodologicznych w naukach humanistycznych." *Prace ofiarowane Kazimierzowi Wóycickiemu*. Vilnius and Warsaw: Dom Książki Polskiej. 1937b. 33–56.

Żółkiewski, Stefan. "Nad nową książką metodologiczną." *Życie Literackie* 3.2 (1938a): 68–74.

Żółkiewski, Stefan. "Powrót do Itaki." *Życie Literackie* 3.5 (1938b): 192–195.

Żółkiewski, Stefan. "Slovo a slovesnost." *Kuźnica* 15 (1946): 11–12.

Żółkiewski, Stefan. "O literaturoznawstwie burżuazyjnym epoki imperializmu w Polsce." *Pamiętnik Literacki* 41.1 (1950): 1–46.

Żółkiewski, Stefan. "Tezy Stalina o języku a metodologia badań literackich." *Pamiętnik Literacki* 42.2 (1951): 345–352.

Żółkiewski, Stefan. "Integracja nauk społecznych i uwspółcześnienie ich problematyki (propozycje redakcyjne)." *Kultura i Społeczeństwo* 4.1–2 (1960a): 4–17.

Żółkiewski, Stefan. "O integracji badań literackich." [1960] *Problemy teorii literatury*. Ed. Henryk Markiewicz. Wroclaw: Ossolineum, 1967. 485–517.

Żółkiewski, Stefan. "Deux stucturalismes." *Sign*, *language*, *culture*. Ed. Algirdas Julien Greimas et al. *The Hague*: Mouton, 1970.

Żurowski, Maciej. "Uwagi na Marginesie." *Przegląd Humanistyczny* 11 (1977): 181–187.

Rainer Grübel

Russian Structuralism and Semiotics in Literary Criticism and its Reception

1 Preliminary remarks on the fundamental openness of semiotic history

In his short preface to the 25th edition of the *Σημειωτική. Sign Systems Studies* – it would be the last he could prepare himself – Lotman (1992a, 4) alluded to Hegel's saying that history (*res gestae*) ends the moment the historian transfers it into his thinking/writing (*historia rerum gestarum*). Hegel was the historian of philosophy who was convinced he was bringing the history of philosophy to an end, considering philosophical history to be the highest level of historical discourse, since it recognizes the process of liberation, the final freedom of consciousness, as inevitable: "World history is progress in the consciousness of freedom – a progress that we have to recognize in its necessity" (Hegel 1986, 32). This progress, Hegel believed, ended with philosophical history's culmination in his (public) Berlin Lectures on the philosophy of history.

Lotman probably also had Fukuyama's (1989) article "The end of history?" in mind, which at the moment of the crash of Soviet socialism and the Soviet imperium declared that in the future there would be no longer be a development of world history. Fukuyama was a scholar of the Russian philosopher Kojève (1990), who had lectured on Hegel's philosophy in Paris during the 1930s and declared the end of history after the Second World War (Auffret 1990, 443–449). These visions of (philosophical) historians who close the book on history are similar to the concept of the author in Bakhtin's cultural philosophy, who has to bring his hero to his end, to death, in order to tell his story.

However, shortly before alluding to Hegel, Lotman (1992a, 3) states that the semiotic method of history strives to avoid this end/death of history (as *res gestae*) in the historical discourse (*historia rerum gestarum*). In his view, the aim to keep history going in the creation of the historical discourse can be achieved when the (semiotic) historian himself becomes an object of his research (on self-description, see Monticelli 2012a) – when he shows himself as belonging to the historical process. In this case, historical writing (*historia rerum gestarum*) is expressly integrated into history (*res gestae*) itself:

> History is a process which takes place "with interference from a thinking being". This means that at the bifurcation points, what comes into action is not only the mechanism of chance but also the mechanism of conscious choice, and this becomes the most important objective factor in the historical process. (Lotman 1990, 232).

Lotman (1998, 87) himself has stressed the personal, subjective view of the 'witness' Boris Gasparov (1998a) with regard to Russian semiotics: although Gasparov paints – in line with French poststructuralism – a nameless picture of the Tartu–Moscow School without authors, he himself as an author presented a very personal view of its history. While Gasparov calls his sketch a 'semiotic' reconstruction and thus underlines its semiotic specialty, Lotman argues that every historical look back is semiotic: Gasparov's semiotic history inevitably integrates his argumentation into the history of semiotics. Later, Gasparov (1998b, 94) agreed with the objection that his portrayal of the Tartu–Moscow School implied a very personal perspective.

And indeed, if we consider history using Russian semiotics as a text and see our reflection on the history of Russian structuralism and semiotics in Tartu and Moscow and its reception as a document of this reception, then this reflection itself, as a text, becomes a recognizable part of this reception. Furthermore, it cannot be ruled out that it will influence the future development of semiotics. This applies especially to the last section of our article, where, after an overview of the elements, aspects and tendencies in/of Russian semiotic structuralism, we will suggest some moments in the historically reconstructed activities as possible aspects or matters of/for future semiotic research. However, arguing with Loman's concept, with this speculation we stand "On the verge of the unpredictable" (Lotman 1993a).

Lotman (1994, 502–503) has argued that every semiotician writing about the history of semiotics himself goes down in it. I myself am part of his historical object: I have written a review on Lotman's most-read book, *Struktura khudozhestvennogo teksta* (1970, *The Structure of the Artistic Text*), (Grübel 1972), have edited and translated two books of Lotman's (1973a, 1975a; cf. Grübel 1973, 1975; the first together with Hans-Eberhard Seidel and Walter Kroll), have published articles on Russian structuralism and semiotics for handbooks (Grübel 1996, 1999), and have spent years working with some of its concepts, mainly in field of the semiotics of culture (cf. Grübel 1995, 2000), and, inspired by Lotman and Bakhtin (cf. Reid 1990), developed together with Igor' Smirnov the idea of 'culturosophy' (Grübel and Smirnov 1997). Since 1970, I have met Zara Mints, Iurii Lotman, and many of their colleagues and pupils.

In the context of the rejection of Hegel's (and also Marx's) concept of the end of history, I understand the distance of almost all Russian semioticians (besides

Piatigorskii) to philosophy, which is also evident in the title Lotman gave to his article on Voltaire, "V mire groteska i filosofii" ("In the World of the Grotesque and Philosophy"; 1993b), but I nevertheless consider this gap a loose one which weakens the epistemological foundation of their concepts. Since the late 1970s, I have thus turned to Bakhtin's theory of culture with its (neo-Kantian) philosophical basis. Holenstein (1975) has suggested that Husserl's phenomenology is the philosophical basis for Jakobson's concept of communication (some researchers doubt about the validity of this attribution: Raynod 1997, Zhivov 2009). The neoplatonic philosopher Lev Losev (1982), who in the early 1980s published a book entitled *Sign. Symbol. Mif*, in which he complained about the fact that the Moscow–Tartu semioticians' investigations did not address his philosophical work (Stolovich 1994, 99–100). In the late 1970s, Losev (1978) had already criticized the use of the notions 'model' and 'structure' in the texts of the Moscow–Tartu semioticians as indefinite and ambiguous. The question still remains whether further development of the semiotic movement will be able to close its epistemological gap(s).

2 The double origin and orientation of Russian structuralism and semiotics in linguistics (Moscow) and literary criticism (Tartu)

The title of my article combines the two concepts of structuralism and semiotics with regard to certain developments in Russian literary criticism and linguistics: the study of myth and fine art, and the theory and history of culture since the 1960s. This is appropriate because the two local centers of this unique historical movement, Moscow, the capital of the USSR, and Tartu, a provincial university city in Estonia (then a peripheral Soviet republic), often had different, complementary theoretical, methodological, and referential orientations regarding these matters. In his look back at the beginnings of Russian semiotics in the 1960s, Boris Uspenskii (1984, 268) noted in1980 the conviction that the bipolarity which comes forth in the development of Soviet semiotics was a genuine quality of Russian culture itself.

The notion of *structural semiotics* interconnects these two branches, the first of which is more methodologically coined, while the second is primarily marked by the fundamental (semiotic) molding of its object, the world of signs. In the Soviet Union, the agents of this (more philologically and less ethnologically shaped) primarily linguistic structuralism and of semiotics (mostly literary critics) worked

in close contact with one another from 1963 onwards. This close and constant cooperation between humanitarians over more than three decades, unique to the Soviet Union, was founded on the friendship of Iurii Lotman (Tartu, a literary critic by training, with an interest in history) and Boris Uspenskii (Moscow, originally a linguist), who coordinated rather diverse researchers with complementary scientific backgrounds and often different but mostly comparable, if not indeed coherent interests (Uspenskii 1987, 18–19). All of these researchers were united by their skepticism towards the suitability of the official Soviet Marxist ideology as a basis for their 'parallel' (Waldstein 2008, 186; 2011) scientific investigations. It was Lotman (1994, 502–503) himself who drew attention to the fact that it is significant for semiotics that it "becomes one of the objects of its own research as belonging to the historical process."

The Moscow wing, built up by Viacheslav Ivanov (1929–2017) (see Toporov 1993a, 72–73) under the protection of the founder or Soviet cybernetics, Admiral Aksel' Berg (1893–1979), was initially orientated towards structural linguistics, represented in particular by Roman Jakobson (cf. Seyffert 1985, 60–61; Grzybek 1989, 301–313). Jakobson, who had left Moscow in 1920, was, as a Jew, forced to flee from Czechoslovakia in 1939 due to German National Socialism. He left Scandinavia in 1941 in order to work in the USA, first in New York and then in Boston. Via his biography, he can be traced back to the "Moscow Linguistic Circle" of Russian formalism. Jakobson's and Tynianov's (1928) theses "Problemy izucheniia literatury i iazyka" ("Problems of Literary and Linguistic Studies"), which proposed the fundamental separation and combination of systematic (synchronic) and historical (diachronic) research in the humanities, is the founding document of Russian structuralism. This movement also had as its starting point Nikolai Trubetzkoy's *Basic Features of Phonology* (1939) which until the early fifties was condemned by Russian Marxist linguists as part of 'non-materialist' linguistics. It was Sebastian Shaumian (1916–2007) who introduced structural phonology with its methodological binarism to Soviet linguistics. It first appeared in December 1962 at the "Symposium for Structural Research in Sign Systems" in Moscow.

The Moscow branch of the new semiotic development implied interest in the relationship between natural languages and the languages of logic and of natural sciences such as chemistry. It was inspired by the algorithmic proposals of the mathematician Andrei Kolmorogov (1903–1987) with regard to poetic language (cf. Kolmorogov 2015), and it engaged with mathematical linguistics, the theory of information, and cybernetics, which were no longer forbidden in the USSR after the early 1960s due to their military relevance. The opposition of exact science and poetry as two fundamentally different cultures, formerly strictly observed in accordance with the slogan 'physics and/or poets' (cf. Grübel 1980), was partially overcome.

When Roman Jakobson gave a lecture on phonology in Moscow in 1956, the linguist Sebastian Shaumyan, assisted by the philologist and ethnologist Vladimir Toporov, attempted to establish structuralist linguistics in the field of phonology (introduced, as already mentioned, before the war by N. S. Trubetzkoy [1939]), who had worked in Vienna since 1923 and collaborated with Jakobson). In the late 1980s, Shaumyan (1987) published *A Semiotic Theory of Language*, which is characterized by its opposition to the transformational grammar of the American linguist Chomsky, and his monograph *Signs, Mind, and Reality* (Shaumyan 2006), in which he interpreted language as the peoples' model of the world. Also stimulated by Lévi-Strauss (see below), the principle of binaries was transferred from linguistics to ethnology by Toporov and Viacheslav Ivanov and to the semiotics of art and history by Boris Uspenskii. Uspenkii gave a stimulating paper, "On the Semiotics of Art", which programmatically related the notions of the 'sign' and 'conventionality/conditionality' (*uslovnost'*, Uspenskii 1962, 127) to language and discerned from it the medium of art, opposing it to the principle of 'reflection', a core argument in the oblique program of Socialist Realism.

The Tartu School of semiotics has its roots in the Petrograd/Leningrad Society of Poetic Language (OPOIaZ) of Boris Èikhenbaum, Iurii Tynianov, and Viktor Shklovskii and in the historical poetics of Potebnja and Veselovskii. The so-called 'young formalist' Grigorii Gukovskii, who converted to Marxism in the 1930s but nevertheless died in Moscow's Lefortovo prison in 1950 as a victim of the Soviet anti-Semitic campaign "Against Cosmopolitism", was the most influential teacher of Iurii Lotman, who also followed lectures in Leningrad given by Boris Èikhenbaum, Vladimir Propp, and Boris Tomashevskii. For the Tartu branch of semiotics, foundational works were Jakobson's article "Linguistics and Poetics" (Jakobson 1960), suggesting a functional model of verbal communication, and his 1961 Warsaw lecture "The Poetry of Grammar and the Grammar of Poetry" (Jakobson 1968), which defined grammatical parallelisms as the fundamental feature of poetic texts.

Dmitrii Segal (1998, 110), a former representative of the Moscow branch, identified Toporov as the creating figure of Moscow structuralism and ascribed the leading role to Ivanov and Toporov. In 1964, the Tartu group launched the famous Summer School of Secondary Model-Building Systems initiated by Lotman (on the notion of the 'model', cf. Grzybek 1994a). This summer school was subsequently held in Kääriku in 1966, 1968, and 1986, but returned to Tartu in 1970 and 1974. Its founding text was the "Program and the Theses of the Studies" (1964a) and Lotman's monograph *Lektsii po struktural'noj poètike* (*Lectures on Structural Poetics* (1964b). There is no Engl. translation, but a reprint of the Russian text appeared in the USA). Lotman's paper "Problema skhodstva iskussva i zhizni v svete struktural'nogo podkhoda" (1962, "The Problem of Similarity between Art and Life in

the Light of the Structural Method") implicitly challenged the mimetic aesthetic dogma concerning the "reflection of reality" in Socialist Realism. It conceived of art (and with it literature) as differing from the arbitrary natural language, the obligatory 'mirror' of reality in Socialist Realism. With their ideological criticism of the Moscow Symposium of 1962, Russian public newspapers provided structural linguistics with remarkable publicity.

In the 1960s, the Soviet minister of defense asked Khrapchenko, the head of the Section of Literature and Language at the Academy of Sciences, how he should present the question of semiotics in his report at the meeting of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. Khrapchenko told the minister about the potential this science held for the defense of the Soviet Union (Balashov and Saraulov 2005, 1127), and hence (unlike genetics) it was not forbidden as a 'bourgeois science' in the USSR. However, in his article "Iazyk khudozhestvennoi literatury" ("The Language of Artistic Literature", Khrapchenko 1983), Khrapchenko limited the function of the sign in language by claiming from a Marxist point of view that metaphors, metonymies and allegories are not signs. On the highest level, the discussion between advocates and opponents of structural semiotics took place in 1965 in the journal *Voprosy literatury* (*Questions of Literature*), in two articles by the proponent Isaak Revzin, who later also published in Lotman's yearbook (Revzin 1971), and his antagonist Vadim Kozhinov (1965), a supporter of Mikhail Bakhtin (cf. my article on Bakhtin in this volume). Rezvin's (1965, 87) main argument concerned the "interdependence of the development of literary forms and literary languages", whereas Kozhinov (1965, 237) argues that the proponents of structural poetics "reduce the laws of poetry to the rules of language".

In the history of Soviet culture, structuralism and semiotics feature as vivid responses to the often monolithic and stable referential (and often ideological) orientation of Russian literary critics in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (from Belinskii, Chernyshevskii and Dobroliubov to A. Lezhnev, E. Usievich, A. Zhdanov and V. Ozerova; see also Jakobson 2011, 13). The rigid censorship of philosophy, originally practiced by the Orthodox Church and then by the Russian Communist Party, motivated the agents of Russian culture to transfer the functions which in other cultures are carried out by independent theoretical thinking mostly to literature, in which the critics accordingly traced those abstract reflections they missed in an unfree philosophical discourse. Due to this situation, it is very difficult, if not impossible, to reconstruct the epistemological basis forming the foundations of the works of the exponents of Soviet semiotics from the 1960s to the 1980s – Iurii Lotman and Boris Uspenskii, Zara Mints and Tamara Nikolaeva, Vladimir Toporov and Viacheslav Ivanov, Ėleazar Meletinskii and Sergei Nekliudov, Boris Gasparov and Dmitrii Segal, Iurii Levin and Isaak

Revzin, and others – works which represent the most influential development in Russian culture (besides Bakhtin).

Each appeal to a philosopher or thinker beside the classics or followers of Marxism and Leninism entailed danger. Hence in his first monograph, Lotman, a member of the Communist Party since 1943, repeatedly referred to Marx and Engels (Lotman 1964b, 16, 28, 29, 38) and to the 'Marxist works' of Viktor Shtoff (theory of model-building), Adam Schaff (semasiology), and Georg Klaus (epistemology, the philosophy of cybernetics). Possibly the most important cultural and social role of Russia structuralism and semiotics from the 1960s to the 1980s was demonstrating that in the Soviet scientific context a collective practice which was not controlled by official institutions of the Communist Party was possible. Ol'ga Sedakova (1994, 262–263) has stressed that not only the manner of studying objects but also the special selection of alternative aesthetic objects (texts, figures, attitudes) not belonging to the socialist-realist canon had a formative influence on her (Soviet) generation.

As the term of *semiotics* (*semiotika*) was still officially forbidden in the USSR in the early 1960s, instead the researchers had to use the term "system of signs" (Èrlikh 2018, 353) or even (cf. Lotman 1964a, 1) "secondary modeling systems", a camouflage term proposed by the mathematician Vladimir Uspenskii (1930–2018), the brother of Boris Uspenskii (V. Uspenskii, 1995a, 106; 2002, 1171, and Lotman 1994, 503; see also Fleischer 1989, 161, and Birnbaum 1990, 154). The conference, held in Moscow in December 1962, was thus called the "Symposium for Structural Research in Sign Systems", but its Estonian counterpart, which took place from 1964 on, even had to be called the "Summer School of Secondary Model-Building Systems" (in order to avoid the term 'sign'). In these years, public meta-reflection on the epistemological preconditions and the philosophic fundamentals of semiotic research were practically impossible. Hence the discussion of Peirce's and Morris' triadic concept of the sign, which with its three components (the signifier, the object, and the concept or 'interpretant') differs from Ferdinand de Saussure's binary model (the signifier and the signified) and belongs to the philosophy of pragmatism, had to be postponed until the end of the Soviet Union (Lotman 2002, 7). Peirce's insights that the meaning of a sign is the result of its translation into another sign system and that sense emerges in the dynamics of communication was accepted by Jakobson but was initially much less realized by the semioticians of Moscow and Tartu. However, as early as 1971, Isaak Revzin (1971), who was a linguist and partisan of structuralism and semiotics who with an interest in philosophy, related structuralism and (Soviet) semiotics to the fundamental alternative of the orientation towards rules (Classicism) or freedom from them (Romanticism). Although Revzin associated both Jakobson and Humboldt with Romanticism, Jakobson's tendency towards binarism and system-binding can be

seen as a clear preference for Classicism. This orientation towards rules was also obvious in Lotman's (1967) programmatic article published in the prominent literary journal *Voprosy literatury* under the title "Literaturovedenie dolzhno byt' naukoi" ("Literary Criticism must be a Science").

In 1971, the ideologists of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union organized a heavy attack on structuralism in Soviet journals and newspapers and in the mid 1970s the paper for Lotman's periodical was drastically shortened. In 1980, the authorities even threatened to deprive him of his chair at the university (the official reason: his wife worked in the same department). The future of Tartu and Moscow semiotics was repeatedly in danger.

In Lotman's publications, his official attitude towards the totalitarian Soviet system was rather ambivalent. The same holds for his use of dialectics, which in spite of Mikhail Gasparov's (1996, 2003) thesis comes closer to the positivism of Carnap than to the philosophy of Hegel or Marx (Avtonomova 2019, 236–237). However, Lotman's vision of the historian Karamzin, the founder of the journal Vestnik Evropy (Bulletin of Europe), culminated in the idea that the presentation of the reported foreign voices serves as the masked representation of the opinion of its editor, Karamzin (see Zorin 2006). If this is the case, then in analogy we can read Lotman's presentation of Karamzin's political choice as the masked presentation of the political vision of the author of Karamzin's biography, of Lotman himself:

> If we put the statements of the Herald of Europe of 1802–1803 in a certain political formula, it appears that the real content of Karamzin's monarchism during this period was presidential rule with very strong presidential power both in the executive sphere and in the field of legislative initiative [...]. (Lotman 1987, 283–284)

Lotman (1987, 286–7), who had carefully compared Karamzin's translations in Vestnik Evropy with the original texts, came to the conclusion that because of their divergences, many translated texts in fact appear as political declarations of its editor. And again, by analogy, we can read the sentence "An important theme of the Herald of Europe was preaching enlightenment" as a concealed declaration of the function of Lotman's periodical Works on Sign Systems. (In this sense we cannot agree with Zhivov's (2009, 20–22) thesis that the texts by Lotman and the Tartu–Moscow groups did not imply any political resistance.) If this is the case, then the enthusiastic Lotmanian narrative about Karamzin's travel through Europe can also be understood as a lament on how it was impossible for the average Russian intellectual to visit (Western) European countries until the late 1980s (in 1970 Lotman himself was also forbidden to visit the countries of 'real socialism'). Lotman collected the letters of invitation from outside the Soviet Union in a portfolio with the ironic label "Letters to a Russian Traveller" (Stolovichs.a., 5).

Karamzin's famous book itself was entitled Letters from a Russian Traveler. This impression is stressed by the many public lectures Lotman gave in the glasnost' and perestroika era, in which he exposed the function of art to build a sphere of free choice and every individual's responsibility for his or her life.

In 1998, Klaus Städtke (Städtke 2002), who had been in close contact with Iurii Lotman, traced information in Lotman's texts that usually remained hidden from readers in Western cultures due to their lack of knowledge of the Soviet historical context. For instance, Städtke argued that Lotman intentionally chose the 'golden' age of Russian culture (the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries) as his main object of historical research in order to present the concept of the 'honest person', which in Russian culture goes back to the French figure of the *honette homme*, and implies a positive example of habitus which is not representative of Soviet culture. Lotman himself presented – that is, exposed and proposed – this type of character in his own academic, pedagogic, and administrative practice in – semiotically speaking, iconic – accordance with his object of research, for instance Karamazin. In a cultural-sociological article entitled "Jurij Lotman (1922–19393): The Aristocrat in the Soviet State", Dieter Thomä, Ulrich Schmid, and Vincent Kaufman (2015) characterized Lotman in a book demonstrating the interpenetration of the life and thinking of prominent representatives of the twentieth century as a person who himself represents those historical figures about which he himself had written most intensely. For instance, he concluded his article on the everyday behavior (or as Greenblatt would say, the 'self-fashioning') of the Decembrists, the aristocratic revolutionaries of the early nineteenth century, with the words (Lotman 1992b, 336): "The transfer of freedom from the realm of ideas and theory into breathing – into life. This is the essence and significance of the everyday behavior of the Decembrists." We cannot but read the finishing passage of this text, published in 1975, (also) as a proclamation (cf. Ventsel 2011).

Although the heading for this part of my article only announces information about the beginning of the movement known as Soviet structural semiotics, here I will also provide some suggestions about its end. When in the spring of 1993 the critical journal *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, NLO (New Literary Observer)*, founded just a year earlier, dedicated in already its third volume eighty pages to "The History of the Moscow–Tartu Semiotic School" (NLO 3, 1993, 9–88), one could assume that the death knell had tolled for this movement. The appearance of nine articles by members of this group, most of which had the character of memoirs, was a signal announcing the termination of this 'school' – if in its complex total praxis it ever had been one (see Torop 1995). The death of its unchallenged *spiritus rector*, Iurii Lotman, in the fall of that year served as its final signal. With good reason, some others identified this end in the nascent *perestroika* in 1986 or with the collapse of the Soviet Union in December 1991. A more internal signal of

the end of the Tartu–Moscow School was the publication of Iampol'skii's (1992) article on the culture of Paris, in which the concept of the sign was replaced by the concept of the diagram (see Obermayr 2015). Certainly, there remains an ongoing development of semiotic concepts that is no longer dominated by the Tartu–Moscow School. But it can be inspired, as I will argue at the end of the article, by some concepts, aspects, and results of its Russian (Soviet) wing(s).

The impact of the place of Tartu–Moscow semiotics on Russian humanities becomes obvious by the very successful series of conferences beginning in 1982 founded by Aleksandr Chudakov and Marietta Chudakova and known as the "Tynianovskii Lectures", which resulted in fifteen volumes from 1984 onwards. Following Lotman's example of meeting on the periphery of the Soviet Union (in their case in Rēzekne in the Latvian Republic) until the end of the Soviet Union, they also published the lectures outside of the Russian Republic, in Riga (five volumes up to 1994).

Before I outline the semiotic concepts of Lotman and its reception in and outside of the Soviet Union, which very often formed the focus of other researchers, I will provide a brief outline of the work and the impact of some of his important colleagues, who often undeservedly stood and still stand in his shadow. I will also present their visions on the history of the semiotic movement, because in many cases they differed greatly and were often significant. Many of Lotman's colleagues were interested in history and most used semiotics as a methodological framework of and for history, including the history of Russian semiotics.

3 Semiotic concepts of Lotman's colleagues: Viacheslav Ivanov, Vladimir Toporov, Eleazar Meletinskii, Aleksander Piatigorskii, Iurii Shcheglov, Aleksandr Zholkovskii, Zara Mints, and Boris Uspenskii

I begin my overview of the Tartu–Moscow School with Viacheslav Ivanov, who as the chief of the Sector of Structural Typology of the Academic Institute of Slavic Studies in the years 1961–1989 represented the Moscow branch of structuralism and semiotics. Vsevolod Ivanov was a very productive linguist and literary critic, anthropologist, and ethnologist. One of the founders and leaders of the Seminar on Mathematical Linguistics at the Moscow State University from 1956–1958, he was dismissed from his professorship for disagreeing with the official assessment

of Pasternak's novel *Doctor Zhivago* and for supporting the structuralist views of the linguist Roman Jakobson at scientific congresses.

From 1959–1961 Ivanov worked as the head of a machine translation group at the Institute of Precision Mechanics and Computer Engineering of the USSR Academy of Sciences and as the chairman of the Linguistic Section of the Academic Scientific Council on Cybernetics. In 1959 he gave a lecture on basic problems of semiotic research at a conference on "The Sign and the System of Language" in Erfurt. From 1989–1993, he was the director of the important All-Union Library of Foreign Literature. In charge of the newly created Department of Theory and History of World Culture at Moscow State University from 1989–1994, he held concurrent professorships at the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures at Stanford University and the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures and the Indo-European Studies Program at the University of California in Los Angeles from 1992 on.

In the 1970s, Ivanov undertook historically important work with the linguist Tamaz Gamkrelidze. They presented not only a new theory of the Indo-European phonetic system (glottal theory) and of a/the Indo-European proto-language (Ivanov and Gamkrelidze 1994), but also a new concept of the Indo-European migrations and an Indo-European proto-culture south of the Caucasus, which was slightly revised by Burla and Starostinin in 2004 (Burla and Starostinin 2005).

Ivanov also produced fundamental and pioneering research on the history of semiotics in Russia (1979), which he later divided into two chapters of his collection on semiotic research: one on Éizenshtein's aesthetics (Ivanov 1998a) and one on the protohistory of Russian semiotics (Ivanov 1998b). In this book, translated into German in 1983 and revised in Russian in 1998, he presented as predecessors of modern (Soviet) semiotics the philosopher Gustav Shpet, the theologian Pavel Florenskii and the biologist Vladimir Vernadskii, the psychologist Lev Vygotskii, and the director and theoretician of cinema Sergei Eisenstein [Eizenshtein], among others.

Ivanov's investigations of the contrasting ways the right and the left hemispheres of the human brain experience reality and how this is documented in the differences between their semiotic and verbal competence (Ivanov 1978) paved the way for neurolinguistic and neurosemiotic research in Russian culture. This book has a forerunner in Kartsevskii's (1929) article "Du dualisme asymétrique du signe linguistique" ("On the Asymmetric Dualism of the Linguistic Sign"), which came out in 1929 in the Papers of the Prague structuralists. Ivanov was convinced that he could correlate the frontside of the left hemisphere with Bakhtin's concepts of the official culture and its language, with logical forms and serious rituals, and the rear side of the right hemisphere with the concepts of the non-official culture of carnival, with the grotesque body and the rituals of carnival laugh-

ter (Ivanov 1992, 329). Ivanov's book, which was translated into German in 1983 (Ivanov 1983), into Hungarian three years later (Ivanov 1986), and into Japanese in 1988 (Ivanov 1988), has been the most influential of Ivanov's publications. One of its effects was the neurosemiotics of Peter Grzybek (1984). Ivanov's interest in Ėizenshtein was primarily related to the theory and practice of the cineastic technique of montage, which he considered the opposite to a chronological showing and telling.

As in this book Ivanov supposes that one of the interconnected hemispheres of the brain can resemble a classical computer while the other could work like a quantum computer, this model also opens perspectives on the research on and with artificial intelligence. Ultimately, along with other works of Ivanov, it is a contribution to an anthropological semiotic theory of culture which in this case finds its most fundamental features in the dawn of human history (on the role of binary structures in early human cultures, see Ivanov 2008). Ignoring criticism of Romanticism (for instance McGann 1985) and the dialectics of Enlightenment (for instance Horkheimer and Adorno 1944), as if also incorporating the rationality of Voltaire and Rousseau's Romantic belief in the pureness of the origin of human beings, Ivanov combined a sharp systematic methodology with an obstinate historical view. He ultimately considered history to be retrograde prophecy, in the tradition of Schelling. His aim was the integration of systematic and historical research as well as the (re-)unification of science and the humanities.

Ivanov himself did not consequently transcend from the binary linguistic model of the sign to the triadic one when he replaced in his work the opposition of the signifier and the signified with the juxtaposition of the symbol-concept and the symbol-denotatum (Grzybek 1989, 162–177; Birnbaum 1990, 156). From 1992 to 1999, he edited the journal *Elementa: Journal of Slavic Studies and Comparative Cultural Semiotics*, in which Lotman (1994b) published his programmatic article "Theses Towards a Semiotics of Russian Culture".

Ivanov's closest collaborator in Moscow was Vladimir Toporov (1928–2005), an ethnologist and historian of religion, a linguist, and literary critic. Because of his public criticism of the ideology and politics of the Soviet Union, the representatives of the Communist Party in Moscow prevented Toporov from defending his doctorate and becoming a professor for some twenty years. Voicing his protest against the repressive politics of the Soviet administration in Lithuania in 1991, he gave back the USSR State Prize he had been awarded the previous year. Together with Ivanov, he provided a solid foundation for the concept of mytho-poetics, the cultural crossing of myth and poetry. Its most famous elaboration is Toporov's (1984) proposal of the term Petersburg text (Moscow, Riga, Rim, Vilnius) in cultural history. The term outlines a more or less coherent historical interrelation of (literary) works referring to the Russian capital and conceiving of a (sometimes

questionable) unity of their sacral (metaphysical) ground. The Petersburg text has the character of a genre with a topic, a syntax, a combination of predicates, relatively stable basic semantics, and a broad variation or realizations: from Pushkin's *Mednyi vsadnik* (*The Bronze Horseman*) via the *Peterburgskie povesti (Petersburg Tales)* of Gogol' to Andrei Belyi's *Peterburg (Petersburg*) and Akhmatova's *Poėma bez geroia* (*Epos without a Hero*). Later, it was further developed *inter alia* by Iurii Lotman (1984), Renate Lachmann (1990, 88–126, and 2000), Riccardo Nicolosi (2002), Aage Hansen-Löve (2014), and Susi Frank (2015).

A myth that reaches much deeper into the history of mankind is that of the 'world-tree', the intercultural variants of which, the 'cosmic tree', the 'taman tree', the 'tree of knowledge', the 'tree of life', the 'tree of light', and the 'tree of the center', Toporov (1980a, 1980b, 1980c) conceived as universal models of the cosmos and at the same time the extreme compression of complex cultures. The mythical tree also represents the vertical topical connection of the earthly world with the underworld on the one hand and heaven on the other. A second example is the myth of the 'world egg' (Toporov 2010, 390–407), which implies evolutionary, transformational, temporal, and cosmogonical dimensions. Toporov reconstructs these complex mythical images of the world tree or the world egg on the basis of many mythological representations, recorded in verbal texts of different genres, in monuments of fine art, in architectural structures, in utensils with a ritual function, and in ritual actions. Some of these studies had been published earlier in short versions in the encyclopedia *Mify narodov mira (The Myths of the Peoples of the World*) (Toporov 1980a), which together with its complementary follow-up publication, the *Mythological Dictionary*, edited by Meletinskii (1990), represented an integral concept of world culture that is quite extraordinary in the Soviet culture.

Outlining suggestions of the comparatist Pavel Grintser (1964), Toporov has tried to point out that the linguistically substantiated model of poetics in structuralism can already be found in early Indo-European poetry, especially in Sanskrit poetics: in this reconstruction, poetry principally works with (the) elements of language in a special way; it exposes words in its grammatical, semantic, and axiological potentials (cf. Iudin 2018 on Toporov, who bracketed myth and literature together). This vision implies a specific (binary) polyglossy of poetic texts (poetic vs. non-poetic language, stylistically marked vs. stylistically unmarked language, the language of gods vs. the language of human beings), which goes back to basic ideas of Russian formalism. In his vision, poetic language is also the (dark) idiom of the seer (cf. the Latin *poetavates*). (The concept of the Romantic syncrisis of the poetic and the mythical can be traced back to the "Ältestes Systemprogramm (1796/97)" (NN 1995) of possibly Hegel, Hölderlin, and/or Schelling). Toporov connects the mytho-poetic medium of the seer with the historical faculty of having

insight into the origin of the world. And he conceives the poet as the creator of the basic myth, as a mytho-poetic author and hero at the same time, who is never an individual person, however, but always a collective projection (of the *Volk sensu* Herder). In this context, Toporov referred both to Lévi-Strauss' concept of early societies and to Jung's psychological 'archetypes' (Toporov 1995a, 239).

Toporov's most daring mytho-poetic construct appears to be the *holy/saint* ("sviatoe"), which culminates in the author's religious belief "that the blessed power of holiness at this desecrated place has yet to be finally exhausted" (Toporov 1995c, 16), thus executing the author's transition from the studies of religion and its languages via the art of religion to religion itself. In doing so, Toporov ignores Otto's (1917) alternative concept of the holy with its relation to 'idiograms' (concepts of interpretation) as well as the query of the holy in Foucault's (1998, 180) concept of the sacralization of space in Christian religion (see also Foucault 1999, XVI). Probably because of Roland Barthes' (1957) criticism of myths (executed by the negative, veiling, and non-enlightening function of myths in everyday life), the concept of mytho-poetics in the Francophone and Anglophone world seems to be restricted to Slavi(sti)c contexts, while in Italian and German research it is encountered more often, even in relation to the cinema (cf. Bauer and Jäger 2011). But in the German-language context too, the editor of two volumes on the relation of myth and literature in antique culture (Bierl 2007) wrote a long preface without even mentioning the names of Viacheslav Ivanov, Vladimir Toporov, or Eleazar Meletinskii.

A work of basic importance for the methodology of Moscow–Tartu semiotics is Ivanov's and Toporov's (1965) monograph *Slavic Linguistic Modeling Systems*, which exists only in Russian. Its foundation is the thesis that the world model of societies/cultures, which consists of interrelations between human beings and their surroundings, can be described by semantic oppositions. Its result is the construction of secondary sign systems (which differ from the primary sign system of the language; cf. Chang 2003) rather than the interpretation of primary facts (perceived by experience). By these means, these models construct textual cultural concepts of the world. The texts presenting these world models are interrelated with each other in (inter-)cultural communication.

I have already mentioned that in the early days of structuralist semiotics in the USSR, the term "secondary modeling systems" was used by Russian theorists in order to avoid the notion of the "sign system" due to a possible conflict with the authorities of the Communist Party. Later, the term developed its own history and became a point of discussion in international semiotics. It occupied a debatable place in the relationship between the biosphere, natural language, and the semiosphere/noosphere. While Russian semiotics tended to regard natural language as a primary modeling system and culture insofar as it works with language, as

a secondary system (and they felt supported by the famous Russian geo-biologist Vladimir Vernadskii, who discerned a biosphere and a noosphere), the well-known American theorist of signs in biology Thomas Sebeok (1991) tended to distinguish a nonverbal biological primary modeling sign system from a verbal one. The recognition of language as the basis of the primary model is an expression of Russian culture's logocentric orientation (cf. Hansen-Löve 2017).

Toporov's studies demonstrated a broad range, his foci including time and place, the human being and his word, myth and destiny. Beside these matters, a decisive role in his vision of culture is also played by the simple thing ("veshch'", Toporov 1995a, 7–111; French transl.: Toporov 2011) in which he detects the traces of an entire culture. As an enthusiast of Russian literature, in his compound monograph on Karamzin's seminal short story *Bednaia Liza* (1792, *Poor Lisa*) Toporov (1995b) provides an impressing example of the art of 'slow reading', suggested by Friedrich Nietzsche (1980, 17), as well as a philological strategy, introduced (with regard to Pushkin) by Mikhail Gershenzon (1919, 1). When, on the level of "meta-history", Toporov (1995b, 507–508) acclaims the line which Daniil Andreev (1992, 361–366) draws from poor Liza to Pushkin's Tat'iana Larina (in *Eugen Onegin*, 1832) and which – transcending his proposal – one could extend to Lev Tolstoi's *Anna Karenina* (1878) and Andrei Platonov's Ivanovna Chestnova in *Schastlivaia Moskva* (written 1932–36, publ. 1991, *Happy Moscow*), he crosses the border from hermeneutics to mysticism via transcendence.

An important example of Toporov's rootedness in the Russian cultural tradition of personalism (Berdiaev, 1939) is his book on Virgil's Aeneas with its telling title *Ėnej – chelovek sud'by. K "sredizemnomorskogo" personologii* (*Aeneas – a human being of destiny: Towards a "Mediterranean" Personology*, Toporov 1993b). Here, Toporov combines the cultural topic type of the Mediterranean area (in its fixed relation with the sea: 'being to the sea') with the teleological project of a persistent change of the future by the fundamental change of the person as a phenomenon of the textual genesis of the mental space known as the noosphere. The development of the human concept, which Toporov opposes to the more adventurous type of Odysseus, is achieved by Aeneas/Vergil by constructing a new type of psychological mentality and a new strategy of human behavior. Toporov considers this new personality the prototype of the coming European human being, which was also a potential option for Russian society (Toporov 1993b, IV).

Together with Ivanov (both were devotees to comparative mythology), Vladimir Toporov proposed the reconstruction of a singular common basic Indo-European proto-myth; they presented as such a narrative about the anthropomorphic god of thunder (for instance Perun or Zmei Gorynych) who defeats his opponent, the chthonic serpent, snake, or dragon (for instance: Veles) at the foot of the world-tree (Ivanov and Toporov 1991). This 'main myth' was built up by the

comparison of the Vedic myth of the duel between Indra and Vritra and the plots in Baltic mythology concerning Perkunas and Velnyas.

Besides this thematic plot-related reconstruction of a problematic original basic myth, Ivanov and Toporov generally detected the structural origin of myths in the dismemberment and subsequent reunification of the divine body. However, we stay with the question as to whether in these cases the intention to see world culture as a unique whole does not conceal significant differences in the cultures of the Aborigines in Australia and the old Mexicans in America as well as in the cultures of Africa, Asia, and Europe. The historian, archaeologist, cultural anthropologist, philologist, and historian of science Lev Samuilovich Klein (Klein 2004, 58–65) criticized this construct of a universal mythic prototype, using the example of the Slavic god Perun, due to often questionable, sometimes lingual, sometimes material similarities.

An approach less integrated into the Moscow–Tartu filiations of Russian structuralism and less restricted to reception in slavistic circles is displayed by the work of the ethnologist Eleazar Meletinskii (1918–2005), who represents a structuralist line in the study of myths that goes back to the Russian philologist and Russian folklore specialist Vladimir Propp and the French mythologist Lévi-Strauss. Lévi-Strauss had been brought into contact with structural methods by Roman Jakobson in New York in the 1940s. In 1970, Meletinskii had already published an article on the structural method in Lévi-Strauss' investigation of myths (Meletiniskii 1970). Thirteen years later, he (Meletinskii, 1983) wrote the preface to the Russian translation of Lévi-Strauss's famous book *Structural Anthropology* (Lévi-Strauss 1958). Meletinskii (1976, 295–372) presented examples of the mythology in literature during the twentieth century not only in Russian texts but also in the prose of Joyce, Thomas Mann, Kafka, und Marquez (cf. Iudin 2018 on the integration of myth into literature in Toporov's work).

Meletinskii's program was a typology and the reconstruction of historical transformations of the main images in myth and folklore, as well as in literary monuments of antiquity, the Middle Ages and the New Age. He was most interested in structural and stage relationships of three large genre-thematic complexes of oral literature: the myth, the fairytale, and the epic. Like Propp, he investigated the plot organization of folklore narration and the semantic structure of its motifs.

Propp's *Morfologiia skazki* (1928, *Morphology of the Folktale*), which was translated into English in 1958 (Propp 1958), was read by ethnologists such as Lévi-Strauss and linguists such as Algirdas Greimas, by literary critics such as Roland Barthes, and semioticians such as Umberto Eco, but also by philosophers such as Michel Foucault. Hansen-Löve (1978, 260–263) stressed Propp's distance to formalism, Grazzini (1999) noted his proximity to Russian structuralism, while Volkova (2011, 2013), due to this ambivalence, placed his methodology in an inter-

mediate sphere between formalism and structuralism. Propp's study *Istoricheskie korni volshebnoy skazki* (1946, *The Historical Roots of the Magic Fairy Tale*) (only partial translation into English [Propp 1984], but complete translations into Italian in 1949 and 1972, into Spanish in 1974, and into French, Romanian, and Japanese in 1983) can be seen as complementary to the *Morphology of the Folktale*. While the former studies the composition of the folktale (not without reference to Goethe's notion of 'morphology', which was related to objects of the humanities, such as texts, and to objects of nature, such as plants and clouds) by suggesting an inventory of thirty elements of the plot (narrative motifs), termed 'functions', the second reconstructs the evolution of the genre of the magic fairytale. Propp did not conceive of an historical 'original' of the folktale, but a model of its construction, and he did not investigate its historical 'origin'; rather, in a posthumously published work on rural festivities (Propp 1995) he considered its evolution out of (mythical) ritual practice. Rodari (1973) even related Propp's model to his concept of the manner in which a child imagines the motif of the child in a folktale.

Although Propp, who taught Lotman at university, lived and worked in Leningrad until 1970, it seems he never took part in the activities of the Moscow and/or the Tartu group, both of which held his work in high regard, however. This is different from Petr Bogatyrev (1893–1971), a friend and colleague of Roman Jakobson, who with his knowledge of ethnology in semiotics was a cofounder of Prague structuralism and in his later years cooperated with the Tartu semioticians in the area of folk theater (cf. Lotman 1975b, 5–6). The strongest similarities between Propp's method in his investigations of early prose (folktales, magical tales) and rituals in agricultural feasts (Propp 1995) and the methodology of the Russian structuralists and semiotics lie in the intention to carry out research in the humanities with verifiable methods and to integrate them into a broad vision of culture.

The orientalist Sergei Nekliudov (*1941), a pupil of Meletinskii, is a prominent representative of semiotics in folklore. In particular, he studied the magical tale of the orient. His investigation of time and place in the Russian epic (*bylina*) (Nekliudov 1972) conceives of space and time as the background to narrative texts, whereby time is static in relation to the hero and his dynamic version is subordinated to the chain of events. The space is marked as dynamic by the hero's changes of location and, in contrast to the folktale, is mainly limited to Earth. Space and time are closely correlated; the moves mostly take place from the familiar to the foreign.

Much later, in a retrospective article, Nekliudov (2010) described the break in the Soviet government's relationship to contemporary phenomena of folklore around 1927 (the year Stalin took power), its factual negation and ban with the threat of very severe punishments (in 1941 the death penalty for singing a slanderous song), and the disastrous consequences this had for its study. This policy cul-

minated in the obvious negation of the Soviet cultural reality, and in the ordered falsification of unpleasant folkloristic documents.

The inclination to uphold strict science in the projects of Soviet humanitarians from the 1950s on was often caused by the arbitrary way representatives of the scientific establishment such as Vladimir Ermilov (1904–1965) and Boris Suchkov (1917–1974), Aleksei Metchenko (1905–1985), and Petr Vykhodtsev (1923–1994) dealt with literary facts and concepts such as Socialist Realism in literature. In order to avoid the arbitrariness and the stamp-like character of these mimetic interpretations, the Moscow linguists were, on the one hand, interested in the precise topology of the French mathematician René Thom (1970) with its discursive Cartesian tradition, in a lecture which was published in Russian in 1975 (Tom 1975). On the other hand, the philosopher and Indologist Aleksander Piatigorskii (1929–2009) developed a line to alternative Asian philosophical traditions which came much closer to the study of mythology. Together with the well-known Georgian-Russian philosopher Merab Mamardashvili, he published a paper on the meta-theory of consciousness in Lotman's series *Sign Systems Studies*. Special interest is due the passage in which the partners of the dialog reflect on the possibility of examining consciousness without or with consciousness. In this case, consciousness becomes "meta-consciousness" and the theory of consciousness becomes a "meta-theory" (Mamardashvili and Piatigorskii 1971, 346). In his memoirs on the beginnings of structural semiotics, Piatigorskii (1993, 77), naming Carnap and Quine, recalls the positivism of the Vienna Circle of philosophy as the background to (implicit) appellations by the Moscow and Tartu semioticians. But for himself, Piatigorskii (1996, 147) reclaims a tendency to philosophical anarchism as a way of protecting himself from a totalitarian culture.

Incidentally, Piatigorskii (1993, 77) criticized Boris Gasparov's (1989) manner of looking back on the history of Soviet semiotics of the 1960s and 1970s, as the latter's retrospective account did not discern his position in the past from his position in the present (of writing). Piatigorskii himself noted *ex post* a certain congruence concerning philosophical positivism in the practice of Lotman and his group in the use of the method to investigate the natural and the 'secondary languages' as quasi-philosophies and a (later) tendency to 'naturalize' culture (Piatigorskii 1993, 78). He pointed out that it was the notion of the 'text' which allowed Lotman and his group to transcend from the investigation of language(s) to research on culture(s). And he underlined that the semiotician should have taken a phenomenological meta-position in order to consider the sign instead of its application, as had been widely practiced by the members of the group. In a way, he admitted, it was Russian culture that (we would say: in the tradition of Russian culturosophy) controlled the semioticians:

> Now I think that the reason why culture has become a universal object in semiotics lies not in semiotics, but in the specific Russian cultural context. (We thought that we were writing about culture from outside; she led our hand from the inside). (Piatigorskii 1993, 78)

Semiotics, he was convinced, could not become a philosophy of language and it was used in France and Russia in order to replace the philosophy of culture.

While Uspenskii considered the bipolarity (within its own argumentation) as a necessary quality of Russian semiotics, Piatigorskii condemned it as a weakness because of its inability to describe it from a meta-position. Il'ia Kalinin (2009, 27–29) analyzed this contradiction as a consequence of the Soviet ideological control, which resulted not in an alternative structural model of humanitarian investigation but in its "inversion", its no less hegemonial reduplication, which preserved the totalitarian structure of Soviet ideology. Here I object that the appearance of an alternative possibility of humanitarian research itself broke through the closed discourse of Soviet literary, historical, and mythical discourse and, regarded from the outside, presented the humanitarian investigation in the Soviet Union as not being without an alternative.

If Piatigorskii himself developed an important line of the Moscow branch to non-Western philosophy and religion which would deserve consideration in its own right, the linguist and musicologist Boris Gasparov (*1940) elaborated it in the study of music (B. Gasparov 1969). He defined 'musical language' as a system which is given not only in the regularities of the artistic works of one and the same composer but possibly in the work of others too. From 1968–1980 he taught at the University of Tartu and was a member of the editorial board and a regular contributor to Lotman's *Sign Systems Studies*. After his emigration to the USA, which was possible due to his wife's Jewish provenance, instead of his own (thereby fooling the authorities), the verse scholar Mikhail Gasparov, who declared himself to be an epigone of the positivistic literary critic Boris Iarchov (1889–1942) and (later) called the Tartu–Moscow School at once an "esoteric lodge" and an "enlightening College" (M. Gasparov 1998, 113–114), had to be presented as a member of the editorial board of Lotman's *Sign System Studies*.

In his monograph *Speech, Memory, and Meaning*, Boris Gasparov (2010) evolved the basic structural concept of language with the help of the poststructuralist concept of intertextuality by stating that sentences of human speech are not formed by syntactical combinations of word-units but by the combination of memorized idiomatic units. According to Boris Gasparov, it is not the rational construction of a grammatical system that guarantees communication with language, but human memory, which by using communicative fragments as parts of an organic collective whole makes the understanding of speech-acts possible. In linguistics, an explanatory combinatory dictionary of Russian, compiled by

Ivan Mel'chuk and Andrej Zholkovsky (1984), had already taken some preparatory steps in this direction.

In his book *Five Operas and a Symphony: Words and Music in Russian Culture*, Boris Gasparov (2005) portrays in five works of Russian music from Glinka to Shostakovich the interrelation of musical works with literary and historical sources against their ideological and cultural background. He tries to reconstruct the/a distinctive sound of 'Russian music' in order to trace the special interaction of words and music in Russian culture and to outline meaning in music. Is it not an ethnocentric idea to presuppose that in Russian culture, like politics and philosophy, so too literature and music are dominated not by rationality but by intuition, not by mediacy but by immediacy, not by social suppression but by personal charisma, not by distance but by spontaneity, not by the coldness of institutionalized rules but by the warmth and flexibility of the family (cf. Emerson 2005, 181)? This set of qualities is highly reminiscent of the representation of Russia in the traditional binary opposition of Westerners and Slavophiles.

B. Gasparov (1998b), who after his emigration as one of very few Russian semiotic structuralists welcomed French poststructuralism, wrote in 1994 about the "clear features of utopian thinking" in Lotman's semiotics (B. Gasparov 1994, 292; I doubt that Lotman could have agreed with this characterization of his work). Although Boris Gasparov maintained close personal contact with the Lotman family, he increasingly distanced himself from Russian structuralist semiotics. He characterizes the change after the 1960s and the early 1970s as one leading to new oppositions such as (Western) grammatical (code) culture vs. (Eastern) semantic (text) cultures. However, it is surprising that the semantic culture corresponds precisely with what Boris Gasparov characterizes as 'Russian' in his book on Russian music.

A year earlier, Boris Gasparov, Iurii Shcheglov (1937–2009), and Aleksandr Zholkovsky (*1937) had left Russia: Shcheglov taught at the University of Wisconsin at Madison from 1989–2007 and Zholkovsky at the University of Southern California from 1984 on. Zholkovsky, who had worked with Ivan Mel'chuk on a *Tolkovo-kombinatornyj slovar' russkogo jazyka (Explanatory Combinatorial Dictionary of Modern Russian*, Mel'chuk and Zholkovskii 1984), conceived with Iurii Shcheglov a generative poetics of prose, which followed the example of generative linguistics (generative grammar). Their 'generative poetics' (Shcheglov and Zholkovsky 1987), like Chomsky's transformational grammar, is based on the hypothesis that (in this case: literary) texts have a semantic deep and a syntactical surface structure. The English title *Poetics of Expressiveness* stresses the function of the surface level, while the more frequent alternative name 'generative poetics' exposes the idea that an unlimited number of themes are produced by a limited number of semantic items. The basic problem of the transfer of Chomsky's linguistic idea to

poetics is the fact that generative grammar has never been applied to long texts in full. Furthermore, lingual competence differs from poetic competence just as much as verbal performance differs from poetic performance. The poetics of expressiveness formulated the structural system as a 'code', a kind of grammar of social behavior that can be taught and studied, like linguistic grammar; this 'grammatical' behavior is 'absorbed' by the texts in which it is implicitly embedded in the process of perceiving and memorizing these texts. These procedures included combination, contrast and variation, dimming, magnification and deployment, repetition, concretization, and reduction.

In contrast, looking back on early Soviet Semiotics, Dmitrii Segal (1996; 2011, 207–278) emphasized the saving function of this current in Soviet culture for literary critics who did not subscribe to the official line of Soviet Marxism. In his vision, language initially served as a way to view objects of culture. Later, culture itself become the home of the languages and their products. He also hints at the cultural-ecological aspect: the preservation of small (for instance Paleo-Asiatic, Tunguso-Manchzhurian, Finno-Ugric cultures, which were threatened by extinction in the Soviet Union), which became the focus of mythological research. He also underlines the relevance of the semiotic view of Russian Orthodox objects such as the religious icon and the concept of Jesus Christ, and he (Segal 2011, 268) draws attention to the Russo-centric tendency in the history of Russian literature in the Tartu–Moscow School. In the mid 1990s, Segal (1996, 7), who had been examining the patterns of oral poetry and also very intensely studied the work of Osip Mandel'shtam (Segal 1998), conceded that the semiotic investigation of the Acmeistic work of Mandel'shtam and Akhmatova also aimed to influence the future of Russian culture. From a different point of view, Lipovetskij and Berg (2011) reconstructed the work of Lotman and his colleagues as the development of liberalism in Soviet literary criticism from the 1970s on.

Zara Mints (1927–1990), married to Iurii Lotman from 1950 on, specialized very early in the work of the symbolist Aleksandr Blok and created a center for the study on this poet in Tartu. In the late 1940s, due to Soviet anti-Semitism, she did not receive a position at the Leningrad State University and in the 1970s her doctorate was blocked for five years for the same reason. At the same time, she was not allowed to publish unedited documents in her university editions (Lavrov 1999, 13–17). From 1962 until her death, she organized periodical conferences in Tartu that featured virtuoso discussion inter alia on the relationship between Blok's works and those of other authors. These conferences were well documented in eleven Blok anthologies. The last of them is dedicated to her memory by her friends and colleagues. She was also the editor of all of Lotman's monographs and the first twenty-two *Proceedings in Sign Systems* (Tartu 1974–1988), to which she was also a regular contributor.

Early in her small monograph on Blok's verses in the tradition of Russian democratic poetry of the nineteenth century (Mints 1973, 5) as well as on the first page of her detailed article on Blok's artistic works' relation to those of Nikolai Gogol', Zara Mints (1972, 122) distinguishes three methodically possible approaches with regard to poetic texts: a "social-genetic" approach investigating artworks' relation to their sociohistorical context, an "intra-textual" approach analyzing the "structure of the artistic text", and a "comparative" approach considering a given text's relation to other poetic works. The third is the specialty of most of Zara Mints' research and is already indicated by the metonymic title of her article: "Blok and Gogol'." This choice opens with its comparative precondition, the (possibly closed) structural concept of a work of art which has its meaning and takes its sense all by itself – towards a poststructuralist vision of art. Mints integrates the inspiring sides of the concept of intertextuality into her method without, however, accepting the maximalist theses of the death of the author: "This approach explores the dialectical relationship of both sides of a cultural contact, each of which lives and changes in the process of dialogue" (Mints 1972, 123). The concept of a 'dialogue of cultures', in which not only does the previous text act on the later text but also the later text (for instance in Blok) enriches the older one (in Pushkin, for instance), alludes to the ideas of Mikhail Bakhtin (cf. the chapters on Bakhtin in this volume). In her article "The Function of Reminiscences in the Poetics of A. Blok", Mints (1973, 327–404) suggested a helpful typology of quotations and explicated the workings of the "word of the other" (Bakhtin/Voloshinov) in the texts of different poets. In particular, she pointed to the practice of citations with 'poly-genesis' (Mints 1973, 402), which alludes to more than one source and maps out cultures as possibly growing wholes. (See also Valentin Peshanskyi's chapter on intertextuality in this volume.)

When at the end of her chapter on Blok in the fourth volume on the *History of Russian Literature*, edited by the Russian Academy of Sciences in 1983, Mints described the images of the coming culture and art in the late Blok's vision as "capacitors of the future, antipodes of despotism, bureaucracy, and philistine dullness" (Mints 1983, 548), the Soviet reader could also understand this characterization as a rejection of the present situation in the Soviet culture. In the next, tenth volume of the Blok anthologies, she intended to publish an article on "Soviet Camp Poetry and the Legacy of Symbolism" (Lavrov 1993, 10), which she was no longer able to write. A masterstroke is her vivid and forceful article on Aleksandr Blok in Russkie pisateli 1800–1917 *(Russian Writers 1800–1917)*, where she once again, stressing the relevance of Vladimir Solov'ev's philosophy for Aleksandr Blok, describes the interrelation of his life and work as a model case of the Symbolist's idea of culture as life-building. Although she does not use the term 'life-writing', her works on Blok can be read as early and convincing Russian

(semiotic) contributions to this concept of the interrelation of life and literature. Her concepts have been further developed in the three volumes of Hansen-Löve's (1989, 1998, 2014) monographs on Symbolism.

In her publications, Zara Mints often cooperated with colleagues, with students, and with her husband, Iurii Lotman. While this cooperation was mostly of a complementary nature with regard to the field and subject matter, the cooperation of Lotman with Boris Uspenskii, a close friend from Moscow since 1963, was much more complementary in the fields of theory. Boris Uspenskii (*1937), who, like most members of the semiotic group, hailed from Moscow, was a linguist by education and was initially inclined toward the typology of languages but soon showed a growing interest in the history of language (mostly Russian). Via the history of art, he became increasingly involved in problems of history itself and developed a concept of a semiotic view of history based on the conviction that all objects of history can be considered semiotic texts, chains or agglomerations of signs. Probably also as an effect of the omnipresence of Soviet (pseudo-)Marxist ideology, he shared with Lotman a profound skepticism of philosophy, the place of which in his case was taken up by linguistics. Together with Lotman, during the 1970s Uspenskii transcended from the dominance of the (dyadic) sign-text relation to the (triadic) sign-text-culture relation.

For literary critics, Uspenskii's most interesting monograph is *Poėtika kompozitsii* (1970, *Poetics of Composition*), the subtitle of which coincides with Lotman's famous book *Struktura khudozhestvennogo teksta* (1970, *The Structure of the Artistic Text*). Moreover, the two monographs appeared the same year with an identical layout, the upper-case sign Σ, an abbreviation of Σημειωτική – 'Semiotics' (also the main title of Lotman's *Proceedings*), in the same Moscow publishing house, Iskusstvo (Fine Art) (this publishing house therefor soon came under pressure, cf. Grishakova and Salupere 2015, 178). While Lotman's book is more related to poetry than to prose, Uspenskii analyzes only prose and (in the final chapters) fine art. Taking up a hint by Grigorii Gukovskii (Uspenskii 2000, 18), who proposed three levels of point-of-view practice in narrative texts, an ideological level (in the first edition, due to censorship Uspenskii had to replace the level of 'ideology' with the level of 'evaluation'), a geographical level, and a psychological level, Uspenskii expands the topical with the temporal perspective and, most spectacularly, a linguistic one. In substantial reviews of this book, Wolf Schmid (1971, 127–127) and Frans de Valk (1971) have criticized that the author provides neither a theoretical reasoning for his tableau nor a well-founded delimitation of the different levels. Furthermore, they observe that there is a lack of a clear methodological separation of the historical and the implied author from the teller and from the ideal reader as well as from the real one. Schmid, first in his review (Schmid 1971) and later in his book on narratology (Schmid 2005, 120–125), com-

plains with good reason that Uspenskii does not introduce his sign-theoretical concepts until the last part of his book. Innovative moments in Uspenskii's book are the consideration of the changes between an inward and an outside point of view and the study of the interrelations between the different levels of focuses and his examination of the possibilities that one of them is dominant or all of them are on an equal footing.

At the end of his book, the author considers the relations between the points of view in literature and fine art, on which he has elaborated further in other texts, for instance in "The Semiotics of the Icon", "Right and Left in the Iconic Representation" and "The Composition of Van Eyck's Altar in the Light of Semiotics" (Uspenskii 1995a, 221–294, 297–303, 304–328). The subtitle added in brackets, "Divine and Human Perspective", shows that in his discourse, which he calls "meditative travel" (Uspenskii 1995b, 328), the author transcends the border with the fields of theology and religion.

Latterly, Boris Uspenskii turned to historical objects as the emperor (without reference to Jürgen Osterhammel' theory of the imperium), the czar and the patriarch, but also to religious symbols (such as the Christian cross) and the theme of the holy space.

The results of Uspenskii's research which are most worth discussing in the context of semiotic culturology are his proposals for a semiotic research of history. The first volume of his *Selected Writings* has the double title *Semiotics of History. Semiotics of Culture* (Uspenskii 1994). And indeed, in the practice of Tartu and Moscow semioticians it is difficult to separate one from the other. For instance, Uspenskii transferred his practice of semiotic analysis from the history of language (mostly Russian) to the history of culture. Here he conceives of the historical process (*res gestae*) as a (narrative) text (*historia rerum gestarum*), and he supposes that this is the case in any historical discourse. It is only in such a text that the events of history can take on meaning and a possible sense. Its result is a world model which conditions both the perception of (the) events and the reaction to them. It combines the events by means of chronological and causal order into a semiotic-textual (not necessarily verbal) historical whole. However, in the Western discourse on the humanities, the thesis that history (*historia*) is a text is not new: it has been declared in significantly different ways by Arthur Danto (1965, 1985), Hayden White (1973), and Frank Ankersmit (1983, 2005). Il'ia Dëmin (2017, 218–219) has argued that Uspenskii's semiotic hermeneutics of history (and with it the method of semiotic research in history generally) bids farewell to causality as the only relevant logical bind between phenomena, reconstructed in historical discourse, in favor of a much more open registration and interpretation of the effects of culturally relevant contextual factors, which he calls the 'semiotics of history and hermeneutics of historical experience'.

However, in the area of semiotic historical investigation, Uspenskii's position is the most linguistic and semiotic one: he analyzes and explains history primarily and almost exclusively with linguistic and semiotic means. He 'reads' the historical process as semantically, syntactically, and pragmatically decipherable semiotic communication. In doing so, Uspenskii (1978; 1987, 69) discerns a logical semiotics of the sign, which he finds in Peirce and Morris, from a semiotics of language, of which Saussure is the representative. He uses the latter primarily with regard to the historical process; he needs the former not only for the (re-)construction and interpretation of historical consciousness, but also for the construction of a model of historic description and explanation. Ultimately, he opposes a historical to a cosmical consciousness, which in itself is fundamentally ahistoric, that is, not organized by chronology and causality. And it seems that Uspenskii considers this cosmic knowledge of the world in modern times (in contrast to Europe) to be a Russian peculiarity. The most intense discussion and critique of this concept is provided in Peter Grzybek's (1994b) review of the German edition of *Semiotika istorii* (Uspenskii 1991). Here I want to stress that our own historical reconstruction of some features of Russian semiotic structuralism and its consequences in the humanities has a semiotic and an interpretative (i. e. hermeneutic) shape. The former conceives of history as a semiotic text; the latter reads this text, including the interpreter as its relevant element.

4 Iurii Lotman's concepts of the sign, text, and culture and their final reformulation in the 'semiosphere' as elements of endlessness and the impossibility of understanding and translation

Iurii Lotman has suggested his own, less linguistically shaped concept of humanitarian semiotic historicity. In his late research, he sees it in opposition to the exact sciences (whose accuracy and reliability he initially attempted to follow), observing that unlike in the latter, in the former the fact is not the starting point of investigation but its endpoint (1996, 306). He asserts that this is the consequence of the phenomenon that objects of history are given to the investigator not as a solely material object (as for instance in physics), but as a sign that is at once both material and mental, the place, time and meaning/sense of which have to be reconstructed by the historian. And it has to be reconstructed, which also dis-

tinguishes it from natural objects, as the part of a text which itself is an element of (a) culture. Lotman defines culture "as the totality of messages exchanged by different senders [...] and as a single message sent by the collective 'I' of humanity to itself." (1992a, 87) From this point of view, the culture of humanity is a complex example of hetero- and auto-communication.

The first of Lotman's articles, which openly used the structural method, appeared in 1962, and it immediately declared the correspondence between life and art: "The problem of the similarity of art and life in the light of the structural approach" (Lotman 1962). It later became the second part of his first monograph *Lectures on Structural Poetics* which appeared in 1964 as the first volume of the new and soon to be famous serial Σημειωτική. S*ign Systems Studies* (Lotman 1964b). As its print run was limited to 500 copies and sold out within a few weeks, in 1968 Thomas Winner published a reprint in Providence, which was not followed until 1994, by a new run of 10,0000 copies. (Fleischer [1989, 173–185] documented the themes and titles of the semiotic conferences and Lotman's serial.)

In the early 1960s, Lotman (1963) already demarcates the notion of 'structure' in literary criticism from its equivalent in linguistics: for him, the poetic word loses its freedom of syntactical binding and is integrated into material and mental connections, unlike the linguistic lexeme. For instance, in verse they are characterized by parallelisms (Lotman 1964a, 88), which destroys redundancy. Here he seems to take a position which differs from Uspenskii's more linguistic point of view. Generally speaking, we can discern three main periods in his research, with different object-dominants and corresponding methods. In the beginning, from the late 1950s to the late 1960s, we encounter investigations focusing on the study of the sign with regard to its (syntactical) place, meaning, and function in the structure of the poetic text. During the 1970s, we notice a growing shift towards research on texts as historical elements of cultures and in the typology of these cultures. And from the mid 1980s to his death there is a third phase, characterized by the intentional expansion and decomposition, generalization, and disintegration of semiotic concepts, objects, and their scope. While during the first two periods the main emphasis lay on the formation of concepts, as sign and structure, text and model, secondary sign systems and culture, their interrelation and their typology, parallel to the step from structuralism to poststructuralism Lotman transferred the focus in the last period on the relativization of the scope and the stability of the concepts. Though he discredited French poststructuralism as a 'fashion' (Martynov 2020, 89–90), the late Lotman ascribed a much more decisive role to the cultural context of semiotic communication and its topic dimension than in his early days. And we notice in the depth structure of his investigations a conspicuous coincidence with his life in the first two periods and with his death in the last. At the same time, in the works of the late Lotman the center of gravity

moves from the chronical aspect of culture to a topical one (Wutsdorff 2012, 294) called the 'semiosphere'.

However, here I must agree with Fleischer (1989, 160–161) and Grzybek (1989, 314–316) that Lotman, like Ivanov and Uspenskii, did not present an epistemologically well-founded and consistent theoretical concept of signs (and, I might add: also of texts and/or of cultures). The strength of the semiotic research of the semioticians of the Tartu–Moscow School – and this is valid *a fortiori* for Lotman– lies not in the discussion and presentation of theoretical notions but in the application of semiotics to quite different matters and periods in the history of human culture. Nevertheless, we must keep in mind the epistemological basis and contexts of their semiotic argumentations. From the very outset of his semiotic orientation in the late 1950s (which can be seen as having become possible in the context of the de-Stalinization of the Soviet Union from 1956 on), Lotman works with Saussure's dyadic sign-concept in the glossematic tradition of Hjelmslev, which uses the latter's term *connotation* and in its binary structure corresponds with the modality of opposition in Russian formalism (poetic vs. practical language). Although the semioticians from Tartu seem to have been more or less familiar with the triadic concept of the sign of the philosopher Peirce and/or the theorist of semiotics Morris, they mostly preferred the more basic and less sophisticated model of the sign with the binary relation of the (for instance verbal) sign and its object/meaning (cf. Lotman 1996b, 367).

While Lotman and his colleagues mostly ignored Peirce's basic model of the sign, they worked with his three-part typology: besides the symbol (represented by the majority of words in the verbal dictionary, which is arbitrary in the Saussurian sense with regard to the relationship between the sign and its object), it also takes into consideration the symptom with an essential, often causal, relationship between sign-vehicle and sign-object and the icon, which is based on the similarity between the signifier and the signified. Lotman (1970, 31, 72–74, 188) called the iconic type a 'picture' (*obraz*) and, in so doing, implicitly thwarted the concept of the picture as a result of reflection in the dogma of Socialist Realism. During the 1970s, there is a tendency in Lotman's terminology to replace the term 'sign' with the notion of the 'model', with its double orientation towards material representation and realities ('real', artificial, investigatory, and so on) (Lotman 1970, 91–92; Zajnetdinova 2007, 125–127).

In this early stage, the cultural context was conceived more implicitly than explicitly as a more or less stable (but developing) system. Now the integration of the circumstances (inspired by Bakhtin's dialogism and separating Lotman from Jakobson's linguistic model of communication; see Lotman 1983) takes on more relevance: the author and the recipient (even if the recipient is the author himself) use different ('primary' and 'secondary') languages (Lotman often wrote 'codes',

borrowing the term from cybernetics and information theory) and cultures exist by virtue of the richness and/or a plentitude of artistic and natural languages:

> "The dialogue partner is located within the 'I' as one of its components, or conversely, the 'I' is part of the constitution of the partner [...] The need for the 'other' is the need for the origin of the self; a partner is needed insofar as he presents a different model of the familiar reality, a different modeling language, a different interpretation of the familiar text." (Lotman 2000, 589)

In Lotman's vision of art and culture, the personality of the actors plays a decisive role, and this is most notably valid for himself as an investigator. At this point, we have to register some aspects of his personality, because he consciously displayed these qualities in the organization of conferences, in the way they were conducted, in order to discuss elements and aspects of research that were sensitive in a Soviet context. In his first period, Lotman already presented himself as a charismatic personality who by his brave, gallant, and reliable character impressed both his colleagues and his students and often even the Soviet authorities, who (including the rector of his university) were less rigorous in Tartu up to 1970 than in the Russian capital and in Leningrad. This becomes obvious in the amicable biography written by his friend Boris Egorov (1999). As a courageous individual, Lotman dared to organize five scholarly symposia without the licenses for the participants he was formally obliged to request from their universities.

The eavesdroppers sent by the KGB to report on these 'illegal' activities were repeatedly disarmed by his charm and politeness, but also by the high level of the scientific discourse. However, in January 1970 the KGB conducted a house search in Lotman's apartment for papers by the dissident Natal'ia Gorbanevskaia, who in August 1968 had publicly protested against the intrusion of Warsaw Pact troops into Czechoslovakia and whom he had helped find a place to live (Egorov 1999, 161–163; Lotman 2005, 47–50). The scissors of the Ministry of the Interior did even not find the copy of Solzhenitsyn's *Arkhipel Gulag* (*The Gulag Archipelago*), stored on a shelf near the ceiling, or a copy of the secret addition to the Molotov-Ribbentrop treaty of 23 August 1939, which was located in a second apartment. Although Lotman was not actively engaged in dissident activities, as a result of the Gorbanevskaia case he was forbidden to travel outside the Soviet Union for over ten years.

One of Lotman's findings concerning the structure of artistic texts to have persistently influenced Western literary studies too is his definition of the (narrative) *event* (*sobytie*) as the "transposition of a person across a boarder in the semantic field" (Lotman 1970, 282; cf. Renner 2004, Schmid 2017). Later, this sensitivity to space, which can be related to his personal biography (his life since 1950 in the Estonian Republic and his absence from Leningrad), proved productive in his con-

cepts of *semiosphere* (*semiosfera*). And it is prominent in the notion of the frame, the semi-permeable border of every work of art.

One of the important changes in Lotman's concept of the sign, text, and culture concerns the replacement of the concept of *re-codification* (*perekodirovka*) with the concept of *translation* (*perevod*; cf. Soo-Hwan 2003, Ruhe 2009). While re-codification is a mechanical process which can be performed by artificial intelligence (Lotman 2001a, 580–589) because it is not sensitive to the context, translation is a process that cannot be undertaken by a computer (cf. Salupere 2015). The concept of translation is correlated with understanding and therefore also with hermeneutics. While the philosopher of culture Bakhtin (cf. also my chapter on Bakhtin in this volume) conceives of translation as (a way of) dialogic understanding (translation implies dialogue), Lotman sees dialogic understanding as a way of translation (dialogue implies translation).

The fundamental move in Lotman's works of the 1980s from 'signs' to 'texts', from the binary concept of meaning to complexes of meanings, was a further step in order to process the difference between the singular phenomenon and the complex whole.

In his investigations in literary history, Lotman could rely on Tynianov's study "O literaturnoi evoliutsii" (1927, "On Literary Evolution") (Tynianov 2019), which in a pre-structuralist way differentiated between two constructive functions in literary history: a 'syn-function', meaning the interconnection of an element with other elements in the very same text, and an 'auto-function', which refers to the interrelation of an element with analogous elements in other (literary) texts, but also in other (for instance: social) systems (cf. Hansen-Löve's 2017 and 2019 articles on the difference between evolution and history; see also Schamma Schahadat's chapter on literary evolution in this volume). Historically, Russian structuralism and semiotics followed the line of late Russian formalism, which integrated systematic-synchronic and historical-diachronic elements but insisted on the consideration of the relation between literary and other historical developments and on taking into consideration the specific conditions of literary evolution) and early structuralism, represented in the "Thesis" of Tynjanov and Jakobson (1928) and in the work of Claude Lévi-Strauss (cf. Lotman, Egorov, and Mints 1960, 3, 7). In this period, the relevance of the person is also presented in a fundamental work on the function of people's names in texts (Lotman and Uspenskii 1975).

However, as reference to 'formalist' studies was dangerous in Soviet culture up to the 1980s, Lotman also had to distance himself from Tynianov, with whom he had more in common than he was allowed to show. And, like Tynianov, he became the author of historical narratives (on Karamzin and Pushkin). This artistic qualification, which also comes to the fore in his sketches (Kuzovkina and Daniel 2016), was at the same time practical proof of his anthropological thesis that every

human being is (more or less) an artist: without this capacity he/she is not able to receive an artistic work adequately. This high regard for the aesthetic dimension of life also features in his conviction that the informative type of the code guarantees the exact reduplication of the message from the sender to the receiver. However, new information is never generated here. Unlike in the case of the artistic code, the sender's message will never be reproduced exactly by the receiver, but in this case he will also use the new code to create a maximum of new information.

In this second period, Lotman and Uspenskii (1977) published an article which confronted the dual model of Russian culture with a ternary model of Western cultures: while, for instance, in Russian culture heaven is directly opposed to hell, in Western cultures purgatory exists as a third place between them, embodying a third (ethical) possibility between salvation and sin: a place for the sinner, who can be forgiven. (Due to its ternary structure, Andrey Makarychev and Alexandra Yatsyk [2017] consider this model more inclusive than Carl Schmitt's conservative model of a society in which there are only friends and enemies, and recommend it for the study of international relations.) At the same time, Lotman characterized the Russian culture as the 'archetypical model' of genuine religious, asymmetric 'self-surrender' (*vrucheniesebia*), while he saw the Western cultures as marked by the dominance of the counter-model of an originally magical, symmetric 'contract' (Lotman 1990, 254–255). However, there is a certain historical tension between the two models: in Russia, the sacred was historically identified with Byzantium, i. e. with another culture. The transformation of the culture of Peter's time led to the fact that the West, the symbol of the 'satanic', the 'hellish' (and previously the opposite of Byzantium), took the place of Byzantium as a source of tradition, knowledge, and authority, inheriting sacredness.

In this very general intercultural relationship, we still find the tendency to build up a binary opposition, which had already been present in 1970 in the infra-cultural rapports of 'shame' and 'fear' (Lotman 2001a, 664–66). In both cases, the qualifications are not free from ethical markings: a culture based on fear is held together by the external role of power and suppression (which generate fear), while a culture grounded in shame remains intact due to the inner relationship and the free will of its subjects. According to Lotman, shame makes the transformation of physiology to culture possible and stands at the beginning of the history of human beings. It goes without saying that a culture dominated by fear and a person's unconditional submission to the society/state corresponds to an authoritarian if not totalitarian regime, while a culture dominated by shame and the equivalence of contracting with every person correlates with a democratic society with the validity of human rights (on the Russian reception, see Verenich 2014). A similar binary opposition was suggested by Nietzsche in the principles of the Dionysic and the Apollonian.

It is notable that in the article's first version, Lotman drew on Jung in calling the cultural habits/procedures of 'self-surrender' and 'contract' (reprinted in Lotman 1993c, 3, 345–355) "archetypes", while in the later version they figure as "typological symbols" (Lotman 1990, 254; 1996b, 357). Although he provides some instructive examples, we miss any argumentation for their fundamental and universal validity. Lotman characterizes the former as 'magical' and the latter as 'symbolic', which in the latter case results in the strange figure of a 'symbolic (typological) symbol'. The idea may be stimulated by a book of Claude Reichler (1979) which, however, primarily investigates the diabolic forms of deception in "Van den Vos Reynarde" and connects them with reflections on the general beguiling effect of semiotic discourses.

The investigative energy Lotman invested in research on semiotic phenomena seems to be driven not only by a strong aesthetic eros but also by a pedagogic and didactic one (see Koserina 2007). The aim of this drive is a person who has not only aesthetic ability but also ethical courage. The result of this education, which Lotman (2003) summed up in his book *Vospitanie dushi* (*Education of the Soul*, Lotman 1993d) was a self-responsible person without fear and with great aesthetic ability. Faina Sonkina asserts that Lotman "wanted to build his life as Pushkin had built his own" (Sonkina 2016). In his Pushkin biography (which bears the subtitle "Biografija pisatelja" ["Biography of a Writer"] and in this sense can also be seen as Lotman's own life-writing) Lotman states that the poet "built his personal life as the personality of a Poet" (Lotman 1983, 117). This characteristic was along the lines of symbolistic 'life creation' (Viacheslav Ivanov and Andrei Belyi) and early avant-garde 'life-building' (Chuzhak) (cf. Schahadat 2017). It has parallels with the poet Aleksandr Prigov (1940–2007), who belonged to the next generation and whose general artistic concept has recently been identified with life-writing (Lipovetskii and Kikulin 2022). Lotman's second biography had the even more telling title *Sotvorenie Karamzina* (1987, *The Creation of Karamzin*) and was dedicated to the writer's life. Lotman has shown that Karamzin planned his travel in accordance with the intended travelogue *Pis'ma russkogo puteshchest-vennika* (1791–1792, *Letters of a Russian Traveler)*.

In the course of the 1980s, Iurii Lotman expanded the traditional model of hetero-communication with the type of auto-communication in which persons speak or write to themselves. He noted that besides the pure acts of hetero- or auto-communication, in many cases we encounter, as in all artistic texts, the coexistence of both types and the implication of hetero-communication in auto-communication and auto-communication in hetero-communication (Lotman 1990, 32; Lotman 1992a, 76). We can also call these acts of complementary implications co-implications. The same holds true for the relations of the "text in the text" (Lotman 1992b), in which the hierarchy of the containing and the contained text

can be turned upside down in their production and the reception. Here we point to the fact that for Lotman, cultures also can be regarded as texts and can thus be involved in bi-conditional relations (Russian culture as a part of world-culture, which for its part is also a part of Russian culture).

The relationship of co-implication is also prominent in Lotman's last book, which has been read as his last testament: *Vnutri mysliashchikh mirov* (1996a, *Inside Thinking Worlds*). The title of the English translation, *The Universe of the Mind* (Lotman 1990), overlooks not only the plurality of the world but also this fundamental relationship, as do the German version, *Die Innenwelt des Denkens* (Lotman 2010) and its French equivalent: *La Sémiosphère* (Lotman 1999). The thinking person(s) is/are in the universe and the universe is at the same time in the thinking person(s), in which there is a 'thinking world' again. This logic of the co-implication of the world and the text (we can model the process of thinking with Lotman as a text) had already been described in the verbal art of Khlebnikov, whose work Lotman (1991a, 161, 512, 596) held in very high regard, as the relationship between the universe and the book: the universe is in the book and at the same time the book is in the universe (Grübel 2008, 270–272). Once again, it demonstrates the interrelation of art and theory in Lotman's practice. In his article "Fenomen iskusstva" ("The Phenomenon of Art", Lotman 2001a, 129), he had written: "Art creates a fundamentally new level of reality that is distinguished by its sharp increase in freedom."

Lotman's second period is also characterized by the expansion of the horizon in which semiotic objects are viewed. In 1973, his small monograph *Semiotika kino i problem kinoėstetiki* (*Semiotics of the cinema and Problems of Cinema Aesthetics*, 1973b) (cf. Konstantinov 2019) was published in Tallinn, and in 1994, in the same city, now the capital of Estonia, the monograph *Dialog s ėkranom* (*Dialogue with the Screen)* was published in co-authorship with his brilliant student, the film critic Iurii Tsiv'ian. There are also relevant articles by Lotman on the language of the theater, and as early as 1975 he (Lotman 1975c) analyzed the relationship between card games and Russian literature of the early nineteenth century.

Lotman's later works are characterized by two fundamental shifts. Whereas he was initially concerned with the more technical aspects of semiotics (especially in regard to literature, fine art, and film), his later writings are far more philosophically and historically oriented. His idea of the works of fine art as ensembles (Lotman 1998) is particularly noteworthy. One offshoot of his philosophical thinking is the notion of the *semiosphere*, which is understood as the semiotic space that surrounds any specific linguistic or cultural sign system. "The unit of semiosis, the smallest functioning mechanism, is not a separate language but the whole semiotic space of the culture in question. This is the space we term the semiosphere" (Lotman 1990, 125). Inspired by Vladimir Vernadskii's (1863–1945)

concepts of a *biosphere*, which is formed by the living matter on earth, and a *noosphere*, the space in which consciousness and self-consciousness have developed, Lotman's semiosphere marked a new 'organicist' turn in his thought (cf. Kotov and Kull 2006). Nöth's (2006, 252) proposal concerning "Vernadsky's materialist concept of the noosphere" is untenable. However, together with Édouard Le Roy (1928) and Teilhard de Chardin (1925, 92), the Russian founder of biogeochemistry, who was convinced that the mental life of human beings runs along four lines – science, philosophy, art and religion – considered the noosphere the final stage of cosmogenesis (Vernadskii 1988, 392–393).

Together with Vernadskii, who presented a special concept of living space, of time as an historical development (cf. Levit, Krumbein and Grübel 2006), Lotman also stood in the tradition of Russian cosmism, a view of the world that correlates every single phenomenon and each event with the world in its entirety (cf. Ićin 2004). It seems to be a reduction of the notion of the semiosphere to identify it with "national literature", as was proposed in the epilog to the German translation of *Inside Thinking Worlds* (Frank, Ruhe, and Schmitz 2010, 393).

In 2012, Daniele Monticelli (2012b) noticed a certain correspondence between Derrida's and Lotman's critiques of Saussure. But here too we must stress the difference between them, as Lotman always adheres to science as the general context of semiological reflection. Three years later, George Rossolatos (2015, 112), the editor of *International Journal of Marketing Semiotics & Discourse Studies* (founded in 2013) criticized Lotman's concept of the biosphere as an unsuccessful attempt to compensate for the shortcomings of klinging to the personal subjectivity of the agents of communication, the adherence to binarism, and a hierarchical organization of meaning.

In his concept of the semiosphere, Lotman integrated in relation to history the aspect of endlessness, which he confronted with Hegel's thesis concerning the end of history. In semiotic communication, only infinity guarantees the fullness of meaning and sense (cf. however Kim Kvan [2003], who saw finality beside locality, mythical orientation and personality as obligatory ingredients of Lotman's concept.) Along with infinity goes the impossibility of final understanding and exact translation. Kalevi Kull and Ekaterina Velmezova (2018) detected in Lotman's last texts the correlation between the old and the new, cyclicity in relation with openness and the algorithmicity and non-algorithmicity as aspects of semiosis in all acts of interpretation.

Lotman's semiosphere encompasses all semiotic acts of the world, all its agents, its addressors and its addressees, all sign-vehicles, sign-objects, and sign-interpretants (*sensu* Peirce), that is, all attributions of lack of meaning and sense, of non-meaning and nonsense. It implies all apophatic acts and all moments of silence. Furthermore, the semiosphere exists in presence, living by

memory from all the past time of semiotic activity and inactivity, and reaching by expectation, hope, and fear into the future. It is not limited to the social world of the human being, but also involves its relation to animals and plants and to non-living matter. In doing so, it can serve as a means of ecology, of bioethics, and of concepts not only of world literature but also of world culture.

The basic difference between alternative theories of culture that work with the notions of the sign and the symbol concerns the problem of the unity or inner diversity of these cultures. While the concept developed by the neo-Kantian philosopher Cassirer (1923, 26) still implied the prerequisite of a holistic mind, Lotman's universal semiosphere implies, like Goodman's (1978) idea of a plurality of sign-systems and symbolically constructed versions of the world (*semiotic monads*), the inner diversity of partial spaces of communication which cooperate with each other or work parallel to, against, or relatively independently of each other (cf. Tamm and Kull, 2021).

5 The reception of Tartu and Moscow semiotics and its perspectives for the future

In the case of Russian structuralism and semiotics, the transfer of literary theory should not be imagined as a one-way movement from East to West. It is a much more complex, reciprocal motion. For instance, the influence of Claude Lévi-Strauss and the physical chemist Ilya Prigogine who worked on dissipative structures and systems was significant, and it is disputable whether in this context Roman Jakobson can be considered a figure of the East or the West. The semiotician and Romance scholar Daniele Monticelli studied in Italy, but took his PGD in Tallinn, where he also seems to be working today. And does the capital of Estonia belong to the 'East' or to the 'West'?

In the first (auto-)historical survey of the development of this wing of literary (and cultural) theory of the Soviet Union, Boris Gasparov (1989), writing shortly before the death of Iurii Lotman, described the group around Lotman, who had taught in Tartu since 1950, as a kind of 'Russian Westernizers' who alienated themselves from the (Stalinist) Russian context. Lotman (1994, 500–501) agreed only partly with this analysis and differentiated this judgment by alluding to the historical fact that the Russian Westernizer Belinskii had no knowledge of languages and always had Russian aims in mind. In 1989, Lotman had planned a semiotic manifestation in memory of the "The great French Revolution and the ways of the Russian Liberation Movement", which was intended to confront the break-up of the Soviet Union with the principles of liberty, equality, and fraternity.

Initially, the reception of Tartu and Moscow semiotics took place more outside than inside the Soviet Union, where it was met with harsh criticism by official Soviet literary critics. In the early sixties, Lev Timofeev (1963) and Palievskii (1963) published articles in which the former lamented the structuralists' backward step to formalism and the latter 'defended' the poetic 'picture' (*obraz*) as a quasi-autonomous nucleus of the artistic work against any formal analysis, which, he argued, is not compatible with any work of art. In the late 1960s, this retrograde attack along the Hegelian lines of 'poetry is thinking in pictures' was even criticized by the Marxist aesthetician Moisei Kagan (1960).

After the perestroika and glasnost' era, we notice ten years of an active Russian reception of Moscow and Tartu semiotics, which could be the topic of an article its own right. Here, Zhivov (2009), who himself said 'farewell' to structuralism in 1997 due to its excessively strong orientation around language as a system and the insufficient attention it paid to its concrete individual use (Zhivov and Timberlake [Timberleik] 1997), provides a good overview of what was considered productive and what was considered superfluous after the first two decades of intensive Russian discussion. At the turn of the new century, Abram Reitblat (2001) criticizes with reason the Russian (and also Lotman's) image of Pushkin as the projection of a Romantic hero onto the (literary) historical process.

Ivan Kalinin (2009) has described how in Lotman's semiotics the analogy between the culture and the text has implied two parallels between the functioning of natural language and history: the rules of language (its code) correspond to the laws of history and the historical process to oral communication. He considers Jakobson's and Tynianov's (1928, 37) thesis that the history of a system is itself a system to be the basis of this investigative assumption.

Mikhail Ryklin criticizes the supporters of the semiotic project in the USSR much more radically, because, he asserts, they denied "whole areas of knowledge (for example, almost everything that relates to modern culture)". He declared semiotics to be a way for them to transform "[...] what was not yet seduced (or imperfectly collapsed) ideology into the object of a non-political, 'clean' knowledge" (2008,147).

Sergei Zenkin (2012, 125) considered Lotman's type of continuous development of cultures and showed that in Lotman's early works discontinuity was a quality of space and in his later oeuvre became a quality of time (cf. De Tienne 2015). 'Explosion' is an example of this new perspective. Bifurcation is Bergson's irreversible physical time (*temps*), transferred into life experience (*durée*). Zenkin objects to Lotman that an explosion always can be integrated. It is significant that in Lotman's model of culture, common names tend to be given to processes (organization), while the space of proper names is a site of explosion. Here, we should join Thomas Grob (2012, 141) in asking whether 'explosion' (for instance

also in the titles of the English and German editions of Lotman's [2009, 2010] book) is the best translation of the Russian word *vzryv*. Besides 'explosion', *vzryv* also means 'eruption' and in figurative speech it designates a 'violent, sudden manifestation or development of something' (Gorbachevich 1991, 219–220). It is thus less bound to the use of force than 'explosion'. In Lotman's earlier work, the continuous state was the myth, which is based on proper names. 'Neomythological' works are those in which the myth acts as a language of its own.

Later, the identification of opposites occurs in the ex/implosion. Zenkin argues that initially, Lotman used continuous and discontinuous phenomena as subjective tools of research in semiotic cultures, but later, for instance in *Kul'tura i vzryv* (1993, *Culture and Explosion*), he considers them characteristics of objective historical processes. And in the time of perestroika, he related them to the reality of history, which cannot be reduced to culture. Zenkin leaves the reader with the question as to how we can use historical semantics for the examination of objects that are difficult to access but attractive to look at. We stay with the main problem of Lotman's concept of the universe of signs: it is how non-spatial relations and values are given spatial and axiological expression.

In the world of real socialism beyond the Soviet Union, Russian semiotics was most intensely studied in Poland, Hungary (Granits 1998), and the GDR. In Poland, we have to bear in mind especially Jerzy Faryno, Bogusław Zyłko, and Danuta Ulicka. While Faryno, who was also in personal contact with Lotman, published an article about the text theory of the Tartu semioticians as early as 1971 and a (Russian) *Introduction to Literary Criticism* in in 1991 (Faryno 1971, 1991) and wrote many accurate analyses and interpretations of Russian works of art, Zyłko focused on Lotman's work and the semiotics of culture (Zyłko, 2001, 2015). Ulicka translated texts by Iurii Lotman and Boris Uspenskii into Polish and has edited, together with Włodzimierz Bolecki (Ulicka and Boleki 2012), a brilliant reconstruction of structuralism in Central and Eastern Europe. No fewer than six of Lotman's monographs and two anthologies were published in Polish translation from 1984 to 2008. From 1973 to 2002, five of Lotman's books appeared in Budapest.

I now switch our focus to some foreign 'Western' cultures. The reception of Lotman's and his colleagues' works in Italy was described by Margherita De Michiel (De Mikel' 1998) two decades ago. She states that Italy is one of those countries in which Lotman's work has been read very frequently, and refers to the translations of Lotman's works, from his early article "Exact Methods in Soviet Literary Criticism" in *Strumenti critici* 36–37 of 1967, and *The Structure of the Artistic Text* (1971) *Culture and Explosion* (1993) to *Looking for the Way* (1994). The early translations and documents of reception up to 1977 are listed in the bibliography by D. Ferrari Bravo (1978). Andrea Mirabile (2006) has reported the relationship between structuralism and semiotics.

The most sophisticated readers of Lotman in Italy seem to have been Cesare Segre and Umberto Eco. In the late 1990s, Segre (1997) asked the reasonable question whether in his last works (*Look for the Way* and *Semiosphere*) Lotman did not leave the realm of semiotics, and referred to the fact that Lotman was always transcending boundaries. Seven years earlier, Eco (1990, VIII) wrote in his preface to the English edition of *Universe of the Mind* (answering the question in advance, as it were) that "aesthetics, poetics, semiotic theory, the history of culture, mythology, and cinema, in addition to the principal themes of the history of Russian literature" were the manifold subjects of Lotman's work. Eco saw two reasons for the shift in the paradigm of Russian semiotics: the first problem they had to solve was the difficulty that in some cases in the process of communication the sign-systems used in this process changed themselves. The second problem was that there were sign systems in which it was difficult to identify a code or there was even a conflict between different codes. According to Eco, Lotman left the structuralist paradigm when he discovered that cultures use different codes at the same time, for instance a code orientated around grammar and a code orientated around the text. This is, incidentally, in accordance with the two types of language learning: internalization of either the grammar or of texts.

The reception of Lotman's work in France seems to be the most controversial. The discussions about Lotman until the middle of the 1990s have been adequately reported by E.I. Balakhovskaia (1998; cf. also Zenkin 2019). She refers to Renate Lachmann's (1987) article on value aspects of the semiotics of culture and of the text and to Boris Gasparov's allusions to the difference between the French and Eastern European concepts of semiotics in order to explain the difficulties of reading Moscow and Tartu semiotics in the French context. It is, as Mikhail Gasparov (1998, 96) highlights in another article, the difference between a dualistic and a multifocal vision of the world. (At least in his late work, Lotman integrates the plurality of visions into his concept.) On the other hand, we must point to the circumstance that one of the first presentations of Lotman and his colleagues in French was by Kristeva (1968) in *Tel Quel* in her 'mathematical period', with articles on numbers and ciphers, which demand an extremely one-dimensional understanding. Later, as Balakhovskaia (1998, 297–299) shows, Kristeva, who was guided by the goal of constructing a "materialistic epistemology" (Kristeva 1969, 26), was convinced that the works of her colleagues from Moscow and Tartu were made possible because of the "framework of Marxism, seen as a science and a scientific methodology". It is most interesting that some years later Charles Ridoux's (1976) doctoral thesis on the development from Russian formalism to "Soviet semiotics" that was directed by Kristeva criticized in Lotman's work the isolation of art from society and its economic basis and the absence of any interest in the social-political function of literature. In an earlier

article, which is not mentioned by Balakhovskaia, Ridoux (1974, 26) rejects the concept of the sign in the work of Lotman and his colleagues, because it does not take meaning as a matter of change à la Derrida but examines the sign as the foundation of communication. After Ridoux's indictment of Lotman as a reactionary conservative structuralist Russian intellectual who was not able to keep up with the progressive French post-structuralists, the obituary which Kristeva (1994) published in PMLA comes as a surprise. Now she complains that during the 1960s in France "the metaphysical generalities dear to existentialism [...] had been renewed only superficially by a few touches of Hegelo-Marxism" (1994, 375). She wrongly claims that in 1968 she herself published in *Tel Quel* the 'first Western' translations of the Tartu semioticians. She could have known at least from Umberto Eco's (1990, IX) prologue to the English translation of Lotman's *Inside of the Thinking Worlds* that the Italian journal *Strumenti critici* published an translation of his article "Exact Methods in Russian Literary Science" in 1967 (Lotman 1967). But now, after fighting against all concepts of the subject as backwards herself, she complains that Lotman did not show "the exceptional discourse of each subject, which ultimately constitutes the richness of literature and culture" (Kristeva 1994 376). In our view, it was the very individual (and artistic) richness of every writer which Lotman already had in mind in his interpretations of twelve artistic works (from Batiushkov to Zabolotskii) in *Analysis of the Poetic Text* (Lotman 1972, 137–270). And in his late work it is also the exceptional interpretation of every reader that characterizes (often as a didactic aim; Lotman 1988) the goals of his undertakings (on Kristeva's problems with Lotman, cf. Landolt 2012). Ten years later, Michelle Lamarche Marrese (2004) revised Lotman's 'poetics of the everyday behavior' of the Russian nobility in the late eighteenth and the early twentieth century, paying much more attention to the historical material and rendering it much more productive by showing parallels in Western societies and relativizing his claim about the Russian language as a 'foreign' language of the Russian nobility.

The Anglophone reception of Lotman's work is well documented by Remo Gramigna (2021). Lotman's English-language publications began in 1973 with the collective theses, published together with Uspenskii, Ivanov, Toporov and Piatigorskii, and a sensational article (Lotman et al. 1973) on "Different cultures, different codes" in the *Times Literary Supplement*. Six publications followed in 1974, and ten in 1975, the peak being reached in 1976 with fourteen and ten in 1977, followed by five in 1978 and three in 1979 before a break in 1980, which was followed by two further peaks with eleven translations in 1984 and thirteen in 1988 (all data taken from Kull 2011). If during the late twentieth century the reception of Lotman's theory of culture was often limited to Slavists, in the new century an increasing number of his articles have also appeared in non-Slavic contexts.

Initially, the works of Lotman and his group were largely known only to Slavists who were interested in new developments of their special field and only reached colleagues with other areas of expertise or of theoretical literary criticism by exclusion. For instance, in 1977 Terence Hawke could still edit the book *Structuralism and Semiotics* in London without any reference to Russian works in this field (Hawke 1977). This was surely impossible after the publication of the very thorough book by Ann Shukman (1977). This book does not only present and recommend Lotman's achievements but it also speaks rather critically with regard to his theoretical concepts and in some cases his interpretations of texts too. Shukman also raises the delicate matter of the difference between the broad orientation and knowledge ("polymathy", Shukman 1977, 192) of Russian literary critics, linguists, and specialists in mythology and the specialism, seen by many American critics as a virtue, that hinders the reception of the work of Russian semiotics. Almost another twenty years later, Deltcheva and Vlasov (1996, 148) read Lotman's last works a little too lightheartedly as the 'synthesis' of the Tartu–Moscow School. In the late 1990s, Henryk Baran (1998) paints a very differentiated picture of the reception of Moscow and Tartu semiotics in the USA and Great Britain. In the field of ethnology, Portis-Winner (1994, 115–116) saw a growing consensus between her American colleagues and the Soviet semioticians. Indeed, it would be worthwhile comparing Lotman's method of analyzing cultures more intensively with Clifford Geertz's (1973) 'Thick Description' following an initial study by Andrei Zorin (2004).

Strangely enough, Uspenskii's (1973) *Poetics of Composition* had almost no effect on American narratology (Steiner 1976, 315). The situation in Britain was less desperate; there the Neo-Formalist Circle, founded by Joe Andrew and L. M. O'Toole, guaranteed a certain limited attention. It seems significant that Lotman's book on the Russian aristocracy of the late eighteenth and the early twentieth centuries has (yet) to be translated into English. Instead, there is a translation of his much less significant monograph on high society dinners in tsarist Russia (Lotman and Pogosjan 2014). In the "Introduction: Every-day life and culture" (5–15) and in the epilogue "Instead of a conclusion: 'Between a double abyss'" (Lotman [1984] 2014, 385–389) to this book, Lotman provides a vision of (Russian) culture that does not coincide with the convictions of the mainstream of Anglo-American intellectuals. It shows that the so often despised Russian aristocracy produced, in the form of the Decembrists, a group of people whose members were supported by their wives, who were ready to offer their happiness and their lives in order to change the tsarist system, which brought misery and suffering to the majority of the Russian people and who expressed their visions mostly in literary texts. Compared to this situation, we have to concede that during the Stalin era, in Soviet society (as far as we know) there was never a group of people who

were ready to sacrifice their happiness for the end of the suffering of the people in Stalin's totalitarian society and who would have published their visions of a necessary change in literary texts. Instead, there were functionaries of the official Stalin system, who, like, for example, Vsevolod Ivanov, worked in the suppressive machine while writing critical texts about it (such as his novel *U.*, 1930–1931) for the desk drawer.

One year after the death of Lotman, Amy Mandelker (2004, 390), in a very fundamental article, analyzed Lotmans concept of the 'semiosphere' against the background of Bakhtin's 'logosphere' and Vernadskii's relationship between the 'biosphere' and the 'noosphere' and came to the conclusion that the development of "modern Russian theoretical thought from the biosphere to the logosphere and then to the semiosphere constitutes a new organicism" in which Russian structuralism has changed "in a way paralleling poststructuralist reconsiderations of formalism, structuralism, and semiotics". She states that with Bakhtin's term 'logo-sphere,' his concept of the dialog influenced the development of Lotman's notion of the 'semiosphere', and she ends her article with an appeal: "Lotman transcends the structuralist gridlock in ways that have yet to be recognized by theorists in the West." (Mandelker 2004, 396). Recently, Taras Boyko (2022, 325) has seen Lotman in accordance with Derrida insofar as he replaces identity with self-differentiating.

Edna Andrews (2012) reconstructed the function of auto-communication in Lotman's concept of the memory-code, compared it with Vygotskii's notion of 'inner speech', and related it to the collective semiotic space, which Lotman called semiosphere. In the same year, Peeter Selg and Andreas Ventsel (2012) raised the political theme of hegemony as a subject of semiosphere semiotics. Some books and many articles by Lotman have yet to be translated into English (mostly studies on Russian culture, for example his monographs on Nikolai Karamzin, Alexander Pushkin, and Nikolai Gogol, and his lectures on the Russian aristocracy).

There are two different reports on Lotman's reception in the German speaking cultures by Ol'ga Aspisova (1998) and Nadez[h]da Shevchenko (2004, 146), who states that the most intensive (early) reception of Lotman and his school took place in West Germany (Shevchenko, 2004, 146–149). While Aspisova regards Germany without limiting it to the East or the West, Shevchenko calls her field of research "(West) Germany". Aspisova, who incorrectly states that people in West Germany could not generally buy books published in East Germany (this was limited to books that had also been produced in West German publishing houses), addresses Renate Lachmann, a relevant researcher and a dialogue partner of Lotman's, entirely without motivation as a "pupil" of Juri Striedter (1926–2016), who edited translations of the formalists and promoted Czech structuralism. Perhaps this suggestion is a result of the fact that Striedter (until his switch to Harvard in

1977), Renate Lachmann, and Aleksandar Flaker were initially the only professors to take part in the conferences in which the works of Lotman and his colleagues from Moscow and Tartu were intensively discussed from 1974 on. Up to 2021, they took place in Konstanz, Bochum, Vienna, Zagreb, Hamburg, Munich, Bielefeld, Utrecht, Saarbrücken, Fribourg, Oldenburg, Lovran, and Berlin. An important role as a medium of publication for this open group was played by the *Wiener Slawistischer Almanach*, founded in 1977 by Aage Hansen-Löve (then working in Vienna, later in Munich) and edited by him until 2021, which repeatedly opened its pages to the members of the Tartu–Moscow School School (Lotman, Uspenskii, Toporov, B. Gasparov, Zholkovskii, Sheglov and others).

After a first period when (as in other cultures) the works of the Tartu–Moscow School were discussed (cf. Eimermacher 1969) and reprinted (cf. Eimermacher 1971), there was a period from 1972 until 1986 when many texts of Lotman (1972, 1973a, 1975a) and his colleagues were translated (Eimermacher 1986). A second period of translations from 1997 to 2010 introduced the 'late Lotman' (1997, 2010a, 2010b) to the German-speaking public.

The foundation of the Lotman Institute for Russian and Soviet Culture in Bochum by Karl Eimermacher (*1938) in 1993 falls in between these two periods in the reception of Lotman's work. Eimermacher initiated Lotman editions, Lotman bibliographies (Eimermacher 1972, 1986 Eimermacher and Shivkov 1977) and research on the Tartu–Moscow School of semiotics by his pupils and colleagues, for instance Michael Fleischer (1998), Peter Grzybek (1999), and Georg Witte (2000). As the rich production of this institute (it has a parallel in the Bakhtin Centre founded in Sheffield two years later; see my article on Bakhtin in this volume) has been extensively discussed by Aspisova (1998, 281–282), I refer to her article in which she accurately reports on the critical attitude with regard to the concept of the sign elaborated by Lotman and his colleagues in their main works (Fleischer 1989 and Grzybek 1989). From 1989 to 1995, Michael Fleischer and Peter Grzybek edited *Znakolog, An International Yearbook of Slavic Semiotics* in seven volumes. Fleischer (1987) also extended his research to zoosemiotics and Grzybek to paremiology and neurosemiotics. The Bochum group's active work with the concepts of Moscow and Tartu semioticians seems to have ended with Grzybek's and Eisman's (1994) obituary for Lotman.

In the early years of the new century, Christa Ebert (2002) stated in a profound and fair article that the flowering of semiotics in Tartu owed to a considerable extent to the congruence of the semiotic world of its researchers as a well-hidden referential point. She largely puts the success of Lotman and his compatriots down to their provocative subversive habit. In her eyes, the situation changed with the break-up of the Soviet Union, in which, according to Ebert, Lotman possibly also conceived *Culture and Explosion* as a farewell to semiotics.

Winfried Nöth, the author of a handsome *German Handbook of Semiotics* (Nöth, 2000), was one of the few non-Slavist semioticians to consider Lotman's work. Eight years ago he claimed that Lotman's topography of the semiosphere underwent a change from a structuralist to a post-structuralist conception of culture (Nöth 2015). In this respect he agrees with Albrecht Koschorke, who stated in his narratological monograph *Fact and Fiction* that "over recent decades, a strong convergence has become manifest between literary theory, cultural semiotics, and the history of knowledge". In his opinion, this is related to "career of the concept of narration, a concept that has long marked a counter-pole to the knowledge of science and scholarship" (Koschorke 2018, 268). Koschorke provides four reasons for actual narratology to integrate concepts of Lotman into its practice: 1. The interdependence between the center and the periphery, understood in a semiotic way, whereby there is no dominance by either of the two sides and the periphery shows less subjection to the rules of the system. 2. Lotman's model of communication, which implies a fundmental difference between the codes used by the addressee and the sender, draws no sharp distinction between information and informational noise and considers fundamental processes of translation to be involved. 3. Lotman is seen as a theoretician of disorder who also integrates (systematic) indeterminateness and, besides collective regulations, also individual variance into his model of communication. 4. The parallel between the structure of the semiosphere – which Koschorke (2012) investigated in another context – and the space-grammar of actual theories of power and of imperia (here he refers to Mann 1994) (Koschorke 2018, 93–100). In his chapter "Cultural fields", Koschorke (2018, 86–107) combines theories of the space as developed in Lotman's semiotics of culture with elements from Lévi-Strauss' structural anthropology to form a 'cultural-semiotic model of space', which is characterized by anisotropy, i. e. by uneven density and characterized by a multiple gradient between structural cores and weakly structured zones. This model of an anisotrope sphere of communication completes "a model of the discontinuous distribution of semantic energies", which includes considerations on "meaning as an energy problem" (Koschorke 2012, 148–152).

In the same year, Schamma Schahadat (2012, 170), like Andreas Schönle (2001, 2006), compared Lotman's *poetics of behavior* with Greenblatt's *poetics of culture* and showed that they share the embedding of the literary text in its culture, whereby Lotman, unlike Greenblatt, reads culture itself as a text without different discourses ('codes'), but also with different historical stages, while Greenblatt conceives of it as a discursive field. Schahadat demonstrated that Lotman's marking of the periphery of a cultural unit as the space where most activity takes place corresponds with the geographical and administrative place of Tartu in the Soviet imperium.

In the same anthology where many of the aforementioned articles were published, which (two years after the publication of its German translation) extensively comments on Lotman's *Culture and Explosion*, Renate Lachmann (2012) considers the period of Lotman's publications from the 1960s to the 1970s. She stresses that the attention to axiological aspects demanded the inclusion of the internal point of view in cultures and the difference between the system and the observer. Hence the model has a double function: it is a reductive icon and a concept. Lachmann (2012, 102–103) also considers the different types of 're-codification' and reconstructs the modifications of the notion of the sign and the consequences for Lotman's complex terms of the 'text' and the 'culture', which she unfolds in four different types. At a later juncture she explicates the significance of memory (one of her specialties) for Lotman's model of culture (including its counter-model and the prominent example of the 'Petersburg text'). She closes by emphasizing Lotman's advocacy of an 'open culture' and concludes that the shifts in his main concepts were much less drastic than has often been thought.

In his article in the same publication, Valery Gretchko (2012, 79) focuses on Lotman's model of communicative asymmetry. He shows how the dichotomy of two types of communication runs through Lotman's entire oeuvre and that it is his transfer of concepts deriving from exact sciences into the humanities despite all its semantic frictions that guarantees the productiveness of his research. However, the discontinuity of the scientific discourse is counteracted in Lotman's concept and practice by the exposition and the indispensable use of continuous (iconic) metaphorical terms, which in the picture of the folkloristic 'matryoshka doll' even designate the entire universe of the production and consumption of signs (cf. Nöth 2006).

In his contribution to the volume, Thomas Grob (2012, 133) analyses "Lotman's Concepts of Cultural Historical Dynamics Between Law and Coincidence". He doubts whether the opinion voiced by Deltcheva and Vlasov (1996, 148) that the late work is a 'synthesis' of his former writing holds true and shows how throughout Lotman's work an orientation around scientific methods competes with his attention for the new, for the incoherent. In his reconstruction of Lotman's historical narrative, which correctly points to the incompatibility of Lotman's picture of Pushkin as the originator of Russian realism with his own historical-typological model, we miss the rendition of Lotman's argument that traditional historical inquiry results in 'insight' into the necessity of the historical process, because historians consistently practice a retrospective method which grasps the historical events only as moments of a (narrative) text. This view, argues Lotman, should be relativized, if not corrected, by a prospective view, which allows him to demonstrate that people involved in historical events had a choice and that an alternative history has always been possible. Grob's criticism of Lotman's idealization of

Pushkin in his biography can be explained on the one hand by Lotman's endeavor to show him as a poet who had freed himself from the dominant example of the Romantic hero Byron. However, the strange result of Lotman's Pushkin biography is the picture of the poet as a Romantic genius, which is simply an aesthetic equivalent to Lord Byron!

The editors' epilog to the German translation of Lotman's (2010, 392) monograph *Inside of the Thinking Worlds* reproduces a very disputable passage of the "Introduction" to Schönle's and Shine's *Lotman Compendium*, in which they assert: "We believe that discourse most aptly renders Lotman's sensitivity to the ambivalent function of language, to its ability to convey at once referential and normative representations" (2006, 8). Lotman, who of course knew the French poststructuralist concept of 'discourse' (Foucault, Barthes, Kristeva, et al.) very well, never used the Russian term *diskurs*, neither in his monograph *Culture and Explosion* (Lotman 1992) nor in his book on the semiosphere (Lotman 1996a), nor in *Talks about Russian Culture* (Lotman 2001b). I do not think that it aptly promotes the reception of Lotman's work if we artificially post-modernize his way thinking (cf. Knabe 1995, Rossolatos 2015). Although Lotman (1994, 498), in accordance with poststructuralism, was convinced that the general movement of cultures can be characterized as a transition from language to text, from statics to dynamics, from synchrony to diachrony, he would never have agreed with the idea of a nameless discourse without a responsible personal author.

But of course, we should not do the opposite either: blame Lotman for what he did not do. After his death, Julia Kristeva (1994) published a strange necrology on Iurii Lotman in *PMLA*, saying that nobody looking East from Paris or New York had expected the collapse of the Berlin Wall in the fall of 1989 with all its consequences, but that since the early 1960s fissures in this wall (which had only been built in August 1961!) could have been perceived by Western spectators in the writing of the representatives of Tartu and Moscow semiotics. However, there has been also an examination of the Berlin Wall from the East and West sides of the city. Klaus Städtke, who together with the linguist Ewald Lang edited the Lotman anthology *Kunst als Sprache* (*Art as Language*; Lotman 1981) in East Berlin, was not allowed to publish an already prepared second omnibus with articles by Lotman and Uspenskii. Lotman's German Pushkin biography (1989) with its telling subtitle "Leben als Kunstwerke" ("*Life as a Work of Art*") and Städtke's (1989) epilog about the European orientation of Lotman (cf. Kantor 2009) could not be published until the year the Berlin Wall fell. In a way, despite its involvement in Soviet culture, Lotman's semiotics had indeed, in its self-reliant way, anticipated the collapse of (Soviet) communism.

Since Lotman's death we notice most of the semiotic activity in his chosen homeland, in Estonia, and especially at the universities of Tartu and Tallinn. The

last part of this section is devoted to the reception of Moscow–Tartu semiotics in Estonia, in Tartu and Tallinn. Here, on the one hand additional works of Lotman (2018) are published from his archive or translated from Estonian into Russian and/or English. On the other hand, questions such as the problem of translation, which Lotman and his colleagues had asked but not answered or had touched upon only superficially, are studied more fundamentally (Andrews and Maksimova 2008).

In recent years, Lotman's work with literature has been seen as a contribution to a concept of world literature or even world culture (Kliger 2010). Further research is required on the gender question in Lotman's (2001b, 53) work, provoked by his thesis that in the early nineteenth century female activity in Russian culture had been stimulated by the reading of male poetry.

There seem to be three interesting specifics of the Tartu–Moscow semiotic school, which remain less focused to date. The first is the fact that its concept can be aptly applied to the phenomena of this school itself (autoreflexive relation; cf. Makarychev and Yatsyk 2018, 31). This is only possible with respect to a restricted number of mental subjects (there is a semiotics of semiotics and a philosophy of philosophy, but no astronomy of astronomy). As retrospectives of this object have also been written by semioticians, most of them use semiotic methods with more or less intensity (cf. Städtke 1992). This retrospective self-fashioning of a development became one of its own elements.

A second special feature of the Tartu part of Russian semiotics is the fact that it took place in Estonia, a Soviet republic until 1990, which had its own language. Most of the oral and written communication happened in Russian, but as Lotman himself learned Estonian and wrote and published Estonian articles on semiotics, he contributed to the Estonian culture as well as the Russian. This situation generated a transnational perspective (Pilshchikov and Trunin 2016). And it seems to have been easier to get some texts published in Estonian than in Russian.

The third specialty is a less unique one: some of the representatives of Russian structuralism and semiotics left Russia and continued their work in other countries, most of them in the USA (Aleksandr Zholkovsky, Iurii Shcheglov, Mikhail Gasparov), but others also in Israel (Dmitrii Segal), France (Boris Ougibenin), and Germany (Gabriel Superfin). Some (like Viacheslav Ivanov) worked inside and outside of Russia at the same time. What consequences does this dislocation have for the development of the semiotic concepts and for their historical reconstruction?

In his introduction to the (East) German edition of a collection of articles entitled *Art as Language*, Lotman recalled his development from the analysis of poetry with a focus on phenomena such as meter, rhyme, and verse "to complex and singular artistic literary works, which made a new selection of texts for the

analysis necessary, works from the 18th, 19th and 20th century" (1981, 8). He also drew attention to a new notion of the text which is based on a new understanding of the function of the term 'text' in culture: "The text is the result of the embodiment of a lingual structure in a material substance" (Lotman 1981, 9). The critics of the new development, he argued, tend to reduce the text once again to the old and unproductive opposition of form and content. As the works of literature present a quality of all texts in a condensed form, the artistic text, he stressed, is not a special case of the verbal text; rather, the verbal text is a special case of the artistic text. For Lotman, artistic models are unique combinations of scientific and play-type models: they simultaneously organize both the intellect and behavior. In comparison to art, play is without content, while science is without effect.

In 1994, shortly after the death of his father, Mikhail Lotman (1994, 216) wrote in his article "Behind the Text. Remarks on the Philosophical Background to the Tartu Semiotics (First Article)"): "Iu. M. Lotman was a Kantian". However, in the most influential of his father's books, *The Structure of the Artistic Text*, the name "Kant" appears only in brackets – as a cleverly covert hint to colleagues, "(avoiding the accusation of Kantianism)", significantly in relation to the play-like quality of literature (Lotman 1970, 81). M. Lotman argues that for Iu. Lotman the notion of the 'text' has the function of the 'thing in itself' (*Ding an sich*) in the philosophy of Kant, that is, the rational thing, as it appears in the broadest context of meaningful sentences. From the early 1960s on, Lotman and his companions mapped this broad context as human culture and their research as a 'semiotics of culture' (cf. Lotman 2019 *Culture, Memory and History*; on memory, cf. Lachmann 2022). In doing so, they did not have to perform the 'cultural turn' in literary criticism in the Anglophone world of the 1980s and 1990s.

In 1989, Lotman repeatedly referred to Leibniz, whose monadology (cf. Goodman 1978) seemed to be also applicable to a model of the notion of the 'text': "Culture as a subject and an object in itself." (Lotman 2001, 640). But in his article on "conditionality/convention" for the *Philosophical Encyclopedia* Lotman and Uspenskii (1970, 287) quoted Kant (on the contentlessness of beauty, without distancing themselves from him) but they did not quote Leibniz.

Russian semiotics was founded in the 1960s on a structural concept of the literary text and in a programmatic article of Lotman; it was combined with the demand for exact knowledge: "Literary criticism has to be a science." (Lotman 1967, 90). This scientific appeal also manifested itself in the title of Lotman's first monograph (1972): *Analizis poėticheskogo teksta* (*The Analysis of the Poetic Text*), and in some cases was orientated towards mathematical methods like those of the French mathematicians who published under the pseudonym of Nicolas Bourbaki (Lotman 1964b, 4). Waldstein has reconstructed how in its development Russian

literary structuralism and semiotics became emancipated from a strict scientific concept of research to a more open concept of different possibilities:

> If the target of radical Western intellectuals of the 1960s and later decades was existing class, gender, and race privilege embodied in educational institutions, Soviet intellectuals were more concerned about preserving their privilege as knowledge- and cultural tradition-producers and transmitters. (2008, 134–35)

Natal'ja Avtonomova (2009, 206) stated that Lotman never gave up the criterion of scientific quality, although its foundation shifted from the model of the natural sciences to hermeneutics in the humanities. One of its most striking features is the condition that via his/her investigation the semiotician becomes part of the object of his/her research (Lotman 1994, 502–503).

In his reflections on the "Semiotika kul'tury v tartusko-moskovskoi shkole" ("Semiotics of Culture in the Tartu–Moscow Semiotic School"), which he wrote at the end of his life and in which we can identify an (unintended) self-obituary, Lotman (2002) divided all researchers into two groups: one which asks questions and one which provides answers to those questions. He included himself in the first category, which in his opinion has to do the much more difficult work. He saw his texts as belonging to the reflection on the further development of semiotic research in culture and the investigations of concrete materials of cultural studies. As he did not like polemics, he did not publicly criticize, for instance, the linguo-centric vision of Jakobson, but practiced his own concept of the pluralism of many different languages in culture. And he considered semiotic research an empirical discipline, which brings us back to the suspicion of positivism. However, this seemingly naive way of thinking has its origin in the knowledge that semiotics was initially the art of the doctor who, reading the signs on the body of the ill person, recognizes a disease (Lotman 2001a, 462–484). One of the most important perspectives that the Tartu and Moscow semioticians and especially Iurii Lotman opened for future research is the problem of a semiotic history (cf. Torop 2005). While writing the present article, the author of these lines realized that he had taken the conscious decision to become involved in the dialog about the history of semiotics once more, and that in doing so he himself has once again become part of the semiotics of the semiosphere.

References

Andrews, Edna. "Lotman and the cognitive sciences: The role of autocommunication in the language of memory." *Explosion und Peripherie: Jurii Lotmans Semiotik der kulturellen Dynamik revisited*. Eds. Susi Frank, Cornelia Ruhe, and Alexander Schmitz. Bielefeld: Transcript, 2012. 175–190.

Andrews, Edna, and Elena Maksimova. "Semiospheric transitions: A key to modeling translation." *Sign systems studies* 36.3 (2008): 259–269.

Ankersmit, Frank. *Narrative Logic: A Semantic Analysis of the Historian's Language*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1983.

Aspisova, Ol'ga. "Vospriiatie moskovsko tartuskoi semioticheskoi shkoly v Germanii." *Moskovsko-Tartuskaia shkola: Istoriia, vospominaniia, razmyshleniia*. Ed. Sergei Nekliudov. Moscow: Iazyki russkoi kul'tury, 1998. 276–293.

Auffret, Dominique. *Alexandre Kojève: La philosophie, l'état, la fin de l'histoire*. Paris: Grasset, 1990.

Avtonomova, Natal'ia: *Otkrytaia struktura: Iakobson. Bakhtin. Lotman. Gasparov*. Moscow: Tsentr gumanitarnykh initsiativ, 2019.

Balakhovskaia, Elena. "Moskovsko-Tartuskaia semioticheskaia shkola vo Frantsii: Budet li pereizdana v Parizhe 'Struktura khudozhestvennogo teksta'?" *Moskovsko-Tartuskaia semioticheskaia shkola: Istoriia, vospominaniia, razmyshleniia*. Ed. Sergei Nekliudov. Moscow: Iazyki russkoi kul'tury, 1998. 294–309.

Balashov, Nikolai, and Iurii Karaulov. "Put' russkogo filologa v XX veke: K 100-letiiu so dnia rozhdeniia akademika M.B. Khrapchenko." *Vestnik Rossiiskoi akademii nauk* 75.12 (2005): 1123–1132.

Baran, Henryk [Baran, Khenrik]. "Retseptsiia moskovsko-tartuskoi semioticheskoi shkoly v SShA i Velikobritanii." *Moskovsko-Tartuskaia semioticheskaia shkola: Istoriia, vospominaniia, razmyshleniia*. Ed. Sergei Nekliudov. Moscow: Iazyki russkoi kul'tury, 1998. 246–275.

Barthes, Roland. *Mythologies*. Paris: Seuil, 1957.

Bauer, Matthias, and Maren Jäger (eds.). *Mythopoetik in Film und Literatur: Studien zu Natur, Kultur und Film*. Vol. 5 of *Projektionen*. Munich: Richard Boorberg, 2011.

Berdiaev, Nikolai. *O rabstve i svobode cheloveka (Opyt personalisticheskoi filosofii)*. Paris: Ymca-press, 1939.

Bierl, Anton. "Literatur und Religion als Rito- und Mythopoetik: Überblicksartikel zu einem neuen Ansatz in der Klassischen Philologie." Anton Bierl, Rebecca Lämmle, Katharina Wesselmann, *Literatur und Religion: Wege zu einer mythisch-rituellen Poetik bei den Griechen. Mythos. Eikon. Poiesis*. Vol. 1. Berlin and New York, NY: De Gruyter, 2007, 1–76.

Birnbaum, Henrik. "Semiotic Modeling Systems, Primary and Secondary." *Language Sciences* 12 (1990): 53–63.

Boyko, Taras. "History." *The Companion to Juri Lotman: A Semiotic Theory of Culture*. Eds. Marek Tam and Peeter Torop. London: Bloomsbury, 2022. 245–256.

Burlak, Svetlana, and Sergei Starostin. *Sravnitel'no-istoricheskoe iazykoznanie*. Moscow: Akademiia, 2005.

Cassirer, Ernst. *Philosophie der symbolischen Formen*. Vol. 1. Berlin: Cassirer, 1923.

Chang, Han-liang. "Is language a primary modelling system? On Iurii Lotman's concept of semiosphere." *Sign Systems Studies* 31.2 (2003): 9–23.

Danto, Arthur C. *Analytical Philosophy of History*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1965.

Deltcheva, Roumiana, and Eduard Vlasov. "Lotman's 'Culture and explosion': A shift in the paradigm of the semiotics of culture." *Slavic and East European Journal* 40 (1996): 148–152.

Dëmin Il'ia V. *Semiotika istorii i germenevtika istoricheskogo opyta: Monografiia*. Samara: Samarskaia gumanitarnaia akademiia, 2017.

de Tienne, André. "The Flow of Time and the Flow of Signs: A Basis for Peirce's Cosmosemiotics." *The American Journal of Semiotics* 31.1/2 (2015): 29–53.

de Valk, Frans. Review of *Poétika kompozicii*, by Boris Uspenski. *Russian Literature* 2 (1972): 165–175.

Eco, Umberto. "Introduction." Iurii Lotman, *Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture*. Trans. by Ann Shukman. London and New York, NY: I. B. Tauris, 1990, vii–xiii.

Egorov, Boris F. *Zhizn' i tvorchestvo Iu. M. Lotmana*. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 1999.

Eimermacher, Karl. "Entwicklung, Charakter und Probleme des sowjetischen Strukturalismus in der Literaturwissenschaft." *Sprache im technischen Zeitalter* 30 (1969): 126–157.

Eimermacher, Karl (ed.). *Teksty sovetskogo literaturovedcheskogo strukturalizma / Texte des sowjetischen literaturwissenschaftlichem Strukturalismus*. Munich: Fink, 1971.

Eimermacher, Karl. *Semiotica sovietica: Sowjetische Arbeiten der Moskauer und Tartuer Schule zu sekundären modellbildenden Systemen (1962–1973)*. Vol. 2. Ed. Karl Eimermacher. Aachen: Raderberg, 1986.

Eimermacher, Karl, and Serge Shishkoff. *Subject Bibliography of Soviet Semiotics: The Moscow–Tartu School*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan, 1977.

Emerson, Caryl. Review of *Five Operas and a Symphony: Words and Music in Russian Culture*, by Boris Gasparov. *Pushkin Review/Pushkinskii vestnik* 8–9 (2005–2006): 141–144.

Ėrlikh, Sergei. "U menia stoiala troika po istorii KPSS: No v aspiranturu menia vse zhe vziali". Interv'iu s B. A. Uspenskim." *Istoričeskaja ėkspertiza: Zhurnal retsenzii* 14.1 (2018): 347–359.

Faryno, Jerzy. "Zagadnienia teorii tekstu literackiego na lamach zeszytów naukowych Uniwersytetu Tartuskiego: (Historia – dynamika – spójność – funkcja – typologia)." *Pamiętnik literacki* LVII.4 (1971): 346–381.

Ferrari Bravo, Luigi. "La scienza letteraria sovietica in Italia: Saggo bibliografico. 1969–1977." *Strumenti critici* 36–37 (October 1978): 353–412.

Fleischer, Michael. *Die sowjetische Semiotik: Theoretische Grundlagen der Moskauer und Tartuer Schule*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 1989.

Fleischer, Michael. "Die Schule von Moskau und Tartu." *Semiotik. Semiotics: Ein Handbuch zu den zeichentheoretischen Grundlagen der Natur und Kultur*. Eds. H. Posner, K. Robering, and Th. A. Sebeok. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1998. 2289–2299.

Foucault, Michel. "Different spaces." Michel Foucault, *Aesthetic, Method and Epistemology: Essential works*. Ed. James Faubion. Vol. 2. New York, NY: The New York Press 1998, 175–185.

Foucault, Michel. *Religion and Culture*. Ed. Jeremy R. Carrette. New York, NY: Routledge, 1999.

Frank, Susi. "St. Petersburg: Exzentrische Moderne." *Handbuch Literatur & Raum*. Eds. Jörg Dünne and Andreas Mahler. Berlin and Boston, MA: De Gruyter, 2015. 461–467.

Fukuyama, Francis. "The end of history?" *The National Interest* 16 (Summer 1989): 3–18.

Gasparov, Boris M. "Tartuskaia shkola 1960-kh godov kak semioticheskii fenomen." *Moskovsko-tartuskaia semioticheskaia shkola: Istoriia, vospominaniia, razmyshleniia*. Ed. Sergei Nekliudov. Moscow: Shkola "Iazyki russkoi kul'tury", 1998a. 57–69.

Gasparov, Boris. "Pochemu ya perestal byt' strukturalistom?" *Moskovsko-tartuskaia semioticheskaia shkola: Istoriia, vospominaniia, razmyshleniia*. Ed. Sergei Nekliudov. Moscow: Shkola "Iazyki russkoi kul'tury", 1998b. 93–96.

Gasparov, Mikhail. "Vzgliad iz ugla." *Moskovsko-Tartuskaia semioticheskaia shkola. Istoriia, vospominaniia, razmyshleniia*. Ed. Sergei Nekliudov. Moscow: Iazyki russkoi kul'tury, 1998. 113–116.

Gasparov, Boris. *Five Symphonies and an Opera: Word and Music in Russian Culture*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2005.

Gasparov, Boris. *Speech, Memory, and Meaning: Intertextuality in Everyday Language*. Berlin and New York, NY: De Gruyter and Mouton, 2010.

Gasparov, Mikhail. "Iu. M. Lotman: nauka i ideologija." Iurii M. Lotman, *O poėtakh i poėzii*. St. Petersburg: Iskusstvo-SPB, 1996. 9–16.

Geertz, Clifford. "Thick description: Toward an interpretive Theory of Culture." Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. New York, NY: Basic Books, 1973. 3–30.

Gershenzon, Mikchail. *Videnie poėta*. Moscow: Vtoraia tipografiia MGSNKH, 1919.

Goodman, Nelson. *Ways of Worldmaking*. Indianapolis, IN: Harvester Press, 1978.

Gorbachevich, K.S. (ed.). *Slovar' sovremennogo literaturnogo iazyka v 20 tt*. Vol. 2. Moscow: Russkii iazyk, 1991.

Gramigna, Remo. "Lotman in English: A bibliography." *The Companion to Juri Lotman: Semiotic Theory of Culture*. Eds. Marek Tamm and Peeter Torop. London: Bloomsbury 2021. 489–516.

Granits, Ishtvan. "Tartusko-moskovskaia semioticheskaia shkola: Vzgliad iz Vengrii." *Moskovsko-Tartuskaia semioticheskaia shkola: Istoriia, vospominaniia, razmyshleniia*. Ed. Sergei Nekliudov. Moscow: Iazyki russkoi kul'tury. 1998. 309–339.

Grazzini, Serena. *Der strukturalistische Zirkel: Theorien über Mythos und Märchen bei Propp, Lévi-Strauss, Meletinskii*. Wiesbaden: Deutscher Universitäts-Verlag 1999.

Gretchko, Valerii. "Juri Lotmans Modell der kommunikativen Asymmetrie: Entstehung und Implikationen." *Explosion und Peripherie: Jurij Lotmans Semiotik der kulturellen Dynamik revisited*. Eds. Susi Frank, Cornelia Ruhe, and Alexander Schmitz. Bielefeld: Transcript, 2012.

Grintser, Pavel. "Opredelenie poėzii v sanskritskoi poėtike." *Problemy teorii literatury i ėstetiki v stranakh Vostoka*. Moskva: Nauka, 1964. 35–61.

Grishakova, Marina, and Silvi Salupere. "A school in the woods: Tartu-Moscow Semiotics." *Theoretical Schools and Circles in the Twentieth Century: Humanities. Literary Theory, History, Philosophy*. Eds. Marina Grishakova and Silvi Salupere. New York, NY: Routledge 2015. 173–195.

Grob, Thomas. "Der doppelte Lotman: Jurij Lotmans Konzeptionen kulturhistorischer Dynamik zwischen Gesetz und Zufall." *Explosion und Peripherie: Jurij Lotmans Semiotik der kulturellen Dynamik*. Eds. Susi K. Frank, Cornelia Ruhe, and Alexander Schmitz. Bielefeld: transcript, 2012. 133–152.

Grübel, Rainer. Review of *Struktura khudozhestvennogo teksta*, by Iurii Lotman. *Kritikon litterarum* 1.1 (1972) 203–208.

Grübel, Rainer. "Nachwort des Herausgebers." Jurij Lotman, *Die Struktur des künstlerischen Textes*. Ed. Rainer Grübel. Trans. by Rainer Grübel, Walter Kroll, and Hans-Eberhard Seidel. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1973. 451–459.

Grübel, Rainer. "Einleitung." Jurij M. Lotman, *Die Analyse des poetischen Textes*. Ed. and trans. by Rainer Grübel. Kronberg: Scriptor 1975. I–X.

Grübel, Rainer. "'Physiker und Lyriker'." *'Voz'mi na radost'': To Honour Jeanne van der Eng-Liedmeier*. Amsterdam: Slavic Seminar, The University of Amsterdam, 1980. 207–229.

Grübel, Rainer. "Formalismus und Strukturalismus." *Grundzüge der Literaturwissenschaft.* Eds. Heinz-Ludwig Arnold and Heinrich Detering. Munich: dtv, 1996. 343–366.

Grübel, Rainer. "Entwürfe der poetischen Sprache in der Russistik." *Handbuch der sprachwissenschaftlichen Russistik und ihrer Grunddisziplinen*. Ed. Helmut Jachnow. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1999. 1245–1273.

Grübel Rainer. "Äquivalenz vs. Ambivalenz: Die axiologische Basis von Chlebnikovs Poetik." *Literature and Beyond: Festschrift for Willem G. Weststeijn on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*. Vol. 1. Eds. Eric de Haard et al. Amsterdam: Pegasus, 2008. 263–273.

Grübel, Rainer, and Igor' Smirnov. "Die Geschichte der russischen Kulturosophie im 19. und frühen 20. Jahrhundert." *'Mein Russland': Literarische Konzeptualisierungen und kulturelle Projektionen*. Ed. Aage Hansen-Löve. Special Issue of *Wiener Slawistischer Almanach* 44 (1997): 5–18.

Grzybek, Peter. *Lechts und Rinks kann man nicht velwechsern?!? Zur Neurosemiotik sprachlicher Kommunikation*. Trier: Linguistic agency, University of Trier, 1984.

Grzybek, Peter. *Studien zum Zeichenbegriff der sowjetischen Semiotik*: (Moskauer und Tartuer Schule). Bochum: Brockmeyer, 1989.

Grzybek, Peter. "The Concept of 'Model' in Soviet Semiotics." *Russian Literature* 36.3 (1994a): 285–300.

Grzybek, Peter. "Semiotics of history – historical cultural semiotics?" *Semiotica* 98.3/4 (1994b): 341–356.

Hansen-Löve, Aage. *Der russische Formalismus: Methodologische Rekonstruktion seiner Entwicklung aus dem Prinzip der Verfremdung*. Vienna: Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1978.

Hansen-Löve, Aage. *Der russische Symbolismus: System und Entwicklung seiner Motive.* Vol. 1: *Diabolischer Symbolismus*. Vienna: Österr. Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1989.

Hansen-Löve, Aage. *Der russische Symbolismus: System und Entfaltung der poetischen Motive*. Vol. 2: *Mythopoetischer Symbolismus, Kosmische Symbolik*. Vienna: Österr. Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1998.

Hansen-Löve, Aage. *Der russische Symbolismus: System und Entfaltung der poetischen Motive*. Vols. 3.1: *Mythopoetischer Symbolismus*. 3.2: *Lebensmotive*. Vienna: Verlag der Österr. Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2014.

Hansen-Löve, Aage. "Perspektivy russkogo formalizma: logocentrizm vchera i segodnja. Ėpocha 'Ostraneniia'." *Russkii formalizm i sovremennoe gumanitarnoe znanie*. Eds. Ia. Levchenko and I. Pil'shchikov. Moscow: NLO, 2017. 21–41.

Hansen-Löve, Aage. "Ėvoljucija protiv istorii." *Ėnergija krizisa: Sbornik v čest' 77-letija I.P. Smirnova*. Eds. Koreliia Ičin and Ivan Kalinin. Moscow: NLO, 2019.

Hawke, Terence. *Structuralism and Semiotics*. 2nd Edition. Berkely and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1977.

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *Werke in 20 Bänden mit Registerband*. Vol. 12: *Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Geschichte*. Eds. Eva Mollenhauer and Karl Markus Michel. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1986.

Holenstein, Elmar. *Roman Jakobsons phänomenologischer Strukturalismus*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1975.

Horkheimer, Max, and Theodor Adorno. *Die Dialektik der Aufklärung*. Amsterdam: Querido, 1944.

Iakobson, Roman, and Iurii Tynianov. "Problemy izucheniia litratury i iazyka." *Novyi Lef* 12 (1928): 36–37.

Ićin, Kornelija [Ichin, Korneliia] (ed.). *Filosofiia kosmizma i russkaia kul'tura*. Belgrade, Filosofskiji fakul'tet, 2004.

Iudin, Aleksei. "Svjaz' mifologii i literatury v trudakh V. Toporova." [2018] https://biblio.ugent. be/publication/8619995/file/8620002.pdf (27 February 2022).

Ivanov, Viacheslav. *Chet i nechet: Asimmetriia mozga i znakovykh sistem*. Moscow: Sovetskoe radio, 1978.

Ivanov, Viacheslav. *Ocherki po istorii semiotiki v SSSR*. Moscow: Nauka 1979.

Ivanov, Viacheslav. "Dominanta v tvorchestvo Bakhtina: dialog i karnaval." *Russian philology and history: in honour of professor Victor Levin*. Ed. W. Moskovich. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1992. 320–332.

Ivanov, Viacheslav V. "Èstetika Èizenshteina." Viacheslav Ivanov, *Izbrannye trudy po semiotike i istorii kul'tury*. Vol. 1. *Znakovye sistemy. Kino. Poètika*. Moscow: Shkola Iazyki russkoi kul'tury, 1998a. S. 143–380.

Ivanov, Viacheslav V. "Ocherki po predystorii i istorii semiotiki." Viacheslav Ivanov, *Izbrannye trudy po semiotike i istorii kul'tury*. Vol.1: *Znakovye sistemy. Kino. Poètika*. Moscow: Shkola Iazyki russkoi kul'tury, 1998b. 605–812.

Ivanov, Viacheslav V. *Dual'nye struktury v antropologii: Kurs lektsii*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo RGGU, 2008.

Ivanov, Viacheslav, and Taman Gamkrelidze. *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans: A reconstruction and historical analysis of a proto-language and a proto-culture*. 2 vols. Vol. 1. Trans. by Johanna Nichols. Berlin and New York, NY: Mouton and De Gruyter, 1994.

Ivanov, Viacheslav, and Vladimir Toporov. "Zmei Gorynych." *Mifologicheskiy slovar'*. Ed. Eleazar. M. Meletinskii. Moscow: Sovetskaia ènciklopediia, 1991. 220–221.

Jakobson, Roman. "Linguistics and poetics." *Style in Language*. Ed. T. Sebeok. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1960. 350–377.

Jakobson, Roman. "Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry." [1961] *Lingua* 21 (1968): 225–232.

Jakobson, Roman. *Formal'naia shkola i sovremennoe russkoe literaturovedenie*. Eds. T. Glanc and D. Sichavin. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kul'tur 2011.

Kagan, Moisei. "Itak, strukturalizm ili antistrukturalizm." *Voprosy literatury* 2 (1969): 113–134.

Kalinin Il'ia. "Tartusko-moskovskaia semioticheskaia shkola: Semioticheskaia model' kul'tury. Kul'turnaia model' semiotiki." *NLO* 98.4 (2009): 27–55.

Kartsevskii, Sergei [Karcevskii, Sergej]. "Du dualisme asymétrique du signe linguistique." *Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Prague* 1 (1929): 88–92.

Khrapchenko, Mikhail. "Iazyk khudozhestvennoi literatury." *Novyi mir 9* (1983): 235–248.

Klein, Lev. *Voskreshenie Peruna: K rekonstruktsii vostochnoslavianskogo iazychestva*. St. Petersburg: Evraziia, 2004.

Kliger, Ilya. "World literature beyond hegemony in Yuri M. Lotman's cultural semiotics." *Comparative Critical Studies* 7.2/3 (2010): 257–274.

Knabe, G.S. "Znak. Istina. Krug: Iu.M. Lotman i problema postmoderna." *Lotmanovskii sbornik*. Vol. 1. Ed. Evgenii Permiakov. Moscow: ITS-Garant, 1995. 266–277.

Kojève, Alexandre. *Le concept, le temps et le discours: Introduction au Système du Savoir*. Paris: Gallimard, 1990.

Kolmogorov, Andrei. *Trudy po stikhovedeniiu*. Ed. A. V. Prokhorov. Moscow: MCNMO, 2015.

Koschorke, Albrecht. "Zur Funktionsweise kultureller Peripherien." *Explosion und Peripherie: Jurij Lotmans Semiotik der kulturellen Dynamik revisited*. Eds. Susi Frank, Cornelia Ruhe, and Alexander Schmitz. Bielefeld: Transcript, 2012. 27–39.

Koschorke, Albrecht. *Fact and Fiction: Elements of a General Theory of Narrative*. Trans. by Joel Golb. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2018.

Koserina, Ėlina. *Nauchno-pedagogicheskoe nasledie Iu.M. Lotmana: Aftoreferat*. Smolensk: Smolenskii gosudarstvennii universitet, 2007.

Kotov, Kaie, and Kalevi Kull, 2006. "Semiosphere versus biosphere." *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Ed. Keith Brown. Vol. 11 (2nd edition). Oxford: Elsevier, 194–198.

Kozhinov, Vadim. "Vozmozhna li strukturnaia poėtika?" *Voprosy literatury* 6 (1965): 88–107.

Kristeva, Julia. "La nouvelle sémiologie en URSS." *Tel Quel* 35 (1968).

Kristeva, Julia. *Semeiotike: Recherches pur une sémanalyse*. Paris: Éditions du Seul, 1969.

Kristeva, Julia. "On Yury Lotman." Trans. by Martha Noel Evans. *PMLA* 109.3 (1994): 375–376.

Kull, Kalevi. "Juri Lotman in English: Bibliography." *Sign Systems Studies* 39.2–4 (2011): 232–356.

Kull, Kalevi, and Ekaterina Velmezova. "O paradokse 'semiotiki zhizni': raboty poslednikh let Iuriia Lotmana." *Slovo.ru: Baltic accent* 9.4 (2018): 6–14.

Kuzovkina, Tat'jana, and Sergei Daniel. *Juri Lotmani autoportreed. Avtoportret Ju.M. Lotmana. Juri Lotman's self-portraits*. Tallin: Tallina Ülikoolo kirjastus, 2016.

Kvan, Kim Su. *Osnovnye aspekty tvorcheskoi évoliucii Iu. M Lotmana: Konechnost', prostranstvennost', mifologichnost', lichnost'*. Moscow: NLO 2003.

Lachmann, Renate. "Value aspects in Jurii Lotman's 'semiotics of culture/semiotics of text'." Trans. by Raoul Eshelman and Marc Davis. *Dispositio* 12 (1987): 13–33.

Lachmann, Renate. *Gedächtnis und Literatur: Intertextualität in der russischen Moderne*. Frankfurt/M., 1990. [English translation: *Memory and Literature: Intertextuality in Russian Modernism*. Trans. by Roy Sellars and Anthony Wall. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.]

Lachmann, Renate. "Stadt als Phantasma." *Die Stadt in der europäischen Romantik*. Ed. G. von Graevenitz. Würzburg: Königausen & Neumann, 2000. 227–250.

Lachmann, Renate. "Die vorexplosive Phase." *Explosion und Peripherie: Jurij Lotmans Semiotik der kulturellen Dynamik revisited*. Eds. Susi K. Frank, Cornelia Ruhe, and Alexander Schmitz. Bielefeld: Transcript, 2012. 97–118.

Lamarche Marrese, Michelle. "'The poetics of everyday behavior' revisited: Lotman, Gender, and the Evolution of Russian Noble Identity." *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 11.4 (2004): 701–739.

Landolt, Emanuel. "Histoire d'un dialogue impossible: J. Kristeva, J. Lotman et la sémiotique." *Langage et société* 142.4 (2012): 121–140.

Lavrov, Aleksandr. "Neskol'ko slov o Zare Grigor'evne Mints, redaktore i vdokhnovitele tartuskikh 'Blokovskikh sbornikov'." *Blokovskii sbornik* 12 (1993): 6–10.

Lavrov Aleksandr. "Aleksandr Blok v trudakh i dniakh Z. G. Mints." *Blok i russkii simvolizm: izbrannye trudy: v trekh knigakh*. Vol. 1: *Aleksandr Blok i russkie pisateli*. Ed. Zara Mints. St. Petersburg: Iskusstvo, 1999. 7–20.

Levit, George, Wolfgang Krumbein, and Rainer Grübel. "Space and Time in the Works of V.I. Vernadsky." *Biogeology* 4 (2001): 377–396.

Le Roy, Edouard. *Les origines humaines et l'évolution de l'intelligence*. Paris: Boivin & Cie, 1928.

Lipovetskii, Mark, and Mikhail Berg. "Mutatsii sovetskosti i sud'ba sovetskogo liberalizma v literaturnoi kritike semidesiatykh: 1970–1985." *Istoriia russkoi literaturnoi kritiki: Sovetskaia i postsovetskaia epokhi*. Eds. N. Dobrenko and Galin Tikhanov. Moscow: NLO, 2011. 477–532.

Lipovetskii, Mark, and Il'ia Kikulin. *Partizanskii logos: Proekt Dmitriia Aleksandrovicha Prigova*. Moscow: NLO, 2022.

Lotman, Iurii. "Problema skhodstva iskusstva i zhizni v svete struktural'nogo podkhoda." *Tezisy dokladov pervoi nauchnoi regional'noi sessii*. Gor'kii 1962. 92–102.

Lotman, Iurii. "O razgranichenii lingvisticheskogo i literaturovedcheskogo poniatiia struktury." *Voprosy iazykoznaniia* 3 (1963): 44–52.

Lotman, Iurii. (ed.) *Programma i tezisy dokladov v letnei shkole po vtorichnym modeliruyushchim sistemam*. Tartu: Tartuskii Gosudarstvennyj universitet, 1964a.

Lotman, Iurii. *Trudy po znakovym sistemam*. Vol. 1: *Lektsii po struktural'noj poètike*: *Vvedenie, teoriia stikha*. Tartu: Tartuskii Universitet, 1964b.

Lotman, Iurii. "Literaturovedenie dolzhno byt' naukoi." *Voprosy literatury* 1 (1967): 90–100.

Lotman, Iurii. *Struktura khudozhestvennogo teksta*. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1970.

Lotman, Iurii. *Analiz poèticheskogo teksta: Struktura stikha*. Leningrad: Prosveshchenie, 1972.

Lotman, Iurii [Lotman, Jurij M.]. *Die Struktur des künstlerischen Textes*. Ed. Rainer Grübel. Trans. by Rainer Grübel, Walter Kroll, and Hans-Eberhard Seidel. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1973a.

Lotman, Iurii. *Semiotika kino i problemy kinoèstetiki*. Tallin: Éésti Raamat, 1973b.

Lotman, Iurii [Lotman, Jurij M.]. *Die Analyse des poetischen Textes*. Ed. and trans. by Rainer Grübel. Kronberg: Scriptor, 1975a.

Lotman, Iurii. "Pamiati Petra Grigor'evicha Bogatyreva." *Trudy po znakovym sistemam* 7 (1975b): 5–6.

Lotman, Iurii. "Tema kart i kartochnoi igry v russkoj literature nachala XIX v." *Trudy po znakovym sistemam* 7 (1975c): 120–142.

Lotman, Juri M. *Kunst als Sprache*. Eds. Ewald Lang and Klaus Städtke. Leipzig: Reclam, 1981.

Lotman, Juri. *Aleksandr Sergeevich Pushkin: Biografiia pisatelia*. Leningrad: Prosveshchenie, 1983.

Lotman, Iurii M. "Simvolika Peterburga i problemy semiotiki goroda." *Trudy po zakovym sistemam* 18 (1984): 30–45.

Lotman, Iurii. *Sotvorenie Karamzina: Pisateli o pisateliakh*. Moscow: Kniga 1987.

Lotman, Iurii. *Alexander Puschkin: Leben als Kunstwerk*. Trans. by Beate Petras. Leipzig: Reclam, 1989.

Lotman, Iurii. *Universe of the mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture*. Trans. by Ann Shukman. London and New York, NY: I. B. Tauris, 1990.

Lotman, Iurii. "O dvukh modeliakh kommunikacii v sisteme kul'tury." Iurii Lotman, *Izbrannye stat'i*. Vol. 1. Tallinn: Aleksandra, 1992a. 76–89.

Lotman, Iurii. "Dekabrist v povsednevnoi zhizni: Bytovoye povedenie kak istoriko-psikhologicheskaia kategoriia." Iurii Lotman, *Izbrannye stat'i*. Vol. 1. Tallinn: Aleksandra, 1992b. 296–336.

Lotman, Iurii M. "Na poroge nepredskazuemogo." Iurii Lotman, *Vospitanie dushi*. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1993a. 177–180.

Lotman, Iurii M. "V mire groteska i filosofii." Iurii Lotman, *Vospitanie dushi*. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1993b. 118–127.

Lotman, Iurii M. *Izbrannye stat'i v trekh tomakh*. Vol. 3. Tallinn: Alleksandra 1993d.

Lotman, Iurii M. *Vospitanie dushi*. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1993d.

Lotman, Iurii M. "Zametki o tartuskikh semioticheskikh izdaniiakh." *Iu. M. Lotman i tartusko-moskovskaia semioticheskaia shkola*. Ed. Aleksei Koshelev. Moscow: Gnozis, 1994a. 497–503.

Lotman, Iurii. "Theses Towards a Semiotics of Russian Culture." *Elementa: Journal of Slavic Studies & Comparative Culture* 1.3 (1994b): 219–227.

Lotman, Iurii M. *Vnutri mysliashchikh mirov: Chelovek – tekst – semiosfera – istoriia*. Moscow: Iazyki russkoi kul'tury, 1996a.

Lotman, Iurii. "O roli tipologicheskikh simvolov v istorii kul'tury." Iurii Lotman, *Vnutri mysliashchikh mirov. Chelovek. Tekst. Semiosfera. Istoriia*. Moscow: Iazyki russkoi kul'tury, 1996b. 357–379.

Lotman, Iurii. "Zimnie zametki o letnikh shkolakh." *Moskovsko-tartuskaia semioticheskaia shkola: Istoriia, vospominaniia, razmyshleniia*. Ed. Sergei Nekliudov. Moscow: Shkola "Iazyki russkoi kul'tury", 1998. 85–88.

Lotman, Iurii. *La Sémiosphère*. Trans. by Anka Ledenko. Limoges: PULIM, DL, 1999.

Lotman, Iurii M. *Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture*. Trans. by Ann Shukman. Ed. Umberto Eco. Bloomington, IN, and Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Press, 2000.

Lotman, Iurii. *Semiosfera: Kul'tura i vzryv. Stat'i. Issledovania. Zametki*. St. Petersburg: Iskusstvo, 2001a.

Lotman, Iurii. *Besedy o russkoj kul'ture: Byt i tradicii russkogo dvorianstva (XVIII – nachalo XIX veka)*. St Peterburg: Iskusstvo SPb, 2001b.

Lotman, Iurii. "Semiotika kul'tury v tartusko-moskovskoi shkole. Predvaritel'nye zamechaniia." Iurii Lotman, *Istoriia i tipologiia russkoi kul'tury*. St. Petersburg: Iskusstvo, 2002. 5–20.

Lotman, Iurii. "Ne-memuary." Iurii Lotman, *Vospitanie dushi: Vospominaniia. Interv'iu. Besedy o russkoi kul'ture (televizionnye lekcii)*. St. Petersburg: Iskusstvo, 2005. 8–51.

Lotman, Iurii. *Culture and explosion*. Trans. by Wilma Clark. Ed. Marina Grishakova. Berlin: Mouton and De Gruyter, 2009.

Lotman, Iurii. [Lotman, Jurij]. *Kultur und Explosion*. Eds. Susi K. Frank, Cornelia Ruhe, and Alexander Schmitz. Trans. by Dorothea Trottenberg. Frankfurt/M. Suhrkamp, 2010.

Lotman, Iurii, and Elena Pogosian. *Dining with Nobility in the Heyday of the Russian Empire*. Trans. by Marian Schwartz. Totnes, Devon: Prospect Books, 2014.

Lotman, Iurii. *O strukturalizme: Paboty 1965–1970 godov*. Tallinn: Izdatel'stvo TLU, 2018.

Lotman, Iurii, Boris Egorov, and Zara Mints. "Osnovnyye étapy razvitiia russkogo realizma." *Uchenye zapiski tatarskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta* 98 (1960): 3–23.

Lotman, Iurii, et al. "Theses on the Semiotic Study of Cultures." *The Tell-Tale Sign: A Survey of Semiotics*. Ed. T. A. Sebeok. Lisse: de Ridder, 1973. 57–84.

Lotman, Iurii, and Boris Uspenskii. "Myth – name – culture." *Soviet Studies in Literature: A Journal of Translations* 11.2/3 (spring/summer 1975): 17–46.

Lotman, Iurii, and Boris Uspenskii. "Rol' dual'nykh modelei v dinamike russkoi kul'tury: do kontsa XVIII veka." *Trudy po russkoi i slavianskoi filologii*. Vol. 28: *Literaturovedenie*. Tartu: Tartuskii Gosudarstvennyi universitet, 1977. 3–36.

Lotman, Iurii, and Iurii Tsiv'ian. *Dialog s ékranom*. Tallinn: Aleksandra, 1994.

Lotman, Mikhail. "Za tekstom: Zametki o filosofskom fone tartuskoi semiotiki. Stat'ia pervaia." *Lotmanovskii sbornik*. Vol. 1. Ed. E. Permiakov. Moscow: IC-Garant, 1994. 214–222.

Lotman, Mikhail. "A few notes on the philosophical background of the Tartu School of semiotics." *European Journal of Semiotic Studies* 12.1 (2000): 23–46.

Makarychev, Andrey, and Alexandra Yatsyk. *Lotman's Cultural Semiotics and the Political*. London: Rowman and Littlefield, 2017.

Makarychev, Andrey, and Alexandra Yatsyk. "Unpacking the Post-Soviet: Political Legacy of the Tartu Semiotic School." *All Azimuth: A Journal of Foreign Policy and Peace Research* 7.2 (2018): 31–45.

Mamardashvili, Merab, and Aleksandr Piatigorskii. "Tri besedy o metateorii soznaniia: Kratkoe vvedenie v uchenie vidzhnianavady." *Trudy po znakovym sistemam*. Vol. 5. Tartu: Tartuskii gos. univ., 1971. 345–376.

Mandelker, Amy. "Semiotizing the sphere: Organicistic theory in Lotman, Bakhtin and Vernadsky." *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America (PMLA)* 109.3 (1994): 385–396.

Martynov, Vladimir. "Casus strukturalizma: Stat'ia vtoraia." *Vestnik Omskogo universiteta* 25.4 (2020): 8–93.

McGann, Jerome J. J. *The Romantic Ideology: A Critical Investigation*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1985.

Mel'chuk, Ivan, and Andrei Zholkovskii. *Tolkovo-kombinatornyi slovar' russkogo iazyka*. Vienna: Wiener Slawistischer Almanach, 1984.

Meletinskii, Eleazar. "Klod Levi-Stross i strukturnaia tipologiia mifa." *Voprosy filosofii* 7 (1970): 165–173.

Meletinskii, Eleazar. *Poétika mifa*. Moscow: Nauka, 1976.

Meletinskii, Eleazar. "Mifologiia i fol'klor v trudakh K. Levi-Strosa." Claude Levi-Strauss [K. Levi-Stros], *Strukturnaia antropologiia*. Eds. N. A. Butinov and Via. Vs. Ivanov. Moscow: Nauka GRVL, 1983. 467–523.

Meletinskii, Eleazar (ed.). *Mifologicheskii slovar'*. Moscow: Sovetskaia énciklopdediia, 1990.

Mints, Zara. *Blokovskij sbornik*. Vol. 2: *Blok i Gogol'*. Tartu: Tartuskij gos. universitet, 1972. 122–205.

Mints, Zara. "Funktsiia reminiscencii v poétike A. Bloka." *Trudy po znakovym sistemam* 6 (1973): 387–417.

Mints, Zara. "Aleksandr Blok." *Istoriia russkoi literatury v 4 tomakh*. Vol. 4: *Literatura kontsa XIX – nachala XX veka (1881–1917)*. Ed. K. D. Muratova. Leningrad: Nauka – Leningradskoe otdelenie, 1983. 520–548.

Mints, Zara. "Aleksandr Blok." *Russkie pisateli 1800–1917: Biograficheskii slovar'*. Ed. P. A. Nikolaev. Moscow: Sovetskaia éntsiklopediia, 1989. 277–283.

Mirabile, Andrea. *Le strutture e la storia: La critica italiana dallo strutturalismo alla semiotica*. Milano: LED, 2006.

Monticelli, Daniele. "Challenging identity: Lotman's 'Translation of the Untranslatable' and Derrida's 'différance'." *Sign Systems Studies* 40.3–4 (2012a): 319–339.

Monticelli, Daniele. "Self description, dialogue and periphery in Lotman's later thought." *Explosion und Peripherie: Jurii Lotmans Semiotik der kulturellen Dynamik revisited*. Eds. Susi Frank, Cornelia Ruhe, and Alexander Schmitz. Bielefeld: Transcript, 2012b. 57–77.

Nekliudov, Sergei. "Vremia i prostranstvo v byline." *Slavianskii fol'klor: Sbornik statei*. Eds. B. N. Putilov and B. K. Sokolova. Moscow, 1972. 18–45.

Nekliudov, Sergei. "Fol'klor i vlast' v zakrytom obshchestve." *NLO* 101 (2010): 84–108.

Nicolosi, Riccardo. *Die Petersburg-Panegyrik: russische Stadtliteratur im 18. Jahrhundert*. Frankfurt/M.: Peter Lang, 2002.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. "Morgenröthe." Friedrich Nietzsche, *Sämtliche Werke: Kritische Studienausgabe*. Munich: dtv/De Gruyter, 1980. 7–332.

[NN]. "Ältestes Systemprogramm (1796/97)." *Materialien zu Schellings philosophischen Anfängen*. Eds. Manfred Frank and Gerhard Kurz. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1975, 110–112.

Nöth, Winfried. "Yuri Lotman on metaphors and culture as self-referential semiospheres." *Semiotica* 161.1–4 (2006): 249–263.

Obermayr, Brigitte. "Jurij Lotmans Kultursemiotik und ihre Aktualität in der gegenwärtigen Slawistik." Review of *Explosion und Peripherie: Jurij Lotmans Semiotik der kulturellen Dynamik revisited*, by Susi K. Frank, Cornelia Ruhe, and Alexander Schmitz (eds.). *Welt der Slaven* 60 (2015): 374–397.

Otto, Rudolf. *Das Heilige: Über das Irrationale in der Idee des Göttlichen und sein Verhältnis zum Rationalen*. Breslau: Trewendt & Granier, 1917.

Palievskii Petr. "O strukturalizme v literaturovedenii." *Znamia* 12 (1963): 189–196.

Piatigorskii, Aleksandr. "Zametki iz 90-kh o semiotike 60-kh." *NLO* 3 (1993): 77–80.

Piatigorskii, Aleksandr. "Reaktsiia filosofii na totalitarizm: Ne-metodologicheskie zametki o vozmozhnosti anarkhicheskoi filosofii." Aleksandr Piatigorskii, *Izbrannye trudy*. Ed. G. Amelina. Moscow: Iazyki Russkoi Kul'tury, 1996. 147–158.

Pilshchikov, Igor', and Mikhail Trunin. "The Tartu-Moscow School of Semiotics: A transnational perspective." *Sign Systems Studies* 44.3 (2016): 368–401.

Portis Winner, Irene (ed.). *Semiotics of Culture: 'The strange intrudor'*. Bochum: Walter A. Koch, 1994.

Propp, Vladimir. *Morfologiia skazki*. Leningrad: Akademia, 1928.

Propp, Vladimir. *Istoricheskie korni volshebnoy skazki*. Leningrad: Izd. LGU, 1946.

Propp, Vladimir. *Morphology of the folktale*. Trans. by Laurence Scott. Bloomington, IN: Research Center, Indiana University, 1958.

Propp, Vladimir. "Historical roots of the wondertale." Vladimir Propp, *Theory and History of folklore*. Trans. by A.Y. Martin, R.P. Martin, et al. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minneapolis Press, 1984. 100–123.

Propp, Vladimir. *Russkie agrarnye prazdniki: Opyt istoriko-ėtnograficheskogo issledovaniia*. St Peterburg: Terra-Azbuka, 1995.

Raynod, Savina. "The Critical Horizon of Jakobson's Work and its multidisciplinarity." *Cahiers de l'ILSL* 9 (1997): 187–198.

Reichler, Claude. *La diabolie, la séduction, la renardie, l'écriture*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1979.

Reid, Allan. *Literature as Communication and Cognition in Bakhtin and Lotman*. New York, NY, London: Garland, 1990.

Reitblat, Abram. *Kak Pushkin vyshel v genii: Istoriko-sotsiolocheskie ocherki o kniazhnoi kul'ture Pushkinskoi ėpokhi*. Moscow: NLO, 2001.

Renner, Karl N. "Grenze und Ereignis: Weiterführende Überlegungen zum Ereigniskonzept von J.M. Lotman." *Norm – Grenze – Abweichung: Kultursemiotische Studien zu Literatur, Medien und Wirtschaft*. Eds. Gustav Frank and Wolfgang Lukas. Passau: K. Stutz, 2004. 357–381.

Revzin, Isaak. "O celiakh strukturnogo izucheniia khudozhestvennogo tvorchestva." *Voprosy literatury* 6 (1965): 73–87.

Revzin, Isaak. "Sub"ektnivnaia pozitsiia issledovatelia v semiotike." *Trudy po znakovym sistemam* 5 (1971): 334–344.

Ridoux, Charles. "Eléments pour une critique de la sémiotique structurale de Lotman." *Revue européenne de sciences sociales* 32 (1974): 9–26.

Ridoux, Charles. *Des formalistes russes … aux sémioticiens soviétique*. Thèse présentée a l'Université de Paris VII […] Siutenue le février 1976.

Rodari, Gianni. *Grammatica della fantasia: Introduzione all'arte di inventare storie*. Torino: Einaudi, 1973.

Rossolatos, George. "Is the semiosphere post-modernist?" *Kodikas / Code – Ars Semiotica* 38.1–2 (2015): 95–113.

Ruhe, Corneila. "Das Konzept der Übersetzung in Jurij Lotmans Kultursemiotik." *Translating society: A Commentator's Conference October 29 to 31, 2009*. Konstanz: University of Konstanz, 2009. https://www.translating-society.de/conference/papers/8/ (28 February 2022).

Ryklin, Mikhail. *Svoboda i zapret: Kul'tura v ėpokhu terrora*. Moscow: Logos, Progress, Traditsiia, 2008.

Salupere, Silvi. "O poniatii 'perevod' v trudakh Iuriia Lotmana." *Sign Systems Studie* 36.2 (2008): 417–436.

Schahadat, Schamma. "Russische Poetik des Verhaltens und amerikanische poetics auf culture." *Explosion und Peripherie: Jurii Lotmans Semiotik der kulturellen Dynamik revisited*. Eds. Susi Frank, Cornelia Ruhe, and Alexander Schmitz. Bielefeld: Transcript, 2012. 153–172.

Schahadat, Schamma [Shakhadat, Shamma]. *Iskusstvo zhizni. Zhizn' kak predmet ėsteticheskogo otnosheniia v russkoi kul'ture XVI–XX vekov*. Trans. by Aleksei Zherebin. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2017.

Schmid, Wolf. Review of *Poėtika kompozitsii: Struktura khudozhestvennogo teksta i tipologiia kompozicionnoi formy*, by Boris Uspenskii. *Poetica* 4 (1971): 124–134.

Schmid, Wolf. *Elemente der Narratologie*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2005.

Schmid, Wolf. "Eventfulness and Repetitiveness Two Aesthetics of Storytelling: Jurii Lotman's Concept of Event." Wolf Schmid, *Emerging Vectors of Narratology*. Berlin and Boston, MA: Walter De Gruyter, 2017. 229–247.

Schönle, Andreas. "Social power and individual agency: The self in Greenblatt and Lotman." *The Slavic and East European Journal* 45.1 (2001): 61–79.

Schönle, Andreas, and Jeremy Shine. "Introduction." *Lotman and Cultural Studies: Encounters and Extensions*. Ed. Andreas Schönle. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2006. 3–40.

Shcheglov, Iurii, and Alexander Zholkovsky. *Poetics of expressiveness*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1987.

Sebeok, Thomas. "In what sense is the language a 'primary modelling system'." Thomas Sebeok, *A sign is just a sign*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, 1991. 49–58.

Sedakova, Ol'ga. "'Vechnye sny kak obrazchiki krovi…': O Iurii Mikhailove Lotmane i strukturnoi shkole v kontekste kul'tury 70-kh godov." *Lotmanovskii sbornik*. Vol. 1. Ed. Evgenii Permiakov. Moscow: IC Garant, 1995. 260–265.

Segal, Dmitrii. "Russkaia semanticheskaia poėtika 20 let spustia." *Russian studies* 2 (1996): 7–52.

Segal, Dmitrii. "'Et in arcadia ego' vernulsia: Nasledie Moskovsko-Tartuskoi shkoly semiotiki segodnia." *Moskovsko-Tartuskaia semioticheskaia shlola: Istoriia, vospominaniia, razmyshleniia*. Ed. Sergei Nekliudov. Moscow: Iazyki russkoi kul'tury, 1998. 99–112.

Segal, Dmitrii. *Puti i vekhi: Russkoe literaturovedenie v dvadtsatom veke*. Moscow: Vodolei, 2011.

Segre, Cesaro. "El testamento de Lotman." *En la esfera semiótica lotmaniana: Estudios en honor de Iuri Mijáilovich Lotman*. Ed. M. Cáceres. Valencia: Episteme, 1997. 85–97.

Selg, Peeter, and Andreas Ventsel. "On a semiotic theory of hegemony: Conceptual foundations and a brief sketch for future research." *Explosion und Peripherie: Jurii Lotmans Semiotik der kulturellen Dynamik revisited*. Eds. Susi Frank, Cornelia Ruhe, and Alexander Schmitz. Bielefeld: Transcript, 2012. 41–55.

Seyffert, Peter. *Soviet Literary structuralism: Background, Debate, Issues*. 2nd edition. Columbus: Slavica Publishers, 1985.

Shevchenko, Nadezhda. "Zur Rezeption Jurij Lotmans in (West-)Deutschland." *Interkultureller Transfer und nationaler Eigensinn: europäische und angloamerikanische Positionen der Kulturwissenschaften*. Eds. Rebekka Habermas and Rebekka von Mallinckrodt. Göttingen: Wallstein, 2004. 146–156.

Shaumyan, Sebastian. *A Semiotic Theory of Language*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1987.

Shaumyan, Sebastian. *Signs, mind, and reality: A theory of language as the folk model of the World*. Amsterdam et al.: John Benjamin, 2006.

Shevchenko, Nadezhda. "Zur Rezeption Jurij Lotmans in (West-)Deutschland." *Interkultureller Transfer und nationaler Eigensinn: europäische und angloamerikanische Positionen der Kulturwissenschaften*. Eds. Rebekka Habermas and Rebekka von Mallinckrodt. Göttingen: Wallstein, 2004. 146–156.

Shukman, Ann. *Literature and Semiotics: A Study of the Writings of Yu.M. Lotman*. Amsterdam, New York, NY, Oxford: Elsevier, 1977.

Sonkina, Faina. *Iurii Lotman v moei zhizni: Vospominaniia. Dnevniki. Pis'ma*. Moscow: NLO, 2016. https://document.wikireading.ru/hWPABjOrNd (28 February 2022).

Soo-Hwan, Kim. *Osnovnye aspekty tvorcheskoj évoliutsiiiu. M. Lotmana*. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2003.

Städtke, Klaus. "Das Problem der Geschichte in der sowjetischen Kultursemiotik." *Zeit des Ereignisses – Ende der Geschichte?* Eds. Friedrich Balke, Erik Mechoulan, and Benno Wagner. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1992. 55–68.

Städtke, Klaus [Shtedtke, Klaus]. "Figura umolchaniia v Moskovsko-Tartuskoi shkole." *Uskol'zaiushchii kontekst: Russkaia filosofiia v XX veke*. Eds. Mikhail Ryklin, Dirk Uffel'mann [Uffelmann], and Klaus Städtke [Shtedtke]. Moscow: Ad marginem, 2002. 163–182.

Steiner, Wendy. "Point of view from the Russian point of view." *Dispositio* 1.3 (1976): 315–326.

Tamm, Marek, and Kalevi Kull. "Toward a reterritorialization of cultural theory: Estonian theory from Baer and Uexkull to Lotman." *History of the Human Sciences* 29.1 (2016): 75–98.

Tamm, Marek, and Peeter Torop (eds.). *The Companion to Juri Lotman: A Semiotic Theory of Culture*. London: Bloomsbury, 2021.

Teilhard de Chardin, Pierre. "L'hominisation." Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, *Œuvres complètes*. Vol. 3: *La vision du passé*. Paris: Seuil, 1925. 75–111.

Thomä, Dieter, Ulrich Schmid, and Vincent Kaufman. "Jurij Lotman (1922–1933): Der Aristokrat im Sowjetstaat." *Der Einfall des Lebens: Theorie als geheime Autobiographie*. Ed. Dieter Thomä, Ulrich Schmid, and Vincent Kaufman. Munich: Hanser, 2015. 237–249.

Tom, Rčnč. "Topologiia i lingvistika." *Uspekhi matematicheskikh nauk* 30 (1975): 199–221.

Timofeev, Leonid. "Sorok let spustia…: Chislo i chuvstvo mery v izuchenii poétiki." *Voprosy literatury* 4 (1963): 62–80.

Toporov, Vladimir. *Slavianskie iazykovye modeliruiushchie semioticheskie sistemy: Drevniy period*. Moscow: Nauka, 1965.

Toporov, Vladimir. "Drevo zhizni." *Mify narodov mira: Ènciklopediia*. Ed. S.A. Tokarev. Moscow: Sovetskaia ènciklopediia, 1980a. 396–398.

Toporov, Vladimir. "Drevo mirovoe." *Mify narodov mira: Ènciklopediia*. Ed. S.A. Tokarev. Moscow: Sovetskaia ènciklopediia, 1980b, 398–406.

Toporov, Vladimir. "Drevo poznaniia." *Mify narodov mira: Ènciklopediia*. Ed. S.A. Tokarev. Moscow: Sovetskaia éènciklopediia, 1980c, 406–407.

Toporov, Vladimir. "Peterburg i peterburgskii tekst russkoj literatury: Vvedenie v temu." *Uchenye zapiski Tartuskogo universiteta* 664 (1984): 4–29.

Toporov, Vladimir. "Vmesto vospominanii." *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* 3 (1993a): 66–77.

Toporov, Vladimir. *Ènej – chelovek sud'by: K "sredizemnomorskogo" personologii*. Vol. 1. Moscow: Radiks, 1993b.

Toporov, Vladimir. *Mif. Ritual. Simvol. Obraz: Issledovaniia v oblasti mifopo èticheskogo*. Moscow: Progress and Kul'tura, 1995a.

Toporov, Vladimir. *'Bednaia Liza' Karamzina: Opyt prochteniia: K dvukhsotletiiu so dnia vykhoda v svet*. Moscow: RGGU, 1995b.

Toporov, Vladimir. *Sviatost' i sviatye v russkoi dukhovnoi kul'ture*. Vol. 1. Moscow: Gnosis and Shkola "Jazyki russkoi kul'tury", 1995c.

Toporov, Vladimir. *Mirovoye derevo: Universal'nye znakovye kompleksy*. Vol. 1. Moscow: Rukopisnye pamiatniki Drevnei Rusi, 2010.

Toporov, Vladimir. *Apologie de Pluchkine: De la dimension humaine des choses*. Trans. by Luba Jurgenson. Lagrasse: Éditions Verdier, 2011.

Torop, Peeter. "Tartuskaia shkola kak shkola." *Lotmanovskii sbornik*. Vol.1. Ed. Evgenii Permiakov. Moscow: ITs-Garant, 1995. 223–239.

Torop, Peeter. "Semiosphere and/as the research object of semiotics of culture." *Sign Systems Studies* 33.1 (2005): 159–173.

Trubetzkoy, N.[ikolay]. *Grundzüge der Phonologie*. Prague: Poligrafie v Brně, 1939.

Ulicka, Danuta, and Włodzimierz Bolecki (eds.). *Strukturalizm w Europie środkowej i wschodniej: Wizje i rewizje*. Warsaw: Instytut Badań Literackich Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 2012.

Uspenskii, Boris. *Poètika kompozitsii*. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1970.

Uspenskii, Boris. *A Poetics of Composition: The Structure of the Artistic Text and Typology of a Compositional Form*. Trans. by Valentina Zavarin and Susan Wittig. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1973.

Uspenskii, Boris. "Semiotics of the icon. An interview." *PTL – A journal of descriptive poetics and theory of literature* 3 (1978): 529–548.

Uspenskii, Boris. "K probleme genezisa tartusko-moskovskoj semioticheskoi shkoly." *Iu. M. Lotman i tartusko-moskovskaja semioticheskaia shkola*. Ed. Aleksei Koshelev. Moscow: Gnozis, 1984. 265–278.

Uspenskii, Boris. "Istoriia i semiotika: vospriiatiye vremeni kak semioticheskaia problema." *Trudy po znakovym sistemam* 22 (1987): 66–84.

Uspenskii [Uspenskij], Boris: *Semiotik der Geschichte*. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1991.

Uspenskii, Boris. *Izbrannye trudy*. Vol. 1: *Semiotika istorii: Semiotika kul'tury*. Moscow: Gnozis, 1994.

Uspenskii, Boris. *Semiotika iskusstva*. Moscow: Shkola "Iazyki russkoi kul'tury", 1995a.

Uspenskii, Boris. "Kompositsiia Gentskogo altaria Van Èika v semioticheskom svoscshenii: Bozhestvennaia i chelovecheskaia perspektiva." Boris Uspenskii, *Semiotika iskusstva*. Moscow: Shkola "Iazyki russkoi kul'tury", 1995b. 304–328.

Uspenskii, Boris. *Poėtika kompozicii*. St. Petersburg: Azbuka, 2000.

Uspenskii, Boris. *Krest i krug: Iz istorii khristianskoi simvoliki*. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kultur, 2006.

Uspenskii, Vladimir. *Trudy po nematemimatike*. Moscow: OGI, 2002.

Ventsel, Andreas. "On the independence of the humanities: Tartu-Moscow School and official Soviet politics of science." *Sign Systems Studies* 39.2/4 (2011): 357–365.

Verenich, Vadim. "The reception of Lotman's models of 'agreement' and 'self-giving' in Russian legal Philosophy." [2014] https://www.academia.edu/7218839/The_reception_of_Lotmans_models_in_Russian_philosophy_of_law (28 February 2022).

Vernadskii, Vladimir. *Filosofskie mysli naturalista*. Moscow: Nauka, 1988.

Volkova, Ekaterina Georgievna. "Metodologiia issledovanii V. Ja. Proppa: mezhdu formalizmom i strukturalizmom." *Prepodavatel' 21 vek* 4 (2011): 226–229.

Waldstein, Maxim. *The Soviet Empire of Signs: A History of the Tartu School of Semiotics*. Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller, 2008.

Waldstein, Maxim. Review of *Lotmani maailm / Lotman's World*, directed by Agne Nelk. *Slavic Review* 70.1 (2011): 169–170.

White, Hayden. *Metahistory: The historical imagination in nineteenth-century Europe*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.

Witte, Ernst. "Kulturökonomie und Kultursemiotik: Am Beispiel von Groys, mit Rücksicht auf Lotman." *Kultur – Wissenschaft – Russland: Beiträge zum Verhältnis von Kultur und Wissenschaft aus slawistischer Sicht*. Eds. Wolfgang Eismann and Peter Deutschmann. Frankfurt/M. et al.: Peter Lang, 2000. 225–238.

Wutsdorff, Irina. "Jurij Lotmans Kultursemiotik zwischen Russland und Europa." *Explosion und Peripherie: Jurij Lotmans Semiotik der kulturellen Dynamik revisited*. Eds. Susi Frank, Cornelia Ruhe, and Alexander Schmitz. Bielefeld: Transcript, 2012. 289–305.

Zenkin, Sergei. "Continuous models after Lotman." *Explosion und Peripherie: Jurij Lotmans Semiotik der kulturellen Dynamik revisited*. Eds. Susi Frank, Cornelia Ruhe, and Alexander Schmitz. Bielefeld: Transcript, 2012. 119–132.

Zenkin, Sergei. "Ot Tartu do Parizha (Zametki o teorii)." Review of *O strukturalizme: Raboty 1965–1970 godov*, by Iurii Lotman. *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* 160.6 (2019): 336–347.

Zhivov, Viktor. "Moskovsko-tartuskaia semiotika: ee dostizhenia i ee ogranichenia." *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* 98.4 (2009): 11–26.

Zajnetdinova, Regina. "Lotman v kontekste sovremennoj zapadnoj filosofii." *Diskurs Pi* 7 (2007): 124–128.

Zhivov, Viktor, and Alan Timberlake [Timberleik]. "Rasstavaias' so strukturalizmom: Tezisy dlia diskussii." *Voprosy iazykoznaniia* 3.3 (1997): 3–14.

Zorin, Andrei. "Progulka verkhom v Moskve v avguste 1799 goda: Iz istorii emotsional'noy kul'tury." *NLO* 65.1 (2004): 170–184.

Zorin, Andrei. "Lotman's Karamzin and the late Soviet liberal intelligentsia." *Lotman and Cultural Studies: Encounters and Extensions*. Ed. Andreas Schönle. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2006. 208–228.

Zyłko, Bogusław. "Culture and semiotics: Notes on Lotman's conception of culture." *New Literary History* 32.2 (2001): 391–408.

Zyłko, Bogusław. "Notes on Yuri Lotman's structuralism." [2014] *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 18.1 (2015): 27–42.

III Beyond Literary Theory

Galin Tihanov
Semantic Paleontology and Its Impact

Itself a relatively small group of academics brought together by admiration for Nikolai Marr's 'new theory of language' and his methodology of cultural analysis, *semantic paleontology* (*semanticheskaia paleontologiia*) was a current in cultural and literary theory that had a considerable impact on some of its contemporaries (notably Bakhtin) and wider resonance beyond the 1930s.

The presence of semantic paleontology in literary studies and its importance for the methodological debates of the 1930s have only recently begun to be examined systematically (see Tihanov 2017, esp. 425–427; Kliger and Maslov 2016; Braginskaya 2016; Martin 2016). I thus begin by outlining the foundations of semantic paleontology and its interventions in the study of literature during the 1930s; as a next step, the analysis focuses on the principal methodological distinctions which semantic paleontology sought to draw in order to assert its own identity vis-à-vis other trends. Attention then turns to the central question: what was the place of semantic paleontology in the 1930s polemics on how and where one should draw the boundaries of modernity. In the final sections I weigh the impact of semantic paleontology on cultural and literary theory. As will become evident, this impact did not follow the channels of official recognition, yet it persisted into the early 1980s, at times paradoxically reinforced by the critique which semantic paleontology attracted.

1 Foundations and Early Work: The Manifesto Volume on Tristan and Isolde

The exponents of semantic paleontology came of age as scholars and thinkers in the course of the 1920s and produced their most significant work in the 1930s; by that time Nikolai Marr had reached the apogee of his public influence: in 1930 he was accorded the honour of addressing the sixteenth Party Congress and soon afterward joined the Party as its only member amongst the academicians elected to the Academy of Sciences before 1917 (cf. Tolz 1997, 107).

Unlike 'bourgeois', purely 'formal' linguistics (the vast body of primarily historical and comparative research that Marr brushed aside as sterile Indo-Europeanistics), the new theory of language prioritized the exploration of its origins (*glottogenesis*) and socio-economically conditioned evolution, mirrored in the transformations of core semantic elements at various historical stages. The new

theory proclaimed that the study of language should be conducted not 'abstractly', but in close connection with the study of material culture. Archeology and ethnography became indispensable allies of linguistics, furnishing evidence of the social and economic functions of language and the changes it underwent as societies moved through successive stages based on different modes of production. In the summarising words of a contemporary folklorist (and a somewhat sceptical commentator), Marr's method was grounded in a) paleontology; b) belief in stage-like transformation, or *stadialism* (*stadial'nost'*); and c) semantics, "stage-like transformation being the principle of his theory, paleontology – its tool, semantics – its material" (Azadovskii 1935, 13).

Semantic paleontology was an expression authorized by Marr himself; he used it in his 1931 article "K semanticheskoi paleontologii v iazykakh neiafetich-eskikh system" (1931, "On semantic paleontology in the languages of the non-Japhetic systems"; Marr 1936), a text which reads as a compendium of his views on language. In a nutshell, semantic paleontology was considered a method that enables scholars to make their way into the depths of glottogenesis; crucial here was the need to study precisely semantics, and precisely in a paleontological fashion, so that meanings that had crystallized at earlier stages ('deposits' [*otlozheniia*], in Marr's parlance) could be uncovered: "Semantics has allowed us, step by step, through the paleontology of speech, to get to the process of organisation of the linguistic material, to penetrate it" (Marr 1936, 251). Informing this paleontological quest was an assumption of homogeneity. Not only do languages evolve inexorably from a state of multitude and diversity to one of unity (eventually flowing into a single world language), but also right from the start the process of glottogenesis had highlighted underlying typological similarities between the various languages of communities that were at the same stage of socio-economic development. Instead of thinking in terms of language families based on race and ethnicity (in the words of one of Marr's followers, "from the point of view of Japhetic theory, ethnos is the outcome rather than the starting point of historical development" [Frank-Kamenetskii 1932, 270]), Marr was abolishing this vital mainstay of 'traditional' (Indo-European) linguistics by denying the existence of a proto-language. The unity Marr stipulated sprang not from belonging to a common family of languages (although initially he had used *Japhetic* as a designation for one such language group) but from being located at the same stage of socio-economic evolution (Japhetic thus gradually became a label for a particularly important foundation stage which all languages went through). Since for Marr language and thought were inseparable, the commonality between languages was in the final analysis based on the commonality of ideas, attitudes, and sentiments accessible to humanity, and in need of being articulated, at various points of its economic progression.

Semantic paleontology was furnishing proof of this commonality by identifying the building blocks that supposedly constructed the semantic universe of mankind. These building blocks, regardless of the potentially endless transformations and combinations, presented a finite number according to Marr. Initially he believed there were twelve such elements, later reducing that number to nine, seven, and ending up with four (Marr 1936 [1931], 250) (the notorious *sal*, *ber*, *yon*, *rosh*, replaced on occasion – not without pressure from some of Marr's skeptical associates – by the more sensible sequence A, B, C, D). Confronted with the question of how exactly he had arrived at this number, Marr would typically provide metaphysical explanations: the four elements reflected the four parts or directions of the world; "certain things need no proof; they can be demonstrated" (Marr 1932a, 44). Nor was Marr any wiser when attempting to explain why – if language morphology were indeed conditioned by the respective socio-economic stage and mode of production, with the expectation that all languages used by communities occupying that particular stage would display the same type of morphology – "the feudal of the West spoke a flective language, that of the East, however, an agglutinative one?" (Meshchaninov 1933, 83)

Marr himself almost never applied his doctrine to the study of modern literature (on Marr's knowledge of contemporary Russian literature, especially the avant-garde, see Nikol'skaia 1993,7; Vasil'kov 2001, 390–421). A rare exception is his speech at the celebration of the fortieth anniversary of Gorky's literary career. Along with a number of platitudes, Marr offered here a stage-like account of the evolution of literary genres, referring to poetry as an earlier mode of writing and insisting on prose being the product of a later stage, when the "technique of thinking in images is supplanted, actually improved when it comes to precision, by the technique of thinking through concepts" (see Marr 1932b, 14). Earlier attempts to advance the new theory in the area of literary studies had been associated above all with classics and folklore and were initiated in the mid-1920s when Boris Bogaevskii, an historian of the ancient world, organized a circle in his home with the participation of several orientalists and historians, united by the ambition to study Homer in the light of Marr's Japhetic theory (the full list of participants can be found in Nina Braginskaia's notes to Ol'ga Freidenberg (1991, 82, n. 23). Despite Bogaevskii's ambition to found a "truly historical, i. e. *materialist poetics*" (Bogaevskii 1929, 20), grounded in japhetidology and applicable to any work of literature, including Goethe's *Faust*, Tolstoi's *War and Peace*, or Pushkin's poems, it was only in 1932 that a collaborative study, edited by Marr and discussing the multiple transformations of the motif of Tristan and Isolde from prehistoric times to feudalism (Marr 1932), consolidated the new methodology. Significantly, the volume's title evoked an earlier article by Marr but deliberately reversed the perspective to emphasize the paleontological descent: thus Marr's

"'Ishtar': ot bogini matriarkhal'noi Afrevrazii do geroini liubvi feodal'noi Evropy'" (1927, "'Ishtar': from the matriarchal goddess of Afroeurasia to the love heroine of feudal Europe") became *Tristan i Izol'da. Ot geroini liubvi feodal'noi Evropy do bogini matriarkhal'noi Afrevrazii* (1932, *Tristan and Isolde. From the love heroine of feudal Europe to the matriarchal goddess of Afroeurasia*). Ol'ga Freidenberg drew attention to this intentional reversal in her opening article, "Tselevaia ustanovka kollektivnoi raboty nad siuzhetom Tristana i Izol'dy" ("The Purpose of the collective work on the Sujet of Tristan and Isolde"; Freidenberg 1932, 3); a contemporary reviewer also noted the inversion (Lozanova 1934, 209).

The volume on Tristan and Isolde effectively played the role of a collective manifesto for the scholars who were intent on studying literature by employing the method of semantic paleontology. The book attracted participation from twelve scholars and incorporated essays researched and written in 1929–1931. It enjoyed a thorough and benevolent review in the West (Schlauch 1933) and even made its way into Stalin's personal library (Ilizarov 2003, 125). Two of these scholars, Ol'ga Freidenberg (1890–1955) and Izrail' Frank-Kamenetskii (1880–1937), embraced semantic paleontology in a way that essayed to assess its philosophical foundations and to inscribe it in the wider landscape of Soviet literary and cultural theory (on Freidenberg see Moss 1985; Perlina 2002; Kabanov 2002; Tihanov 2004; on Frank-Kamenetskii see Frank-Kamenetskii 1994; Barsht 1997; Debaker and Shilkov 2002; Brandist 2011).

2 Methodological distinctions: Against Russian formalism and vulgar sociologism

As a method of literary studies, semantic paleontology saw its principal opponent in Russian formalism. Although at a public discussion on the formal method held in Leningrad, having seen the slight of hand applied against the formalists by the chair of the meeting, Freidenberg publicly voted in their favour (see Braginskaia 1986, 274), no other school of literary theory was attacked in her and Frank-Kamenetskii's writings with such consistency and intensity. This might come as a surprise, given that by the early 1930s Russian formalism had already been defunct for a couple of years, and on the wane for much longer. Freidenberg criticised the formalists not simply for neglecting content or for their lack of interest in the ideas literature embodies or promotes. In *Poetika siuzheta i zhanra* (1936, *Poetics of Plot and Genre*), Freidenberg's only book published in her lifetime, she launched a covert assault on Shklovskii for his attempt to devise a 'theory of prose' (Freidenberg refers to Shklovskii solely by evoking the title of his eponymous book,

without even putting it in quotation marks) and on Tynianov, whose doctrine of 'literary evolution' is evoked in Freidenberg's remark that the formalists had turned poetics into an application of "Darwin to literature" (cf. Freidenberg 1936, 7–8). Initially, Freidenberg had considered two other titles for her book, *Semantika siuzheta i zhanra* (*Semantics of Plot and Genre*) and *Prokrida* (*Procris*), the latter pointing to her principal idea that differences turn out to be embodiments of sameness (Procris' new lover as her old husband) (see Braginskaia's note in Gasparov 2008, 27, n. 7.). Elsewhere, Freidenberg polemicises with Boris Ėikhenbaum (without naming him explicitly), questioning the principles behind his 1924 book on Lermontov (see Freidenberg 1995, 275–277) (a polemic with the same book, naming openly Ėikhenbaum, can also be found in Frank-Kamenetskii 1935a, 93–94; see also Braginskaia 1995, 259). Freidenberg's chief objection, however, was much more radical than these instances would suggest: she was deeply unhappy with formalism's neglect not as much of particular ideas articulated in the works of literature, but rather with formalism's disinterest in uncovering the very laws of thinking (*myshleniia*) that informed the creativity of humankind since its very first steps. Formalism's attention was arrested by form, which made for a static approach to literature. Unlike the formalists, the paleontologists, Freidenberg insists, conceive of literature not as a 'ready' (*gotovogo*) and always already given phenomenon, but as the specific product of a multi-stage transformation, at the heart of which there lies a change in outlook conditioned by the economic base (Freidenberg 1932, 5).

Admittedly, both formalism and semantic paleontology agreed on individual authors and their 'inventions' having no significance in the grand scenarios of literary and cultural evolution. To this extent, semantic paleontology, just as Marxism, formalism, and psychoanalysis, partook of the larger paradigm of literary history 'without names' (to recall Wölfflin's art-historical paradigm) that dominated the Soviet 1920s and 1930s. Yet Freidenberg and Frank-Kamenetskii were arguably the most radical exponents of this trend. Not only was literary history to be 'without names'; it also had to be more than historical, because the historical method itself would not do in describing the mechanisms of cultural change. Unlike the formalists, who assumed literariness to be an ever-present feature and thus limited the applicability of the historical method solely to studying the processes whereby non-literary material enters the established literary system (or, conversely, parts of that system exit it or settle on its margins), the semantic paleontologists went much further in insisting that literariness itself should be subjected to fundamental scrutiny that goes far deeper than merely tracing its diachronic undulations. In order to signal their radical departure, the semantic paleontologists proclaimed that the 'historical' approach should be reserved for phenomena within and of the literary system, whereas literariness – the funda-

mental quality that makes literature what it is – should be studied 'genetically'. In Freidenberg's words, "to the ready-made, finalized literary phenomenon one had to react by posing the question of the origins of literature itself" (Freidenberg 1932, 6). If history was thus too much for the formalists, it was too little for the semantic paleontologists.

The genetic approach, unlike the historical, questioned the very core of literature by enquiring into what was there before literature, and asking how literature came to be. The answers of the semantic paleontologists differed in detail but not in substance. Freidenberg and Frank-Kamenetskii believed that the growth of culture could be traced with reference to three key stages: myth, folklore, and then literature, each corresponding to qualitatively different socio-economic formations and modes of production. Early on in the protracted prehistory of humanity, in 'pre-class' society (Freidenberg cautiously toes the official line which increasingly insisted on Communism being the pinnacle of history and the only embodiment of 'classless' society, with the formation preceding slave-holding society being referred to as 'pre-class' rather than 'classless'), myth was the only ideological superstructure, the only available conveyor of a wider world picture. Later on, with the transition to class society, but at a stage that was still marked by a relatively primitive development of the forces of production, folklore emerged as a typical by-product of this transition: it still preserved the cosmological elements of myth but these were now often transformed into narratives about the (mis)fortune of individuals. Folklore was thus the ideological superstructure of the stage of transition from pre-class to class society, while literature was expressly seen as the (relatively late) "product of class society" (Freidenberg 1932, 5). In Frank-Kamenetskii's scheme, this general sequence was preserved but somewhat qualified by the introduction of matriarchy, patriarchy, and feudalism as the principal early stages of social evolution. On Frank-Kamenetskii's reading, matriarchy was the age of myth, patriarchy saw the first noticeable rise in social stratification and, with it, the rise of the mixed form of the epic which combined the cosmological and the privately human, followed by feudalism, in the course of which the deities of the previous stages were supplanted by 'real personae', giving rise to 'quasi-everyday' plots ('quasi', because underneath the surface these plots often remained bound to myth and its large-scale vision of the natural cycle [cf. Frank-Kamenetskii 1932, 266]).

Two features differentiated this model from the staple and no doubt rather primitive sociological account of the succession of various base-conditioned modes of creativity. To start with, the model advanced by Freidenberg and Frank-Kamenetskii allowed for some complexity embedded in continuity: myth did not go away with the arrival of folklore, nor did folklore disappear with the advent of literature. It is this co-existence of superstructural layers drawn from

different socio-economic stages that is emphasized in Freidenberg's definition of folklore: "I mean by folklore the pre-class 'production of ideas,' [still] functioning in the system of class Weltanschauung" (Freidenberg 1936, 12). Literature – "before coming into its own" – had been evolving in close contact with folklore. All through to the nineteenth century, when the age of industrial capitalism set in, literature would borrow its plots either directly from folklore (by processing popular legends, as did Boccaccio, Calderón, and Shakespeare [Freidenberg 1936, 335–361]) or from other literary works; only following the nineteenth-century revolution in the organization of production and the corresponding revolution of consciousness did writers break with tradition, beginning to draw their plots from the newspapers, from daily occurrences (*bytovomu proisshestviiu*), or from their own power of imagination and invention (Freidenberg 1936, 11; cf. Freidenberg 1925, 236–237).

That Freidenberg should focus on the nineteenth century as "the last frontier of the ready-made plot and the beginning of the freely invented one" (Freidenberg 1936, 361) was not entirely surprising. Nineteenth-century Western European literature, particularly the French novel (especially Balzac, Stendhal, and Zola), was accorded paramount attention by Soviet sociological criticism during the 1930s; from these debates, the Soviet version of 'critical realism' was to crystallize during that decade. Yet Freidenberg employed the nineteenth-century simply to mark the chronological endpoint of what she thought had been a considerably longer process. Much more important than the endpoint was the extensive transformation leading up to it. The semantic paleontologists' true interest and curiosity were claimed by the remote realm of pre-history, antiquity and feudalism, where myth and folklore were the principal discursive formations, and where literature, understood in the modern (pre-structuralist) sense of autonomy of the author and supremacy of the new and original, did not exist.

The second feature that set apart semantic paleontology from vulgar sociologism – despite the shared belief that literature is a superstructural phenomenon conditioned historically by the base – was Marr's, Freidenberg's, and Frank-Kamenetskii's insistence that the dependence of literature on the mode of production and the wider forms of sociality can only be established by tracing the historical transformations of thinking mirrored in the origins of 'language' and 'linguistic' change. No theory of cultural evolution was possible without embedding its hypotheses in, and endorsing them through, the study of glottogenesis and the evolution of language.

To do this, the findings of semantic paleontology had to be supplemented by what Frank-Kamenetskii called *paleontological morphology*, i. e. the study of how plot emerged in addition to the formation of primeval *semantic bundles*. Frank-Kamenetskii, along with Marr, believed that once these bundles, or clusters,

were established (each reflecting a potentially very wide circle of interconnected meanings, such as 'love', 'death', and 'resurrection', or 'sky', 'water', 'light', 'fire', 'vegetation', 'winter', 'ice', to name but a few), plot only began to develop after the verb had severed itself from the noun, assisted by the already formed pronouns. As man's active impact on nature grew with the help of new techniques and tools of labour, gradually the conflict between the 'subject and object of action' came to the fore, which issued in a distinction between the passive and the active voice of the verb. Before this distinction was available, creativity lived on "the border-line between semantic identity and plot construction" (Frank-Kamenetskii 1932, 275), where the function of the protagonist was expressed not through action but through his changing conditions (as in the "alternation of life and death in the myth of the dying and rising god" [Frank-Kamenetskii 1932, 275]). Finally, while at the very early stages there was most likely no grammatical differentiation between first, second, and third person – grammatically they were all expressed through the third person pronoun, believed to have ascended from the name of the totem (in this grammatical identity Frank-Kamenetskii thought to have found the "paleontological source" of the trinitarian nature of God [Frank-Kamenetskii 1932, 274]), with the gradual evolvement of grammatical distinction the nucleus of everyday plot began to emerge. Thus the staple motif of adultery, where three distinct protagonists are needed to enact the plot scheme, serves Frank-Kamenetskii as a narrative evidence for a more advanced stage of grammatical differentiation within language.

3 Drawing the boundaries of modernity: From image-based to conceptual cognition

All of this rested, of course, on an unshaken belief in the evolution of the mind from a primitive, pre-logical state to a rational, logical modus operandi. Harking back to work on myth, language, and the genesis of concepts by Ludwig Noiré and Lucien Lévy-Bruhl (and by Potebnia, closer to home), Frank-Kamenetskii, who had also seriously engaged with the philosophy of Ernst Cassirer (see Frank-Kamenetskii 1929), asserted the central role of metaphor as a "cognitive category which fore-shadowed the logical concepts in the thinking based on images" (Frank-Kamenetskii 1935b, 173), thus clearing the way to theoretical schemes informing the "scientific cognition" (Frank-Kamenetskii 1935b, 173) of reality. Metaphor was seen to be genetically linked to mythological images; for Frank-Kamenetskii, both are tools of "knowing the concrete through the concrete" (Frank-Kamenetskii 1935a, 141), in contradistinction to theoretical cognition which relies on formal-logical abstrac-

tion, thus "artificially severing the link between the general and the singular" (Frank-Kamenetskii 1935a, 141). Even though myth was considered an earlier stage of cultural evolution, preceding 'poetry' ('poetry' was often used by the semantic paleontologists as a generic term for 'literature'), poetic metaphor developed in close contact with, and out of, myth. This "genetic link to myth" (Frank-Kamenetskii 1935a, 145) was, however, not supposed to "discredit poetic metaphor, just as the undeniable connection of astronomy with astrology or of chemistry with alchemy cannot cast a shadow on these areas of knowledge" (Frank-Kamenetskii 1935a, 145). There was no value judgement involved in describing the transition from one stage of cultural evolution to the next; rather, the mechanism of transition revealed a recurring regularity whereby what functioned as content at an earlier stage would become form at the next one. Frank-Kamenetskii repeatedly uses this formulation with reference to myth and literature (see e. g. Frank-Kamenetski 1935a, 142; 1935b, 172; 1932, 268–269). A good example of how this rule is applied in practice is furnished in his long (and at the time of his death unfinished) work "K genezisu legendy o Romeo i Iulii" ("On the genesis of the legend of Romeo and Juliet"):

In myth, we find an image-borne perception of nature in terms borrowed from [the realm of] social relations. Poetry, orientated [as it is] towards depicting the life of society, uses the phenomena of nature for an image-borne representation of man in [the framework of] human relationships. And if in myth the separation of the lovers (gods) is a metaphor of winter as nature's death, whereas marriage is a metaphor of vegetation and fecundity, [then] in poetry we find the reverse correlation: here winter serves as a metaphor of separation and death, and vegetation... as an emblem of marriage, love, or woman as the embodiment of love magic. (Frank-Kamenetskii 1996, 186)

Thus what used to be content at the mythological stage (the cycle of seasons in nature) becomes form at the stage of literature: nature and the change of seasons now function as a metaphor of human relations. No doubt under pressure from the prevalent paradigm of Soviet literary studies in the 1930s, this transition is seen, both by Frank-Kamenetskii and Freidenberg, as containing the early germs of realism, testifying to the emerging ability of literature to portray and analyse human relationships (Frank-Kamenetskii 1995, 197; 1935a, 144); this is also one of the central arguments of Freidenberg's lectures of the late 1930s-early 1940s, published posthumously by Nina Braginskaia as part of a one-volume selection of Freidenberg's works, *Mif i literatura drevnosti* (1976; 1998 [first full edition of the text], *Myth and the Literature of Antiquity*; 2008). Realism processed the lingering deposits of myth through various acts of 'rationalisation' (*ratsionalizatsiia* [see Frank-Kamenetskii 1994, 184; 1995, 186, 189]), enhanced the plausibility of the inherited plots. Thus, for example, instead of dying and rising again and again as

part of the mythical cycle, with the transition to realism the protagonists had to limit their deaths to a single event, saturating the plot with a string of deceptive demises.

Although metaphor was credited by the semantic paleontologists with performing the role of a bridge between image-based and conceptual cognition, thus holding these two aspects of culture in equilibrium, the theory of stadialism embraced by Freidenberg and Frank-Kamenetskii issued in asserting rationality as an indispensable and non-negotiable feature of modernity. With the spread of industrial capitalism in the nineteenth century, Freidenberg averred, plot left behind its period of 'pre-historic' anonymity. All this points to a contradiction at the heart of semantic paleontology, never quite resolved, between, on the one hand, continuity (e. g. the passion for identifying recurring semantic bundles and motifs) and, on the other, leap, rupture or discontinuity (e. g. Freidenberg's thinking of literature as a qualitatively new superstructure that at some point is bound to sever the umbilical cord which attaches it to folklore). In contravention to her belief in enduring 'semantic deposits', but in accord with her relentless stadialism, folklore, despite being praised for its mediating role between myth and literature, was eventually castigated by Freidenberg as a relict of the past that had to be eradicated, along with any survivals of religion. In her paper at the discussion on folklore in Leningrad in June 1931, she was at her most militant, demanding that folklore be actively destroyed – a rather uncomfortable statement, both in tone and in substance, from an otherwise sophisticated thinker: "Therefore we shouldn't passively await the fading of folklore; instead, we should employ all methods, fighting for its radical extermination", Freidenberg told her colleagues at the discussion on 11 June 1931 (Freidenberg, 1931a). Thus although semantic paleontology had undertaken a persistent quest into the depths of time, establishing primordial semantic bundles and tracing their transformations at successive stages of history, it maintained a less than flexible distinction between modernity and pre-modernity, the former sustaining and nurturing rationality and conceptual thinking, the latter – despite its huge power of generating archetypal images and motifs – perpetuating a mode of thinking grounded in a picture of the world stigmatised as 'diffuse', undifferentiated, and therefore deprived of potency and real social impact. The boundaries of modernity were thus drawn rather rigidly.

Even some of the Marxist sympathisers of semantic paleontology felt that this rigid dichotomy should be revised, not necessarily in order to do justice to pre-modern thinking but to chart the persistence of 'irrationalism' throughout human history. Ieremeia Ioffe, the principal exponent of a new, more radical – in some aspects cruder, in others perhaps more imaginative – sociological aesthetics in the 1930s (like the semantic paleontologists, Ioffe lived and worked in

Leningrad), endeavoured to revisit Marr's stage theory in light of what he judged to be a much more fundamental (and thus conceptually more effective) divide: that between socio-economic formations based on exploitation and those which precluded it. Here the nineteenth century ceased to be the crucial demarcation line that separated industrial capitalism (Freidenberg's synonym for modernity) from an allegedly amorphous, primitive, and pre-logical culture. In his book *Sinteticheskoe izuchenie iskusstva i zvukovoe kino* (1937, *The Synthetic Study of Art and Sound Cinema*), Ioffe argued that the bourgeoisie, hard as it tried and despite its bold revolutionary acts, was never able to cut off its links to feudalism, for the bourgeoisie remained after all a class committed to exploitation. This fundamental affinity with feudalism was reawakened once capitalism moved away from its early, revolutionary period and entered the crisis-ridden imperialist stage. "The curve of capitalist thinking goes back to its origins" (Ioffe 1937, 16); in other words, the humanist thought of early capitalism which had liberated man from the "irrational fetters of cosmogony, from kin and guild constraints" (Ioffe 1937, 18) was later supplanted by a positivist (in essence, secondarily cosmological) picture of the world, in which man was once again denigrated to a cog in the larger wheel of the universe (and the markets). While praising Marr and his associates for detecting a repertoire of recurring semantic bundles (using the same term – *puchok* – which is also employed by the semantic paleontologists), Ioffe accounts for this recurrence differently. The reason for it he locates in the "immobile forms" (Ioffe 1937, 20) of bourgeois thought – forms that go back to feudalism, then disappear in the "cultural underground" during the "progressive" (Ioffe 1937, 20) phase of capitalism, only to resurface in the age of its "dissolution" (Ioffe 1937, 20). These 'immobile forms' are ultimately conditioned by the fact that feudalism and capitalism present a continuum, sharing as they do the nature of formations based on exploitation. Ioffe further charges the semantic paleontologists with failing to recognise that the recurrence of these semantic bundles is not a matter of plain variation: rather, at each stage of development we have to deal with complex transformations, "a split and fight of the elements of one and the same semantic bundle, their distribution onto incommensurable series" (Ioffe 1937, 46). This incommensurability reflects the contradictory nature of class-based thinking. Contrary to Freidenberg, Ioffe believes that irrationality and pre-logical thinking do not go away with the arrival of advanced capitalism; they survive the industrial revolution, because irrationality is the very nature of any thinking grounded in exploitation. (Ioffe's critique of irrationality which extends to encompass the "fascist worldview" [Ioffe 1937, 408] is no doubt part and parcel of the larger Leftist trend of the later 1930s seeking to establish the intellectual genealogy of Nazism in what Lukács termed the process of 'destruction of reason'.) Ioffe thus concludes that "the resilience of the semantic series, the resilience of irrational semantic bundles, the[ir] stability flow from

the conservative nature of the forms of consciousness of class society" (Ioffe 1937, 46), which do not easily alter their substantially contradictory character, even in periods marked by seemingly radical technological progress.

4 The impact of semantic paleontology on literary studies in the 1930s and beyond

Ioffe's serious – critical but not unsympathetic – engagement with semantic paleontology remained, on the whole, an isolated occurrence. This was indicative of the new method failing to gain official approval as a leading paradigm of literary studies in the 1930s. At least on the surface, it didn't seem to attract sufficient attention and to make the public impact its founders would have hoped for. In one of several books to appear in the 1930s, solidifying the Marr cult and canonising his new theory of language, Sergei Bykovskii devoted an entire chapter to exploring "the significance of Marr's scientific theory for the fields of science immediately related to linguistics"; while focusing on archaeology, ethnography, and anthropology, he remained completely silent on issues of literary history and theory (Bykovskii 1933, 70–84). Not even in folkloristics did semantic paleontology enjoy overwhelming success. Freidenberg's hostility towards folklore as relict of the past – a logical conclusion of the theory of stadialism – flew in the face of ever more prominent (and tactically much smarter than her forthrightness) efforts to revive and manipulate folklore for political purposes during the 1930s (see Miller 1990, 3–24; Arkhipova and Nekliudov 2010, 96–100; for an early critique of the encouragement of 'artificial folklore' in the Soviet Union, see N. Leont'ev 1953). If anything, semantic paleontology inhibited this process, and this is why even in the study of folklore the method failed to gain the wide currency one might have been led to expect at the time.

Freidenberg herself had doubts about the immediate relevance of semantic paleontology for literary studies, in the same breath as she was praising its sweeping methodological ambition: "Marr's paleontological analysis has emerged as truly revolutionary; [it is] the most characteristic aspect of the entire new teaching on language, with the smallest number of genuine followers and the largest number of opponents" (Freidenberg 1936, 32). Her own books did not generate much public attention; *Poetics of Plot and Genre* received one negative review (resembling a lampoon more than a scholarly evaluation) and a one-page dismissive and ironic note by a reviewer who had already dedicated a flippant page to her edited volume *Antichnye teorii iazyka i stilia* (1936, *Theories from Antiquity on Language and Style*) (Leiteizen 1936; Nikolaeva 1936a, 238; 1936b, 271).

Only the manifesto volume on Tristan and Isolde sparked a brief but significant newspaper polemic. In Leningrad, Anna Beskina and Lev Tsyrlin, both PhD students at the Institute for the Comparative Study of the Literatures and Languages of the West and East (ILIAZV) at the time (Beskina was arrested and shot in 1936; in the same year, Tsyrlin acted as the editor of Freidenberg's *Poetics of Plot and Genre* at the Leningrad 'Khudozhestvennaia Literatura' publishing house), and both strongly impressed by a paper Freidenberg had delivered there in 1931, appealed to their more senior colleagues, insisting that "literary studies must finally take notice of the existence of Japhetidology; it's better to do that later than never" (Beskina and Tsyrlin 1934, 3). Beskina and Tsyrlin identified two important contributions of semantic paleontology to Soviet literary theory and scholarship. To start with, it significantly broadened the horizons of Soviet literary studies by extending the legitimate domain of literary history beyond the "narrow platform of European nineteenth-century literature" (Beskina and Tsyrlin 1934, 3), vital though discussions of the nineteenth century may have been in establishing the concept of critical realism. Secondly, unlike traditional historical poetics, semantic paleontology understood images to be predominantly a cognitive category; as such, they were a specific, historically conditioned "form of expression of conceptual thinking" (Beskina and Tsyrlin 1934, 3). To these contributions articulated by Beskina and Tsyrlin, we have to add a third one. Perhaps most importantly, semantic paleontology annulled the divorce between literary studies and linguistics that was so characteristic for the earlier stages of Marxist literary theory. Indeed, one could perceive in the work of Freidenberg and Frank-Kamenetskii an – at the time urgent – appeal to put language back on the agenda of Left literary studies. In a sense, their work was a mirror image of what Formalism had done: asserting the centrality of language, yet not as the carrier of 'literariness' but rather as the embodiment of socio-economic change which in turn brings along changes in worldview that are to be examined by looking carefully at the multitude of semantic deposits over the *longue durée* of pre-history and history proper.

It was precisely this radical re-marriage of linguistics and literature and the priority accorded to semantics that proved highly suspect in the eyes of those defending a more orthodox literary sociology. David Tamarchenko, another contributor to the Leningrad exchanges around the collective volume on Tristan and Isolde, charged the doctrine of stadialism with inattention to the Leninist theory of reflection. By this he meant that semantic paleontology tended to deduce the stadial nature and socio-economic aspects of plot from the data of semantics, obtained through linguistic analysis. If for the stages of pre-history this seemed a permissible operation, it fell short of methodological rigour when it came to understanding the more recent stages of development. Marx, Tamarchenko reminded Freidenberg and Frank-Kamenetskii, had called for the forms

of ideological life to be derived from the socio-economic relations that governed reality; instead, the semantic paleontologists appeared to distill the essence of socio-economic reality from the semantic material of myth, folklore, and literature. The centrality of semantics was thus turning the principle of reflection on its head; Marr's followers strove to comprehend socio-economic reality from the superstructural forms it was supposed to have conditioned in the first place (see Tamarchenko 1935).

Freidenberg was aware of this potential rift with Marxism. In an unpublished (and, judging by the full text, apparently unfinished) paper drafted in 1931 and titled "Nuzhna li iafetidologiia literaturovedeniiu?" ("Do Literary Studies Need Japhetidology?") and thus displaying the synonymic and frequently interchangeable use of terms such as 'Japhetidology' (derived from Marr's linguistic doctrine), semantic paleontology, and 'genetic method', she questioned the tactical suitability of the term: "it seems a claim to methodological independence is concealed in it;" "this devastating terminology seems to exist only to enrage the Marxists and to beat the Japhetidologists" (Freidenberg 1931b).

While negotiating the boundaries between her own para-Marxist cultural theory and orthodox sociologism, Freidenberg was to face criticism from some of her own pupils, more often than not for methodological reasons. In an article surveying the history of the 'genetic method', written decades after semantic paleontology had left the stage of Soviet literary theory, Sofia Poliakova charged Marr's followers with reducing cultural history to a 'gigantic tautology'. While in hot pursuit of primeval clusters of meaning, Poliakova maintained, Freidenberg produced a semantic universe, in which everything resembled and echoed everything else. "We are thus in the kingdom of sameness clad in difference" (Poliakova 1997 [1994], 370). Poliakova contrasts in her article Freidenberg and Frank-Kamenetskii; the latter is declared a true scholar and thinker, Freidenberg is apportioned the dubious honour of a helpless and methodologically perplexed follower of Marr and Frank-Kamenetskii. This assessment is historically inaccurate and unfounded. Suffice it to point to Frank-Kamenetskii's unequivocal praise of Freidenberg's pioneering role in the mythological interpretation of the Greek novel, which overturned Erwin Rohde's false assumption of the importance of invention and foreshadowed 'by three years' Karl Kerényi's study *Die griechisch-orientalische Romanliteratur in religionsgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung* (1927, *The Greek-Oriental Novel from the Point of View of Religious History*) which, according to Frank-Kamenetskii, was, compared to Freidenberg's, rather narrow in scope, limiting itself to an examination of the Egyptian myth of Osiris and its impact on the Greek novel.

In 1979–1980, Freidenberg became once again the target of criticism, this time by a group of young classicists at Leningrad University who believed her work to

be lacking in methodological rigour and philological exactitude. Freidenberg was aligned with Lotman, Toporov, Averintsev, and Losev, who were all thought by these budding scholars to be representatives of a new – structuralist – orthodoxy in philology, which, because it was perceived by many as a form of opposition to the regime, was felt to be beyond criticism. Seeking to rectify this undemocratic situation, the students organized small workshops, in which they questioned the methodological untouchability of structuralism and semiotics of which Freidenberg was considered a predecessor *sui generis*, by Toporov and to some extent by Lotman, whose notion of 'explosion' (*vzryv*) as a mechanism of cultural and historical change undoubtedly drew on her idea of the fitful birth of qualitatively new cultural formations (cf. Lotman 2009 [1992], 140; see also Lotman 1976 [1973]). The discussions (except for the one on Averintsev, which had not been recorded) were later published in the samizdat journal *Metrodor*.

However contested and feeble in its 'public' impact on the methodology of literary studies, semantic paleontology exercised considerable subterraneous influence. Viktor Zhirmunskii's work in the 1930s (and for years to come) rested on the premises of Marr's comparative stadialism, where, in Zhirmunskii's words, "we can and must compare analogous literary phenomena that emerge at the same stages of the social-historical process, regardless of any immediate influence amongst them" (Zhirmunskii 1936 [first presented as a paper in December 1935], 384). Similarly, Zhirmunskii lent his unequivocal approval to 'paleontological analysis' as an instrument for charting the transformations of community culture (Zhirmunskii 2004 [1934], 53). At roughly the same time, traces of comparative stadialism can also be found in Zhirmunskii's Herder monograph, written in the 1930s but first published only in 1959: "Thus behind the national specificity of folk poetry, its universal features are revealed to Herder as a particular stage in the development of poetic thought, equally mandatory, from an historical point of view, for the 'classic' and the modern European peoples, as well as for the primitive ones that have not been touched by the influence of European civilization" (Zhirmunskii 1972, 241). Mikhail Bakhtin's rediscovery of Rabelais, folklore, and popular culture was no doubt stimulated by Freidenberg's own work. Although Bakhtin referred to Freidenberg only once in his book on Rabelais, he had read *Poetics of Plot and Genre* for the first time towards the end of 1936, leaving behind revealing marginal notes (see Osovskii 2002). In 1937–38 Bakhtin had engaged once again with Freidenberg's book, making excerpts in his notebooks (cf. Perlina 2011, 213). Freidenberg's understanding of parody as a converted form of deification and veneration, her sensitivity for the coexistence of the serious and the comic, and her belief that the Greek novel was itself a variant of the epic were shared by Bakhtin in his insistence that the 'prehistory' of the novel as genre be examined anew. It is this attention to antiquity and the pre-modern discursive

forms of the novelistic that set Bakhtin apart from Georg Lukács, the other major theorist of the novel in the 1930s, who elected to focus solely on its history since the eighteenth century. Moreover, Bakhtin's entire Rabelais project, as well as his writings on the theory of the novel, were shot through with the same mistrust of ready, fixed, and petrified cultural forms that we have located in Freidenberg's statement: "To the ready-made, finalized literary phenomenon one had to react by posing the question of the origins of literature itself" (Freidenberg 1932, 6). Despite his attention to great canonical writers (Dostoevsky, Goethe, Rabelais), Bakhtin remained – not only in the 1930s but into the 1960s, when his Rabelais book and the revised Dostoevsky monograph were published – an ardent believer in a history of literature without names, in which – just as in Freidenberg's and Frank-Kamenetskii's work – genre and its memory, deposited in anonymous plots and ambivalent semantic clusters, played a much more significant role than any one individual writer. Bakhtin referred approvingly to Marr and Meshchaninov in his writings on the prehistory of the novelistic genre; he preserved his respectful attitude to Marr's work into the 1950s (as a lecture he gave in 1958 at Saransk demonstrates), long after Marr's dethronement by Stalin in 1950.

Thus, one may conclude, the true impact of semantic paleontology on literary studies during the 1930s (and beyond) was much more substantial than the lack of formal public backing and recognition would suggest. It asserted itself as a specific para-Marxist discourse, seeking to differentiate itself both from Formalism and vulgar sociologism, and later as a predecessor *sui generis* of Soviet structuralism and semiotics. The scope of this impact was largely determined by the importance of semantic paleontology in the crucial debates on the boundaries of modernity raging in the Soviet 1930s. The uneasy balance between championing the uniqueness of Soviet classless society and essaying to bestow on it a venerable line of descent was central to the work of the semantic paleontologists. Never quite resolved, the tension between continuity and rupture, between smooth evolution and revolutionary explosion was reflective of the wider process of drawing and re-drawing the boundaries of modernity, of pondering the implications of the incorporation or rejection of pre-modern cultural forms in the face of the new agenda of socialism in one country. The discussions on how cultural forms evolve and what the mechanisms are of the transformations they undergo; on the status and relevance of semantic clusters that had been surviving multiple transitions from myth to folklore to literature; on the radical historicity of literariness and the need to consider it from a genetic perspective – all these disputes were formulating and deliberating one substantive issue: how should culture, and literature as part of it, relate to the challenges flowing from the accelerated accession to modernity during the Soviet 1930s. The political and intellectual stakes of articulating answers to this question were high, and so was the degree of sophistication

amongst the best participants in these discussions, who – perhaps surprisingly for a regime we are wont to think of as ideologically monolithic – were turning their backs on vulgar sociologism and were exploring a range of theoretical alternatives within and beyond Marxism.

> This article is an edited and abridged version of Ch. 4 of my book *The Birth and Death of Literary Theory: Regimes of Relevance in Russia and Beyond* (Tihanov 2019), where the reader can find fuller bibliographical details.

References

Arkhipova, A. S., and S. Iu. Nekliudov. "Fol'klor i vlast' v zakrytom obshchestve." *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* 101 (2010): 84–108.

Azadovskii, M. K. "Pamiati N. Ia. Marra." *Sovetskii fol'klor. Sbornik statei i materialov* 2–3 (1935): 5–20.

Barsht, K.A. "Russkaia mifologicheskaia shkola i literaturovedcheskaia paleontologiia I. G. Frank-Kamenetskogo ('K genezisu legendy o Romeo i Iulii')." *Russkii tekst* 5 (1997): 164–192.

Beskina, A., and L. Tsyrlin. "Marksistskaia poetika i novoe uchenie N. Ia. Marra o iazyke." *Literaturnyi Leningrad* 64 (26 December 1934): 2–3.

Bogaevskii, B. "Gomer i iafeticheskaia teoriia." *Iazyk i literatura* 4 (1929): 1–20.

Braginskaia, Nina. "O rabote O. M. Freidenberg 'Sistema literaturnogo siuzheta'." *Tynianovskii sbornik. Vtorye Tynianovskie chteniia*. Ed. M. O. Chudakova. Riga: Zinatne, 1986. 272–283.

Brabinskaia, Nina. "Siste, Viator! (Predislovie k dokladu O. M. Freidenberg 'O nepodvizhnykh siuzhetakh i brodiachikh teoretikakh')." Nina Brabinskaia, *Odissei: chelovek v istorii*. Moscow: Nauka, 1995. 244–271.

Braginskaia, Nina [Braginskaya, Nina V.]. "Innovation Disguised as Tradition. Commentary and the Genesis of Art Forms." *Persistent Forms: Explorations in Historical Poetics*. Eds. Ilya Kliger and Boris Maslov. New York, NY: Fordham UP, 2016. 172–208.

Brandist, Craig. "Semantic Palaeontology and the Passage from Myth to Science and Poetry: The Work of Izrail' Frank-Kamenetskii (1880–1937)." *Studies in East European Thought* 63.1 (2011): 43–61.

Bykovskii, S. N. *N. Ia. Marr i ego teoriia. K 45-letiiu nauchnoi deiatel'nosti*. Leningrad: Ogiz, Lensotsekgiz, 1933.

Debaker, L., and Iu. M. Shilkov. "Iazyk, mif i metafora (O paleosemanticheskoi kontseptsii I. G. Frank-Kamenetskogo)." *Veche* 13 (2002): 164–176.

Frank-Kamenetskii, Izrail' G. "Pervobytnoe myshlenie v svete iafeticheskoi teorii i filosofii." *Iazyk i literatura* 3 (1929): 70–155.

Frank-Kamenetskii, Izrail' G. "Itogi kollektivnoi raboty nad siuzhetom Tristana i Izol'dy." *Tristan i Isol'da. Ot geroini liubvi feodal'noi Evropy do bogini matriarkhal'noi Afrevrazii. Kollektivnyi trud Sektora semantiki mifa i fol'klora pod redaktsiei N. Ia. Marra*. Ed. Nikolai Ia. Marr. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1932. 261–276.

Frank-Kamenetskii, Izrail' G. "K voprosu o razvitii poeticheskoi metafory." *Sovetskoe iazykoznanie* 1 (1935a): 93–145.

Frank-Kamenetskii, Izrail' G. "Razluka, kak metafora smerti v mife i v poezii." *Izvestiia Akademii Nauk SSSR (Seriia 7: Otdelenie obshchestvennykh nauk)* 2 (1935b): 153–176.

Frank-Kamenetskii, Izrail' G. "K genezisu legendy o Romeo i Iulii." *Russkii tekst 2* (1994): 158–177.

Frank-Kamenetskii, Izrail' G. "K genezisu legendy o Romeo i Iulii," *Russkii tekst* 3 (1995): 167–205.

Frank-Kamenetskii, Izrail' G. "K genezisu legendy o Romeo i Iulii." *Russkii tekst* 4 (1996): 178–203.

Frank-Kamenetskii, Viktor A. "I. G. Frank-Kamenetskii (1880–1937)." *Russkii tekst* 2 (1994): 178–179.

Freidenberg, Ol'ga. "Tezisy k kontr-dokladu O. M. Freidenberg." Ol'ga Freidenberg's typewritten memoirs, *Probeg zhizni*, folder 5, p. 9; Oxford: The Pasternak Family Archive, 1931a.

Freidenberg, Ol'ga. "Nuzhna li iafetidologiia literaturovedeniiu?" Ol'ga Freidenberg's Archive, cited with the kind permission of Nina Braginskaia. 1931b.

Freidenberg, Ol'ga. "Tselevaia ustanovka kollektivnoi raboty nad siuzhetom Tristana i Isol'dy." *Tristan i Isol'da. Ot geroini liubvi feodal'noi Evropy do bogini matriarkhal'noi Afrevrazii. Kollektivnyi trud Sektora semantiki mifa i fol'klora pod redaktsiei N. Ia. Marra*. Ed. Nikolai Ia. Marr. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1932. 1–16.

Freidenberg, Ol'ga. *Poetika siuzheta i zhanra*. Leningrad: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1936.

Freidenberg, Ol'ga. "Sistema literaturnogo siuzheta." *Montazh: literatura, iskusstvo, teatr, kino*. Ed. B. V. Raushenbakh. Moscow: Nauka, 1988. 214–237.

Freidenberg, Ol'ga. "Recollections of N. Ia. Marr." Ed. Nina Braginskaia. *Soviet Studies in Literature* 27.3 (1991): 61–83

Freidenberg, O. "O nepodvizhnykh siuzhetakh i brodiachikh teoretikakh (iz sluzhebnogo dnevnika)." *Odissei: chelovek v istorii*. Ed. N. V. Braginskaia. Moskow: Nauka, 1995. 272–297.

Gasparov, Mikhail. *Vash M. G. Iz pisem Mikhaila Leonidovicha Gasparova*. Ed. E. Shumilova. Moscow: Novoe izdatel'stvo, 2008.

Ioffe, Ieremiia I. *Sinteticheskoe izuchenie iskusstva i zvukovoe kino*. Leningrad: Gosudarstvennyi Muzykal'nyi Nauchno-issledovatel'skii Institut, 1937.

Ilizarov, B. S. "Pochetnyi akademik I. V. Stalin protiv akademika N. Ia. Marra. K istorii diskussii po voprosam iazykoznaniia v 1950 g." *Novaia i noveishaia istoriia* 4 (2003): 125.

Kabanov, Annette. *Ol'ga Michajlovna Frejdenberg, 1890–1955: Eine sowjetische Wissenschaftlerin zwischen Kanon und Freiheit*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 2002.

Kliger, Ilya, and Boris Maslov (eds.). *Persistent Forms: Explorations in Historical Poetics*. New York, NY: Fordham UP, 2016.

Leiteizen, Ts. "Vrednaia galimatiia." *Izvestiia* (31 September 1936).

Leont'ev, N. "Volkhovanie i shamanstvo." *Novyi mir* 8 (1953): 227–244.

Lotman, Juri. "O. M. Freidenberg as a student of culture" [1973] *Soviet Studies in Literature* 12.2 (1976): 3–11.

Lotman, Juri. *Culture and Explosion*. [1992]. Ed. Marina Grishakova. Trans. by Wilma Clark. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter, 2009.

Lozanova, A. "Rabota po fol'kloru v Institute iazyka i myshleniia (IIAM) Akademii Nauk SSSR." *Sovetskaia etnografiia* 1–2 (1934): 209.

Marr, Nikolai Ia. (ed.) *Tristan i Izol'da. Ot geroini liubvi feodal'noi Evropy do bogini matriarkhal'noi Afrevrazii. Kollektivnyi trud Sektora semantiki mifa i fol'klora pod redaktsiei N. Ia. Marra*. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1932.

Marr, Nikolai Ia. "'Ishtar': ot bogini matriarkhal'noi Afrevrazii do geroini liubvi feodal'noi Evropy'." *Iafeticheskii sbornik* 5 (1927): 109–178.

Marr, Nikolai Ia. *K bakinskoi diskussii o iafetidologii i marksizme.* Baku: AzGNII, 1932a.

Marr, Nikolai Ia. "Vstupitel'noe slovo, proiznesennoe vitse-prezidentom Vsesoiuznoi Akademii Nauk akad. N. Ia. Marrom v torzhestvennom sobranii, sostoiavshemsia 27 sentiabria." *Vestnik Akademii Nauk SSSR* 10 (1932b): 5–18.

Marr, Nikolai Ia. "K semanticheskoi paleontologii v iazykakh neiafeticheskikh system." [1931] *Izbrannye raboty*. Vol. 2. Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoe izdatel'stvo, 1936. 246–288.

Martin, Richard P. "Against Ornament. O. M. Freidenberg's Concept of Metaphor in Ancient and Modern Concepts." *Persistent Forms: Explorations in Historical Poetics*. Eds. Ilya Kliger and Boris Maslov. New York, NY: Fordham UP, 2016. 274–313.

Meshchaninov, I. I. "'Problemy klassifikatsii iazykov i narodov v osveshchenii iafeticheskogo iazykoznaniia." *Sovetskaia etnografiia* 2 (1933). 74–83.

Miller, Frank J. *Folklore for Stalin*. Armonk, NY: Sharpe, 1990.

Moss, Kevin. *Olga Mikhailovna Freidenberg: Soviet Mythologist in a Soviet Context*. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 1985.

Nikolaeva, Tat'iana. "Teofrast i drugie." *Krasnaia nov'* 5 (1936a).

Nikolaeva, Tat'iana. "Ėtot slepets Gomer!" *Krasnaia nov'* 7 (1936b).

Nikol'skaia, Tat'iana. "N. Ia. Marr i futuristy." *Kredo* 3–4 (1993).

Nikol'skaia, Tat'iana. *Avangard i okrestnosti*, St. Petersburg: Ivan Limbakh, 2002.

Osovskii, Oleg. "Bakhtin chitaet Ol'gu Freidenberg: o kharaktere i smysle bakhtinskikh marginalii na stranitsakh 'Poetiki siuzheta i zhanra'." *M. M. Bakhtin v Saranske: dokumenty, materialy, issledovaniia*. Vol. 1. Ed. S. A. Dubrovskaia. Saransk: Mordovskii Gosudarstvennyi Universitet, 2002. 1: 24–35

Perlina, Nina. *Ol'ga Freidenberg's Works and Days*. Bloomington, IN: Slavica, 2002.

Perlina, Nina. "Eshche raz o tom, kak po khodu raboty nad knigoi o Rable Mikhail Bakhtin chital 'Poetiku siuzheta i zhanra' Ol'gi Freidenberg'." *Chronotope and Environs: Festschrift for Nikolay Pan'kov/Khronotop i okrestnosti. Iubileinyi sbornik v chest' Nikolaia Pan'kova*. Ed. B. V. Orekhov. Ufa: Vagant, 2011, 209–227.

Schlauch, Margaret. "A Russian Study of the Tristan Legend." *Romanic Review* 24 (1933): 37–45.

Poliakova, S. V. *'Oleinikov i ob Oleinikove' i drugie raboty po russkoi literature.* [1994] Moscow: INAPRESS, 1997.

Tamarchenko, D. "Literaturovedenie i 'iafetidologiia'." *Literaturnyi Leningrad* 2 (1935).

Tihanov, Galin. "Review of Nina Perlina, *Ol'ga Freidenberg's Works and Days* (Bloomington, IN: Slavica, 2002); Annette Kabanov, *Ol'ga Michajlovna Frejdenberg, 1890–1955: Eine sowjetische Wissenschaftlerin zwischen Kanon und Freiheit* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 2002)." *Slavonica* 10.2 (2004): 189–190.

Tihanov, Galin. "On the Significance of Historical Poetics: In Lieu of a Foreword." *Poetics Today* 38.3 (2017): 417–428.

Tihanov, Galin. *The Birth and Death of Literary Theory: Regimes of Relevance in Russia and Beyond*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2019.

Tolz, Vera. *Russian Academicians and the Revolution: Combining Professionalism and Politics*. Basingstoke and London: Macmillan, 1997.

Vasil'kov, Iakov V. "Tragediia akademika Marra." *Khristianskii Vostok* 8.2 (2001): 390–421.

Zhirmunskii, Viktor. "Sravnitel'noe literaturovedenie i problema literaturnykh vliianii." [1935] *Izvestiia Akademii Nauk (Otdelenie obshchestvennykh nauk)* 3 (1936): 383–403.

Zhirmunskii, Viktor. "Zhizn' i tvorchestvo Gerdera." Viktor Zhirmunskii, *Ocherki po istorii klassicheskoi nemetskoi literatury.* Leningrad: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1972. 209–276. [First published in: *Sergeiu Fedorovichu Ol'denburgu: K 50-letiiu nauchno-obshchestvennoi deiatel'nosti, 1882–1932*. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR, 1934. 195–213.]

Zhirmunskii, Viktor. "Problema fol'klora." [1934] Viktor Zhirmunskii, *Fol'klor Zapada i Vostoka. Sravnitel'no-istoricheskie ocherki.* Eds. B. S. Dolgin and S. Iu. Nekliudov. Moscow: O. G. I., 2004. 40–57.

Dirk Uffelmann

Postcolonial Studies: Processes of Appropriation and Axiological Controversies

The Slavic appropriation of postcolonial studies in the early twenty-first century served as an arena for various controversies – this is the thesis which the following handbook entry seeks to defend. Among these controversies, that regarding the question whether the relevant research featured a properly literary focus was at times less prominent. This might be regarded as a symptom of a general decline of literary theory. One might, however, also declare this as proof of the societal relevance of literary theory – in a novel transdisciplinary and transcultural disguise. The latter suggestion becomes plausible when looking at the other areas contested in the wake of this appropriation process – intercultural debates about the perpetrators and victims of imperial rule; axiological controversies saturated with anti-colonial indictments directed against external colonizers, internal elites, communism, and even Christianity; and interdisciplinary debates concerning the applicability of the notion of colonialism to intra-European relations of cultural hegemony and to contiguous empires. The following contribution will proceed with reconstructing the controversies in the aforementioned order, pointing to their varying relevance for literary theory. The overview will round off with outlining explicit appeals to 're-literaricize' East-European postcolonial debates and with identifying lacunae of research to date.

The method applied consists of reconstructing the dialogical, agonal nature of the relevant debates. The underlying assumption is that scrutinizing various vectors of agonality – intercultural, axiological, interdisciplinary, and meta-literary controversies – helps to foster better understanding of what has been at stake in recent East European postcolonial literary theory.

1 Divergent processes of appropriation

Before digging into the aforementioned controversies, it is indispensable to outline the divergent patterns of appropriation (and neglect) of Anglo-American postcolonial studies. How did the processes of appropriation of postcolonial theory in Eastern, East-Central, and Southeastern Europe evolve and which transcultural dynamics characterize the divergent patterns of (dis-)appropriation? As demonstrated in the historical overview by Sproede and Lecke (2011, 66), the process of adoption was very uneven. Sproede's and Lecke's exclusive zeroing in on Poland,

Lithuania, and Russia, however, undeservedly limits the scope and neglects some of the earliest pioneers.

The initial spark for adopting postcolonial categories – Orientalism, Othering, hybridity, mimicry, subalternity, etc. – for the analysis of contemporary literature came from what one might regard as a double margin, which is characteristic since margins are epistemically elevated in Anglo-American postcolonial studies as well; it was migrant intellectuals such as Edward Said, Homi K. Bhabha, and Gayatri Spivak who spoke out most prominently on behalf of the disenfranchised of the post-colonial global order and Australian scholars (Ashcroft et al. 1989) who proposed the most seminal literary concept of 'writing back'. In Slavic literary studies it is also an Australian, here the Ukrainian-Australian literary theorist Marko Pavlyshyn, who, in two precursory articles of 1992 and 1993, first demonstrated the usefulness of postcolonial categories for analyzing Ukrainian postmodernism (Pavlyshyn 1992; 1993). Before the pioneering role of Ukrainian postcolonial studies could eventually be acknowledged more than a decade later, it needed additional external encouragements from America (Spivak 1996, 297–298; Moore 2001; Cavanagh 2003; 2004) to trigger a corresponding debate in homegrown East-European literary theory. Given the global connectedness and the strong contribution of diaspora scholars working in the Anglo-American and German-speaking academia, postcolonial literary studies have remained a transnational phenomenon, with English serving as reference *lingua franca* also for Polish, Russian, and Ukrainian scholars (while the bulk of German-language research has been widely overlooked in the respective Slavic countries).

After the first Ukrainian glimmer and a few other brief precursory sketches (Kiossev 1998; Pirie 1998; Szkudlarek 1998), it took until the early 2000s for other East-European philologies to produce their first topical contributions. More often than not the very first publications steered the subsequent discussions in certain directions (which differ from philology to philology): the Polish-Texan scholar Ewa Thompson directed the Polish focus toward Russian writers as apologists of imperialism (Thompson 2000); Aleksandr Etkind (2001) proposed his novel concept of Russia's internal colonization, based on a triangle constellation derived from Pushkin's *Kapitanskaia dochka* (1836, *The Captain's Daughter*); Romanian scholar Ion Lefter called for exploring the affinities between postcommunism and postcolonialism (Lefter 2001); and Germanist Clemens Ruthner scrutinized Austrian Orientalizations of the Hapsburg Slavs (Ruthner 2002). While the literary theory communities specializing in smaller cultures such as the Baltic countries or Kashubia eagerly adopted postcolonialism (Kelertas 2006; Osinski 2011), and while German-Slavic, especially Prussian-Polish interactions proved to be a fertile ground for postcolonially-inspired literary research (see, for example, Kopp 2012), even with regard to the forced population transfer after World War Two (Fiut 2003,

153; developed in Uffelmann 2017), the hesitation in the post-Hapsburg countries (Feichtinger et al. 2003), the later appropriation for Slovak literature (Pucherová and Gáfrik 2015), and the outspoken resistance in the Czech Republic (Luft 2003; cf. Uffelmann 2008) produced an intriguingly disparate map of postcolonial literary theory adoption in Eastern Europe. It turns out that in some countries such as Ukraine the proactive appropriation in literary theory, hand in hand with popular vulgarization of postcolonial categories in public discourse (*mutatis mutandis* also palpable in Uzbekistan), served an identity-building goal. In other traditions such as Czech philology the rejection (or – if this can be seen as a conscious action – neglect) fulfilled a less visible, but structurally analogous function. In some cases, the respective blindness is strategically partial, as with the Polish focus on the country as a victim of Russian and German colonialism (see Domańska 2008), but not as a colonizer with regard to Ukraine, Lithuania, and Belarus (cf. Uffelmann 2013). The inclusion of Poland's former Eastern Borderlands had been demanded several times (e. g. Bakuła 2006; Gosk 2008), but only later triggered bigger-scale postcolonial research (*Kresy*; Kaps and Surman 2012).

Apart from the Czech exception, most East-European philologies have seen a process of institutionalization of postcolonially-inspired research. Testifying to this are a continuously growing number of edited volumes (Kelertas 2006; Korek 2007; Kuziak 2010; Stępnik and Trześniowski 2011; Kissel 2012; Kołodziejczyk and Şandru 2014; Pucherová and Gáfrik 2015; Smola and Uffelmann 2016), as well as the two multi-volume series *Seria Wydawnicza Centrum Badań Dyskursów Postzależnościowych* (*Publishing Series of the Center for Research in Post-Dependence Discourses*, since 2011) and *Postcolonial Perspectives on Eastern Europe* (since 2012). These publications are supplemented by online platforms (http://www.postcolonial-europe.eu/, since 2009) and prestigious journals (such as *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* and *Teksty Drugie*), which have regularly provided a venue for related debates (see *Postcolonial or Postdependence Studies?* 2014).

2 Intercultural controversies

It comes as no surprise that postcolonial studies, which have from their very start scrutinized relations of hegemony of one culture over others, were especially susceptible to intercultural debates. Before the scope could be directed to disparate hegemonic relations *between* East-Central and East-European cultures, the initial provocation of "learning from the Third World," for example by viewing the partitions of Poland through the prism of the parceling-out of Africa by European colonial powers in 1884 (Pirie 1988, 338), had to be digested. This digestion has taken

quite some time but has ultimately produced research that scrutinized the Polish and Russian literary gaze at Africa (Domdey et al. 2017), South Asia (see also some contributions on Czech and Slovak travel writing in Pucherová and Gáfrik 2015) or at Polish self-positioning toward Native Americans (Surynt 2006, 90–96). It proved productive to relocate not only the 'Oriental' object of Said's *Orientalism* (1978) from the Middle East to the East of Europe (Wolff 1994; Todorova 1997; Adamovsky 2006), but also to move the Orientalizing observer from 'the West' to the Eastern part of Europe: while Ewa Thompson in her 2000 book *Imperial Knowledge* blamed Russian literature for Tsarist imperialism (cf. also Layton 1994; Dickinson 2002; Ram 2003), others demonstrated how various interrelations between East-Central and East-European literatures have been prone to Othering (Petković 2003; Kovačevič 2008; Kissel 2012; Born and Lemmen 2014; Lecke 2015). This pertains also to internal Orientalism as in the case of the Europeanized elite of modern Russia looking down at ethnic Russian peasants and provinces:

> The main trajectories of Russian colonization were not directed outside, but to the interior of the metropolis: not to Poland and even not to Bashkortostan, but to the villages of the gubernias of Tula, Pomor'e, and Orenburg. (Etkind 2001, 65, expanded in Etkind 2011)

Something comparable applies to internal hegemonic relations inside the Hapsburg Empire (Simonek 2003, 133). Here, however, the construction of difference relies less on class culture than on linguistic or religious differences. Given these more obvious distinctions, it is remarkable that the inner-Hapsburg focus could in no way mirror the stunning success that the model of Russia's internal colonization had for Russian literary theory (Etkind et al. 2012).

For most of inner-Slavic hegemonic relations there is one major villain: Ukrainian and Polish postcolonially-inspired literary theory especially displays badly concealed anti-Russian sentiments and a shift from academic inventory to actual self-defense from foreign cultural 'colonization' (Thompson 2005). Interestingly, this concerns not only actual colonial power, but also literary analyses with the help of postcolonial categories: when Russian-born, but Amsterdam-based sociologist Maxim Waldstein (2002) diagnosed Orientalizing implications in the reportages by famous Polish travel journalist Ryszard Kapuściński, this stirred up a wave of anger in Polish literary studies (for the heated debate, see the overview in Zajas 2010). It required the *grande dame* of Polish literary studies, Maria Janion, to acknowledge the justness of Waldstein's reading (Janion 2007, 228–241). Other theoreticians felt compelled to transpose their anti-imperialist stance into resistance against 'Russian' postcolonial theory even if it was produced in the diaspora as well; not only right-wing combatant Ewa Thompson, but also sober scholars such as Vitaly Chernetsky (2007, 43) and Tamara Hundorova (2013, 34)

thought it necessary to argue against Etkind's theory of Russia's internal colonization because recognizing Russians as victims of Russian colonial rule, too, would in their view undermine the victim status of Poland, Ukraine, etc. Even if a heuristic focus on a certain group of victims such as internal colonization in no way precludes other focalizations (Etkind et al. 2012, 24), it remains symptomatic that talking about certain victims creates immediate suspicion of minimizing the suffering of other victims of Russian rule.

3 Axiological controversies

With such claims of exclusivity for certain external victims, we have arrived at the political implications of debating the imperial legacy of communism in Eastern Europe, which surfaced for the first time during the Lisbon conference of Soviet and East-Central European writers in May 1988 (see the contributions in Uffelmann 2016). The almost unanimous, but epistemically fatal assumption is that colonialism has exclusively negative repercussions on the political culture of the colonized (circling around *ressentiment*: Hundorova 2007; 2013, 48–60; Thompson 2007). Negating the complicity of the "colonized" in the national varieties of communism and undialectically externalizing the perpetrator purifies the victim which, if defined in terms of a national community, gives rise to nationalism. In the Polish debate, Ewa Thompson has personified this tendency (Kołodziejczyk 2014, 139; see also the overviews by Golinczak 2008 and Zarycki 2014, 89–114), and in the Russian debate, it is Konstantin Krylov's nationalist foreword (2006) to Aleksandr Govorunov's Russian translation of Edward Said's *Orientalism* (cf. Sproede and Lecke 2011, 59–60). Those who accuse others of a nationalist misuse of postcolonial categories, which they view as a genuinely leftist subversive intellectual practice, have, however, not been spared reciprocal accusations either (see Geraci 2015, 357 against Etkind 2011). A peculiar case is the Polish attempt at 'customizing' postcolonial studies for an allegedly unique Polish situation, 'post-dependence studies' (*studia postzależnościowe*). Here is how the study group defines its orientation:

> The rationale behind the network is to investigate the condition of post-dependence underlying the contemporary Polish society and culture specifically, and, in a broader perspective, defining the difference of Central-Eastern Europe from its Western counterpart. (*Post-Dependence Studies Centre* 2009)

This moderately nationalizing project of post-dependence studies came under attack as well (Dąbrowski 2014 against Gosk 2008 and Kołodziejczyk 2014), which

is partially justified due to the propagation of a structurally mononational navel gaze.

Given the strong politicization of Catholicism in Poland, dating back if not to the partition period, then to resistance against communist rule, the Polish controversy also affects Christianity. The political left made an attempt at denouncing Christianity as a colonizing force in itself (Janion 2007), inevitably triggering Catholic postcolonial protest (Skórczewski 2013, 407–425). Literary attacks on the cultural hegemony of the Catholic Church were countered with the means of a novel category introduced by Dariusz Skórczewski – 'postcolonial disavowal' (*postkolonialne wyparci*e; Skórczewski 2014).

An axiological discussion led by Ukrainianists Marko Pavlyshyn, Tamara Hundorova, and Vitaly Chernetsky went much more calmly: Pavlyshyn proposed an ethically optimistic distinction between confronting anti-colonial verve and conciliatory postcolonial stance (Pavlyshyn 2016, 62). Although Hundorova and Chernetsky might not disagree with the desirability of Pavlyshyn's normative ethics, they regarded a similar clear distinction as incompatible with postcolonial studies, whose strength they saw in analyzing paradoxes of infection and the *longue durée* of repercussions of colonialism:

> [...] it appears somewhat abstract and does not give due weight to the complex structure of postcolonial consciousness, which, in our opinion, erases neither coloniality, nor anticoloniality, but rather transcends them, simultaneously reconstituting the situation of subalternity and deconstructing it. (Hundorova 2007, 342–343; trans. by Marko Pavlyshyn 2016, 63)

4 Interdisciplinary controversies

Having already featured in intercultural and axiological controversies, Aleksandr Etkind has also been a prominent voice in debating the methodological split between advocates of a Russianized variety of postcolonialism, especially the theory of Russia's internal colonization, and of new imperial history (Gerasimov et al. 2014), the former coming from literary studies, the latter from history departments. The Russian historians who promoted their concept of (post-)imperial studies, most visibly in the online journal *Ab imperio*, insisted that 'colonization' *sensu stricto* applied to overseas colonies only and should not be metaphorically transferred to Eastern Europe (for more on *Ab imperio*, see Sproede and Lecke 2011, 55–57). Here it was Ewa Thompson who pointed out the opposite, anti-essentialist position in her essay "A jednak kolonializm" (2011, "It Is Colonialism After All," 2014), refuting generalized rejections, for example, by Borkowska (2010):

> Contending that colonialism is immune to changes in definition is an example of both
> passive acknowledgement of theories worked out in conditions far different from those in
> Poland as well as misunderstanding essentialism itself. (Thompson 2014, 70)

In contrast to historians' marked distance toward postcolonial approaches, film studies (Condee 2012; cf. also Mazierska et al. 2014) have rather smoothly adopted literary theories such as Etkind's 2003 thesis of a continuous "Siuzhet vnutrennei kolonizatsii" ("Plot of Internal Colonization") in Russian literature. Polish academia also saw various non-agonistic social science applications for conceptualizing inequalities in class (Buchowski 2006) and regional differentiations (Zarycki 2007), something also reintroduced into studying regional literature from a postcolonial perspective (Mikołajczak 2015). Another trend reacting to attempts at "national customization" of postcolonial studies is reglobalization (see Sowa 2008). The most outspoken critic of any East-European specificity is the Russian-Swedish scholar Madina Tlostanova who, together with Walter Mignolo, voted for a decolonial option as part of a global left-wing commitment (Mignolo and Tlostanova 2012, 17), more informed by extra-(West-)European "colonial histories of South America and the Caribbean and of Central Asia and the Caucasus under the Russian empire and the Soviet Union" (Mignolo and Tlostanova 2012, 34) than by post-structuralism and – as should be added – its ambiguizing reading techniques.

5 Appeals for a 're-philologicalization' of East-European postcolonial research

As transpires from the preceding sketch of the intercultural, axiological, and interdisciplinary debates, the use of postcolonial categories in East-European literary studies has often remained on the macro-level of general evaluation. In contrast, if actual literary texts were analyzed, analyses were frequently restricted to the micro-level of interpreting single works. What remains less scrutinized is the meso-level – be this with regard to particular epochs (such as postmodernism; Chernetsky 2007), genres (like the Polish *gawęda*; Gall 2007), or social phenomena (such as migrant literature; Artwińska 2010; Uffelmann 2010), be it with attempts at introducing new theoretical categories that transcend the register of prefabricated terms such as hybridity (creolization [*kreol'stvo*]; Abushenka n.d.) and cross-fertilizing Anglo-American postcolonial studies with homegrown East-European notions. The wish for meso-level proposals of East European postcolonial literary theory has periodically led to calls for returning to literature. Although

the pioneering article by Clare Cavanagh from 2003/2004 indulged in extensive name-dropping of Polish classical writers of the twentieth century whom Cavanagh regarded as deserving postcolonial interpretations, it failed to provide any in-depth analysis. Etkind's thesis of a plot of internal colonization, consisting of a triangle composed of Russian beauty, man of the people, and man of the elite, has been found fruitful for further analyses (Lipovetsky 2012), even if the triangle is not entirely appropriate for the very text by Pushkin on which it was based (cf. Sproede and Lecke 2011, 49). Several Germany-based scholars have therefore demanded to rephilologize postcolonial categories by grounding cultural hegemonies in intertextuality (Kirschbaum 2016), in rhetoric (metonymy as a 'trope of identity' [*Identitätstrope*]; Kirschbaum 2018) or by deliberately bracketing other disciplines from an investigation of the postcoloniality of Slavic *literatures* under postcommunist conditions (Smola and Uffelmann 2016, 14–15).

Despite these calls, observers drawing on the agonality of the para-postcolonial debates arrived at the conclusion that the intra-philological discourse about a literary theory like postcolonial studies accomplished a political action, to be precise, that literary theory functioned as a performative means of cultural politics (Uffelmann 2013).

Given this secondary, extra-literary and extra-philological trajectory, the Russian, Polish, and Ukrainian debates, which have experienced a veritable boom since 2005, have left several desiderata: despite isolated efforts by Layton (1994), Zabuzhko (1999), Tlostanova (2010), and Gradskova (2012), the association of postcolonialism and gender has not led to much research in Slavic studies. Almost nothing has been done in the field of postcolonial studies of Internet literature (cf. Merten and Krämer 2016). Even more astonishing in the East-European context is the neglect of the emergence of cultural hegemony out of differences in class as envisaged by Eugene Weber for French peasants (Weber 1976). Some first attempts have been made in pointing to another internal other, at times disappearing out of sight behind the back of Etkind's Russian peasant other – the ethnic literatures of Russia (Smola and Uffelmann 2017), which were only paradoxically favored by the Soviet construct of multinational literature (Frank 2016).

The rather widespread mononational bias of Slavic postcolonial (auto-) research prompted some scholars to call for "comparative studies of postcolonial discourses" and "postcolonial polycentrisms" (Bakuła 2011, 141). This transnational angle would ideally not only have been applied to inner-East-European cultures, but also to the cross-area comparison of 'classical' postcolonial countries and the former Second World. Something similar was studied in political science by Beissinger and Crawford (2002), but still awaits its accomplishment in actual literary analyses. More promising than a comparative approach seems to be an

interactive one as proposed by Heinrich Kirschbaum in his combined study of Polish and Russian romantic literature (Kirschbaum 2016) or claimed by Boris Groys for the feedback loop constitutive of Russia's modern intellectual history:

> The Russian creative artist of the last 150 years resembles an African tribal chief who visited a cubist art exhibition, or an Oedipus who consulted Freud's writings on the Oedipus complex: he reflexively and strategically handles the gaze of the Western observer which is directed toward him. This gaze does not reach the "essence" of Russian culture – not because it is not correctly focused but because this very culture is nothing other than play with the Western gaze. (Groys 1995, 11)

While investigations of political transculturation have led to groundbreaking results in connecting Russia's subaltern empire to Eurocentrism (Morozov 2015), similar effects deserve many more detailed literary explorations. Peculiar varieties of transculturation in the sense of Mary Louise Pratt (1992) such as self-exoticization, self-Orientalization or self-colonization deserve to be freed from automatic negative evaluation (Georgiev 2012), giving way to a more optimistic recognition of feedback loops as a culture-building (Kiossev 1998) and ironic-creative process (Uffelmann 2010), also honoring the subversive potential of the mimicry of the colonized in the sense of Bhabha (1994) and Henry Louis Gates, Jr. (1988). An epistemic shift from conservative lament to subversive creativity might also be welcome regarding political axiology; as one of the mostly overlooked precursors of Polish postcolonial studies called for as early as in 1998: "Let us think about our decolonisation" (Szkudlarek 1998, 57).

References

Abushenka, Uladzimer. "Mitskevich kak 'kreol': Ot 'tuteishykh heneolohii' k heneolohii 'tuteishastsi." *Fragmenty*. http://knihi.com/storage/frahmenty/sem-abuszenka.htm (15 February 2022).

Adamovsky, Ezequiel. *Euro-Orientalism: Liberal Ideology and the Image of Russia in France (c. 1740–1800)*. Oxford et al.: Lang, 2006.

Artwińska, Anna. "Między Polską i Niemcami: Literatura 'emigracyjna' a postkolonializm." *Przegląd Humanistyczny* 54.2 (2010): 27–37.

Ashcroft, Bill, Garret Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures*. London: Routledge, 1989.

Bakuła, Bogusław. "Kolonialne i postkolonialne aspekty polskiego dyskursu kresoznawczego (zarys problematyki)." *Teksty Drugie* 6 (2006): 11–33.

Bakuła, Bogusław. "Studia postkolonialne w Europie Środkowej oraz Wschodniej 1989–2009: Kwerenda wybranych problemów w ramach projektu badawczego." *Kultura po przejściach, osoby z przeszłością: Polski dyskurs postzależnościowy – konteksty i perspektywy badawcze*. Ed. Ryszard Nycz. Krakow: Universitas, 2011. 137–165.

Beissinger, Mark R., and Crawford Young (eds.). *Beyond State Crisis? Postcolonial Africa and Post-Soviet Eurasia in Comparative Perspective*. Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 2002.

Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. London et al.: Routledge, 1994.

Borkowska, Grażyna. "Perspektywa postkolonialna na gruncie polskim." *Teksty Drugie* 5 (2010): 41–52.

Born, Robert, and Sarah Lemmen (eds.). *Orientalismen in Ostmitteleuropa: Diskurse, Akteure und Disziplinen vom 19. Jahrhundert bis zum Zweiten Weltkrieg*. Bielefeld: transcript, 2014.

Buchowski, Michał. "The Specter of Orientalism in Europę: From Exotic Other to Stigmatized Brother." *Anthropological Quarterly* 79 (2006): 463–482.

Cavanagh, Clare. "Postkolonialna Polska: Biała plama na mapie współczesnej teorii." Trans. by Tomasz Kunz. *Teksty Drugie* 2/3 (2003): 60–71.

Cavanagh, Clare. "Postcolonial Poland." *Common Knowledge* 10.1 (2004): 82–92.

Chernetsky, Vitaly. *Mapping Postcommunist Cultures: Russia and Ukraine in the Context of Globalization*. Montreal et al.: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2007.

Condee, Nancy [Kondi, Nensi]. "Sovremennoe rossiiskoe kino i problema vnutrennei kolonizatsii." *Tam, vnutri: Praktiki vnutrennei kolonizatsii v kul'turnoi istorii Rossii*. Eds. Aleksandr Etkind, Dirk Uffelmann [Uffel'mann], and Il'ia Kukulin. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2012. 760–786.

Dąbrowski, Mieczysław. "Wilk w Rosji: Subaltern? W imperium? (Polemika z konceptem 'postzależności.'" *Porównania* 15 (2014): 105–120.

Dickinson, Sara. "Russia's First 'Orient': Characterizing the Crimea in 1787." *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 3.1 (2002): 3–25.

Domańska, Ewa. "O poznawczym uprzywilejowaniu ofiary (Uwagi metodologiczne)." *(Nie) Obecność: Pominięcia i przemilczenia w narracjach XX wieku*. Eds. Hanna Gosk and Bożena Karwowska. Warsaw: Elipsa, 2008. 19–36.

Domdey, Jana, Gesine Drews-Sylla, and Justyna Gołąbek (eds.). *Another Africa? (Post-)Koloniale Afrika-Imaginationen im russischen, polnischen und deutschen Kontext*. Heidelberg: Winter, 2017.

Etkind, Aleksandr. "Fuko i tezis vnutrennei kolonizatsii." *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* 49 (2001): 50–73.

Etkind, Aleksandr. "Russkaia literatura, XIX vek: Roman vnutrennei kolonizatsii." *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* 59 (2003): 103–112.

Etkind, Alexander. *Russia's Internal Colonization: Russia's Imperial Experience*. Cambridge: Polity, 2011.

Etkind, Aleksandr, Dirk Uffelmann [Uffel'mann], and Il'ia Kukulin (eds.). *Tam, vnutri: Praktiki vnutrennei kolonizatsii v kul'turnoi istorii Rossii*. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2012.

Feichtinger, Johannes, Ursula Prutsch, and Moritz Csáky (eds.). *Habsburg postcolonial: Machtstrukturen und kollektives Gedächtnis*. Innsbruck et al.: StudienVerlag, 2003.

Fiut, Aleksander. "Kolonizacja? Polonizacja?" *Teksty Drugie* 6 (2003): 151–156.

Frank, Susi. "'Multinational Soviet Literature': The Project and Its Post-Soviet Legacy in Iurii Rytkheu and Gennadii Aigi." *Postcolonial Slavic Literatures After Communism*. Eds. Klavdia Smola and Dirk Uffelmann. Frankfurt/M. et al.: Lang, 2016. 191–217.

Gall, Alfred. "Die *gawęda* als literarisches Medium der Gedächtnispolitik." *Romantik und Geschichte: Polnisches Paradigma, europäischer Kontext, deutsch-polnische*

Perspektive. Eds. Alfred Gall, Thomas Grob, Andreas Lawaty, and German Ritz. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2007. 108–133.

Gates, Henry Louis, Jr. *The Signifying Monkey: A Theory of African-American Literary Criticism*. New York, NY, and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Georgiev, Plamen K. *Self-Orientalization in South East Europe*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 2012.

Geraci, Robert. Review of *Internal Colonization: Russia's Imperial Experience*, by Alexander Etkind. *Nationalities Papers: The Journal of Nationalism and Ethnicity* 43.2 (2015): 356–357.

Gerasimov, Il'ia, Sergei Glebov, Aleksandr Kaplunovskii, Marina Mogil'ner, and Aleksandr Semenov. "V poiskakh novoi imperskoi istorii." *Novaia imperskaia istoriia postsovetskogo prostranstva*. Kazan': Tsentr Issledovanii Natsionalizma i Imperii, 2004. 7–29.

Golinczak, Michalina. "Postkolonializm przed użyciem wstrząsnąć!" *Recykling idei* 10 (2008): 108–113.

Gosk, Hanna. "Polski dyskurs kresowy w niefikcjonalnych zapisach międzywojennych: Próba lektury w perspektywie *postcolonial studies*." *Teksty Drugie* 6 (2008): 20–33.

Gradskova, Iuliia. "Kúli sem'i kúli: zhenshchiny 'otstalykh narodov' i sovetskie politiki kul'turnosti." *Tam, vnutri: Praktiki vnutrennei kolonizatsii v kul'turnoi istorii Rossii*. Eds. Aleksandr Etkind, Dirk Uffelmann, and Il'ia Kukulin. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2012. 664–683.

Groys, Boris. *Die Erfindung Rußlands*. Munich and Vienna: Hanser, 1995.

Hundorova, Tamara. "Ressentiment v postkolonial'nii perspektyvi (ukraïns'kyi vypadok)." *Kurier Kryvbasu* 7/8 (2007): 340–349.

Hundorova, Tamara. *Tranzytna kul'tura: Symptomy postkolonial'noï travmy*. Kyiv: Grani-T, 2013.

Janion, Maria. *Niesamowita słowiańszczyzna*. Krakow: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 2007.

Kaps, Klemens, and Jan Surman (eds.). *Galicja postkolonialnie, możliwości i granice*. Special issue of *Historyka: Studia Metodologiczne* 42 (2012).

Kelertas, Violeta (ed.). *Baltic Postcolonialism*. Amsterdam and New York, NY: Rodopi, 2006.

Kiossev, Alexander. "Otherness, Again: Notes on Self-Colonizing Cultures." *Bulgaria-avantgarde*. Ed. Haralampi G. Oroshakoff. Cologne: Salon Verlag, 1998. 137–146.

Kirschbaum, Heinrich. *Im intertextuellen Schlangennest: Adam Mickiewicz und polnisch-russisches (anti-)imperiales Schreiben*. Vol. 3 of *Postcolonial Perspectives on Eastern Europe*. Frankfurt/M. et al.: Lang, 2016.

Kirschbaum, Heinrich (ed.). *Wiedergänger – Pilger – Indianer: Polen-Metonymien im langen 19. Jahrhundert*. Vol. 5 of *Postcolonial Perspectives on Eastern Europe*. Frankfurt/M. et al.: Lang, 2018.

Kissel, Wolfgang S. (ed.). *Der Osten des Ostens: Orientalismen in slavischen Kulturen und Literaturen*. Vol. 1 of *Postcolonial Perspectives on Eastern Europe*. Frankfurt/M. et al.: Lang, 2012.

Kołodziejczyk, Dorota. "Post-Colonial Transfer to Central-and-Eastern Europe." Trans. by Marta Skotnicka. *Teksty Drugie English Edition*, Special Issue 1 (2014): 124–142.

Kołodziejczyk, Dorota, and Cristina Şandru (eds.). *On Colonialism, Communism and East-Central Europe – Some Reflections*. Special issue of *Journal of Postcolonial Writing* 48.2 (2014).

Kopp, Kristin L. *Germany's Wild East: Constructing Poland as Colonial Space*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2012.

Korek, Janusz (ed.). *From Sovietology to Postcoloniality: Poland and Ukraine from a Postcolonial Perspective*. Huddinge: Södertörns Högskola, 2007.

Kovačević, Nataša. *Narrating Post/Communism: Colonial Discourse and Europe's Borderline Civilization.* London and New York, NY: Routledge, 2008.

Krylov, Konstantin. "Itogi Saida: zhizn' i kniga." Edward [Edvard] Said, *Orientalizm.* Trans. by Aleksandr V. Govorunov. St. Petersburg: Russkii mir, 2006. 599–637.

Kuziak, Michał (ed.). *Słowacki postkolonialny.* Bydgoszcz: Teatr Polski w Bydgoszczy, 2010.

Layton, Susan. *Russian Literature and Empire: Conquest of the Caucasus from Pushkin to Tolstoy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Lecke, Mirja. *Westland: Polen und Ukraine in der russischen Literatur von Puškin bis Babel'.* Vol. 2 of *Postcolonial Perspectives on Eastern Europe.* Frankfurt/M. et al.: Lang, 2015.

Lefter, Ion B. "Poate fi considerat postcomunismul un post-colonialism?" *Postcolonialism şi Postcomunism: Cahiers de l'Echinox Journal* 1 (2001): 117–119.

Lipovetsky, Mark. "Sovetskie i postsovetskie transformatsii siuzheta vnutrennei kolonizatsii." *Tam, vnutri: Praktiki vnutrennei kolonizatsii v kul'turnoi istorii Rossii.* Eds. Aleksandr Etkind, Dirk Uffelmann, and Il'ia Kukulin. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2012. 809–845.

Luft, Robert. "Machtansprüche und kulturelle Muster nichtperipherer Regionen: Die Kernlande Böhmen, Mähren und Schlesien in der späten Habsburgermonarchie." *Habsburg postcolonial: Machtstrukturen und kollektives Gedächtnis.* Eds. Johannes Feichtinger, Ursula Prutsch, and Moritz Csáky. Innsbruck et al.: StudienVerlag, 2003. 165–187.

Mazierska, Ewa, Lars Kristensen, and Eva Näripea. "Postcolonial Theory and the Postcommunist World." *Postcolonial Approaches to Eastern European Cinema: Portraying Neighbours On-Screen.* Eds. Ewa Mazierska, Lars Kristensen, and Eva Näripea. London and New York, NY: I.B. Tauris, 2014. 1–39.

Merten, Kai, and Lucia Krämer (eds.). *Postcolonial Studies Meets Media Studies: A Critical Encounter.* Bielefeld: transcript, 2016.

Mignolo, Walter D., and Madina V. Tlostanova. *Learning to Unlearn: Decolonial Reflections from Eurasia and the Americas.* Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press, 2012.

Mikołajczak, Małgorzata. "Między mimikrą a rebelią. Pejzaż (post)kolonialny regionalnej literatury." *Teksty Drugie* 5 (2015): 283–305.

Moore, David Chioni. "Is the Post- in Postcolonial the Post- in Post-Soviet? Toward a Global Postcolonial Critique." *Papers of the Modern Language Association* 16.1 (2001): 111–128.

Morozov, Viatcheslav. *Russia's Postcolonial Identity: A Subaltern Empire in a Eurocentric World.* Basingstoke and New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

Osinski, Wojciech. *'Wiatr od morza': Aussöhnung oder Abgrenzung? Stefan Żeromskis literarische Geschichtsverarbeitung der deutsch-polnischen Nachbarschaft im Lichte der postkolonialen Theorie.* Dresden: Thelem, 2011.

Pavlyshyn, Marko J. "Post-Colonial Features in Contemporary Ukrainian Culture." *Australian Slavonic and East European Studies* 6.2 (1992): 41–55.

Pavlyshyn, Marko J. "Ukrainian Literature and the Erotics of Post-Colonialism: Some Modest Propositions." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 17.1/2 (1993): 110–126.

Pavlyshyn, Marko. "'The Tranquil Lakes of the Transmontane Commune': Literature and/against Postcoloniality in Ukraine After 1991." *Postcolonial Slavic Literatures After Communism.* Eds. Klavdia Smola and Dirk Uffelmann. Frankfurt/M. et al.: Lang, 2016. 59–82.

Petković, Nikola. *A Central Europe of Our Own: Postmodernism, Postcolonialism, Postcomunism [sic] and the Absence of Authenticity.* Rijeka: Adamić, 2003.

Pirie, Donald. "The Agony in the Garden: Polish Romanticism." *Romanticism in National Context*. Eds. Roy Porter and Mikuláš Teich. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988. 317–344.

Postcolonial or Postdependence Studies? Special Issue of *Teksty Drugie English Edition* 1 (2014).

Post-Dependence Studies Centre. 2009. http://www.cbdp.polon.uw.edu.pl/index_eng.html (15 February 2022).

Pratt, Mary Louise. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London et al.: Routledge, 1992.

Pucherová, Dobrota, and Róbert Gáfrik (eds.). *Postcolonial Europe? Essays on Post-Communist Literatures and Cultures.* Leiden and Boston, MA: Brill Rodopi, 2015.

Ram, Harsha. *The Imperial Sublime: A Russian Poetics of Empire.* Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2003.

Ruthner, Clemens. "'K.(u.)k. postcolonial'? Für eine neue Lesart der österreichischen (und benachbarter) Literatur/en." *Kakanien revisited: Das Eigene und das Fremde (in) der österreichisch-ungarischen Monarchie.* Eds. Wolfgang Müller-Funk, Peter Plener, and Clemens Ruthner. Tübingen and Basel: Francke, 2002. 93–103.

Said, Edward W. *Orientalism.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978.

Simonek, Stefan. "Möglichkeiten und Grenzen postkolonialistischer Literaturtheorie aus slawistischer Sicht." *Habsburg postcolonial: Machtstrukturen und kollektives Gedächtnis.* Eds. Johannes Feichtinger, Ursula Prutsch, and Moritz Csáky. Innsbruck et al.: StudienVerlag, 2003. 129–139.

Skórczewski, Dariusz. *Teoria – literatura – dyskurs: Pejzaż postkolonialny.* Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2013.

Skórczewski, Dariusz. "Radykalna konwersja jako postkolonialne wyparcie: Kulturowe samowygnanie w powieściach Piotra Ibrahima Kalwasa jako ostateczne rozwiązanie (post-)totalitarnej traumy." *Roczniki Humanistyczne* 62.1 (2014): 45–67.

Smola, Klavdia, and Dirk Uffelmann (eds.). *Postcolonial Slavic Literatures After Communism*. Frankfurt/M. et al.: Lang, 2016.

Smola, Klavdia, and Dirk Uffelmann (eds.). "Thematic cluster: Postkolonial'nost' postsovetskikh literatur: konstruktsii etnicheskogo." *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* 144 (2017): 420–508.

Sowa, Jan. *Ciesz się, późny wnuku! Kolonializm, globalizacja i demokracja radykalna*. Krakow: Universitas, 2008.

Spivak, Gayatri C. "Subaltern Talk: Interview with the Editors (1993–94)." Gayatri C. Spivak, *The Spivak Reader: Selected Works by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak.* Eds. Donna Landry and Gerald Maclean. New York, NY, and London: Routledge, 1996. 287–308.

Sproede, Alfred, and Mirja Lecke. "Der Weg der *postcolonial studies* nach und in Osteuropa: Polen, Litauen, Russland." *Überbringen – Überformen – Überblenden: Theorietransfer im 20. Jahrhundert*. Eds. Dietlind Hüchtker and Alfrun Kliems. Cologne et al.: Böhlau, 2011. 27–66.

Stępnik, Krzysztof, and Dariusz Trześniowski (eds.). *Studia postkolonialne nad kulturą i cywilizacją polską.* Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, 2011.

Surynt, Izabela. *Postęp, kultura i kolonializm: Polska a niemiecki projekt europejskiego Wschodu w dyskursach publicznych XIX wieku*. Wroclaw: Centrum Studiów Niemieckich i Europejskich im. Willy Brandta Uniw. Wrocławskiego, 2006.

Szkudlarek, Tomasz. "Miejsce / przemieszczenie / tożsamość." Trans. by Tadeusz Z. Wolański. *Magazyn Sztuki* 19 (1998): 49–60.

Thompson, Ewa. *Imperial Knowledge: Russian Literature and Colonialism*. Westport, CT, and London: Greenwood Press, 2000.

Thompson, Ewa. "Said a sprawa polska: Przeciwko kulturowej bezsilności peryferii." *Europa: Tygodnik idei* (29 June 2005): 11–13.

Thompson, Ewa. "Sarmatyzm a postkolonializm: O naturze polskich resentymentów." *Dziennik.pl* (5 November 2007). http://wiadomosci.dziennik.pl/wydarzenia/ artykuly/193060,sarmatyzm-i-postkolonializm.html (15 February 2022).

Thompson, Ewa. "It Is Colonialism After All: Some Epistemological Remarks." Trans. by Jan Szelągiewicz. *Teksty Drugie English Edition* 1 (2014): 67–81.

Tlostanova, Madina V. *Gender Epistemologies and Eurasian Borderlands*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Todorova, Maria. *Imagining the Balkans*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Uffelmann, Dirk. "Palackýs 'Dekonstruktion' Mitteleuropas." *Die Slaven und Europa*. Eds. Gerhard Ressel and Henrieke Stahl. Frankfurt/M. et al.: Lang, 2008. 345–370.

Uffelmann, Dirk. "Autoidentyfikacja ze Wschodem w narracjach polskich migrantów." Trans. by Zuzanna Ossowska. *Rocznik Komparatystyczny* 1 (2010): 253–277.

Uffelmann, Dirk. "Theory as Memory Practice: The Divided Discourse on Poland's Postcoloniality." *Memory and Theory in Eastern Europe*. Eds. Uilleam Blacker, Alexander Etkind, and Julie Fedor. Basingstoke and New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013. 103–124.

Uffelmann, Dirk (ed.). *'Divide et impera': The Lisbon Conference of 1988*. Special issue of *Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie* 72.1 (2016): 1–99.

Uffelmann, Dirk (ed.). *Umsiedlung, Vertreibung, Wiedergewinnung? Postkoloniale Perspektiven auf deutsche, polnische und tschechische Literatur über den erzwungenen Bevölkerungstransfer der Jahre 1944 bis 1950*. Special issue of *Germanoslavica* 28.1/2 (2017).

Waldstein, Maxim K. "Observing *Imperium:* A Postcolonial Reading of Ryszard Kapuscinski's Account of Soviet and Post-Soviet Russia." *Social Identities* 8.3 (2002): 481–499.

Weber, Eugen. *Peasants into Frenchmen: The Modernization of Rural France, 1870–1914*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1976.

Wolff, Larry. *Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1994.

Zabuzhko, Oksana. *Khroniky vid Fortinbrasa*. Kyiv: Vydavn. Fakt, 1999.

Zajas, Paweł. "Zagubieni kosmonauci: Raz jeszcze o *Imperium* Ryszarda Kapuścińskiego i jego krytykach." *Teksty Drugie* 3 (2010): 218–231.

Zarycki, Tomasz. "Polska a jej regiony a debata postkolonialna." *Oblicze polityczne regionów Polski*. Ed. Małgorzata Dajnowicz. Białystok: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Finansów i Zarządzania, 2007. 31–48.

Zarycki, Tomasz. *Ideologies of Eastness in Central and Eastern Europe*. London: Routledge, 2014.

Craig Brandist
From Literary Theory to Cultural Studies

In 1991 the British cultural theorist Antony Easthope published a widely received book called *Literary Into Cultural Studies* (Easthope 1991) in which he argued that post-structuralism had decisively undermined the opposition between the canon and popular culture on which literary theory was based. Once literature was understood as merely one discursive practice among others the field became decentred and literature became merely one more part of culture. The title of Easthope's book was, on the one hand, a reflection on an already achieved intellectual shift, wherein the exceptional status of literature has been discredited but, on the other hand, it was an imperative, urging literary scholars to embrace the new reality.

Easthope held a lectureship in English at Manchester Polytechnic from 1969 and became professor of English and cultural studies when it became Manchester Metropolitan University under the Thatcher-era reforms of British Higher Education. The erasure of the titular distinction between the polytechnic and university sectors was often presented as a democratizing move by the Conservative government, but in reality it signaled the leveling down of the higher education open to the majority of potential students in the UK, and its underfunded expansion, justified by an ideology of market populism. Elite institutions survived, but were reduced in number (the so-called Russell Group of twenty-four research intensive universities established in 1994), the sector became increasingly stratified, burdensome tuition fees were levied on students and their maintenance grants cut, placing the survival of less vocational areas of the humanities under particular pressure at less prestigious institutions. This is important since what appears to be an egalitarian development in theory may turn out to be nothing of the sort when considered in its institutional context.

Easthope's work largely concerned the place of English as a discipline within the academy, outlined by F. R. Leavis's centering the discipline on the 'great tradition' at Cambridge in the 1930s, when that university was still focused on creating an administrative cadre for the Empire. The implication was that the canon embodied values cherished by the British establishment, that its study and promotion would exert a salutary influence on both the urbanized masses of the metropolitan centre and on the subjects of Empire. Such assumptions were brought into fundamental question by then Althusserian Marxist Terry Eagleton in the same university faculty half a century later (Eagleton 1991, 3–5). The exclusivity of literature, held by Leavis to bear the class-bound and ethnically specific "standards that order the finer living of an age" (1991, 4) was, however, questioned just as the study of non-vocational subjects was, once more, becoming viewed by gov-

ernment as a "luxury" (1991, 3). The decentred paradigm for studying canonical and popular culture together that Easthope promoted resounded in specific historical conditions. The same imperative might, in various circumstances, raise the social significance and value of the critical study of a wider range of cultural forms, or treat those forms as mere manifestations of an ideology or of entertainment. Disciplines develop and operate within institutions, and the social significance of paradigms cannot be separated from those institutions.

1 European precursors

The questions with which Easthope grappled were ones that had a history that was much wider than the study of English in UK universities. Literary studies as a discipline achieves self-conscious expression with the work of the Russian formalists around the time of World War I, when most of the other disciplines we now accept as part of the university syllabus were forming. Linguistics and literary studies emerged from philology, while sociology, psychology and other disciplines emerged from philosophy. The most systematic philosophical rationalisation of such disciplines was provided by German neo-Kantians, who argued the individual disciplines were aligned to certain objects of knowledge produced by rational, or even mathematical, procedures. The object of linguistics was differentiated from that of philology by focusing not on language in all its multidimensionality but the system of phonetic differences, *langue*. The foundational text for the discipline was the *Course in General Linguistics*, compiled by Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye from notes on lectures given by Ferdinand de Saussure at the University of Geneva between 1906 and 1911. It was published in 1916. For the Russian formalists, *inter alia* Viktor Shklovskii, Boris Ėikhenbaum and Roman Jakobson, the object of literary studies was similarly not literature as such but *literariness* (*literaturnost'*), the quality that distinguished a literary work from other works. This began with an attempt to differentiate 'poetic' from 'practical' language, but later resulted in more sophisticated attempts to present literariness as a *Gestalt* quality arising from the dynamic interaction of a range of factors. Formalism focused attention on what made texts literary, rather than the social, psychological or biographical objects that analysis of such texts had foregrounded hitherto (see Igor' Pilshchikov's chapter on Russian formalism in this volume).

While the nature of disciplines was rationalised according to philosophical principles, institutional factors often proved decisive: competition for funds and chairs among university staff was particularly important. This was most dramatically shown in the heated debates over 'psychologism' in German universities,

where experimental psychologists had encroached upon the territory claimed by German idealists (see Kusch 1995). Disciplines needed to be rationalised in ways that appealed to the agencies of the states that funded universities, and many new European states were emerging after the collapse of the Russian, Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman empires. The grand narratives of Indo-European philology, which had dominated much of the humanities in the nineteenth century, held less attraction here than appeals to the role vernacular literatures could play in the consolidation of the rule of national elites and the promotion of a unitary national identity. Yet many of the most prominent proponents of literary theory were intellectuals who had become refugees from their 'own' states, such as the Russian formalist and then structuralist Jakobson and the Hungarian Marxist György Lukács (Tihanov 2004). The focus of such intellectuals fell on the features of literature that transcended particular national traditions, and so literary theory developed as a field subject to national and international pressures in an age when mass literacy and mass media were becoming significant social forces.

Leavis had no time for the systematizing trends of literary theory, but was nevertheless a part of a wider European movement that perceived modernity and the rise of mass society as a degeneration in which mass taste threatened traditional values and a focus on practical concerns led to vulgarity. In Germany this conservative trend championed the profundities of *Kultur* against the superficial virtues of *Zivilisation*, the manners, knowledge and skills associated with the practicalities of modern life (Elias 2000 [1939]). The former was held up by German nationalist intellectuals as delineating their achievements as the distillation of the values of the German people as opposed to the secondary achievements of the Francophone court. Indeed, some German intellectuals viewed World War I as a conflict between German *Kultur* and Anglo-French *Zivilisation* (Sluga 1993; Luft 2007). Literature entered this sphere as one of the refined articulations of the national psychology and was contrasted to the popular press and forms of mass entertainment that accompanied industrialisation and urbanisation. *Kulturkritik*, as it became known, embodied these ideas, viewing *Kultur* as the moral force of traditional hierarchies in combating the degeneration of culture brought about by industrial capitalism.

2 Aesthetics and politics

There is, however, no simple equivalence between socio-political and cultural values. A defense of high culture is not *necessarily* incompatible with egalitarian politics, while cultural leveling does not *necessarily* imply a drive for politi-

cal and social liberation. Victorian poet and critic Matthew Arnold (1822–1888), for instance, held the leveling down of culture that the market promotes to be as much of a threat to the masses' 'right' to develop their highest faculties as the gross material and educational inequalities that goes along with it. In the aftermath of the October 1917 Revolution, Lenin and Trotsky recommended newly enfranchised, and often barely literate, workers prioritise mastery of the high culture of the past rather than seek to hothouse a proletarian culture that often, but not always, combined nihilism and utopianism. The Stalin-era doctrine of Socialist Realism, which claimed to be the expression of a classless society, was to a considerable extent a codification of middle-class taste, which coexisted with a paternalistic attitude towards the masses, the elimination of democratic institutions and a considerable widening of social inequality. Responding both to Stalinism and the emergence of mass culture before and after World War II, members of the Frankfurt School such as Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno, held the commodification of culture and its presentation as 'popular' to undermine the critical capacities of the masses, while resistance to such forces lies in the more elite forms of avant-garde culture. The apparent egalitarianism of the market, rooted in the idea that equal value should exchange for equal value is, for these thinkers, illusory as long as society rests on a division between those who own and control the means of production, on the one hand, and those who sell their labour power to survive, on the other.

Alongside *Kulturkritik* there was, therefore, a Marxist trend that viewed culture as a stratified phenomenon embedded in wider socio-economic processes. Rejecting nationalist and imperialist agendas, Marxists of the inter-war period to varying degrees both critiqued and succumbed to various assumptions of *Kulturkritiker*. In the Stalin-era USSR assumptions of European superiority were decisively challenged, with well-funded projects to highlight the achievement of non-European writers. Nevertheless, policy imperatives to make common cause with 'progressive' bourgeois governments in a popular front alliance against rising fascism required continuities between the 'progressive era' of bourgeois culture and Socialist Realism to be foregrounded. Lukács's work on the novel as the bourgeois epic was perhaps the most sophisticated theoretical justification of this perspective. Thus, classical realism was championed over the modernist literary forms that were allegedly the products of the bourgeoisie in the age of reaction. The most prominent Marxist critic of such a perspective was the German dramatist Bertolt Brecht, who championed the multiple ways of portraying reality, which needed to be assessed according to practice rather than aesthetics. Drawing on the innovations of Russian and German avant-gardistes, who had adopted and reworked popular forms such as circus and cabaret in their works, Brecht fashioned a form of theatre oriented on the incomplete and unresolved present.

Burgeoning folklore and ethnographic studies meanwhile subjected some forms of popular culture to serious study, and such concerns made their way into mainstream literary theory in the work of figures such as Viktor Zhirmunskii, who wrote on the Turkic epic, and Mikhail Bakhtin, who presented the novel as the heir to forms of critical folk culture. These critics also drew heavily on sociological analyses of literature developed in Germany in the inter-war years, such as the work of Oskar Walzel and Levin L. Schucking, for whom literary forms were manifestations of ideological orientations on the social world. Literature was not simply one cultural form among many for such thinkers, however. For Bakhtin, while one could not justifiably posit a special language of literature as the early formalists had, there was no simple continuity between forms of pragmatic and literary language. The novel, for Bakhtin, represented at once the coming to self-consciousness of culture, and its radical decentering. The democratizing impulses within popular culture, that were opposed to forms of elite culture became, in and through the novel, systematized, deliberate and so historically effective. While the special status of literature was certainly reconsidered here, with the novel having its roots in popular culture and relativising other canonical genres, a hierarchy of cultural and historical value nevertheless remained in place. Symptomatic of this is the conspicuous silence in Bakhtin's work on the most popular, burgeoning medium of the time: cinema, even though writing on the subject by both practitioners and commentators was reaching a significant level of theoretical sophistication at the time.

3 The Frankfurt School

In inter-war Germany the Frankfurt School (see Mikhał Mrugalski's chapter on the Frankfurt School in this volume) focused on the stabilisation of capitalism and the assimilation of the individual into the structures of bureaucracy and the market. Political isolation and the rise of both Stalinism and Nazism often resulted in a profound pessimism, especially among Jewish exiles who ended up in the United States (Adorno and Horkheimer 2002 [1947]). Formulations such as the 'culture industry', and the 'totally administered society', typically erased the distinction between various forms of mass culture and failed to discern the critical potential therein. Particularly notorious was Adorno's (1989–1990 [1936]) conflation of commercial forms of, predominantly middle-class white, jazz music and the radical forms of jazz that played an important role in the formation of a black consciousness movement (for a contrast see Kofsky 1970). As Mike Davis (1990) has shown, Horkheimer and Adorno also failed to distinguish between

standard Hollywood genres and the critical forms of consciousness at work in, for instance, film noir. While insufficiently sensitive to these distinctions, the work of these intellectuals had considerable critical power in analyzing the encroachment of the commodity form and modern bureaucracy into the cultural sphere. The overarching pessimism of such perspectives, however, led to a rethinking as oppositional social and political movements began to emerge in the 1960s, along with insurgent forms of popular culture.

Former Frankfurt School thinker Herbert Marcuse combined elements from Freud and Marx in his influential works where he challenged the pessimism of Horkheimer and Adorno. Marcuse drew upon Freud's late works *Die Zukunft einer Illusion* (1927, *The Future of an Illusion*) and *Das Unbehagen in der Kultur* (1930, *Civilisation and Its Discontents*) in which the distinction between *Kultur* and *Zivilisation* was scornfully rejected (Freud 1985 [1930], 184). Freud now saw culture/ civilisation as the learned social behavior humans develop to cooperate and progress historically, which is founded on the repression and sublimation of human instincts. In his 1966 'political preface' to *Eros and Civilization* (1955), Marcuse proclaims that "the fight for life, the fight for Eros, is the *political* fight" and that it is industrial capitalism that prevents humanity from realising the potential of technology to establish a society that is no longer repressive (1966, xxv). Where Freud viewed the fundamental conflict in society as between work as such (the so-called 'reality principle' or life without leisure) and Eros (the 'pleasure principle' or leisure and pleasure), Marcuse argued it was between *alienated* labour (the 'performance principle', or economic stratification) and Eros. Eros had been the preserve of the ruling class, while the workers were only permitted a pleasure that does not obstruct productivity. Socialism, Marcuse argued, would involve the displacement of alienated labour by "non-alienated, libidinal work" (1966 [1955], 47–48), resulting in a non-repressive civilisation based on non-repressive sublimation. By the time of his next major work *One Dimensional Man* (1964), however, Marcuse had returned to some of the more pessimistic ways of thinking of the Frankfurt School, arguing that the reduction of 'high' culture to mass culture collapses the distance between culture and the present reality, rendering culture a mere appendage of advertisements and consumerism.

4 Structuralism and after

Perhaps the most influential trend emerging at this time was a convergence of structuralism and Marxism, in France in particular. The structuralist understanding of a specific domain of culture as a structure, modelled on Saussure's ideas

about language viewed as a synchronic system of signs, *langue*, was important in treating culture as a 'third order' distinct from both extra-discursive reality and the imagination. Already in his 1957 book *Mythologies*, an engaging compilation of short essays originally published as French magazine articles in 1954–1956, Roland Barthes had shown that structural analyses of cultural phenomena as varied as advertisements about soap powders and detergents, Romans in films and the cultural relevance of wine and milk in French culture could yield impressively critical results. Each could be analysed as texts structured around certain binary oppositions and embedded within a wider context of established social codes. 'Mythologies' result when an object, devoid of any inherent meaning, is endowed with ideological significance through a deliberate social construction of its meaning.

In the work of French Marxist Louis Althusser the configurations of such codes were synonymous with the articulations of what Marx, in the preface to his 1859 book *Zur Kritik der politischen Ökonomie* (*A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*), called the 'superstructure'. While Althusser stressed the 'relative autonomy' of the superstructure, insisting only on economic determinations in the 'last instance', the structuralist methodology meant that the 'lonely hour of the last instance' never actually struck. Instead Althusser embarked on "an 'elaboration of the theory of the particular essences of the specific elements of the superstructure'" (Althusser 2006 [1968], 114; original emphasis), the coherence of which resulted from what Althusser called 'ideological state apparatuses', such as the mass media and educational system, into which ideologies are embedded. Another consequence of Althusser's structuralism was his contention that, as Colin Sparks (1996, 87–88) puts it, "ideology was fundamentally an unconscious operation which was constituted through the entry of the subject into language":

> In order to speak, the individual had to negate itself by entering a preconstituted realm of radical alterity. Since society would be unthinkable without language, ideology was a necessary feature of all human societies. Ideology was thus essentially unitary, without history and all-pervasive. What is more, the operation of ideology was coercively to construct the individual as subject.

This perspective was to be passed on to postmodernist thinkers who followed through the implications of culture as a 'third order' and used it to justify their withdrawal from collective politics. Poststructuralists had shown the instability of the system of language once considered in isolation from its referent and the pragmatic dimensions of language. Now 'post-Marxist' thinkers finally uncoupled the superstructure from the 'base'. As Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe (1985, 85) put it: "the very unity and homogeneity of class subjects has split into a set of precariously integrated positions which, once the thesis of the neutral character

of the productive forces is abandoned, cannot be referred to any necessary point of future unification". Indeterminate, ambiguous and shifting identities came to be seen as the results of the fluid operations of power, based on Nietzsche's idea of the 'will to power', particularly as theorised by Michel Foucault. The potentially depoliticising potential of these ideas were most systematically developed when they entered academic discourse in the United States.

5 The rise of cultural studies

An alternative perspective on culture had developed in Britain, where a group of thinkers began to concern themselves with questions similar to that of the Frankfurt School, namely the threat to the culture of the working class represented by mass culture. The first major statement was Richard Hoggart's 1957 book *The Uses of Literacy: Aspects of Working Class Life*, in which the decline of close-knit working class communities with established forms of working class culture was correlated with forms of manufactured mass culture. While Hoggart was not closely associated with Marxism, two other key thinkers, Edward Palmer Thompson (1924–1993) and Raymond Williams (1921–1988) were, to varying degrees, associated with the British Communist Party, though recoiled from its Stalinist doctrines in the aftermath of Khrushchev's denunciation of Stalin and the Soviet suppression of the Hungarian uprising in 1956. This gave their thought a distinctly critical distance from what was then mainstream Marxist theory, even while they remained committed to the liberatory project of Marx and the centrality of class in their analyses.

For Thompson, a founder of the social history of the British working class and long-time Communist Party activist, Althusser's anti-humanism, replacement of mass experience in struggle with 'theoretical practice', and insistence on the inescapable forms of ideology were regarded as last-ditch theoretical justifications for Stalinism. Thompson's most outspoken work on the matter, *The Poverty of Theory* (1978), stimulated considerable discussion within British Marxism, that was documented by Perry Anderson (1980). In the late 1950s Williams who, like Hoggart, was closely involved with the workers' educational movement, was already critical of the narrow conceptions of culture among still-dominant Leavisites at Cambridge (the so-called 'Great Tradition') and what he viewed as the tendency of contemporary Marxists to reify culture as 'superstructure' and construct their own selective tradition. For Williams, an anthropological conception of culture should flow from Marxism if pursued consistently: "from their emphasis on the interdependence of all elements of social reality, and from their analytic empha-

sis on movement and change, Marxists should logically use 'culture' in the sense of a whole way of life, a general social process" (Williams 1963, 273). For both Thompson and Williams the centrality of class consciousness, the self-activity of the working class and its creativity in shaping their perspectives, and the importance of wider cultural aspects in this process formed important bridges between Marxism and what was to become cultural studies. Williams became more overtly Marxist in his later years and, in 1977, was among the first seriously to engage with Antonio Gramsci's ideas about hegemony, which appeared in English translation in the early 1970s, as a resource for the study of culture.

In *Marxism and Literature* (1977) Williams heralded hegemony as retaining the importance of class-specific ways of thinking, but refusing "to equate consciousness with the articulate formal system which can be and ordinarily is abstracted as 'ideology'" (Williams 1977, 109). Rather than suggesting mere "manipulation" or "indoctrination", hegemony refers to "a whole body of practices and expectations, over the whole of living [...]. It is a lived system of meanings and values – constitutive and constituting – which as they are experienced as practices appear as reciprocally confirming" (Williams 1977, 110). Hegemony is a "culture which has also to be seen as the lived dominance and subordination of particular classes" (Williams 1977, 110). The notion of hegemony for Williams was a powerful weapon against those structuralist and poststructuralist approaches that downplayed the agency of the masses: "it does not just passively exist as a form of dominance. It has continually to be renewed, recreated, defended, and modified. It is also continually resisted, limited, altered, challenged by pressures not at all its own" (Williams 1977, 112). The roots of the idea in Gramsci's early studies of historical linguistics, the proletarian culture movement in Russia and Italy and in the attempts to build proletarian leadership over the peasantry in the Russian Revolution (see Brandist 2015) were unknown to Williams. Thus decontextualized and connected with a range of theoretical positions quite distant from Gramsci, the idea of hegemony was quickly adopted by such influential scholars as Edward Said (1978) and became a key resource for what became postcolonial studies and cultural studies. Here Gramsci's subtle considerations of the cultural dimensions of political struggles were contrasted with an allegedly class-reductionist Marxism, even though Gramsci remained a Leninist until his death, and his discussions of hegemony were fundamentally considerations of the lessons of Bolshevism for the Italian Communist Party in the 1930s. In the mid 1980s these works were employed to justify the policies of the reforming wing of the CPGB centred on the journal *Marxism Today* aimed at building a 'broad democratic alliance' against the 'authoritarian populism' of the Thatcher government among whose leaders was the Jamaican-British sociologist and cultural theorist, Stuart Hall.

Cultural studies developed into a budget holding discipline at the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS) at Birmingham University between 1968 and 1979 first under the leadership of Hoggart and, from 1969, Hall. It was during this period that a 'neo-Gramscian' approach by degrees came to supplant Althusser's structuralist Marxism in the work of the Centre, to be supplemented with recent developments in gender and race theory. Hall also sought to incorporate the perspective on language developed by Bakhtin and his colleague Voloshinov to weaken the hold of structuralism and poststructuralism. Cultural studies now focused its attention on the very aspects of the 'mass' culture of late capitalism that had so repelled *Kulturkritik*: cinema, television, popular journalism, advertising, shopping and the like. As Francis Mulhern (1997, 45) puts it: "its leading political theme [...] has been that such culture is not a mere opiate, successfully designed to induce passivity in a homogenized mass, but on the contrary that popular perception in it is active, deliberate, selective, and even subversive". In terms of methodology, there was a bold incursion of the methods of the social sciences into the humanities: "ethnographic fieldwork, interviewing, textual and discourse analysis, and traditional historical methods of research to investigate a wide variety of communication-related issues" (Schulman 1993). What Mulhern (1997, 44) calls a "procedural equilization" between literature and other bearers of social meanings had truly been established, with a focus on the social position of artists and writers; the social composition and orientation of audiences; the formation of social attitudes; the production and distribution of texts and the interactions between writers and their audience (Hoggart 1964, 251–252). In many respects results such as Hall et al's (1978) analysis of the law and order debate in the UK and Morley's (1980) analysis of TV audiences have been impressive in focusing attention on hitherto neglected areas of cultural production and reception and highlighting the negotiated meanings of cultural phenomena.

6 Concluding remarks

While Hall was distinctly equivocal about following Laclau and Mouffe in finally abandoning the determining role of class in his work, the dominant trends in cultural studies were less constrained and much more eclectic. With a focus firmly on popular culture, practitioners of cultural studies have often succumbed to populism, understood as a valorisation of popular forms over those of the elite, rather than a focus on the dynamics of a 'whole way of life'. While the active and even subversive side of popular forms have been rescued from the pessimistic over-totalizing analyses of the Frankfurt School and structuralist Marxism, the commod-

ified and conformist trends within corporatized forms of recreation that they diagnosed has too readily been discarded rather than qualified. Cultural difference has often tended to usurp social and political categories, erasing the important distinctions and disjunctures between cultural and political phenomena. Literary studies may, as Easthope suggested, have been absorbed into cultural studies, but what has often resulted is a mode of investigation that is the flip side of *Kulturkritik* rather than a fully transformed type of analysis.

The internationalisation of cultural studies has taken a variety of forms and has revealed many previously understudied forms of cultural domination and resistance, especially in the context of colonialism and its aftermath. The same tensions and ambiguities have been reproduced at a number of levels, however, as pre-colonial, indigenous cultures have sometimes been valorized as having an organic unity as opposed to the fragmentary cultures and identities of post-colonial societies. While new phenomena is subject to study, the inversion of the values of colonial paradigms while retaining its fundamental architecture often produces a scholarship that is little less one-sided than that which preceded it. Cultural studies has therefore often opened up a range of questions for investigation rather more successfully than it has managed to answer them.

References

Adorno, Theodor. "On Jazz." [1936] *Discourse* 12.1 (1989–1990): 45–69.

Adorno, Theodor, and Max Horkheimer. *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. Trans. by Edmund Jephcott. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2002.

Althusser, Louis. *For Marx* [1968]. Trans. by Ben Brewster. London: Verso Books, 2006.

Anderson, Perry. *Arguments Within English Marxism*. London: Verso Books, 1980.

Brandist, Craig. *The Dimensions of Hegemony: Language, Culture and Politics in Revolutionary Russia*. Leiden et al.: Brill, 2015.

Davis, Mike. *City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in Los Angeles*. London: Verso, 1990.

Eagleton, Terry. *Ideology: An Introduction*. London: Verso, 1991.

Easthope, Antony. *Literary into Cultural Studies*. London: Routledge, 1991.

Elias, Norbert. *The Civilizing Process: Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations* [1939]. 2nd edition. Oxford: Blackwell, 2000.

Freud, Sigmund. *Civilization and its Discontents* [1930]. *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. Ed. James Strachey. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1985.

Hall, Stuart et al. *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State and Law and Order*. London: Macmillan Press, 1978.

Hoggart, Richard. "Schools of English and Contemporary Society." *The American Scholar* 33.2 (1964): 237–255.

Kofsky, Frank. *Black Nationalism and the Revolution in Music*. New York, NY: Pathfinder, 1970.

Kusch, Martin. *Psychologism A Case Study in the Sociology of Philosophical Knowledge*. London: Routledge, 1995.

Laclau, Ernesto, and Chantal Mouffe. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy*. London: Verso, 1985.

Luft, H. Sebastian. "Germany's Metaphysical War. Reflections on War by Two Representatives of German Philosophy: Max Scheler and Paul Natorp." *Themenportal Erster Weltkrieg* 2007. http://www.erster-weltkrieg.clio-online.de/2007/Article=208 (19 July 2020).

Marcuse, Herbert. *One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1964.

Marcuse, Herbert. *Eros and Civilization* [1955]. Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1966.

Morley, David. *The 'Nationwide' Audience*. London: British Film Institute, 1980.

Mulhern, Francis. "The Politics of Cultural Studies." *In Defense of History*. Eds. Ellen Meiksins Wood and John Bellamy Foster. New York, NY: Monthly Review Press, 1997. 43–50.

Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books, 1978.

Schulman, Norma. "Conditions of their Own Making: An Intellectual History of the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies at the University of Birmingham." *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 18.1 (1993). https://www.cjc-online.ca/index.php/journal/article/view/717/623 (19 July 2020).

Sluga, Hans. *Heidegger's Crisis: Philosophy and Politics in Nazi Germany*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993.

Sparks, Colin. "Stuart Hall, Cultural Studies, and Marxism." *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*. Eds. David Morley and Kuan-Hsing Chen. London and New York, NY: Routledge, 1996. 71–101.

Tihanov, Galin. "Why Did Modern Literary Theory Originate in Central and Eastern Europe? (And Why Is It Now Dead?)" *Common Knowledge* 10.1 (2004): 61–81.

Williams, Raymond. *Culture and Society*. [1958] New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1963.

Williams, Raymond. *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Gesine Drews-Sylla

Russian Theory in Africa: From Marxism to the Bakhtinian Postcolony

The reception of Russian theory in and in relationship with the Global South is as much connected with global history as it is with the history of literary and cultural theory itself. Research on these connections is vibrant, however, with many fields still uncharted.

The best-known case of a reception of Russian theory in the thinking of the Global South is certainly the transfer of the concept of *hybridity* from the writings of Mikhail Bakhtin to the theoretical framework of Postcolonial Studies. However, entanglements go beyond the term's illustrious career in Postcolonial and Cultural Studies, both with regard to Bakhtin and in a broader sense. The relationship between Postcolonial Studies and Russian or Eastern European thinking is twofold. On the one hand, it is a paradigm that was applied to Eastern Europe after the demise of the Soviet Union from the 1990s on, thereby fulfilling different functions that again roughly fall into two subfields. Firstly, the theoretical framework is applied in order to analyze hegemonial structures within imperial Russia, the Soviet Union, or the post-socialist world, and secondly, it has also proven useful for scrutinizing the relationships between Eastern Europe and the West.

On the other hand, we can observe an entanglement of the field itself with Eastern European thinking in the shifts facilitated by Postcolonial Studies and subsequent paradigmatic changes. Thus, from this vantage point, connections between the Global South and Eastern Europe can be productively re-evaluated. Hence we can take into account the importance of global entanglements within the world order of the Cold War while leaving its epistemological binarisms behind.

1 Modes and spaces of entanglements

This article focuses on different intersections between the paradigm of the Postcolonial Studies and Russian thought. However, it is important to note that the entanglements between Global South and Russian or East European thinking are certainly not restricted to this field. Historically, Marxism and in its vein Soviet thinking constitute a layer in the palimpsest of Postcolonial Theory (for postcolonial theory as a palimpsest, cf. Young 2001, 68). Recently, both Monica Popescu's *At Penpoint: African Literatures, Postcolonial Studies, and the Cold War* (2020)

and Rossen Djagalov's *From Internationalism to Postcolonialism: Literature and Cinema between the Second and the Third Worlds* (2020) have addressed different questions of global entanglements between the Global South and the Soviet space. Popescu's monograph is devoted to African literatures' reactions and interactions with the dynamics of the Cold War. It describes African literatures situated at a focal point, not only within those postcolonial dynamics they were subjugated to by the West, but also in a dialogue with and in opposition to the former Soviet bloc and the latter's outreach towards the Global South. Djagalov mainly focuses on the development and the effects of the Soviet Union's attempts to create and facilitate an internationalist counter model to Western hegemonial cultural structures that consciously supported and funded cultural structures and their agents in the Global South, such as the multilingual *Lotus* magazine. While this funding was readily accepted within the superstructures of the global Cold War, writers, filmmakers and other cultural figures from the Global South took advantage of the situation while safeguarding their independence.

The interaction facilitated by the Soviet Union had impacts that are still of relevance and, in many cases, still have to be accounted for. The fact that Ousmane Sembène studied the art of filmmaking in the Soviet Union during an internship with Mark Donskoi has left its conceptual and aesthetical imprints on the history of African film just as much as it did in the case of Sarah Maldoror, who studied in Moscow at the same time as Sembène (Chomentowski 2019; Dovey 2020), or in the cases of the later generations of Souleymane Cissé or Abderrahmane Sissako (Woll 2004). Monica Popescu (2020, 12) opens her book with a reference to Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o's stay in the Soviet writers' residence in Yalta while he was working on his *Petals of Blood* (1977), Łukasz Stanek (2020) draws attention to the impact of socialist architecture in West Africa, and Kate Cowcher (2019, 163) mentions the case of the Ethiopian artist and teacher Eshetu Tiruneh, a former student of the Surikov Academy of Art in Moscow, who had studied art history through the writings of Soviet theoreticians of African art such as Ivan Potekhin or Vil' Mirimanov. The approaches they developed on "polycentric supersystems" (Cowcher 2019, 163) may be forgotten in Western discourses, she writes, but remain present in the practical and theoretical work of those who studied them. They resurface in projects such as the art history textbook Tiruneh was preparing for young Ethiopian artists and will thus continue to be part of the intertextual realm within which African arts are discussed.

The same is true for the paradigm of Soviet Socialist Realism, for instance, as a layer within the intertextual realm of African literatures. While many Global South writers were rightly opposed to being classified within this ideological scheme, it nevertheless forms one of the models that they were actively reacting to. Writers such as Alex La Guma, Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o, or Ousmane Sembène pro-

ductively adapted the model and integrated it into their own poetics. Agostino Neto's speech *Concerning National Culture* (1979) can serve as an example of how consciously Global South writers both read and reacted to Soviet literary formations. With hardly any further explanation of the terms which can thus be presupposed to be generally understood, Neto argues against a transferability of both Proletkult and Socialist Realism to Angolan literature. Lenin fiercely opposed the avant-garde project of Proletkult, he argues, because "the Soviet nation, for the elaboration of a new socialist culture aimed at the masses, should necessarily find fulfilment in and take advantage of its cultural heritage" (Neto 2007, 493). However, according to Neto's argument, Socialist Realism proved to be just as detrimental because of its fixed patterns of stereotypes that were an inapt model for Angolan literature. As a consequence, Neto consciously calls for cultural expressions that turn to "our own reality, without chauvinism and without denying our universalist calling" (Neto 2007, 493).

An acknowledgement of layers related to Socialist Realist aesthetics as articulated in the Soviet Union was also impaired by the general condescension shown towards this type of literature in Western discourse. In the final decade of the Cold War, which coincided with the time of the rise of Postcolonial Studies, Socialist Realist aesthetics were yet to be considered a topic worthy of research. Hence "African or Asian writers who claimed to enjoy and emulate the works of their Soviet fellows were perceived with added skepticism and derision" (Popescu 2020, 129). Western critics in particular "regarded them as politically naïve or derelict in their duty to preserve the autonomy of literary creation from the intrusion of the state" (Popescu 2020, 129). However, these were not the only reasons why Socialist Realist aesthetics were ultimately hardly ever fully embraced by Global South writers. Oftentimes, as in the case of Alex La Guma, commitments to Socialist Realist aesthetics ended in tautological statements. In the case of Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o, it had more to do with "the creation of aesthetic solidarities that inscribed him within a progressive, Afro-Asian, or even tricontinental community of writers" than with a real engagement with the forms developed by classics of Soviet Socialist Realism (Popescu 2020, 130). In Ousmane Sembène's *Ô Pays, mon beau peuple!* (1957, *O Country, my beautiful people!*), it is possible to observe a number of formulaic analogies to Socialist Realist paradigmatic configurations corresponding to those elaborated by Caterina Clark in her *The Soviet Novel: History as Ritual* (1981). However, they do not dominate his social (not socialist) realist poetics and constitute just one sublayer among many others (Drews-Sylla 2013).

Another example of a field that has yet to be studied systematically is the reception of various individual authors, such as Maksim Gor'kii or Georgii Plekhanov, in Global South thinking. The Senegalese artist Issa Samb, for instance, repeatedly referred to Plekhanov in his works (Kouoh 2013, 282–283, 310–311). As

Koyo Kouoh states, Issa Samb's "Marxist-influenced readings have contributed to the production of a radical aesthetic rarely present in the canons of contemporary art in Africa. After the student revolt of May 1968, which lasted several years in Dakar, Samb founded the Laboratoire Agit'Art in 1974 with a group of artists from various disciplines." (Kouoh 2013, 8–9). The projects undertaken in this laboratory were directed against those art forms which had been canonized under Léopold Sédar Senghor. Samb's artwork can best be judged within and not beyond poststructuralist or postcolonial paradigms. His works may serve as an example of how the two poles, autonomy of art and socialist inspired endeavors, were by no means completely opposite. On the contrary, just as in the Russian avantgarde, or in the cases of Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o or Ousmane Sembène, they were dynamically fused.

In a socialist-leaning context, Samb was not the only African cultural actor to refer to Plekhanov. In his essay "Towards a Marxist Sociology of African Literature" (Onoge 2007 [1985]), the Nigerian Marxist social anthropologist Omafume F. Onoge refers to Plekhanov in order to underline an argument that establishes that bourgeois literature is an invalid tool for an adequate scientific evaluation of (African) literature. The allegation is that bourgeois literature only criticizes content and "stagnates on the mere descriptive reproduction of manifest material" (Onoge 2007, 471). Onoge's reception of Plekhanov is embedded in a more general Marxist context. Later, he refers to Georg Lukács, whom he attests decisive achievements in Marxist criticism with regard to European literature, before turning to an "emergent Marxist mode of African literary theory" (Onoge 2007, 472). Thus it is not solely Plekhanov who is referred to, but Plekhanov in a global array of Marxist thinkers and criticism which is scrutinized for its relevance for African literature. While for Onoge Plekhanov is just one representative of socialist thinkers in a wide field spanning from Marx and Engels to Mao Tse-Tung, he nevertheless seems to have studied him closely, judging by the notes in which he cites Plekhanov extensively (Onoge 2007, 475).

Onoge's essay not only serves as an example of the integration of Russian socialist texts into the theoretical thinking of African Marxist theoreticians. It also spotlights the relevance of foreign language publishing activities within the Soviet Union, which produced enormous quantities of books distributed in the Global South (Djagalov 2020, 96–102). Onoge cites several of these sources, among them not only Plekhanov but also Lunacharskii, both published in Moscow, the former by the Foreign Languages Publishing House in 1957, the latter by Progress Publishers in 1973 (Onoge 2007, 475). Kate Cowcher (2019, 162) likewise highlights that Soviet texts distributed through Soviet cultural programs circulated in Africa and reached its audiences. In the case of Ousmane Sembène, one of these books can be seen in the short Soviet documentary *V Senegale* (1961, *In Senegal*) produced

on the occasion of Senegalese independence. However, an assessment of these publications with regard to their impact on a reception of Russian thinking in Global South contexts has yet to be undertaken.

2 Russian layers in Edward Said

Onoge, but also Sembène belong to a generation that Djagalov denominates as Third-Worldist critics and scholars whose work would be continued by postcolonial scholars. "What has changed, however, was not only the location where that cultural and intellectual labour is performed (from the capitals of Africa, Asia, and Latin America or Moscow to Anglo-American literature departments) but also its substance." (Djagalov 2021, 225) As Monica Popescu states, "Neil Lazarus has observed that issues central to postcolonial studies, such as Said's injunction to 'unthink Eurocentrism', were formulated a couple of decades earlier by African scholars and writers." (Popescu 2020, 28) "[I]ntellectuals from the Third World laid claim to an anti-imperialist vocabulary that criticized both American and Soviet forms of domination." (Popescu 2020, 41)

From a different perspective, fundamental aspects of postcolonial thinking can also be connected to the thinking of the early Soviet Union. Thus Russian thought forms a layer not only in the socialist or Marxist-Leninist strata of the historical postcolonial palimpsest but also in the later, canonical theoretical framework of deconstructive Postcolonial Studies.

It has often been observed that concepts that developed out of early Soviet discourse were quite similar to later postcolonial thinking, for instance, within Soviet Oriental Studies. The linguist Nikolai Marr argued against models of genealogical trees for language development (on Marr see Galin Tihanov's chapter on semantic paleontology in this volume). In his conception, languages do not split into different branches but rather intersect, or, to use this term, hybridize (which is, however, not to be confused with postcolonial hybridization, cf. Sasse 2018, 138). Vera Tolz shows that there is a direct connection between Soviet Oriental Studies and Edward Said. Said studied with Arab scholars who combined Marxist and postcolonial perspectives during the 1960s. Furthermore, some of these scholars had educational ties to the Soviet Union (Tolz 2011, 20) and were thus familiar with paradigms of Soviet Oriental Studies. Tolz argues that Anouar Abdel-Malek directly referred to Sergei Ol'denburg. Citing Aijaz Ahmad, she shows that not only a few arguments, but the entire conceptual framework of Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1978), his critique of Western orientalism, is astonishingly close to Sergei Ol'denburgs critique of Western Orientology (Tolz 2011, 100).

The second pillar on which Said's theoretical framework rests, the concept of hegemony based on Antonio Gramsci's thinking, can also be related to Soviet discourse, as Craig Brandist (2012, 26–28) shows. Brandist argues that Antonio Gramsci spent enough time in the Soviet Union during the early 1920s to learn Russian well enough to leave the closer radius of the Italian delegation with whom he had travelled. Thus he can easily have become familiar with the emphasis on culture within the concept of hegemony that was already being developed within the discussions of this period and which would later become so important for Said's thinking. Like Tolz, Brandist concludes that the relationship between language structures and other cultural fields fundamental to structuralism and, subsequently, to poststructuralism and postcolonialism was already present in early Soviet debates. However, it was only beyond the boundaries imposed by the totalitarian Soviet structures that these germs of critical thinking could fully develop into the critical paradigm that was to shape the debates of poststructuralism and postcolonialism.

There is one more instance in Said's thinking which leads back to Russian contexts. One of the authors he kept returning to throughout his academic career was Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* (1899). *Heart of Darkness* is one of the literary texts that became seminal for the field of postcolonial studies. Its ambiguities, the harsh identification with the colonial project on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the disturbing distance that the different modes of narration evoke have turned it into one of the most discussed literary texts in the field. Said attributes the text's ambiguities to Conrad's biographical background. In his first book, *Joseph Conrad and the Fiction of Autobiography* (1966), Said deals with the identity conflicts, the processes of self-definition of the assimilated migrant of Polish origin coming from imperial Russia to colonial England within the contexts of "imperial struggle, war, exile, cultural dislocation, and assimilation" (McCarthy 2010, 17). In Said's reading, Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* in *Culture and Imperialism* (1993) becomes a text shaped by an ironic distance to any representation which stems from the permanent knowledge of the author's own marginality in imperial England. On the one hand, according to Said Conrad is totally assimilated and fully identifies with the imperial project, on the other hand his own hybrid identity as a migrant to England as a Pole from imperial Russia whose father was imprisoned because of his nationalist engagement imbues him with ironic distance to representation per se (Said 1994, 27). Seen through this lens, it is migration, a hybrid identity, and distance from the conditions of imperial Russia that catalyze the flourishing of the critical potential (cf. also Drews-Sylla 2017).

3 Hybridity and postcolonialism

That a distance to Russia, or rather the Soviet Union, led to a further theoretical development which allowed the critical germ to flourish, is certainly also true for the best-known case of a reception of Russian theory within the field of Postcolonial Studies: Homi Bhabha's transformative appropriation of Mikhail Bakhtin's notion of hybridity. The case has been described by Mieke Bal (2002) as a prototypical example of a *travelling concept*. These concepts are characterized by a fluidity of meaning, application, and functioning as they travel "between disciplines, between individual scholars, between historical periods, and between geographically dispersed academic communities" (Bal 2002, 24). The term hybridity originates in biological discourse, where it was and still is used in order to describe cross-breeding in horticulture. During the nineteenth century, it was also transferred to racializing discourses. Mikhail Bakhtin, however, transformed it into a linguistic category used to describe the polyphony of the novel.

In postcolonial discourse, "hybridity [in its broadest sense] commonly refers to the creation of new *transcultural* forms within the contact zone produced by colonization" (Ashcroft 1998, 135; italics in the original). This hybridity of the cultural discourse – the transcultural forms that are produced by the colonial discourse – "reverse the structures of domination in the colonial situation" (Young 1995, 23).

> Bakhtin's intentional hybrid has been transformed by [Homi] Bhabha into an active moment of challenge and resistance against a dominant colonial power. Bhabha then translates this moment into a 'hybrid displacing space' which develops in the interaction between the indigenous and colonial culture which has the effect, he suggests, of depriving 'the imposed imperialist culture, not only of the authority that it has for so long imposed politically, often through violence, but even of its own claims to authenticity.' (Young 1995, 23)

For Bhabha's reconfiguration of hybridity, this unsettling of power hierarchies, of questioning and destabilizing hegemonial relationships is crucial. Therefore, its application to denote any kind of cross-cultural exchange as 'hybridity', which happened all too often in the subsequent excessive usage of the term, misses decisive aspects. In Bhabha's reading of Bakhtin, the latter "provides a knowledge of the transformation of social discourse while displacing the originating subject and the causal and continuist progress of discourse". (Bhabha 1994, 269)

It is noteworthy that the extensive reception and transformation of the Bakhtinian notion of hybridity is rather surprising, as Sylvia Sasse (2018, 131–134) observes. In Bakhtin's writings, it is not a central category. The phrases featuring the expressions "hybrid" or "hybridity" are rather peripheral and are used more extensively in only one of his essays, in "Slovo v romane" (1934–1935, "Discourse

in the Novel"; Bakhtin 1981). Sasse explains that contrary to common understandings, dialogicity and hybridity are not identical, that they are separate categories that can but need not interact. The "intentional hybridity" that Young refers to in the quotation above is an intentional and consciously attributed artistic device within the novel. These hybrids are polyphonic, dialogic, because there is no unconscious mixture which turns the hybrid into a monologic construct. Within the hybrid as an artistic device, a dialogue is taking place, a confrontation. Ambivalence and ambiguity are an inevitable result of the dialogic intentional hybridity in the novel.

The adaptability and translatability of this Bakhtinian conception of the hybrid into the intellectual debates of Postcolonial Studies is not surprising given the fact that founding texts of the field, such as Said's, can also be reconnected with the cultural atmosphere and those very debates within which Bakhtin began to develop his own thinking. The applicability is even less surprising if the general interest in non-European art forms at the time is taken into further consideration, not in the sense of a straight argument, but rather in a broad discursive frame. Not only Western European, but also Russian and early Soviet thinkers shared an interest in both the practical and the theoretical research on form, and this research was often combined with an interest in those works of art that lay outside the Eurocentric canons. It was a Latvian art theorist, Voldemārs Matvejs, writing under the Russian pen name Vladimir Markov, who, just a little before Carl Einstein even, was the first to analyze African art as art that used specific forms (*Iskusstvo negrov* [1914, The Art of the Negroes]). Even though Matvejs' work on African art did not have much impact due to his early death, his writings on art theory were to have an impact on Malevich, Tatlin, and the Constructivists (cf. Howard et al. 2016). In literary theory, it was Russian formalism that not only laid many of those conceptual foundations that would be further developed in twentieth century literary and cultural theory from structuralism and poststructuralism, from narratology and concepts of intertextuality to cultural semiotics. The Russian formalists and their contemporaries were also interested in orality in literature, as in *skaz* (Ėikhenbaum), a mode of narration intrinsically connected with orality, or in folklore, as elaborated by Vladimir Propp. The tools they developed were decidedly applicable not only to canonized classical Eurocentric writing. On the contrary, their application to formal structures, to art as the sum of its devices (Shklovskii) and, in late Formalism, the conception of literature as a system of inconstant and changing interaction with its social surroundings mean it is predisposed to analyzing any kind of literature and literary system.

4 Formalist readings of African literature

Postcolonialism's reception of Bakhtin was catalyzed by the general rediscovery and re-evaluation of Bakhtin's theories by Western scholars, which was initiated by Julia Kristeva's essay "Bakhtine, le mot, le dialogue et le roman" (1967, "Word, Dialogue and Novel"; Kristeva 1991) and the subsequent development of the concept of intertextuality out of Bakhtin's dialogic word. In the Anglophone world, the first publication of Bakhtin's writings was *Rabelais and His World*, translated by Hélène Iswolsky, only shortly after the book's belated publication in Russian in 1965 (Renfrew 2015, 174). It led to Bakhtin's being associated with folk art, laughter, and, of course, the carnival. More translations appeared throughout the 1980s, notably the collection *The Dialogic Imagination by M.M. Bakhtin* (1981), edited and translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, which was the second major collection of Bakhtin's writings in English. The volume's essays include the work containing Bakhtin's notion of hybridity, "Discourse in the Novel".

The general intellectual and academic climate that catalyzed the transformation of the notion of hybridity from a literary device within the dialogic novel into a fundamental category of postcolonial cultural critique is not the only re-reading of Russian literary theory that can be observed in the last two decades of the twentieth century. Bakhtin's rediscovery was partially pre-figured, with regard to the thinking of and in Global South literatures, partially paralleled by the reception and re-evaluation of Russian Formalism. Both Russian formalism and Bakhtinian thought found their way into the thinking of and about Global South literature and culture roughly at the same time and were to shape the field's discussions decisively.

In 1989, in his essay "Orality, Literacy, and African Literature", Abiola Irele discussed the renewed attention of scholarly interest in questions of orality and its relation to literacy with regard to African literatures. He argues that the study of African oral forms is embedded in an intellectual climate that facilitates serious discussions of these questions. The first of the two factors he identifies as a reason for this development is the attention the development of structural linguistics drew to the oral basis of language. As is well known, he continues, this development was stimulated by Russian formalism, "much of which, as is evident in the case of Vladimir Propp, was based on the examination of folk and oral material" (Irele 2007, 74). Therefore, in Irele's understanding, Propp's impact on narratology, his reception in Western academic discourse, would eventually contribute to preparing the field for the academic reassessment of orality in African literatures.

A year later, in 1990, Kenneth Harrow (2007) applied readings of Shklovskii's and Tynianov's formalist writings on African literature in order to free it from sociological explanatory models, which were still playing an important role in the

discussions of the time – among them certainly Marxist models, such as Frederic Jameson's. Harrow is pre-eminently concerned with the problem of the periodization of African literature, for which Formalist approaches can prove useful, he argues. Formalism teaches that art reacts to art; the target for change in art is always primarily other art. It is only secondarily that larger social systems become relevant. Thus developments in African literatures can be explained via their inner dynamics just as much as via the social configurations under which they are produced. Harrow argues that such an approach restores to literature its integrity as a system. It is not a mere reaction to social circumstances that initiates the development of new forms. In African literatures, just as in any literary system, it is the continuous process of automization and defamiliarization pointed to by Formalist thinking that is at work. In this reading, earlier works of African literatures during the colonial period provided a point of departure with their revalidation of African cultures while still perpetuating automatized colonial values. Later texts would react to the automatized idealization of African cultures that these texts provided with devices of defamiliarization. Ironic, anti-colonial or revolutionary fiction began to appear in which the negation of the earlier successes emerged as a new form. Later, these texts, one might add, were often read within postcolonial theoretical paradigms. In any case, these works are not creations *ex nihilo*, but rooted in the constant processes of the dialectic between automization and defamilarization that will always continue to produce new forms. As a consequence, a new way of describing processes of change emerges that is different from previous models, which were grounded in concepts such as progress or notions of development and which ultimately remain grounded in colonial discourse even though they may be anti-colonial in intention (Harrow 2007, 426).

5 The African Bakhtin

The reception of Bakhtin is a parallel phenomenon and deeply intertwined with the application of Formalist readings to African literature, as can be seen by Harrow's remark that he is interested in Russian Formalist thinking in spite of the Bakhtinian critique of formalism (Harrow 2007, 423). In African receptions of Bakhtin, however, it was not hybridity that was foregrounded. The case of the Zimbabwean novelist Dambudzo Marechera, for instance, shows how the urge to develop explanatory modes for African literatures that are both grounded in literary theory and situated beyond automatized binary models also accounts for mediated readings of Bakhtin in African literary thought. In his essay "The African Writer's Experience of European Literature" (Marechera 2007 [1987]),

he refers to Bakhtin via Neil McEwan's book *Africa and the Novel* (1983). What appeals to Marechera is that McEwan's book allows him to bypass the division of European and African literatures via a reading of Bakhtin. The notion of carnival can unite writers from different backgrounds without distinguishing between them geographically. As a result, works by a writer like Wole Soyinka can exist beside those of Rabelais and Swift in the category of the Menippean novel (Marechera 2007, 187–188).

Marechera's essay is a *tour de force* through his readings of European literature, which he continuously connects with African literature. In a final argument, Marechera identifies with the Soviet-Russian dissident writer Andrei Siniavskii. He extensively cites Siniavskii's writings on Russian literature in order to define his own position: "My task as a writer was to take the veins of modernism, symbolism, futurism that had developed in poetry and transfer them to the language of prose." (Siniavskii as cited in Marechera 2007, 190) According to Marechera, Siniavskii made this statement after he was accused of being a modernist, an allegation that Marechera had to face himself when his book *Black Sunlight* (1980) was banned. Like Siniavskii, whom Marechemba cites once again, he asserts he "will never give [his] blessing to censorship on [any] grounds – any more than I would go to war, or prison, or for that matter, death." (Siniavskii as cited in Marechemba 2007, 190). Marechera ends his tour de force with references to Russian absurdist authors, under which he subsumes not only the Oberiuty Daniil Kharms, Aleksandr Vvedenskii and Nikolai Zabolotskii, but also the conceptualist Dmitrii Prigov. Russian literature is thus integrated into a world literary horizon within which Marechera proudly takes his place.

In Bakhtin's thinking, the category of the Menippean is closely connected to the carnivalesque. The extent to which the carnivalesque became one of the key categories in the reception of Bakhtin, which is of similar significance to that of hybridity in postcolonian thought, can be demonstrated with the prominent example of Achille Mbembe's influential *On the Postcolony* (2001) and its chapter "The Aesthetics of Vulgarity". The chapter was originally published in 1992 as "Provisional Notes on the Postcolony". In 2001, the essay was to become a chapter in the English translation of *On the Postcolony*, first published in 2000 in French. For Mbembe, Bakhtin's carnival is a point of departure from which he develops his description of the postcolony as a "chaotically pluralistic" but internal coherent space. "It is a specific system of signs, a particular way of fabricating simulacra or re-forming stereotypes." (Mbembe 2001, 102) Bakhtin located elements of the obscene and the grotesque in non-official cultures, Mbembe writes. In a generalizing move, however, he argues that these elements "are intrinsic to all systems of dominations and to the means by which those systems are confirmed or deconstructed" (Mbembe 2001, 102).

Bakhtin's concept of the carnival as a counterculture that temporarily reverses the order of things is transferred to both official and unofficial cultures. In Mbembe's reading, the carnivalesque becomes the central organizing principle of the semantic space of the postcolony. The grotesque and the obscene are used to erect and ratify particular regimes of violence and domination just as they deconstruct them (Mbembe 2001, 105). Bakhtin is thus once again used in order to transcend binaries, in this case those of "standard interpretations of domination, such as resistance vs. passivity, autonomy vs. subjection, the state vs. civil society, hegemony vs. counter-hegemony, totalization vs. detotalization" (Mbembe 2001, 103). In contrast to Bakhtin, Mbembe claims that in the postcolony, the grotesque and the obscene are not to be understood as grounded in the ordinary people. The grotesque and the obscene not only provide refuge from the dominant culture when they ridicule it and thereby point out its arbitrariness. In the postcolony, Mbembe postulates, state power resorts to the grotesque to dramatize its own magnificence via certain ceremonial displays which render them spectacles for the 'subjects' to watch. "It is only through such a shift in perspective that we can understand that the postcolonial relationship is not primarily a relationship of resistance or of collaboration but can best be characterized as convivial, a relationship fraught by the fact of the *commandement* and its 'subjects' having to share the same living space." (Mbembe 2001, 104)

In summary, it can be concluded that Russian and Eastern European theory's entanglements with African thought have proven productive throughout the twentieth century. They encompass fields not discussed in this article, such as the reception of Russian Realist writers such as Tolstoi (cf. e. g. Foster 2013), as a counter model to colonial European literatures, or early (later often disappointed) hopeful references by Global South thinkers to the Soviet Union as a "new society", as in the case of Aimé Césaire's *Discours sur le colonialisme* (1950, 1955) (Césaire 2000, 52). Socialist Realist paradigms belong to the world literary palimpsest of African literatures just as much as readings of Russian Formalism and of Bakhtin. The latter in particular have been applied to develop models that sought to conceive of African literatures as literatures transcending the binary schemes imposed on them by the division of the world into Europe and the rest. Russian thought has thus provided multiple points of departure for Global South thinking that will certainly have to be explored in more detail in future research.

References

Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. *Postcolonial Studies: The Key Concepts*. Third Edition. London and New York, NY: Routledge, 2013.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Discourse in the Novel." Mikhail Bakhtin. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1981. 259–423.

Bal, Mieke. *Travelling Concepts in the Humanities: A Rough Guide*. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 2002.

Bhabha, Homi. *The Location of Culture*. London and New York, NY: Routledge, 1994.

Brandist, Craig. "The Cultural and Linguistic Dimensions of Hegemony: Aspects of Gramsci's Debt to Early Soviet Cultural Policy." *Journal of Romance Studies* 12. 3 (2012): 24–43.

Césaire, Aimé. *Discourse on Colonialism.* [1955] New York, NY, and London: Monthly Review Press, 2000.

Chomentowski, Gabrielle. 2019. "Filmmakers from Africa and Middle East trained at VGIK during the Cold War." *Studies in Russian and Soviet Cinema* 13. 3 (2019): 189–198.

Cowcher, Kate. "Soviet Supersystems and American Frontiers: African Art Histories amid the Cold War." *The Art Bulletin* 101. 3 (2019): 146–166, DOI: 10.1080/00043079.2019.1564180.

Djagalov, Rossen. *From Internationalism to Postcolonialism: Literature and Cinema between the Second and the Third Worlds*. Montreal, Kingston, London, and Chicago: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2020.

Dovey, Lindiwe. "Listening Between the Images: African Filmmakers' Take on the Soviet Union, Soviet Filmmakers' Take on Africa." *The Oxford Handbook of Communist Visual Cultures*. Eds. Aga Skrodzka, Xiaoning Lu, and Katarzyna Marciniak. Oxford and New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2020. 364–385.

Drews-Sylla, Gesine. "Spuren Ost- und Mitteleuropas in Vorgeschichte und Palimpsest der Postcolonial Studies." *Theory of Literature as a Theory of the Arts and the Humanities.* Wiener Slawistischer Almanach, Sonderband 92. Eds. Michał Mrugalski and Schamma Schahadat. Leipzig and Wien: Biblion Media, 2017. 299–315.

Drews-Sylla, Gesine. "Ousmane Sembène's Hybrid 'Truth': Social(ist) Realism and Postcolonial Writing Back." *Realisms in Contemporary Culture: Theories, Politics, and Medial Configurations.* Eds. Dorothee Birke and Stella Butter. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013. 70–90.

Foster, John B. jr. *Transnational Tolstoy: Between the West and the World*. New York, NY et al.: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013.

Harrow, Kenneth. "A Formal Approach to African Literature." [1990] *African Literature: An Anthology of Criticism and Theory*. Eds. Tejumola Olaniyan and Ato Quayson. Malden, MA, Oxford, and Carlton: Blackwell Publishing, 2007. 422–427.

Irele, Abiola. "Orality, Literacy, and African Literature." [1989] *African Literature: An Anthology of Criticism and Theory*. Eds. Tejumola Olaniyan and Ato Quayson. Malden, MA, Oxford, Carlton: Blackwell Publishing, 2007. 74–83.

Howard, Jeremy, Irena Bužinska, and Z. S. Strother. *Vladimir Markov and Russian Primitivism: A Charter for the Avant-Garde*. Routledge, 2016.

Kouoh, Koyo. *In His Own Words: Issa Samb's Ultimately Decipherable Form. En ses propres mots: Issa Samb et la forme somme toute déchiffrable.* Oslo: Office for Contemporary Art Norway, Berlin: Sternberg Press, Dakar: Raw Material Company, 2013.

Kristeva, Julia. "Word, Dialogue and Novel." *The Kristeva Reader*. Ed. Toril Moi. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 1991. 34–62.

Mbembe, Achille. *On the Postcolony*. Berkely and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 2001.

McCarthy, Conor. *The Cambridge Introduction to Edward Said*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Marechera, Dambudzo. "The African Writer's Experience of European Literature." [1987] *African Literature: An Anthology of Criticism and Theory*. Eds. Tejumola Olaniyan and AtoQuayson. Malden, MA, Oxford, Carlton: Blackwell Publishing, 2007. 186–193.

McEwan, Neil. *Africa and the Novel*. London et al.: Macmillan, 1983.

Neto, Agostino. "Concerning National Culture." [1979] *African Literature: An Anthology of Criticism and Theory*. Eds. Tejumola Olaniyan and Ato Quayson. Malden, MA, Oxford, Carlton: Blackwell Publishing, 2007. 492–496.

Onoge, Omafume F. "Towards a Marxist Sociology of African Literature." [1986] *African Literature: An Anthology of Criticism and Theory*. Eds. Tejumola Olaniyan and Ato Quayson. Malden, MA, Oxford, Carlton: Blackwell Publishing, 2007. 463–476.

Popescu, Monica. *At Penpoint: African Literatures, Postcolonial Studies, and the Cold War*. Durham, NC, and London: Duke University Press, 2020.

Renfrew, Alastair. *Mikhail Bakhtin*. London and New York, NY: Routledge, 2015.

Said, Edward. *Joseph Conrad and the Fiction of Autobiography*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1966.

Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. [1978] London et al.: Penguin Books, 2003.

Said, Edward. *Culture and Imperialism*. [1993] London: Vintage Book, 1994.

Sasse, Sylvia. *Michail Bachtin zur Einführung*. Rev. 2nd edition. Hamburg: Junius Verlag, 2018.

Stanek, Łukasz. *Architecture in Global Socialism: Eastern Europe, West Africa, and the Middle East in the Cold War*. Princeton, NJ, and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2020.

Tolz, Vera. *Russia's Own Orient: The Politics of Identity and Oriental Studies in the Late Imperial and Early Soviet Periods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Young, Robert J. C. *White Mythologies*: *Writing History and the West*. [1990] London and New York, NY: Routledge, 2004

Young, Robert J. C. *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race*. London and New York, NY: Routledge, 1995.

Young, Robert J. C. *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction*. Oxford and Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers; Chennai, India: T.R. Publications, 2001.

V Senegale (*In Senegal*). Directed and edited by O. Podgoretskaia. Moscow: Tsentral'naia Ordena Krasnogo Znameni studiia dokumental'nykh fil'mov, 1961.

Woll, Josephine. "The Russian Connection: Soviet Cinema and the Cinema of Francophone Africa." *Focus on African Films*. Ed. Françoise Pfaff. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2004. 223–240.

Tamara Brzostowska-Tereszkiewicz

Translation Studies (From Theories of Literary Translation to a Paradigm of Modernity)

In a sense, modern translation theory originated in Central and Eastern Europe. And, contrary to the so-called 'death of (modern literary) theory', it is still alive and well. This counterpoint to Galin Tihanov's reflections on the birth and present condition of modern literary theory (Tihanov 2004a, 2004b) does not seek to resuscitate polemics on the intellectual history of Modernism. Rather, it is intended to emphasise the overlapping and intertwined character of questions regarding the respective transitions of literary theory and translation studies towards the paradigm of modernity. Moreover, it is also intended to highlight the decisive stimulus provided by critical currents that originated in Eastern and Central European countries in the decades between the World Wars to later developments in Western literary and translation studies. Both the chronotope of modern translation theory and the dynamics of the process of its conception parallel those of modern literary theory. However, contrary to modern literary theory, which according to Tihanov's post-mortem has been so thoroughly transformed and deeply absorbed (or perhaps dissipated) into new cultural discourses that it has lost its self-sufficiency and disciplinary distinctiveness, modern translation theory can be seen to have progressively succeeded in acquiring the status of a guiding science (*Leitwissenschaft*) for the humanities (Salevsky and Müller 2011, xv).

This chapter briefly examines the role of Eastern and Central European formalist and structuralist scholarly cultures in the transformations that led to the conceptual leap whereby translation came to be considered not simply as a form of intercultural communication, but as a quasi-organizational principle (a structural matrix) within the discourse of cultural studies.

1 The translational turn in cultural studies: A postulate or an on-going movement?

Indeed, the translational turn so boldly announced in cultural studies has established translation as a model for conducting inter- and transdisciplinary cultural research, and as the main analytical category for investigating the cross-cultural diffusion and historical transformation of art forms and art theories (see

Bachmann-Medick 2009, 2010, 238–283; 2016). Cultural historians now describe translation not only as one of the basic instruments of cultural self-reflection and self-criticism, but, indeed, as an over-arching methodological concept for the study of culture (Wendland 2012, 59–62). The question of the extent to which, in the process, modern cultural translation studies has managed to preserve "translation proper" as its point of reference would, of course, require a separate and much longer discussion that would go beyond the scope of this chapter (Dizdar 2009, 90). A second, no less important problem is the actual status of the translational turn within the contemporary humanities.

In her influential book *Cultural Turns: Neuorientierungen in den Kulturwissenschaften* (2010; English translation: *Cultural Turns: New Orientations in the Study of Culture*, 2016), Doris Bachmann-Medick expresses a significant reservation regarding the impact of translation research on Western cultural studies discourses: "Such developments are showing with particular clarity how translational attitudes toward research are gaining a foothold in the social sciences and the study of culture – and how, through a honing of their systematic theoretical framework, they are making a breakthrough to become part of a true turn" (Bachmann-Medick 2016, 176). What was referred to nearly two decades ago as a mere postulate (Bassnett 1998), a preliminary intention (West 2000, 162), and an urgent task yet to be accomplished (Venuti 1998, 9) has now become a fact, primarily in the field of new comparative literature outlined in Emily Apter's study *The Translation Zone* (Apter 2006). Indicating the growing demand for translations in the marketing of national literatures and in the global political arena, Apter proposed the term "global translation" as "another name for comparative literature" (Apter 2006, xi).

The pivotal turn towards translation is perhaps most clearly seen in contemporary comparative Modernism studies. As recent historiographic and methodological developments show, Modernism studies has undergone all the stages necessary for diagnosing a translational turn in a given discipline: (1) the expansion of the thematic field of research to encompass the issues of interlingual translation, (2) the increasing metaphorisation of the notion of translation in studies concerning intercultural encounters and various modalities of cultural contact, and finally, (3) the methodological refinement in the course of which the category of translation acquired a greater epistemological value and wider transdisciplinary application (Bachmann-Medick 2009, 4). In line with Bachman-Medick, the translational turn in a given research field can be understood as a decisive shift in the field's theoretical attention "in which the main points of focus are condensed into methodologically significant approaches of inquiry" (Bachmann-Medick 2008). Within Modernism studies, the new conceptual and terminological lexes derived from translation studies not only serve to identify and describe new objects of

inquiry, but also operate as analytical categories and methodological procedures which have the power to challenge our previous understandings of the subjects studied (Brzostowska-Tereszkiewicz 2016, 19–33).

Apart from comparative literature and Modernism studies, the increasing role of translation research has been an important part of the academic discussion in historiography, ethnology, cultural anthropology, and religious studies, particularly those focusing on a non-European history of Christianity (see e. g. Bachmann-Medick 2010, 260–272; 2006; Clifford 1994). Within these fields of scholarly inquiry, not only culture but also cultural studies itself are seen as "an ongoing translation endeavour due to the production of relationships and possibilities of connections between different social realms, groups, fields of agency, institutions, symbolic self-assertions, claims to power, etc." (Bachmann-Medick 2008).

How is it that what was once a particular and limited problem for philology and linguistics came to be placed in another discursive order and became a major theoretical paradigm in modern cultural studies – even, according to some prescriptivists, for cultural theory tout court?

2 The birth of modern translation theory

There is certainly nothing new in stating that the beginnings of modern translation theory, like those of modern literary theory, can be traced back to the activities of the Russian formalists (see e. g. Gentzler 2001, 83; Tihanov 2004b, 61). The historical impact of Russian formalism, which developed into the structuralist functionalism of the Prague Linguistic Circle, on Western translation studies has already been acknowledged as having introduced both novel concepts and systematic methods to translation analysis. It is now generally agreed that, as Susan Bassnett writes in her landmark overview of Western translation theories, "[t]he most important advances in translation studies in the twentieth century derive from the groundwork done by groups in Russia in the 1920s and subsequently by the Prague Linguistic Circle and its disciples" (Bassnett 2002 [1980], 16). The passage of Russian formalist ideas into Western translation scholarship in the second half of the twentieth century took two major routes, which may be pictured as gradually combining to establish the modern paradigm of translation theory.

The first route by which Russian formalist thought penetrated Western translation studies was via the Czech and Slovak schools of translation studies. Zuzana Jettmarová has recently described this as "the lesser-known tradition" underpinning the evolution of "the current Western mainstream" (Jettmarová 2008, 15; 2017, 99; Snell-Hornby 2006, 20–23). As Edwin Gentzler points out, however, the

Czech and Slovak schools, whose ranks included such critics as Jiří Levý, Anton Popovič, and František Miko, evolved from Russian formalism both by adapting its seminal proposals to the sphere of translation theory and, more importantly, by consciously distancing themselves from some of its early tenets, such as the concept of literature as "an autonomous reality governed by its own regularity and more or less independent of contiguous spheres of culture" (Steiner 1984, 245; Gentzler 2001, 83). The contribution of the Czech and Slovak schools was so crucial to translation studies precisely because, as Gentzler observes, they "showed how Formalist structural laws are located in history and interact with at least two literary traditions simultaneously, that of the source culture and that of the receiving culture" (Gentzler 2001, 83). It is no exaggeration to say that the theoretical explorations and analytical practices of the Czech and Slovak schools led to the reformulation of literary translation as part of literary history and cultural discourse, and consequently paved the way for the deep paradigmatic change in translation studies that would later come to be known as the "cultural turn" in the 1980s (Snell-Hornby 2006, 47).

The second, far more widely recognized route by which Eastern European literary and cultural theories were transmitted to Western translation scholarship was via polysystem theory. This theoretical framework emanated principally from the works of two Israeli scholars, Itamar Even-Zohar and Gideon Toury, and their collaborators at the Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics in Tel Aviv (e. g. Zohar Shavit, Shelly Yahalom) from the late 1960s onwards. The polysystem theoreticians elaborated not only on the ideas of the Russian formalists and the Prague structuralist school, but also those of the Tartu semioticians, particularly Iurii Lotman (Even-Zohar 1990, 1–7; Dimić and Garstin 1988). The polysystem theoretical framework, together with its Eastern and Central European scholarly heritage, was itself reassessed and further extended into target-oriented and functionalist descriptive translation studies inaugurated by Gideon Toury (1982). This approach has been recognised as providing a wider cultural context than previously "fragmented philological studies" (Pym 1998, 14), and for giving modern translation studies fresh impetus.

Most importantly, in particular from the perspective of translation theory's efforts to increase its integrity and self-consciousness as an autonomous discipline of critical investigation, descriptive translation studies awakened interest not only in the historical status of translations, but also in the historicity of translation concepts, which were established as legitimate objects of study in their own right. In his article on the "geopolitics of translation theory", Daniel Simeoni emphasises the Russian impulses behind descriptive translation studies, specifying that its dynamic functionalist framework was, in fact, "an extension of the Russian tradition of European linguistics (Jakobson and Tynianov articulated

their notion of culture as a 'system of systems' as early as 1928) and from the poetic modernism of Shklovsky" (Simeoni 2008, 330). Edwin Gentzler goes so far as to make an explicit connection between Russian formalism's distinct self-criticism and self-conscious attention to historical issues, on one hand, and the historical and methodological self-awareness of descriptive translation studies, on the other. Gentzler writes that this incorporation of history into their models has "helped translation studies scholars apply theory inwardly as well as externally, enabling them to address problems as raised by their own and other fields of investigation" (Gentzler 2001, 82).

3 From the peripheries to the centre

Both the potential for methodological adaptability and conceptual flexibility have enabled translation studies to shift successively from the periphery of linguistic and literary studies to the very centre of modern humanities research. Its unique position in current cultural discourse can be attributed not only to its ability to engage in meaningful dialogue with a range of disciplines, and to its 'osmotic capacity' to absorb and adapt new tendencies in cultural research, but also to its superb collection of analytical terms and concepts, which provide the tools for a thorough exploration of contemporary multicultural and transdisciplinary issues (Bolecki 2009, 6–7). Surveying this repertoire of analytical instruments is perhaps the best way to acknowledge how much modern translation theory owes to Eastern and Central European formalist and structuralist schools of linguistic and literary thought. The major theoretical assumptions of these schools have been neatly absorbed and incorporated as dilemmas to be resolved within modern translation studies. Iurii Tynianov's and Roman Jakobson's theses on the study of literature and language (Tynianov and Jakobson 1978 [1928]) provided a firm foundation for polysystem scholars, who foregrounded the notion of literature as a differentiated, dynamic, and hierarchically structured conglomerate of systems characterized by internal oppositions and abrupt shifts between 'primary' (innovative) and 'secondary' (conservative), 'canonized' and 'non-canonized', 'central' and 'peripheral' models, styles and genres. Translation thus came to be viewed in terms of its close correlation with both the surrounding literary polysystem and with larger cultural systems, as an entity embedded in the ideological and socio-economic structures of society (Even-Zohar 1990, 1–7; Dimić and Garstin 1988).

Historians of translation studies have consistently identified the most significant contribution Russian formalism made to modern (i.e. cultural) translation theory to be that it taught translation scholars to think in terms of dynamic corre-

lations between literature and non-literary series while switching between literature-immanent methods and cultural criticism. "The lineage of Formalism from Leningrad to Tel Aviv", writes Else Vieira, "stresses that the function of each work is its correlation with other works, with the whole of literature, and, in turn, with other cultural series" (Vieira 2000, 319). Of particular relevance here is Tynianov and Jakobson's concept of a synchronic literary system which draws works of art from foreign-language literatures into its systemic functioning and thus inevitably triggers changes in the characteristics of the transferred original according to the target literary system (Tynianov and Jakobson 1972 [1928], 389–391; Salevsky and Müller 2011, 49). It is often observed that, within a given literary culture, translations may either constitute a separate subsystem with distinctive characteristics, or function as an integral part of the adapting indigenous systems. They may either grow into the system's centre, or remain at its peripheries. Finally, they may be used either as "primary" polemical instruments to undermine the dominant poetics or they may support and reinforce the prevailing conventions in the target literature (see e.g. Hermans 2014 [1985], 11).

The formalist-structural concept of a dynamic system set in motion by internal oppositions has repeatedly been applied as a means for expanding and structuring historical reflections on the functioning of translated literature within a target literary culture. For example, in her 1982 article on the evolution of Polish twentieth-century narrative prose, Barbara Sienkiewicz clearly associated the deautomatizing function of Hemingway translations with the emergence of a "new style of writing" in the target literary culture:

> In a given literary situation it [the deautomatizing function of a translation] may be taken up by original writers in the culture which has assimilated the translation and developed into a new stylistic convention in the translator's native literature. This means a shift in the system of norms and rules for original writing. (Sienkiewicz 1982, 295)

Similarly, distinct echoes of Tynianov's concept of literary evolution can be heard in André Lefevere's concept of polarity in the evolution of translated literature. The Russian formalists argued that the moment an artistic genre or a trend becomes automatized, it provokes a counter-reaction which is the driving force behind literary evolution. Lefevere, one of the founders and principal members of the Manipulation School of translation studies, writes similarly that "systems develop according to the principle of polarity, which holds that every system eventually evolves its own countersystem [...], and according to the principle of periodicity, which holds that all systems are liable to change" (Lefevere 1992, 38).

Their common roots in Russian formalism contributed to significant convergences between polysystem theory and Polish structuralist translation studies, which likewise made use of the dichotomy between 'innovative' and 'conserv-

ative' translations to explain the evolution of the target literary system. Edward Balcerzan (1967, 66; 1998, 96–97) argued that while conservative (redundant) translations strengthen the target literary system by incorporating the source text into the canon of aesthetic conventions and stylistic norms in the target culture, innovative translations subvert them and thus make novelty possible. As with their influence on Czech and Slovak structuralist schools of translation and on Western European descriptive, target-oriented, systemic translation studies, the role of the formalist ideas in the development of the Polish structuralist school of translation has been duly recognized by literary critics (Balcerzan 1968, 65; Legeżyńska 1999, 198; Barańczak 2004, 35–36; Rajewska 2007, 34; Kaczorowska 2011, 41–43; Bończa Bukowski and Heydel 2015, 44–45). However, while Western translation studies in the 1980s paid particular attention to the literary system's correlations with sociocultural systems (e. g. the manipulist notions of patronage and ideology as governing the production and reception of translations in a given target culture [Lefevere 1992]), Polish, Czech and Slovak literary translation scholars predominantly emphasised issues of historical and descriptive poetics.

Their increased concern with the materiality of artistic language (i. e. the focus on the linguistic medium itself) led Polish, Czech, and Slovak translation theorists to consider the 'constructedness' of both source and target texts, and triggered attempts to launch a 'poetics of artistic translation' as a separate discipline, with its own theoretical language and analytical rules, distinct from the poetics of original literary works. One of the most influential Polish translation scholars, Edward Balcerzan, articulated this theoretical position alongside the Slovak theorist Anton Popovič in 1971: "In order to acquire knowledge of the artistic translation, one needs to have special tools which should be a subject of interest of a separate discipline: the poetics of translation" (Balcerzan 1998, 18; Popovič 1971). The theoretical inquiries of Polish, Czech, and Slovak translation theorists into the methods and tools of translation analysis were accompanied by a profusion of analytical studies devoted to the 'distinctive' literary character of source and target texts. Historiographers of Polish translation studies have taken particular interest in the career of Stanisław Barańczak's notion of a "semantic dominant", defined as "the primacy of a given element within the structure of the work which constitutes a more or less perceptible key to the entirety of its senses" (Barańczak 2004, 37). Close to the central formalist concept of the "dominant" as "the focusing component of a work of art" which "rules, determines, and transforms the remaining components" (Jakobson 1971, 105), it has also been compared to Shklovskii's "device" (*priëm*), Tynianov's "constructive principle," and the "semantic gesture" of Jan Mukařovský (Dziadek 1995, 13).

4 The constructivist model of literary translation

It is perhaps significant that more than a few Eastern and Central European structuralist translation scholars were both writers and translators as well as theorists of poetic language and literature (both original and in translation) – as were a considerable number of Russian formalists. It was these writers and critics who launched and developed one of the most popular and influential "illusionist techniques" (Levý 2011, 19–20) in modernist literary translation, which may best be described as "Constructivist translation", as I have proposed elsewhere (Brzostowska-Tereszkiewicz 2016, 113–128). The theoretical basis for the constructivist approach to translation was again informed by the writings of the Russian formalists, as well as by Eastern and Central European structuralist schools (both the Prague structuralists and the Tartu semioticians). In terms borrowed from the Russian formalists and the Prague structuralists, constructivist translation aimed to lay bare the devices (*obnazhenie priëma*) of the source text, recognizing and extracting the dominant (*dominant*) of its construction and putting the same constructive factor (*konstruktivnyi faktor*) into effect in the target-language text. Formal devices were also assigned semantic functions. Thus, the formal construction of the source text determined the procedures and requirements used for the translation. The key was to recreate the original's dominant in the target poem, while the original's 'minor architectonic' of subjugated elements could be (and most often was) subjected to various changes deemed necessary from the artistic point of view. The reconstruction of the original's dominant in translation usually entailed significant reconfiguration, reordering and subjugation of the remaining target text's architectonic elements. It was precisely by this structural gesture that the deautomatizing potential of translation was thought to manifest itself most clearly.

The constructivist modernist model of literary translation, distinctive for its formal rigor and specialism in theoretical poetics, had already received its most self-consistent articulations in the translation activities of the Russian formalists. Iurii Tynianov's 1927 and 1934 translations of Heinrich Heine's poetry are exemplary in this context. Having recognized the constructive features and characteristic stylistic devices of Heine's satires and lyrical poems, Tynianov not only recreated the formal structure of the translated texts, but made it more visible to the target readers. As German Ritz observes, in Tynianov's renderings of the German poet, "the dominant structure has been worked out even more strongly than in the original" (Ritz 1981, 404; Hodgson 2013). The same principal tenets of translational Constructivism were adhered to strictly in the 1919 Czech translation of Velimir Khlebnikov's *Sestry-molnii* (*2-oi parus, 'Strastnaia ploshchad'*) (*The Sisters-Lightnings* [*The 2ⁿᵈ Sail, 'The Lord's Passion Square'*]) by Roman Aljagrov

(Roman Jakobson) (Jakobson 2012, 238). It should also be noted that Jakobson's theorem of the untranslatability of poetry formulated in his classical article "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation" (Jakobson 1959, 238) strictly corresponds with the basic tenets of the Constructivist approach to translation. No less illustrative examples of the constructivist mode can be found in the translational work of those Polish structuralists who themselves were also linguistic poets, e. g. Balcerzan and Stanisław Barańczak. The Polish version of Aleksei Kruchenykh's radical phonetic and morphological experiment *Zaum': Glukhonemoi* (*Transrational Language: The Deaf-Mute*) from *Zamaul' III* (1919) translated by Balcerzan as *Zaum. Głuchoniemy* (Dąbrowski et al. 1971, 381) is perhaps the most accomplished constructivist experiment in translation.

5 Drawing on the methodological vocabularies

The rediscovery of the work of the Russian formalists and the increasing focus on the problems of linguistics, stylistics, and poetics in literary studies in the second half of the twentieth century also led to a refinement of critical methodology in the field of translation scholarship. It might even be argued that Russian formalism, along with Czech structural poetics and linguistics, helped translation studies scholars to bridge the gap between the disciplines of linguistics and literary criticism. Borrowing such key concepts from Russian formalist theory as (de)automatization (*(de)avtomatizatsia*), *defamiliarization* (*ostranenie*) and literariness (*literaturnost'*) enabled translation studies scholars to not only qualify a text's relation to its (source/target) cultural tradition and to situate it within the evolution of literary forms, but also to focus on the "innovative", "strange," and "distinctly literary" features of the original/translation (Gentzler 2001, 82; Balcerzan 1998, 104–106). It has been suggested that Lawrence Venuti's concept of foreignization bears much resemblance to the Russian formalists' notion of *ostranenie*, rather than providing a label for novel poststructuralist devices, as the American translation theorist claims (Gentzler 2001, 42; Koskinen 2002, 52; 2012, 16). An interesting parallel also links Philip E. Lewis' concept of abusive fidelity to Shklovskii's focus on *defamiliarization*. As Joseph Fitzpatrick observes:

> If for Shklovsky poetic use defamiliarizes language and plot defamiliarizes story, then Lewis' abusive translation seeks to repeat this defamiliarization in the translated text – while simultaneously turning the technique on the act of translation itself, a second defamiliarization that draws attention to the conventions by which we forget the foreignness (and, of course, the absence) of the original text. (Fitzpatrick 2007, 195)

Indeed, it is to the Russian formalists that modern literary and translation scholars owe not only the concept of literature (and literary translation) as an autonomous domain for theoretical investigation, but also the institutional (i. e. functionalist) definition of literature (and literary translation) (Nycz 2002, 44–45; Tihanov 2004a, 62). In the field of Western translation scholarship, a strong concern for literature as an institution, an "established and structured pattern of behaviour or of relationships that is accepted as a fundamental part of a culture" (Dimić 1993, 152), was already pivotal to polysystem theory. Viewing "translation as an institution" (Hermans 1997, 3) marked a methodological and theoretical watershed. Translation was no longer defined in terms of the supposedly immanent, stable, ahistorical, and transcultural nature of its ideal realization, but instead according to historically-situated and culturally-specific institutional criteria for gaining the status of a translation in the target culture (Toury 1980, 14, 37, 43–45; 1982, 27). Thus, in a paradigm shift, translation was redefined as a socially determined mode of language use, institutionalized in the boundaries of a given historical and cultural community, situationally contextualized and governed by culture-specific rules and conditions. Perhaps the most important corollary of redefining translation as a culturally distinct discursive practice is the translational turn that can be currently observed in cultural studies, which has established translation as a key analytical category for intercultural exchange.

6 Towards metatheoretical developments

In this context, it is notable that the impact of the Russian formalists on Western translation studies can also be detected on the level of metatheoretical reflection. According to Maria Tymoczko's observation, modern metonymic approaches to translation highlight the significance of "the creation of connections, contiguities and contexts in and through translation" (Tymoczko 1999, 9) while receiving strong theoretical support from contemporary cultural theoretical discourses. Tymoczko's concept of metametonymics rests on Roman Jakobson's distinction between the 'metaphoric' and the 'metonymic', as the two antipodal yet mutually reinforcing modes of arrangement involved in any linguistic utterance. The American scholar reconstructs the history of Western translation theory in terms of an opposition between metaphorical and metonymic translation discourses, in which 'metaphor' is described as a domain of resemblance, selection, and substitution, and 'metonymy' as the domain of contiguity, combination, and context (Jakobson 1956, 112). As Tymoczko observes, translation has long been modelled primarily as a metaphoric process of selection and substitution based

on resemblance. As a consequence, translation has been constantly devalued, as a merely derivative, servile, inferior and mechanical activity of word replacement rather than as a metonymic process of creating contiguities and contextures (Tymoczko 1999, 279–280). The chief advocate of translation as a mode of experimental creative writing, Clive Scott, proposes a radical solution: "The essential connection between translation and creative writing lies here: the literariness of the ST [source text] is not a given, is subject to history. Translation (particularly if 'straight') is likely to be instrumental in the erosion of the ST's literariness, unless the translator sets out to incorporate the ST into the literature of translation and to re-imagine its literariness by his/her own agency as a reader/writer" (Scott 2006, 116–117). It was the cultural turn in translation studies – and, one could add, the subsequent translational turn in cultural studies – that enabled metonymic criticism and metonymic modes of translational creativity.

7 From the East to the West and back again

Remarkably, a number of Western translation theories which were originally derived from or based directly on Russian formalist ideas (e. g. polysystem theory, descriptive translation studies, the Manipulation School) are now being re-introduced to contemporary Eastern European translation discourse as vehicles for concepts and approaches associated with the cultural turn in the humanities. In a manner symptomatic of such re-absorption of Westernized Russian theory into Eastern European translation scholarship, Veronika Razumovskaia combines Tynianov's 1924 notion of literature as a "dynamic speech construction" (Tynianov 2014, 36) with Lefevere and Bassnett's idea of cultural "textual grids" (Lefevere and Bassnett 1998, 5; Razumovskaya 2011, *207*). In a similar vein, key theoretical concepts in translation studies have been re-filtered through the Russian theoretical experience in Natalia Galeyeva's reflections on translation in culture. Her statement delineating the methodological tenets of the Tver School of translation studies shows a significant renegotiation of methodological frameworks and allegiances, resulting from the asymmetry of Western and Eastern European scholarly cultures. Galeyeva cites her influences as including Susan Bassnett, James Holmes, and André Lefevere – commenting that these authors' approach, usually thought of as target-oriented cultural translation research, is, "as a matter of fact, hermeneutic" (Galeyeva 2006, 25) and, as such, fully comparable to Georgii Shchedrovitskii's methodological research, Georgii Bogin's Tver School, and Victor Litvinov's Piatigorsk School of translation studies.

Reiterating the main arguments in favour of Eastern European origins of modern translation theory, the Brazilian translation scholar Else Vieira recounts in the *Encyclopedia of Literary Translation* into English how the study of words as operational units moved on to methods that drew on cultural history and theories of cultural interaction through translation. These, she notes, "evolved from Even-Zohar's polysystem theory (1979) and stemmed from Leningrad Formalism (Iakubinskii, Shklovskii, Ėikhenbaum, Zhirmunskii, Tynianov, Tomashevskii, etc.), Czech Structuralism, Russian semiotics of culture, mainly Lotman, and recent systems theory" (Vieira 2000, 319). Yet, such seemingly straightforward accounts (including, perhaps, that given in the present chapter) of the Eastern and Central European provenance of Western cultural translation ideas should not obscure the fact that, as Jettmarová observes, "some representations are taken from secondary sources and/or based on one article alone, [and] some traditions are missing" (Jettmarova 2017, 99). This incomplete appropriation of Central-Eastern European scholarly cultures in Western humanities may be explained not only in terms of geopolitical issues and linguistic inaccessibility, but also by the significant asymmetry in scholarly research styles. It is the well-known methodological and conceptual differences between Russian and American formalisms (e. g. Thompson 1971), Slavic structuralist thought and Western European structuralism (e. g. Bojtar 1985) as well as between Western European and Eastern European variants of hermeneutics (e. g. Emerson and Medzhibovskaya 2010) which can be considered particularly relevant for the discussion on Eastern and Central European (pervasive yet deficient) theoretical influence on Western translation studies. All these factors have contributed to unidimensional and simplistic stereotypes with regard to Czech and Slovak schools of translation as well as Russian formalism in Western scholarship (see e. g. Ulicka 2003, 7; Jettmarova 2017).

References

Apter, Emily. *The Translation Zone: A New Comparative Literature*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006.

Bachmann-Medick, Doris. "Meanings of Translation in Cultural Anthropology." *Translating Others*. Ed. Theo Hermans. Manchester: St Jerome Publishing, 2006. 33–42.

Bachmann-Medick, Doris. "Cultural Studies: A Translational Perspective. Interview with Boris Buden." Trans. by Erika Doucette. *Transversal* (September 2008): https://transversal.at/transversal/0908/bachmann-medick-buden/en (28 January 2022).

Bachmann-Medick, Doris. "The Translational Turn." Trans. by Kate Sturge. *Translation Studies* 1 (2009): 2–16.

Bachmann-Medick, Doris. *Cultural Turn: Neuorientierungen in den Kulturwissenschaften*. Reinbek/H.: Rowohlt, 2010. (English translation: *Cultural turns: New Orientations in the Study of Culture*. Trans. by Adam Blauhut. Berlin and Boston, MA: De Gruyter, 2016.)

Bachmann-Medick, Doris (ed.). *The Trans/National Study of Culture: A Translational Perspective*. 2nd edition. Berlin and Boston, MA: De Gruyter, 2016.

Balcerzan, Edward. "Sztuka tłumaczenia a styl." *Studia z teorii i historii poezji*. Vol. 1. Ed. Michał Głowiński. Wroclaw, Warsaw, and Cracow: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1967. 33–71.

Balcerzan, Edward. *Styl i poetyka twórczości dwujęzycznej Brunona Jasieńskiego: Z zagadnień teorii przekładu*. Wroclaw, Warsaw, and Cracow: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich Wydawnictwo PAN, 1968.

Balcerzan, Edward. *Literatura z literatury (strategie tłumaczy)*. Katowice: "Śląsk", 1998.

Barańczak, Stanisław. *Ocalone w tłumaczeniu: Szkice o warsztacie tłumacza poezji z dołączeniem małej antologii przekładów*. Rev. 2nd edition. Cracow: Wydawnictwo a5, 2004.

Bassnett, Susan. "The Translation Turn in Cultural Studies." *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. Eds. Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere. Clevendon, Buffalo, NY, Toronto, and Sydney: Multilingual Matters, 1998. 123–140.

Bassnett, Susan. Translation Studies [1980]. 3rd edition. London and New York, NY: Routledge, 2002.

Bojtar, Endre. *Slavic Structuralism (Linguistic and Literary Studies in Eastern Europe)*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, 1985.

Bolecki, Włodzimierz. "Pochwała translatologii." *Teksty Drugie* 6 (2010): 6–7.

Bończa Bukowski, Piotr de, and Magda Heydel (eds.). "Polish Studies in Translation: Re-Mapping an Interdisciplinary Field." *Translatologica Pragensia IX*, special issue of *Acta Universitatis Carolinae Philologica* 3 (2015): 39–54.

Brzostowska-Tereszkiewicz, Tamara. *Modernist Translation: An Eastern European Perspective. Models, Semantics, Functions*. Frankfurt/M.: Peter Lang, 2016.

Clifford, James. "The Translation of Cultures: Maurice Leenhardt's Evangelism, New Caledonia 1902–1926." *Contemporary Literary Criticism: Literary and Cultural Studies*. Eds. Robert Con Davis and Ronald Schleifer. New York, NY: Longmann, 1994. 626–641.

Dąbrowski, Witold, Andrzej Mandalian, and Wiktor Woroszylski (eds.). *Antologia nowoczesnej poezji rosyjskiej 1880–1967*. Vol. 1. *Wroclaw,* Warsaw, and Cracow: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1971.

Dimić, Milan V., and Marguerite K. Garstin. "The *Polysystem Theory: A Brief Introduction, with Bibliography.*" *Problems of Literary Reception / Problemes de reception litteraire*. Eds. Edward Dickinson Blodgett and Anthony George Purdy. Edmonton: Research Institute for Comparative Literature, University of Alberta, 1988. 177–196.

Dimić, Milan V. "Polysystem Theory." *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory: Approaches, Scholars, Terms*. Ed. Irene Rima Makaryk. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993. 151–155.

Dizdar, Dilek. "Translational Transitions: 'Translation Proper' and Translation Studies in the Humanities." *Translation Studies* 2. 1 (2009): 89–102.

Dziadek, Adam. "Strategia przekładu literackiego." *77 Translations by Stanisław Barańczak and Clare Cavanagh from Modern Polish Poetry*. Ed. Adam Dziadek. Katowice: Towarzystwo Zachęty Kultury w Katowicach, Letnia Szkoła Języka, Literatury i Kultury Polskiej Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 1995. 10–15.

Emerson, Caryl and Inessa Medzhibovskaya. "Innovation and regression: Gustav Shpet's theoretical innovations in 1920s." *Critical Theory in Russia and the West*. Eds. Alastair Renfrew and Galin Tihanov. New York, NY: Routledge, 2010. 26–43.

Even-Zohar, Itamar. "Introduction." *Polysystem Studies*, special issue of *Poetics Today: International Journal for Theory and Analysis of Literature and Communication* 11.1 (1990): 1–7.

Fitzpatrick, Joseph. *Russia Englished*: *Theorizing Translation in the 20th Century*. Durham, NC: Duke University, 2007.

Galeyeva, Natalia. "Perevod v kulture: utochnenie statusa i poniatii." *Kritika i semiotika 9* (2006): 24–35.

Gentzler, Edwin. *Contemporary Translation Theories*. Rev. 2ⁿᵈ edition. Clevendon, Buffalo, NY, Toronto, and Sydney: Multilingual Matters, 2001.

Hermans, Theo. "Translation as Institution." *Translation as Intercultural Communication: Selected Papers from The EST Congress – Prague 1995*. Eds. Mary Snell-Hornby, Zuzana Jettmarová, and Klaus Kaindl. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, NJ: John Benjamins, 1997. 3–20.

Hermans, Theo. "Introduction: Translation Studies and a New Paradigm." [1985] *The Manipulation of Literature (Routledge Revivals): Studies in Literary Translation*. Ed. Theo Hermans. New York, NY: Routledge, 2014. 7–15.

Hodgson, Katharine. "Heine and Genre: Iurii Tynianov's Translations of Heine's Poetry." *The Art of Accommodation: Literary Translation in Russia*. Eds. Leon Burnett and Emily Lygo. Oxford and Bern: Peter Lang, 2013. 117–140.

Jakobson, Roman. "The Dominant." *Readings in Russian Poetics: Formalist and Structuralist Views*. Eds. Ladislav Matejka and Krystyna Pomorska. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1971. 105–110.

Jakobson, Roman. "Two Aspects of Language and Two Types of Aphasic Disturbance." *Fundamentals of Language*. Eds. Roman Jakobson and Morris Halle. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1956. 69–96.

Jakobson, Roman. "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation." *On Translation*. Ed. Reuben A. Brower. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1959. 232–239.

Jakobson, Roman. *Budetlanin nauki: Vospominaniia, pis'ma, stat'i, stikhi, proza*. Ed. Bengt Jangfeldt. Moscow: Gilea, 2012.

Jettmarová, Zuzana. "Czech and Slovak Translation Theories: The Lesser-Known Tradition." *Tradition Versus Modernity: From the Classic Period of the Prague School to Translation Studies at the Beginning of the 21st Century*. Eds. Jana Králová and Zuzana Jettmarová. *Prague*: Univerzita Karlova v Praze, Filozofická fakulta, 2008. 15–46.

Jettmarová, Zuzana. "Czech Translation Theory and the Western Mainstream." *Going East: Discovering New and Alternative Traditions in Translation Studies*. Eds. Larisa Schippel and Cornelia Zwischenberger. Berlin: Frank & Timme, 2017. 99–126.

Kaczorowska, Monika. *Przekład jako kontynuacja twórczości własnej na przykładzie wybranych translacji Stanisława Barańczaka z języka angielskiego*. Cracow: Universitas, 2011.

Koskinen, Kaisa. *Beyond Ambivalence: Postmodernity and the Ethics of Translation*. https://trepo.tuni.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/67049/951-44-4941-X.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y. Tampere: University of Tampere, 2002 (28 January 2022).

Koskinen, Kaisa. "Domestication, Foreignization and the Modulation of Affect." *Domestication and Foreignization in Translation Studies*. Eds. Hannu Kemppanen, Marja Jänis, and Alexandra Belikova. Berlin: Frank & Timme, 2012. 13–32.

Lefevere, *André. Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London and New York, NY: Routledge, 1992.

Lefevere, André, and Susan Bassnett. "Introduction: Where are we in Translation Studies?" *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. Eds. Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere. Clevedon and Philadelphia, NJ: Multilingual Matters, 1998. 1–11.

Legeżyńska, Anna. *Tłumacz i jego kompetencje autorskie: na materiale powojennych tłumaczeń poezji A. Puszkina, W. Majakowskiego, I. Kryłowa i A. Błoka*. 2nd edition. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1999.

Levý, Jiří. *The Art of Translation*. Ed. Zuzana Jettmarová. Trans. by Patrick Corness. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, NJ: John Benjamins Pub. Co, 2011.

Nycz, Ryszard. "Literatura nowoczesna: cztery dyskursy (tezy)." *Teksty Drugie* 4 (2002): 35–46.

Popovič, Anton. *Poetika umeleckého prekladu*. Bratislava: Tatran, 1971.

Pym, Anthony. *Methods in Translation History*. Manchester: St Jerome, 1998.

Rajewska, Ewa. *Stanisław Barańczak – poeta i tłumacz*. Poznan: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, 2007.

Razumovskaia, Veronika. "Khudozhestvennyi tekst v reshetkakh kultury i perevode." *Vestnik Tiumenskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta* 1 (2011): 206–213.

Ritz, German. *150 Jahre russische Heine-Übersetzung*. Bern, Frankfurt/M., and Las Vegas, NV: Peter Lang, *1981*.

Salevsky, Heidemarie, and Ina Müller. *Translation as Systemic Interaction: A New Perspective and a New Methodology*. Berlin: Frank & Timme, 2011.

Scott, Clive. "Translating the literary: genetic criticism, text theory and poetry." *The Translator as Writer*. Eds. Susan Bassnett and Peter Bush. London and New York, NY: Continuum, 2006. 106–118.

Sienkiewicz, Barbara. "Dezautomatyzacyjna funkcja przekładu w przemianach prozy narracyjnej." *Studia o narracji*. Eds. Jan Bloński, Stanislaw Jaworski, and Janusz Slawiński. Wroclaw, Warsaw, Cracow, Gdansk, and Lodz: Wydawnictwo PAN, 1982. 291–304.

Simeoni, Daniel. "Norms and the state: The geopolitics of translation theory." *Beyond Descriptive Translation Studies: Investigations in Homage to Gideon Toury*. Eds. Anthony Pym, Miriam Shlesinger, and Daniel Simeoni. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, NJ: John Benjamins, 2008. 329–342.

Snell-Hornby, Mary. *The Turns of Translation Studies*: *New Paradigms or Shifting Viewpoints?* Amsterdam and Philadelphia, NJ: John Benjamins, 2006.

Steiner, Peter. *Russian Formalism: A Metapoetics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1984.

Thompson, Ewa M. *Russian Formalism and Anglo-American New Criticism*. The Hague: Mouton, 1971.

Tihanov, Galin. "Why Did Modern Literary Theory Originate in Central and Eastern Europe? (And Why Is It Now Dead?)." *Common Knowledge* 10.1 (2004a): 61–81.

Tihanov, Galin. "The Birth of Modern Literary Theory in East-Central Europe." *History of the Literary Cultures of East-Central Europe*. Eds. Marcel Cornis-Pope and John Neubauer. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2004b. 416–424.

Toury, Gideon. *In Search of a Theory of Translation*. Tel Aviv: Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics, 1980.

Toury, Gideon. "A Rationale for Descriptive Translation Studies." *The Art and Science of Translation*, special issue of *Dispositio* 7 (1982): 22–39.

Tymoczko, Maria. *Translation in a Postcolonial Context: Early Irish Literature in English Translation*. Manchester: St Jerome, 1999.

Tynianov, Iurii, and Roman Jakobson. "Problems in the Study of Literature and Language." [1928] *Readings in Russian Poetics. Formalist and Structuralist Views.* Eds. Ladislav Matejka and Krystyna Pomorska. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, 1978. 79–81.

Tynianov, Iurii [Tynyanov, Yury]. "The Literary Fact." Trans. by Ann Shukman. *Modern Genre Theory.* 2nd edition. Ed. David Duff. London and New York, NY: Routledge, 2014. 29–49.

Ulicka, Danuta. "Widma formalizmu." *Stereotypy w literaturze (i tuż obok).* Eds. Włodzimierz Bolecki and Grzegorz Gazda. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo IBL PAN, 2003. 7–36.

Venuti, Lawrence. *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference.* London and New York, NY: Routledge, 1998.

Vieira, Else R. P. "Cultural Contacts and Literary Translation." *Encyclopedia of Literary Translation into English.* Vol. 1 (A–L). Ed. Olive Classe. London and Chicago, IL: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, 2000. 319–320.

Wendland, Anna Veronika. "Cultural Transfer." *Travelling Concepts for the Study of Culture.* Birgit Neumann and Ansgar Nünning in collaboration with Mirjam Horn. Berlin and Boston, MA: De Gruyter, 2012. 45–66.

West, Russell. "Teaching Nomadism: Inter/Cultural Studies in the Context of Translation Studies." *Cultural Studies, Interdisciplinarity and Translation.* Ed. Stefan Herbrechter. Amsterdam and New York, NY: Rodopi, 2000. 161–176.

Michał Mrugalski

The Eastern European Origins of the Contemporary Activist Humanities: The Tragic Template of Socialist Kantianism at the Turn of the Twentieth Century

I use the term 'activist humanities' to describe the currents in the contemporary humanities that engage their explanatory powers to improve the situation of oppressed actors in the cultural field, such as women, people of color or queer people, and in most cases hail from postcolonial and cultural studies and the philosophy of Michel Foucault. However, the most general and established tradition on which all the direct predecessors of the activist humanities depend is so-called Western Marxism, described in more detail in section two; in this chapter I attempt to demonstrate that this style of thinking in fact originated in Eastern Europe at the turn of the twentieth century.

One of the most characteristic features of present-day humanities is the openly left-wing political character of its interpretational practices. The seminal figure of British cultural studies, Stuart Hall, famously called his discipline "politics by other means" (Hall 1990, 12), as it helps constitute socialism amidst the incessant struggles over interpretational sovereignty (Hall 1981, 239). It seems as though no intellectual position could be more distant from the focus on the autonomy of literature and literary studies as professed by the Eastern European originators of literary theory. However, as I seek to demonstrate in this chapter, the emphasis on the autonomy of literature and its study shares a common origin with its apparent opposite, the necessity of commitment; both stances are motivated by the humanities' constant need for legitimacy. At the formative time of literary theory, a foundational pathos dominated in science – an effect of the foundational crisis in mathematics (Robič 2015, 9–30). This explains why representatives of virtually all currents of literary studies gave in to the compulsion to express their attitude toward the most foundationally-oriented philosophies of the age, which claimed to justify the fact of science itself: neo-Kantianism, phenomenology, and neo-positivism. Presently, now that another foundational dispute – that of post-structuralism and deconstruction – has died away, another pathos is arising, one which orients itself toward the ideal of equity or social justice. A shift has taken place: from the Modernist disposition towards the origin of infallible knowledge to purposiveness or instrumentalism; from the origin of knowledge to its goal.

In this chapter I seek to uncover vast resources of instrumentalism within the products of the foundational pathos of the beginning of the twentieth century.

In doing so, I do not concentrate on instrumentalist elements in formalism and structuralism, such as the principle of the least expenditure of energy, which according to Metallmann (1914) was prototypical for the instrumentalist separation of the truth and the efficacy of attaining it and which was present in formalism and structuralism (Iakubinskii 1919; Jakobson 1962 [1931]; Holenstein 1975, 42). The separation between 'truth' and 'efficacy' characterised Polish interwar structuralism in particular, with the confrontation between purely formal methodology and theory, which relates the formal conceptual networks, examined by methodology for consistency, to historical reality and thus somatises them (see my chapter on structuralism in Poland in this volume). Evidently, an instrumentalist approach may be identified in Jakobson's quest for invariants among variations (Holenstein 1975, 30; Jakobson 1985, 3). In this chapter, instead of dealing with the principle of the least expenditure, I will focus on a different current, one which was perhaps more consequential for contemporary activism and which influenced culture at large as well as the scholarly cultures of Eastern and Central Europe, while openly confessing instrumentalism and political commitment – the movement that Andrzej Walicki (1989) called 'social Kantianism'. In a first step, I will define the notion of social Kantianism and trace its tacit and multifaceted influence on the present-day humanities; then, in step two, I will concentrate on the entanglements of neo-Kantianism and Marxism, which were accommodated by aesthetics in which tragedy was considered the most burning issue. Sections three and four analyse the specificity of the theories of tragedy, which generated the scholarly discourse combining aesthetics with political engagement.

1 A genealogy: The Eastern beginnings of Western Marxism

In his monograph *Stanisław Brzozowski and the Polish Beginnings of 'Western Marxism'* (1989), Andrzej Walicki points out the fact that in Eastern and Central Europe exists a deep-rooted but largely forgotten tradition of what came to be called 'Western Marxism'. The tradition was overlooked both by Maurice Merleau-Ponty (1973, 30–58), who coined the term in his *Les Aventures de la dialectique* (1955, *Adventures of the Dialectic)*, while concentrating solely on György Lukács's *Geschichte und Klassenbewußtsein* (1923, *History and Class Consciousness*, 1967), and Perry Anderson, who popularised the notion in his *Considerations on Western Marxism* (1976).

Western Marxism means, in a nutshell, an anti-dogmatic philosophy of practice; it assumes that all apparent absolute values are products of, and dissolve

into the incessant activity of humans struggling with the environment for survival and expansion (Jacoby 1991). The Western Marxists thus try to circumvent economism, understood as a belief in the overwhelming primacy of economic causes in culture, and tend towards studying forms of subjectivity and combining Marxian inspiration with other approaches (Hegelianism, psychoanalysis, theology, linguistics, phenomenology, etc.). The emphasis on the 'Western' character of the movement implied its 'estrangement' from the Soviet orthodoxy as represented by the Third International and the official philosophy of the Warsaw Pact. Anderson (1976, 15–18) advances the separation thesis to an extreme degree, since he relativizes the birth of Western Marxism to the failure of proletarian revolution, which broke out in Germany, Austria, Hungary and Italy in the wake of World War I. As a result, socialist theory split from working-class practice as the latter arranged itself with capitalism. Besides *History and Class Consciousness*, the current's main thinkers were Korsch, Gramsci, Bloch, Benjamin, the Frankfurt School with Adorno and Horkheimer, etc.

Now, Walicki sets out to prove that the Western mindset could not have emerged without Eastern input; this pertains mainly to the notion of class consciousness perceived as – to use Max Adler's term (Adler 1924) – a "social *a priori*" (*Sozial-Apriori*, see section 2). In contrast to the limiting title of his own work apparently devoted to Brzozowski, Walicki extends the birthplace of Western Marxism to the whole of Central and Eastern Europe and moves the terminus *ante quem* to the turn of the twentieth century. Walicki describes the contacts established in Italy between his hero Brzozowski and the 'God-builders' (*bogostroiteli*) Anatolii Lunacharskii and Aleksandr Bogdanov. Both Brzozowski and the 'God-builders' take cues from, or at least agree with, Antonio Labriola's philosophy of praxis (*filosofia della prassi*) and oppose the allegedly dogmatic Marxism of the Second International, on which Engels supposedly had greater influence than Marx. Moreover, both Russian and Polish Marxists (alongside Brzozowski, Stanisław Krusiński, Edward Abramowski, and Ludwik Krzywicki) combine Marxism with the phenomenalist philosophy of experience (Jean-Jaques Gourd, Ernst Mach, Richard Avenarius), adding a pinch of the Nietzschean pathos of the renewal of the human race. As Walicki argues in his book, Lukács's seminal work on historical consciousness was contingent on the previous Central and Eastern European development, which I will reconstruct shortly (in the later Polish edition, Walicki included letters from Lukács's students Ágnes Heller and Ferenc Fechér, who reinforce his claim; Walicki 2011a, 416–420).

These facts (or conjectures) gain importance considering the impact Lukács's book on class consciousness had not only on Walter Benjamin and the Frankfurt School, but on all significant movements of the activist humanities. The proposition is not mine, but Edward Said's. In his essay on "Travelling Theory" (Said

1983), the founder of postcolonial studies traces the impact of Lukács's opposition of 'objectivity' and 'totality', which is experienced or perceived only by the proletariat, on Lucien Goldmann's (1964) concept of the (tragic) vision of the world, Raymond Williams's (2014; 1973) foundation of cultural studies, and the engaged humanities of Fredric Jameson (1981) and Michel Foucault (1972; 1978). They all uncover instrumental powers producing different historical forms of consciousness while at the same time strengthening the revolutionary potential of the subject.

A look at the Polish and Russian social Kantianism of Abramowski, Stanisław Krusiński, Ludwik Krzywicki, Kazimierz Kelles-Krauz, Stanisław Brzozowski, Aleksandr Bogdanov, and Anatolii Lunacharskii will be rewarding in uncovering the genealogy of the currently dominant thought. I will parallel them with the German neo-Kantians in order to lay bare the interdependencies between societal engagement and foundational pathos; this interrelatedness transcends the mere fact that some neo-Kantians, foremost Hermann Cohen and Paul Natorp, adhered to socialism, the former even having a substantial impact on Eduard Bernstein's revisionism (Gay 1970; van der Linden 1988). Still, it is not their political views but their constructionist approach to culture that made the present-day humanities possible.

2 Marburg neo-Kantianism and Marxism: Relative *a priori*

Contrary to popular opinion, which holds that of the two German neo-Kantian schools in the narrow sense, the Southwestern School predominantly studied the historical human world, it is the Marburg coterie that can be compared with Eastern European social(ist) Kantianism. By assuming the unity of culture, consisting of coherent domains, the Marburg School's "transcendental method" turns the work of Hermann Cohen and his followers into a "project of offering a systematic philosophy of culture" (Matherne 2015, 212).

According to the Marburg School's founder Hermann Cohen, the transcendental *a priori* is not absolute, but relative to the current best scientific theories or developments in other fields of culture, whose philosophy of legitimacy establishes the adoption of the transcendental method. The "[t]ranscendental method" purports that "experience is given; the task is then to find the conditions of its possibility" (Beiser 2018, 99). These conditions differ, however, according to the kind of experience and since science serves as a model of experience, the latter must be variable.

The historicity of *a priori* in the Marburg School's 'geneticism' produced Natrop's enticing slogans about the object as being not given (*gegeben)* to knowledge, but assigned to it as a task (*aufgegeben)* (Natorp 2015 [1912], 183–184), science being not a *factum*, but a *fieri*, not an accomplishment, but rather an activity (cf. Natorp 1921 [1910], 14) – one undertaken according to method, which originally, like the Greek *metienai*, implied the *pursuit* of an object (Natorp 2015 [1912], 184–187). Ernst Cassirer's philosophy of symbolic forms (Cassirer 1955–1957 [1923/1925/1929]) originates in this search for the unity in the plurality of culture. In contrast, the Southwestern School's Heinrich Rickert, who allegedly discovered a universal, unconditionally valid system of values (Rickert 1924, 118) and strictly differentiated between the value-free sphere of *nature* and the value-related sphere of *culture* (Rickert 1962 [1926], 21), cannot be reconciled with Central and Eastern European social Kantianism precisely because of the assumed universality and absolute character of his divisions, predominantly between nature and culture.

An Eastern European Marxian equivalent to the transcendental method is "*historical* materialism", which Andrzej Walicki defines as the theory of humane self-creation in the process of collective productive work, whereby the current position in this process determines the shape of cognition (Walicki 2011a, 101–107, 368–394; 2011b, 284). Work occupies an equivalent position to the "principle of origin", according to which in Cohen's philosophy consciousness and being coincide (Soboleva 2010, 462). Analogously to Marburg neo-Kantianism's rejection of the thing-in-itself (*Ding an sich*), the chief theoretical adversary of the social(-ist) Kantians is Engels' dialectics of nature. Their activist approach renders obsolete the old distinction between idealism and realism. "Engels moved Marxism to pre-Kantian positions", writes Stanisław Brzozowski (1907b, 156; 1910, 7), whereas "Marx cannot be grasped without Kant; anyone who understands him otherwise understands him wrong" (Brzozowski 1973 [1907], 357; 1910, 170). Specifically, Marx cannot be grasped without the Copernican revolution Kant proposed, i. e. the assumption that it may be that the mind dictated its laws to nature and not that nature reflects itself in a passive mind (Brzozowski 1910, 53–54; on Kant and neo-Kantianism see also Brzozowski 1906). As for the role of Kantian aesthetics, Marx defined non-alienated work in an analogous way to Kant's description of the experience of beauty as "*the free-play of [the worker's]* bodily and mental activity" (Marx 1967 [1867], 264).

While for most thinkers of the period, Kantianism was supposed to supplement socialism with values and ethical ideals (Adler 1925; van der Linden 1988; 1994), Edward Abramowski (1980 [1899]; 2012 [1899]) claims that socialism in its 'essence' is homologous to Kantianism, even where socialism adheres to economic determinism. Both socialism and Kantian philosophy combine natural

science with ethics, determinism with striving for ideals, pure and practical reason, systematic development and revolutionary action. Precisely this dualism of lawful uniformity and revolution forms the essence of socialism and makes socialism compliant with human nature (thought re-invented later by Gouldner 1980, 37). Socialism is humanism. Both realities have a common root in *apperception* connecting the spontaneous, free subject with the law-governed experience of science. I argue that in this reading, Kantianism and socialism manifest a tragic chronotope in which freedom breaks into the regulated domain of universal laws, the singular clashes with the general. The affinity with tragedy partly motivates aesthetics' significance for the Kantianism of incessant 'world-making'.

Marburg's transcendental method likewise 'upgrades' aesthetics because transcendental method requires demonstrating the unity of science and culture at large; at least since Kant's *Kritik der Urteilskraft* (1790, *Critique of Judgement*), aesthetically appealing forms had been exemplary for introducing unity into multiplicity. The most prominent aesthetician of the period, Theodor Lipps, called this principle of aesthetical unity in which the spontaneity of the subject and an outward form coincide 'apperception' (Lipps 1903; 1906). *In Ästhetik des reinen Gefühls* (1912, *Aesthetics of Pure Feeling*), Cohen identifies art's task for culture as the redesigning (*Neugestaltung*) of morals (Cohen 1912, II 76). The influence is reciprocated; art in general, while depicting societal changes, has the capacity for the homogenous methodical reshaping (*homogene methodische Umformung*) of religious and ethical transformations (*Umgestaltungen*). Cohen agrees with Kant that humanity must be transformed into a unified totality, which makes possible a harmony of free wills, yet he introduces an aesthetic element to this ideal: "unlike Kant, Cohen holds that this means that all our institutions must become unified pluralities or totalities" (van der Linden 1994, 7) in the phenomenal world, such as producer cooperatives. Turning Kantianism into socialism foregrounds aesthetics.

Without art's homogenic method (*homogene Methodik*), religion and ethics would most probably remain somewhat formless, mute, lacking self-consciousness, and meaningless to human beings (Cohen 1912, II 83–84). The great revolutions in morals and beliefs turn out to be "by-products, or better, pre-conditions" of poetical creation (Cohen 1912, II 83–84). The circular temporality of this account indicates that the process of aesthetical shaping of the human world pertains mostly to tragedy. Not only does tragedy emerge historically at the time of Athens's transition from mythical imagination to historical and scientific thought, but it brings about, as Cohen suggests, the greatest of all changes – the emergence of an individual as a communal project. The great ethical ideal for the future burst forth for the first time in the genre of tragedy.

Likewise, social Kantianism models the accursed problem of individuality and the collective in a theory of tragedy that rests at the heart of a broader Schillerian project of the aesthetic education of humankind. As is well known, Lunacharskii (1905a, 377) defines the artist as an organiser of free play whose life is intended as and expected to become "concentrated life", whereby the highest form of valuation consists in aesthetic appreciation of the ideal according to which one works on his or her future as an element of a collective (Lunacharskii 1905b). His then companion Bogdanov asserts that art is, at every stage of society's development, the highest form of organisation. Art models the "true solution to old philosophy's accursed problem of freedom and necessity", i. e. the "conscious collective creation, changing the world according to the laws of nature and human design" (Bogdanov 1910, 113). "The specific tragic, inseparable from philosophy" consists in closing the gap between philosophy's unification of experience and societal praxis, which in capitalism remains fragmented (Bogdanov 1913, 262). A decade later, Lukács influentially charges bourgeois consciousness with precisely this fragmentation of experience and cognition, while the proletariat has at its disposal a true unifying vision, the description of which Lukács models on aesthetic apperception. Moreover, Bogdanov's theory of art, specifically of tragedy, as the highest form of organisation, while incorporating and solving the Kantian dualism of freedom and necessity, paved the way for constructivism as the art that does not aim to depict reality, but to change it in the most efficient manner.

Earlier, the Polish social Kantians had projected onto Kant's characterisation of beauty as 'purposiveness without purpose', as an activity whose goal is located within itself, onto the ideal goal of history, which they associated with the liberation of work and the working class. (It was a fit of intuition, as they could not have known Marx's words from *Ökonomisch-philosophische Manuskripte aus dem Jahre 1844* [*Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*], since they had not been published: "Man produces even when he is free from physical need and only truly produces in freedom therefrom" [Marx 1977, 74].) Abramowski claims in his 1898 polemics with Tolstoi that the node binding art and life is leisure, i. e. freedom from the coercion of pursuing practical goals, the right to rest and leisure being his social ideal in contradistinction to more totalitarian Bogdanov, who believed more in the liberation *of* labour through the enhancement of collectivism than in liberation *from* labour. Art – like freedom, Abramowski hoped – would replace today's social environment set for the struggle for survival (Abramowski 2011a [1898], 7–33). Beauty circumvents intellect, which imposes its categories on phenomena owing to pragmatic goals. Thus, beauty amounts to the thing-in-itself, i. e. to that which transcends the intellect. Beauty shows us what the world looks like outside rational thought driven by actual, daily needs (Abramowski 2011a [1898], 27). As such, beauty is the most individualistic ('anarchist') and most

collective experience at once: sabotaging all attempts at institutionalisation, it nevertheless unites people on the most personal level, stripping them of self-interest (Abramowski 2011a [1898], 28). Memory as the 'mother of art' acquires a new meaning in this post-Kantian (and post-Bergsonian) context. No longer do poets, as in Ancient Greece, teach ever-new generations all that is needed in life, but, conversely, the recollection, as an image of reality unfettered from current needs, becomes the archetype of the work of art (Abramowski 2011a [1898], 21–22; 1911b, 167).

Similarly, in Kelles-Krauz (1905), the notions of 'need' and 'recollection' answer for the aesthetic character of history's development and goal. The current suppression of certain needs endows distant epochs in which these very needs were satisfied with an irresistible beauty. Hence the law of revolutionary retrospection: all revolutionary movements borrow their future-shaping ideals from the distant past (Kelles-Krauz 2018 [1897–1898]). In his review of Kelles-Krauz, Abramowski points out that this revolutionary inversion "on the one hand, draws its vital juices from life interests and, on the other, shows their ideal, aesthetic, expression, which inspires and allures minds, while at the same time revealing the present state of affairs to be even more abominable" (Abramowski 2011b [1898], 174). Thus revolutionary retrospection represents socialism as it mirrors the double structure of Kantianism conjoining determination with freedom, needs and ideals. According to Kelles-Krauz, art itself is such an aesthetic ideal, coming from the past to the future: at its inception, art constituted an integral part of humans' practical activities, for example keeping their rhythm, and for the scientific socialists of ripe capitalism art, having assumed the sophisticated and exclusive form of "art for art's sake", serves as a template for combining social determination with individual freedom, without, however, relinquishing the structural complexity of modern society (Kelles-Krauz 1905, 1004–1111). Such an artform to look back on and look forward to is tragedy.

3 The legacy of Faust and Prometheus: Transgression and self-limitation in social Kantianism

Lunacharskii lists three literary, tragic archetypes, whose actions the socialist had better imitate: Faust, Lucifer, and Prometheus. All three symbolise valuation prevalent in the post-Nietzsche aesthetics of the turn of the twentieth century: the advantage of 'activity' over 'passivity', 'change' over 'standstill', 'pride' over

'self-limitation'. Thanks to these qualities, the three tragic figures are able to rebel against the status quo, formulate ideals for the future, and invent technology enabling humans to reach the ideals (Lunacharskii 1905c, 44–46). Their suffering confirms, however, the dominion of the self-limitation in this world in which they must perish; the social Kantians usually express the inevitability of self-limitation in the scientific jargon of the principle of the minimum possible expenditure of energy. The Janus faces of the three tragic figures of Faust, Lucifer, and Prometheus depict the 'double nature' of Kantianism and socialism as a heroic activity *and* suffering under unescapable conditions.

The tragic character of the metamorphoses of 'social *a priori*', symbolised by the three figures, manifest itself especially in the Russian discussion on tragedy between the socialist Kantians and their adversaries, ex-Kantian Marxists turned idealists (Nikolai Berdiaev, Sergei Bulgakov). Both camps deemed tragedy to be a measure of philosophy and the source of moral code (Berdiaev 1907b, 264, 271; Bulgakov 1902). However, they differed substantially with regard to the 'ideal poetics' of such a tragedy. While for Berdiaev (1907a) Maeterlinck's inward tragedy devoid of external action epitomised the essence of the genre and experience, in that it set tragedy in sharp opposition to positivism's optimistic view of the potential worldly solution to all woes, Lunacharskii denied Maeterlinck the right to call himself a 'tragedian' (Lunacharskii 1905d; 1905e). Greek and Elizabethan tragedy imitate actions in the external world – actions, which are not, as Berdiaev would have it, springboards from the earthly, empirical reality to something completely different. While Berdiaev (1907b) claims that tragedy consists in a leap from an empirical aporia into the metaphysical reality, Lunacharskii praises the joy of the 'active tragic' (Lunacharskii 1905d, 197–200), which does not escape the tensions encountered by the subject in experience, but withstands and upholds them in the constant struggle waged with nature in the name of earthly ideals. Lunacharskii's belligerence reveals that his and Bogdanov's socialism actually possesses, as Abramowski would have it, the double structure of Kantianism: Lunacharskii (1905d, 198) speaks explicitly about the fight with Ananke that reins both outside and inside the subject. There exists, consequently, a spontaneous apperception, for which both the psychological 'I' and 'nature' are nothing other than tasks for its spontaneity.

For the socialist world-makers, Faust symbolises the anti-dogmatic, incessant activity of philosophy (Lunacharskii 1905a; 1905f), which, like art, unites people in the enterprise of at once interpreting and changing the world. While for Berdiaev the impossibility of attaining absolute truth triggers the tragedy of knowledge experienced by a human who cannot make do with the ever-changing truth always relative to the struggle for survival (Berdiaev 1907a, 37–39), the social Kantians regard the development of control over nature as the active strug-

gle against evil. Nature, which wants us dead, bestows value on progress and its relative truths. It should be recalled that Marburg progressivism also correlated an ever-changing *a priori* with coping with nature. Russian Nietzschean (or, if you will, Byronian) Marxists describe this coping as a truly tragic and joyful fight with nature in the name of humanity. In Bogdanov's sci-fi novel *Krasnaia zvezda* (1908, *Red Star*; cf. II, Ch. 1, Ch. 4), tragedy functions as the main art form of utopian society, one staging the great fight with nature for resources and survival. This is a game of life and death, in which humanity (the Martians) fights tooth and nail and even considers the deliberate reduction of the birth rate as a defeat. Bogdanov's prefiguration of socialist realism, with its pathos of great construction projects, including even envy-driven sabotage, reintroduces the Hegelian struggle of the state (the organisation) with the telluric forces, at work also – as Abramowski as well as Lunacharskii and Brzozowski would stress – in ourselves, as subjects. It also heralds Andrei Platonov's (2011) first socialist tragedy as a tragedy of the fight for finite resources. The finitude of resources expresses itself in the necessity of self-limitation according to the principle of minimum effort.

The figures of Faust, Lucifer, and Prometheus symbolise the tragic synthesis of 'self-effacement' and 'transgression', without which neither brotherhood nor progress is possible. Conversely, 'self-effacement' conditions the scientific, necessarian character of progress. Again, revolutionary freedom and science combined make up the tragic form and endow the dualist structure of Kant's philosophy with an intuitively accessible form. Only a collective Faust would be able to survive its own rebellion. Not surprisingly, Cohen's neo-Kantianism regards tragedy as an answer to the puzzle of the concurrence of the individual and the community.

4 Cohen's indivi-dual from the spirit of tragic fiction

Free individuality in a just collective – a reconstruction of their conditions of possibility fills the pages of Cohen's *Aesthetics of Pure Feeling* devoted to tragedy (1912). The relationship between freedom and submission, individuality and generality takes on the form of humanity's victory over myth in tragedy and in (the Jewish) religion. The *Urbild* (archetype) of the tragic hero is accordingly Orestes. In *Ethik des reinen Willens* (1904, *Ethics of Pure Will*), Cohen writes that the tragic poets discovered the will, and thus initiated the history of human subjectivity and human freedom. Tragedy was the genre in which theatrical audiences witnessed, for the first time ever, genuine human will. Previously, it seems, there was only the gods' will, or only fate (*Atë*) (Cohen 1904, 105).

That both religion and tragedy myth is evident in that central to them both are guilt and fate. Guilt, as the foundation (*Grund*) of suffering (*Leiden*), is the main theme and motive power of myth, tragedy, and religion (Cohen 1972 [1919], 137). What is characteristic of the pre-tragic and pre-religious notion of guilt is its collective, heritable nature. This, incidentally, resembles Benjamin's famous definition of fate in his essay on Goethe's *Elective Affinities*: the *Schuldzusammenhang des Lebendigen*, a 'guilt-nexus of the living'. Cohen writes:

> The problem of the Oresteia is the problem of tragedy in general. It is the problem of the human individual in its aesthetic, and more specifically, its dramatic version: as unity of human nature, in the body of its kin, with the eternal question mark of the human soul. (Cohen 1912, II 83)

A hero of a tragedy and much more so a person who believes in God are "dual individuals" or simply indivi-*duals*: they are individuals as long as they are not offspring of a house or simply self-sufficient, but enter into "co-relation" (Cohen 1915, 11). The emergence of these indivi-*duals* in tragedy is explained in Cohen's earlier works as a social phenomenon connected with "a revolutionary-democratic turn" of the newly emerged people's assembly (Cohen 1927, I 185). In *Aesthetics of Pure Feeling*, Cohen (1912) speaks of an aesthetic revolution, which according to the present reader is correlated with transcendental, unifying method. Tragedy acquires the status of the highest form of art because of the degree of unification it attains in its content. This unification, in turn, engenders individuality. The new hero of tragedy brings about a new quality of humanity, free and responsible, but the quality would not emerge without the unprecedented unity of action (*Handlung*). This unity for its part is a function of the new relation of the hero, the poet, and the actor, with the spectator. In other words, it is the actor/poet's new relation with the spectator that occasions the unity of action so that the star of new humanity may at last light up. The indivi-*duality* is contingent on its co-relation with others in the work of generating a fictional world (Cohen 1912, I 494; II 61). The history of theatrical conventions in ancient Greece turns out to be a history of the emergence of the individual as relational, dual. In the first place, the choir of goats had to be replaced with a human chorus that could witness action, not only accompany a hero. Only then could the protagonist cease to be an incarnation of Dionysus and become an actor, *Darsteller* or *Schauspieler*, who plays whoever it is necessary to play according to the law of probability of action (Cohen 1912, II 61–62).

The new modern self is an outcome of the new invention of fiction created and upheld by the actor's interaction with the audience. It is in Greek tragedy that the fictional mode, and with it the individual, arises for the first time in the history of humankind.

5 Conclusion: Anti-institutional institutions

Cohen's theory of the institution of Greek tragedy trumps even the social Kantians when it comes to proving that authentic individuality depends on participation in an accurately organised collective combining freedom and lawfulness. Abramowski identifies the concurrence of individual and collective, freedom and law, value and being as a source of analogy between Kantianism and socialism. Theories of tragedy demonstrate that the co-occurrence holds and thus exemplifies the transcendental method and historical materialism. By Cohen's lights, the transcendental method cuts across all apparently irreconcilable parts of Kant's system, as it is used to investigate the validity of theoretical, practical, and aesthetic judgement. The co-occurrence of freedom and lawfulness in tragedy annuls the difference between *a priori* and experience, a code word of which is the oxymoron of 'social *a priori*'.

The Eastern European theory of the 'social *a priori*' enabled both the "phenomenalism" (Hansen-Löve 1978, 183) of early structuralism, which in the ideology of estrangement (*ostranenie*) foregrounded the historically changing construction of precepts, and Lukács's class consciousness and therefore the rapid development of Western Marxism. In social Kantianism, aestheticism and engagement converge. With regard to the predominance of the tragic, the notion that the most bereft, the least fortunate class has the most unified and insightful consciousness of the social whole facilitated the replacement of the historical working class – factory workers – with new kinds of 'proletariats', e. g. people of colour, queer people, 'illegal' migrants, etc. Social Kantianism, driven by its preoccupation with tragedy, ingrafts into the present-day humanities the double interest in tracing ever-changing forms of consciousness *and* in supporting the strokes of freedom within a thoroughly determined universe. The latter task falls to art and aesthetics, whereby the artistic or aesthetic aspect of the very research activity oftentimes takes precedence over all other concerns. At the turn of the twentieth century, theory aestheticized itself in shifting from official German university philosophy, which neo-Kantianism was, and from the official scientific Marxism of the Second Internationale to the semi-official, oftentimes clandestine institutions, such as the party school for workers convened by Bogdanov, Lunacharskii, and Maksim Gor'kii on Capri and in Bologna (Scherrer and Steila 2017; Ghilarducci 2019) or Warsaw's flying university (cited in the chapter on Polish formalism). The clandestine flying university, initially intended for women, began in defiance of the official Russian school system, which banned women, the Polish language, and progressive ideas. The flying university offered four five-year study paths, two of which included aesthetics in their curriculum, taught inter alia by one of the protagonists of the chapter on formalism, Kazimierz Wóycicki. These two paths were

offered by the historico-philological and the sociological faculties (Cywiński 2010 [1971], 58–59). Social aesthetics hark back to Romanticism's interest in self-organisation of communities without state coercion. One of the socialist sociology professors, Wacław Nałkowski, voiced the liaison between an anarchist, anti-state social institution and autonomous art, which all Polish and Russian social Kantians would have agreed on:

> It is about time the activists (*społecznicy*) and supporters of "new art" stopped looking at each other with hostility, and understood that they are pursuing one common evolutionary goal and that only through their union can a force be created that overcomes reaction. This union will give the socialists a deepening of their psychology and the followers of "new art", who are struggling hopelessly, the courage of life, even with clenched teeth, the conviction that life is worth something if it can be sold dearly – if you can die like Samson, pulling the whole building behind it. (Nałkowski quoted in Cywiński 2010 [1971], 80)

Virtually all social Kantians cited in this chapter wrote poems in verse and prose in which they expressed this Luciferian and Promethean, simply tragic will of destruction and creation of new values: Nałkowski penned *Bojownik* (1904, *Militant*), Ludwik Krzywicki *Takimi będą drogi wasze* (1908, *These Will be Your Paths*), Jan Władysław Dawid *O duszy nauczycielstwa* (1912, *On the Soul of Pedagogy*), Abramowski *Poemat śmierci* (1918, *The Poem of Death*). Stanisław Brzozowski and Alexandr Bogdanov, each in his own poetics, produced numerous novels and dramatic fragments. Lunacharskii was also a prolific poet, translator and playwright, the author of the 1918 play *Faust i gorod* (*Faust and the City*). But principally their research praxis, which in the name of enfranchisement united activism and artistic creation, founded a tradition which was then developed by Lukács and whose ramifications can be only appreciated over 100 years later.

References

Abramowski, Edward. "Pierwiastki indywidualne w socjologii." [1899] *Metafizyka doświadczalna i inne pisma*. Ed. Stanisław Borzym. Warsaw: PIW, 1980. 121–237.

Abramowski, Edward. "Co to jest sztuka? (Z powodu rozprawy L. Tołstoja: 'Czto takoje iskusstwo')." [1898] *Wybór pism estetycznych*. Ed. Krystyna Najder-Stefaniak. Cracow: Universitas, 2011a. 3–34.

Abramowski, Edward. "Kazimierz Krauz, Socjologiczne prawo retrospekcji." [1898] *Wybór pism estetycznych*. Ed. Krystyna Najder-Stefaniak. Cracow: Universitas, 2011b. 170–182.

Abramowski, Edward. "Zagadnienia socjalizmu." [1899] *Zagadnienia socjalizmu. Wybór pism*. Ed. Krzysztof Mazur. Cracow: Wydawnictwo UJ, 2012. 45–124.

Adler, Max. *Das Soziologische in Kants Erkenntniskritik: Ein Beitrag zur Auseinandersetzung zwischen Naturalismus und Kritizismus*. Vienna: Volksbuchhandlung, 1924.

Adler, Max. *Kant und der Marxismus: Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Erkenntniskritik und Theorie des Sozialen*. Berlin: Laub, 1925.

Anderson, Perry. *Considerations on Western Marxism*. London: New Left Books, 1976.

Beiser, Frederick C. *Hermann Cohen:* An Intellectual Biography. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.

Berdiaev, Nikolai. "K filosofii tragedii. Moris Meterlink." Nikolai Berdiaev, *Sub specie aeternitatis: Opyty filosofskie, sotsial'nye i literaturnye (1900–1906 g.)*. St. Petersburg: Pirozhkov, 1907a. 35–56.

Berdiaev, Nikolai. "Tragediia i obydennost'." Nikolai Berdiaev, *Sub specie aeternitatis. Opyty filosofskie, sotsial'nye i literaturnye (1900–1906 g.)*. St. Petersburg: Pirozhkov, 1907b. 247–275.

Bogdanov, Aleksandr. *Krasnaia zvezda*. St. Petersburg: Tovarishchestvo khudozhnikov pechati, 1908.

Bogdanov, Aleksandr. *Padenie velikogo fetishizma*. Moscow: Dorovatovskii i Charushnikov, 1910.

Bogdanov, Aleksandr. *Filosofiia zhivogo opyta. Materializm, èmpiriokrititsizm, dialekticheskii materializm, èmpiriomonizm, nauka budushchego*. *Populiarnye ocherki*. St. Petersburg: Semenov, 1913.

Brzozowski, Stanisław. *Wstęp do filozofii*. Cracow and Warsaw: Friedlein/Wende, 1906.

Brzozowski, Stanisław. "Der Geschichtsmaterialismus als Kulturphilosophie: Ein philosophisches Programm." *Die neue Zeit: Wochenschrift der deutschen Sozialdemokratie* 2.31 (1907b): 153–160.

Brzozowski, Stanisław. *Idee: Wstęp do filozofii dojrzałości dziejowej*. Lviv: Połoniecki, 1910.

Brzozowski, Stanisław. *Kultura i życie: zagadnienia sztuki i twórczości w walce o światopogląd* [1907]. Warsaw: PIW, 1973.

Bulgakov, Sergei. "Russkii Faust." *Voprosy filosofii i psikhologii* 3 (1902): 783–795.

Cassirer, Ernst. *The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms* [1923/1925/1929]. Trans. by Ralph Mannheim. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1955–1957.

Cohen, Hermann. *Ethik des reinen Willens*. Berlin: Cassirer, 1904.

Cohen, Hermann. *Ästhetik des reinen Gefühls*. *System der Philosophie*. Vol. 2. Ed. Hermann Cohen. Berlin: Cassirer, 1912.

Cohen, Hermann. *Der Begriff der Religion im System der Philosophie*. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1915.

Cohen, Hermann. *Kleine philosophische Schiften*. Eds. Albert Görland and Ernst Cassirer. Berlin: Cassirer, 1927.

Cohen, Hermann. *Religion of Reason Out of the Sources of Judaism* [1919]. Trans. by Samuel Kaplan. New York, NY: Unger, 1972.

Cywiński Bohdan. *Rodowody niepokornych* [1971]. Warsaw: PWN, 2010.

Foucault, Michel. *The Archaeology of Knowledge* & *The Discourse On Language*. Trans. by A. M. Sheridan Smith. New York, NY: Pantheon Books, 1972.

Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality 1: The Will to Knowledge*. Trans. by Robert Hurley. London: Random House, 1978.

Gay, Peter. *The Dilemma of Democratic Socialism: Eduard Bernstein's Challenge to Marx*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1970.

Ghilarducci, Manuel. "Rezension von Jutta Scherrer: *Gor'kij-Bogdanov e la scuola di Capri: Una corrispondenza inedita (1908–1911)*." *Die Welt der Slaven* 64 (2019): 393–396.

Goldmann, Lucien. *The Hidden God: A Study of Tragic Vision in the Pensees of Pascal and the tragedies of Racine* [1955]. Trans. by Philip Thody. London: Routledge, 1964.

Gouldner, Alvin W. *The Two Marxisms: Contradictions and Anomalies in the Development of Theory*. New York, NY: Seabury Press, 1980.

Hall, Stuart. "Notes on Deconstructing 'the Popular'." *People's History and Socialist Theory*. Ed. Raphael Samuel. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981. 227–240.

Hall, Stuart. "The Emergence of Cultural Studies and the Crisis of the Humanities." *October* 53: *The Humanities as Social Technology* (1990): 11–23.

Hansen-Löve, Aage A. *Der russische Formalismus: Methodologische Rekonstruktion seiner Entwicklung aus dem Prinzip der Verfremdung*. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1978.

Holenstein, Elmar. *Roman Jakobsons phänomenologischer Strukturalismus*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1975.

Iakubinskii, Lev. "O zvukakh stikhotvornogo iazyka." [1916] *Poètika. Sborniki po teorii poèticheskogo iazyka*. Ed. Victor Shklovskii. Petrograd: Gosudarstvennaia tipografiia, 1919. 37–49.

Jacoby, Russell. "Western Marxism." *The Dictionary of Marxist Thought*. Eds. Tom Bottomore, Laurence Harris, V. G. Kiernan, and Ralph Miliband. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1991. 581–584.

Jakobson, Roman. "Principes de phonologie historique" [1931] Roman Jakobson, *Selected Writings*. Vol. 1. Eds. Stephen Rudy and Linda R. Waugh. The Hague: Mouton, 1962. 202–220.

Jakobson, Roman. *Verbal Art, Verbal Sign, Verbal Time*. Eds. Krystyna Pomorska and Stephen Rudy. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1985.

Jameson, Fredric. *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Social Symbolic Act*. London: Methuen, 1981.

Kelles-Krauz, Kazimierz. "*Kilka głównych zasad rozwoju sztuki.*" *Poradnik dla samouków* 5.2 (1905): 887–1013.

Kelles-Krauz, Kazimierz. "The Sociological Law of Retrospection: The Law of Revolutionary Retrospection as a Consequence of Economic Materialism." [1897–1898] *Marxism and Sociology: A Selection of Writings*. Ed. Helena Chmielewska-Szlajfer. Leiden: Brill, 2018. 29–57.

van der Linden, Harry. *Kantian Ethics and Socialism*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett, 1988.

van der Linden, Harry. "Cohens sozialistische Rekonstruktion der Ethik Kants." *Ethischer Sozialismus: Zur politischen Philosophie des Neukantianismus*. Ed. Helmut Holzhey. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1994. 146–165.

Lipps, Theodor. *Grundlegung der Ästhetik. Ästhetik*. Vol. 1. Hamburg and Leipzig: Voss, 1903.

Lipps, Theodor. *Die ästhetische Betrachtung und die bildende Kunst. Ästhetik*. Vol. 2. Hamburg and Leipzig: Voss, 1906.

Lukács, Györgi. *History and Class Consciousness* [1923]. Trans. by Rodney Livingstone. Poole: Merlin Press, 1967.

Lunacharskii, Anatolii. "K voprosu ob iskusstve." *Ètiudy kriticheskie i polemicheskie*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Zhurnala Pravda, 1905a. 369–391.

Lunacharskii, Anatolii. "K voprosu ob otsenke." *Ètiudy kriticheskie i polemicheskie*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Zhurnala Pravda, 1905b. 392–410.

Lunacharskii, Anatolii. "Pered litsom roka." *Ètiudy kriticheskie i polemicheskie*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Zhurnala Pravda, 1905c. 36–110.

Lunacharskii, Anatolii. "Tragizm zhizni i belaia magiia." *Ėtiudy kriticheskie i polemicheskie.* Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Zhurnala Pravda, 1905d. 191–213.

Lunacharskii, Anatolii. "Moris Meterlink." *Ėtiudy kriticheskie i polemicheskie.* Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Zhurnala Pravda, 1905e. 111–153.

Lunacharskii, Anatolii. "Russkii Faust." *Ėtiudy kriticheskie i polemicheskie.* Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Zhurnala Pravda, 1905 f. 179–190.

Marx, Karl. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy* [1867]. New York, NY: International Publishers Company, 1967.

Marx, Karl. *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*. Moscow: Progress, 1977.

Matherne, Samantha. "Marburg Neo-Kantianism as Philosophy of Culture." *The Philosophy of Ernst Cassirer: A Novel Assessment*. Eds. Sebastian Luft and J. Tyler Friedman. Berlin and New York, NY: De Gruyter, 2015. 201–232.

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Adventures of the Dialectic* [1955]. Trans. by Joseph Bien. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973.

Metallmann, Joachim. *Zasada ekonomii myślenia: Jej historia i krytyka*. Warsaw: Wende, 1914.

Natorp, Paul. *Die logischen Grundlagen der exakten Wissenschaften* [1910]. Leipzig: Teubner, 1921.

Natorp, Paul. "Kant and the Marburg School." [1912] Trans. by Frances Bottenberg. *The Neo-Kantian Reader*. Ed. Sebastian Luft. New York, NY: Routledge, 2015. 180–197.

Platonov, Andrei. "On the First Socialist Tragedy." https://newleftreview.org/issues/II69/ articles/andrei-platonov-on-the-first-socialist-tragedy. *New Left Review* 69 (2011) (28 January 2022).

Rickert, Heinrich. *Die Probleme der Geschichtsphilosophie: Eine Einführung*. Heidelberg: Winters, 1924.

Rickert, Heinrich. *Science and History: A Critique of Positivist Epistemology* [1926]. Trans. by George Reisman. Ed. Arthur Goddard. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand, 1962.

Robič, Borut. *The Foundations of Computability Theory*. Berlin and Heidelberg: Springer, 2015.

Said, Edward. "Travelling Theory." Edward Said, *The World, the Text, and the Critic*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983. 226–247.

Scherrer, Jutta, and Daniela Steila (eds.). *Gor'kij-Bogdanov e la scuola di Capri. Una corrispondenza inedita (1908–1911)*. Roma: Carocci, 2017.

Soboleva, Maia. "German Kogen i Mikhail Bakhtin: dialog ob ėstetike?" *Neokantiantstvo nemetskoe i russkoe: mezhdu teoriei poznaniia i kritikoi kul'tury*. Eds. Irina Griftsova and Nina Dmitrieva. Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2010. 462–476.

Walicki, Andrzej. *Stanislaw Brzozowski and the Polish Beginnings of 'Western Marxism'*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.

Walicki, Andrzej. *Stanisław Brzozowski. Drogi myśli*. Cracow: Universitas, 2011a.

Walicki, Andrzej. *Polska, Rosja, Marksizm*. Cracow: Universitas, 2011b.

Williams, Raymond. *The Country and the City*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1973.

Williams, Raymond. "Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory." [1973] *Raymond Williams on Culture and Society: Essential Writings*. Ed. Jim McGuigan. London: SAGE, 2014. 119–138.

IV Some Key Terms

Erik Martin

Alienation/Defamiliarisation/Estrangement (*ostranenie*)

The term *ostranenie* was introduced by Viktor Shklovskii in the manifesto "Iskus-stvo kak priem" (1917, "Art as Device", 1990) as a basic faculty of art that enables the recipient to see things as if seen for the very first time. Thus, artistic or "poetic language" (*poėticheskii iazyk*) becomes fundamentally opposite to the "prosaic language" (*prozaicheskii iazyk*) of everyday life, where emotions and the plea-sures of sensation are replaced by automatised rational recognition (cf. Shklovskii 1917, 6). As Shklovskii continues, the "tool of art" is supposed to make "a stone feel stony" and "by 'estranging' objects and complicating form [...] make percep-tion long and 'laborious'" (Shklovskii 1990, 6).

Such a definition poses a cardinal ambiguity. On the one hand it seems that Shklovskii is under the strong spell of nineteenth-century positivist psychology (cf. Svetlikova 2005). For example, Shklovskii extensively cites the empirio-criti-cist philosopher Richard Avenarius as a warrant for his claim that poetic language obeys an entirely different "economy of efforts" – and thus different psycho-phys-iological laws – than prosaic language (cf. Shklovskii 1990, 4). Consequently, Medvedev/Bakhtin criticise the formalist method as being psychologist and ide-alist at the same time, following Lenin's analogous critique of empirio-criticism in general and Avenarius in particular (cf. Medvedev 1985 [1928], 145; Lenin 1909).

On the other hand, *ostranenie* is readily compatible with the fundamental notion of structuralist and post-structuralist theories, namely the sign, though Shklovskii did not use this notion in "Art as Device". For Shklovskii, 'percep-tion' does not take place inside a physiological sensory apparatus but within the system of art, where the opposition between laborious and automatic perception becomes a purely differential quality, as also the opposition of prosaic and poetic language is merely functional, for poetic language can become 'automatised' thus turning into prosaic language.

As for the notion itself, *ostranenie* seems to be as ambiguous and volatile as the concept it tries to render. In *Tetiva: O neskhodstve skhodnogo* (1970, *Bowstring: On the Dissimilarity of the Similar*, 2011), which was written over half a century after "Art as Device", Shklovskii claims to have coined the neologism *ostranenie* from the common Russian word *strannyi* (strange, weird, unusual), explaining that one 'n' was lost due to a typographical error (cf. Shklovskii 1970, 230). In the same text, Shklovskii also mentions that *ostranenie* is often "misheard" as "otstranenie", which means "distancing" (*otodviganie*) (cf. Shklovskii 1970, 230). By evoking another key formalist notion – namely *sdvig* (shift) – Shklovskii seems to ostenta-

tiously refuse to give a positivist genesis of his concept. Shklovskii does however offer valuable insights into the semantic field of *ostranenie,* pointing to at least three different subjects: the poetics of estrangement, the cult of mistakes in the Russian Avant-Garde that especially affected him (cf. Shklovskii 1930; Levchenko 2014), and finally the spatial dimension in/of literature and literary theory.

The various translations of *ostranenie* into Western literary studies somehow highlighted (and also somehow obscured) the ambiguities of this term, making it nevertheless even more productive to literary studies. The following sketch shall give a brief outline of some nuances of *ostranenie* in translation.

1 Alienation

Even though many aesthetic concepts of 'making strange' have been developed in different Avant-Garde movements (cf. Erlich 1955, 153) the established German translation of *ostranenie* as *Verfremdung* – despite Lachmann's plea for "Seltsammachen" as a possible translation (Lachmann 1970, 228) – links Shklovskii permanently to Brecht's homonymous device of the epic theatre. The confusion grows even bigger in English, where Brechtian *Verfremdung* and Marxian *Entfremdung* are often both translated as 'alienation', notwithstanding that *Verfremdung* can be seen as a means to overcome *Entfremdung* (cf. Bloch 1970). However, the German terms were translated to Russian as *ochuzhdenie* and *otchuzhdenie* respectively, even though Shklovskii would claim that Brecht borrowed his concept via Tret'iakov (cf. Shklovskii 1983, 203), so that the retranslation of *Verfremdung* should be *ostranenie* after all.

And even if the connection between Marx, Brecht, and Shklovskii that is established by 'alienation' might be some kind of a translational mistake, it illuminates at least two major points of the Avant-Garde's junction between politics and art. Once again, one vector of this junction aims at the nineteenth and one at the twentieth century.

One striking fact, which is often overlooked, is that the examples from Tolstoi in "Art as Device" preferably deal with the question of property of the (artistic) means of production, especially those from *Kholstomer* (1886, *Kholstomer: The Story of a Horse*) (cf. Shklovskii 1990, 7). In the light of those examples, it seems that the "economy of mental efforts" (Shklovskii 1990, 4), which is essential to *ostranenie,* has, besides aesthetic, also socio-economic implications. Thus, the pleasure of perceptions in the works of art granted by *ostranenie* is a kind of 'expropriation of expropriators'; namely of *automatisation*, that "eats away at" the additional value of sensation (Shklovskii 1990, 5). However, this reappropria-

tion is not exactly orthodoxly Marxist, because Shklovskii favours instant gratification instead of historical change. This seems more akin to the French socialist and anarchist Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, whose ideas might have been conveyed to Shklovskii via Tolstoi (cf. Martin and Werberger 2021).

More important than this continuity is, of course, the profound change during the Avant-Garde period about how the political engagement of art can be accomplished. Instead of transporting a revolutionary 'content', as in Realism, the 'form' of a piece of art became a political statement itself.

In this context, the alienation of an element of an artwork would mean the insurmountable heterogeneity of the components (for example in a collage) that cannot be "cured by incorporation, synthesis, or belonging" (Boym 2005, 588). This heterogeneity opposes a false "reconciliation" (*Versöhnung*) of the level within the artwork which refutes the classicist concept of harmony, and the level between the artwork and the realm of politics and aesthetics (Adorno 1973, 283; cf. also Todorov's translation of *ostranenie* as "singularisation" in Todorov 1965, 83). Even if Shklovskian *ostranenie* tends to be more akin to 'permanent revolution' than to an 'insurmountable alienation' (namely by turning poetic language into prosaic and vice versa) his concept highlights the key modernist ambivalence of the aesthetic autonomy – art is political precisely because it is distanced and alienated from politics (cf. the notion of 'aura' in Benjamin 1991).

2 Estrangement

The concept of *estrangement* as an aesthetic device can already be found in Aristotle's *Poetics*, where the use of "foreign words" (ξενικòν [...] γλῶτταν) next to metaphors are seen as devices for "elevated style", i. e. poetic diction (Aristotle 2013, 47). An important contribution to the theory of estrangement was made by Romantics such as Wordsworth and Coleridge (cf. Wellek 1955, 252). The German poet and theoretician Novalis even defines Romantic poetry and poetics as "the art of estranging [*befremden*] in a pleasant way" (Novalis 1989, 109). However, not only Romantics, but also Classicists like Breitinger brought the concepts of the marvellous (*das Wunderbare*), and the new and the strange (*das Seltsame*) into a certain constellation (which was nonetheless governed by the probable [*das Wahrscheinliche*], cf. Breitinger 1966, 130). Even bolder concepts of estrangement existed already during the Baroque and Mannerist periods (cf. Hansen-Löve 1978, 30–33).

On the conceptual level, however, one can discern at least two kinds of estrangement, which Günther (1994), in a somewhat tongue in cheek description,

denotes as the Aristotelian and Platonic type. The later estrangement decontextualises, singles out one thing from the current of phenomena, thus presenting its isolated essence, not unlike the Platonic concepts of ideas. Günther shows this concept at work especially in Schopenhauer's idea of the "veil of Maya", that in a work of art can be lifted and thus show life and things as they really are (cf. Günther 1994, 15). Furthermore, the concept of 'removing the veil' can be traced to Tolstoi's (who was a keen reader of Schopenhauer) own vision of art, and also might have been affected by the scene of "dusting the sofa" which Shklovskii cites in "Art as Device" (cf. Shklovskii 1990, 5). However, as Günther points out, the famous formalist 'laying bare of device' – which can be thought of as *ostranenie* in the second degree, i. e. estrangement of estrangement (cf. Günther 1994, 14) – belongs to the Aristotelian estrangement, a literary technique, a principle of poetic construction that remains on the semiotic level with no connection to the 'essence' of things whatsoever. Thus, Günther points to a modernist dilemma: between the call back to the "things themselves" (Husserl 2001, 168) and formal and ludic elements in art.

3 Defamiliarisation

In the first English monograph on Russian formalism, Victor Erlich rendered *ostranenie* as "making strange" (Erlich 1955, 153). The first English translation of "Art as Technique" by Lee Lemon used for the same term is "defamiliarisation" (Shklovskii 1965, 3); something that the later translator Benjamin Sher bluntly calls "quite wrongheaded" (Sher 1990, xix). Considering that formalist theoreticians tended to think of literary succession in rather distorted heredity lineages, namely from "grandfather to grandson" or from "uncle to nephew" (cf. Hansen-Löve 1978, 384), it would seem that not only 'correct' translations but also 'correct' genealogies (as rendered in the previous sub-chapter) are somehow inadequate in comparison to formalist ideas.

A felicitous attempt to historicise the estrangement concept in the formalist spirit was carried out by Ginzburg, where among the precursors of *ostranenie* we find Marc Aurel, Marcel Proust (whom Shklovskii in 1916 certainly did not read), and Dostoevskii (whom Shklovskii of course did read but did not mention in "Art as Device", preferring instead Tolstoi) (Ginzburg 1996). In presenting this somehow distorted 'family resemblance', it seems Ginzburg also explores the heuristic potentialities of the spatial implications of *ostranenie,* mingling the distant and the near, the related and the unrelated.

Thus, Ginzburg's technique explicates a resemblance of Shklovskii's *ostranenie* and Derrida's *différance* (cf. Crawford 1984) – both terms are 'misspelled' thus contesting the myth of origin; both aim against the predominance of logocentrism (cf. Shklovskii's derogatory term 'automatisation' for rational recognition) and favour a non-essentialist encounter with the deferring phenomena. Consequently, Shklovskii defines art as a "process of creativity" where the "artifact itself is quite unimportant" (Shklovskii 1990, 6). Emerson also pays attention to the fact that there might be a link between Bakhtin's term *ustranenie* (distancing) and Shklovskii's *ostranenie*, since both nouns promote aesthetical "acts of distancing over acts of identification, making this distance a prerequisite for genuine art" (Emerson 2005, 637).

References

Adorno, Theodor W. *Ästhetische Theorie*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1973.

Aristotle. *Poetics: A new translation by Anthony Kenny*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Benjamin, Walter. "Das Kunstwerk im Zeitalter seiner technischen Reproduzierbarkeit." Walter Benjamin, *Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol. I.2. Eds. Rolf Tiedemann and Hermann Schweppenhäuser. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1991. 431–470.

Bloch, Ernst. "'Entfremdung, Verfremdung': Alienation, Estrangement." *The Drama Review* 15.1 (1970): 120–125.

Boym, Svetlana. "Poetics and Politics of Estrangement." *Poetics Today* 26.4 (2005): 581–611.

Breitinger, Johann Jacob. *Critische Dichtkunst* [1740]. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1966.

Crawford, Lawrence. "Victor Shklovskij: Différance in Defamiliarization." *Comparative Literature* 36 (1984): 209–219.

Emerson, Caryl. "Shklovsky's *ostranenie*, Bakhtin's *vnenakhodimost'* (How Distance Serves an Aesthetics of Arousal Differently from an Aesthetics Based on Pain)." *Poetics Today* 26.4 (2005): 637–664.

Erlich, Victor. *Russian Formalism: History, Doctrine*. The Hague: Mouton, 1955.

Ginzburg, Carlo. "Making Things Strange: The Prehistory of a Literary Device." *Representations* 56 (1996): 8–28.

Günther, Hans. "Ostranenie – 'sniatie pokrovov' i obnazhenie priema." *Russian Literature* 36 (1994): 13–28.

Hansen-Löve, Aage A. *Der russische Formalismus: Methodologische Rekonstruktion seiner Entwicklung aus dem Prinzip der Verfremdung*. Vienna: Akademie Verlag, 1978.

Husserl, Edmund. *Logical Investigations* [1900/1901]. London: Routledge, 2001.

Lachmann, Renate. "Die 'Verfremdung' und das 'neue Sehen' bei Viktor Sklovskij." *Poetica* 3 (1970): 226–249.

Lenin, Vladimir. *Materializm i ėmpiriokrititsizm: Kriticheskie zametki ob odnoj reaktsionnoi filosofii*. Moscow: Zveno, 1909.

Levchenko, Ian. "Poslevkusie formalizma. Poliferatsiia teorii v tekstakh Viktora Shklovskogo 1930-kh godov." *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* 128.4 (2014): 125–143.

Martin, Erik, and Annette Werberger. "Anarchism and Art: The Political Roots of Shklovskii's Estrangement." *Welt der Slaven* 66.1 (2021): 130–140.

Medvedev, Pavel. *The formal method in literary scholarship: A critical introduction to sociological poetics* [1928]. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985.

Novalis. *Pollen and Fragments: Selected Poetry and Prose of Novalis*. Grand Rapids, MI: Phanes Press, 1989.

Sher, Benjamin. "Translator's Introduction." Viktor Shklovskii [Shklovsky], *The Theory of Prose*. Ed. and trans. by Benjami Sher. Champaign, IL: Dalkey Archive Press, 1990. xv–xxi.

Shklovskii, Viktor. "Iskusstvo kak priem." *Sborniki po teorii poėticheskogo iazyka* 2 (1917): 3–14.

Shklovskii, Viktor. "Pamiatnik nauchnoi oshibke." *Literaturnaia gazeta* (27 January 1930).

Shklovskii, Viktor [Shklovsky, Victor]. "Art as Technique." *Russian Formalist Criticism: Four Essays.* Eds. Lee T. Lemon and Marion J. Reis. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1965. 3–25.

Shklovskii, Viktor. *Tetiva: O neskhodstve skhodnogo*. Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1970.

Shklovskii, Viktor. *O teorii prozy*. Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1983.

Shklovskii [Shklovsky], Viktor. "Art as Device." Viktor Shklovskii, *The Theory of Prose*. Ed. and trans. by Benjamin Sher. Champaign, IL: Dalkey Archive Press, 1990. 1–14.

Svetlikova, Ilona. *Istoki russkogo formalizma:Traditsiia psikhologizma i formal'naia shkola*. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2005.

Todorov, Tsvetan. *Théorie de la littérature: textes des formalistes russes*. Paris: Seuil, 1965.

Wellek, René, and Austin Warren. *Theory of Literature*. London: Cape, 1955.

Rainer Grübel
Carnival, Carnivalism and Bakhtin's Culture of Laughter

Bakhtin's concepts of carnival and the associated notions of carnivalization and the culture of laughter (*smekhovaia kul'tura*) are rooted in his philosophical thinking of the 1920s and 1930s, in particular his search for a new anthropological relationship between human bodies and minds that establishes the image of the acting human being in the "image of the world, constituted by his act" (Sandler 2017, 20). He principally developed them in two books, the first written as two versions in the late 1930s and early 1940s and the second in the first half of the 1960s. With its title *Francoise Rabelais in the History of Realism*, the first book stresses carnival's significance for the question of realism, which was the subject of debate after the presentation of Socialist Realism as the oblique aesthetic norm in Soviet Russia from 1934 on. Carnival enriches the concept of realism with the incompatible, the unlimited and the unfinishable. The second book, entitled *The Work of Francoise Rabelais and the People's Culture of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*, discusses the impact of European folklore and its history on Rabelais' prose. In so doing, it counteracts the restricted concept of the simplified 'popular' in Soviet culture. The notion of grotesque/gothic realism (*grotesknyi/goticheskii realizm*, Bakhtin 2008a, 23–33) fundamental to the first version and its cultural context is later replaced by the concept of the people's culture of laughter/feasts (*smekhovaia/prazdnichnaia narodnaia kul'tura*, Bakhtin 2010, 11–21; cf. Popova 2009, 143–144), derived from the German term *Lachkultur* (not "Lachenkultur", as erroneously claimed in the commentary, Popova 2010, 588). The notion of carnivalization is also a product of the later versions of Bakhtin's books on Rabelais and Dostoevskii (Bakhtin 2010, 419; 2002a, 122). It paved the way for its boundless application of the concept of carnival in Western, often sociological, research on literature and culture, fine art and cinema.

Bakhtin had already traced the folkloristic basis of carnival in the eighth chapter of his work *The Forms of Time and Chronotope in the Novel* (2012d [1975], 399–471), written in 1937–1939 in the context of his research on the theory of the novel, but the study could not be published until 1975 (and then only after a reworking). He sees the aim of the new Rabelaisian chronotope in the (re)creation of "a new, harmonic, integral human being" (*novogo garmonicheskogo tsel'nogo cheloveka*, Bakhtin 2012d, 420) as a figure in the novelistic art of "realistic phantasm" (*realisticheskaia fantastika*, Bakhtin 2012d, 420) that restores an always very concrete space in the horizon of the endlessly repeating folkloristic time of rebirth and reincarnation. The notion of realistic phantasm possibly goes back to

and opposes the "phantastic realism" (*phantastischer Realismus*) Nietzsche (1980, 7, 32) applied to Shakespeare's tragedies.

Bakhtin first laid down his concept of carnival around 1937–1938 in his – probably uncompleted – work on Goethe's Bildungsroman *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre* (1795/96, *Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship*) (Popova 2010, 611–615) in relation to Goethe's essay "Das römische Carneval" (1789, "The Roman Carnival"; Bakhtin 2008a, 241–251; 2010, 262–275; cf. Nährlich-Slatewa 1989). It is connected to the reception of Georges Lote's (1938) monograph on the life and letters of Rabelais and Christian Rang's article "Historical Psychology of Carnival" (1927–1928, cf. Grübel 1979, 57; Popova 2009, 141; 2010, 555). It consists of five elements: 1) a non-external vision of the body (which coincides with the people and the cosmos), 2) performance without a stage and without an audience, 3) familiarization (the destruction of distances), 4) misalliance (the violation of the social hierarchy), and 5) profanation (the desecration of holy texts and positions). Its epistemological drive is the rejection of abstraction in favor of the concrete single phenomenon, the individual human being – hence the relevance of enumerations and a human collective in Rabelais' novel "in which everybody can be called by his name" (Bakhtin 2008b, 646). The integration of the single body in the collective body of the people goes along with an externalization of the I, which for Bakhtin began in ancient Greek culture: "But this integral outwardness of the human being was not carried out in an empty space [...] but in an organic human collective, 'to the people'" (Bakhtin 2012d, 389). The origin of Bakhtin's concept of the collective body of the people, an important component of which is orthodox synodality (*sobornost'*, Bakhtin 1996d, 114), has yet to be convincingly reconstructed. Bakhtin's concern with Franciscan Catholicism (which he shared with his friend the musician Marina Iudina) is also relevant, but the most important element is the Romantic tradition (going back to Herder; Bakhtin 2012b, 202, 206; 2012c, 249–250; cf. Pypin 1890) of the people as a stereotypical collective symbol which is incorporated in the language and the literature of a nation and which became a political ('populists') argument. Not without good reason, this tradition has recently been criticized by Il'ja Kukulin as 'conservative' (Kukulin et al. 2020). We suppose that Goethe's statement in his talks with Eckermann played a role in the formation of Bakhtin's notion of the collective: "There are no individuals ... This individual or the one you want is representative of the entire species. Basically [...] we are all collective beings, we may pose however we wish" (Eckermann 1986, 691). In his scientific context, Bakhtin used the concepts of culture advanced by Simmel (Davydov 1997; Sasse 2013), Cassirer (Eilenberger 2009) and Freidenberg (Scílard 1985).

Rabelais' novel *Gangantua and Pantragruel*, which Bakhtin had criticized in *Slovo v romane* (*The Word in the Novel*, written in the first half of the 1930s, first

published in 1965; Bakhtin 2012a, 62–65) for the author's (i. e. the narrator's) parodistic rejection of language and its consequence, the absence of truth in language and the complete governance of the lie, is now reinterpreted as the presentation of the people's laughter with its truth against any official seriousness (which is always founded on lies). The extent to which this radical change was caused by the horror of Stalin's Great Purge (*Bol'shoi terror*) of 1937–1938 – which in the Moscow show trials presented overtly transparent lies as truth – and reacts to it as the presentation of gluttony, probably due to the famine years, the result of forced collectivization, is still a matter of debate (Hull 2018; Sasse 2010, 157–158). At any rate, Bakhtin himself always stressed the importance of the concrete context of phenomena and words in the reconstruction of their meaning and sense (Morson and Emerson 1990, 58). This becomes obvious when Bakhtin (1996a, 50) hints at the "unofficial" character of laughter and shapes it as an "inner form" (*vnutrenniaia forma*) which is bound to its own truth, "liberating from outer and inner censorship, from fear of authoritarian interdiction, of the past and of power" (Bakhtin 2012a, 106). While many researchers see Bakhtin's carnival as a response to totalitarian Stalinism (Lachmann 1990; Gjunter 2000), some scholars have interpreted Bakhtin's model of carnival as a legitimation of Stalin's terrorism (Grois 1997), which fits with the phantasmic accusation (alternative facts) that for many years Bakhtin worked for the KGB (see my chapter on Bakhtin's philosophy of literature and its interrelation with literary theory and culture in this volume).

In his later years, Bakhtin stressed his view of carnivalization as the translation of carnival from actual behavior into its representation in literature and art as a core component of the culture of laughter. In opposition to its serious counterpart, this culture points out not unambiguous meaning and univalence, but the ambiguity and ambivalence of acts and spoken words. It is bound to the people's culture, which Renate Lachmann (1987, 8–10) has called a "counter-culture" (*Gegenkultur*). While in the Russian context, the reception of Bakhtin's concept of carnival was, in most cases, very positive until the Orthodox church regained strength (cf. Likhachev and Panchenko 1984) or positive and critical (cf. Gurevich 2004, 53, 108), we notice during recent years growing disapproval, following Averintsev's (1988, 1993) insistence on the religious negation of laughter (Karavkin 2016), above all in Orthodox Christian belief, which in this regard differs from Western culture. Contrary to this supposed opposition, the Russian ethnologist Vladimir Propp (1963) already recognized two years before the appearance of Bakhtin's book the correspondence of Russian and European agrarian feasts with ancient traditions. However, Viktor Shklovskii (1970, 273) and many after him, criticized Bakhtin's unhistorical treatment of mediaeval carnival, underestimating the latter's philosophical and anthropological aim. Bakhtin's words 'carnival', 'carnivalization', and 'world of laughter' are also ingredients of philosophical

anthropology and the philosophy of literature, cultural theory and ethnology (cf. Sandler 2017), which severely hinders any traditional methodological approach. As early as 1804, Jean Paul (1990, 102) remarked that the ridiculous has never been compatible with the definitions of philosophers.

The notable fact that Bakhtin avoids thematizing the carnival as an act in Russian culture can be seen as a consequence of the Soviet ban on its main manifestation, the Butter Week (*maslenitsa*), in the late 1920s, a ban that was only lifted in the 1970s. In the early 1960s, when Bakhtin reworked his book on Rabelais, the Communist Party tried to replace the 'backward' and 'obsolete' Butter Week with the 'progressive' Soviet socialist feast 'Farewell to Winter' (*Provody zimy*, cf. Radchenko 2016, 266, 169). It is also striking that in Russia, Bakhtin's book(s) on Rabelais is/are debated much more critically than the two versions of his Dostoevskii book. While the first Moscow edition of 1965 was limited to 6,000 copies (reprinted in Düsseldorf in 1986), the second edition, appearing only 25 years later, in 1990, enjoyed a much higher circulation, almost tenfold with 50,000 copies. This is probably due not only to the questionable presence of the carnival in the East Slavic culture of the Middle Ages (now present in Russia, cf. Averintsev 1992) but also to the position and role of the concept of Menippian satire ('*menippova satira*', '*menippeia*') developed in the second edition of the Dostoevskii book, a concept which received much more discussion in German during the 1930s and 1940s (on Menippian satire, see also Frye 1944–1955, 1957) than in Russian classical studies (Popova 2010, 564–584). But it is also due to the general critical evaluation of the culture of laughter in dogmatic Orthodox religion. In his books on Rabelais (1965) and Dostoevskii (second version in 1963) Bakhtin combined the quality of the carnivalesque not only with the cultural traditions of Menippian satire but also with the soliloquy and the diatribe on the one hand and a universal culture of laughter (*smekhovaia kul'tura*, Bakhtin 2010, 13–27) on the other. The former is not so much the philological reconstruction of a special satirical tradition of presenting a broken relationship with the narrated world (the Old Greek satires of Menipp have not been preserved) as an account of a double-voiced telling, which in some fragmentary texts by Bakhtin (1996c, 75) is traced back to the dialogue of the human being, for instance Job, with God, but is also found in Dostoevskii's term "fantastic storytelling" (*fantasticheskii rasskaz*, Bakhtin 2002b, 361).

In the context of the mytho-poetics of Modernism, Bakhtin conceived the late Middle Ages and the early Renaissance as strongly fed by pagan, partially religiously reshaped, mythical motifs, following Burckhardt's concept of the Renaissance's break with the medieval period (*Die Cultur der Renaissance in Italien: ein Versuch*, 1860, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*), which, drawing on Greek and Roman classical cultures, sustained Neoclassicism and Huizinga's

response in his book *Herfsttij der Middeleeuwen* (1919, *The Autumn of the Middle Ages,* 1997), which stressed the finality of the Middle Ages with their archaic motif of revenge and the decline of chivalry in favor of an implicit Romanticism. Because Bakhtin's concept of the carnival itself concerns a recurring event of collective human life which comes from the mysteries of mythical culture and carnivalism (especially in literature) is only its expression in artistic culture, and because in his conception authentic carnival events, still present in the Middle Ages, were increasingly translated into artistic culture from the Renaissance onwards, his notion of carnivalism has a melancholic touch that has often been overlooked: he is also reporting a cultural loss. For Bakhtin, the crisis of modern culture consists in the increasing forfeiture of this unofficial, birth-giving, never-ending dialogical laugh culture, the alternative to the stable, serious, death- and end-orientated monologic official culture. Hence he criticizes Lefranc (1953) for remaining within the official culture in his interpretation of Rabelais.

In Bakhtin's thinking, the concept of the carnival is deeply correlated with the ideas of *dialogue* (Elliot 1999) and *polyphony* (Kohler 2004). The human body imbued with the "people's immortality" (*bessmerti[e] naroda*, Bakhtin 2008a, 322) correlates with the endlessness of the word in the dialogue. Just as dialogue negates the singularity of the voice of a spoken word, carnival negates the singularity of the individual person in the world. Every unique single person is potentially integrated into the union of its people and negates the "completely finished, finalized, strictly delineated, enclosed, externally shown, unmixed and expressive body" (Bakhtin 2008a, 317). Due to its cosmic dimension, the carnival body is materialized in the special chronotope of "the body in the air" (*telo v vozdukhe*, Popova 2010, 562), which is also the chronotope of "permanent becoming" (Makhlin 2001, 339).

As most Western readers of the Rabelais book did not perceive its philosophical and anthropological implications, they took it primarily as an historical and/or sociological analysis of European Renaissance culture. For instance, in Germany there arose a dispute between Moser (1986, 1990) and Schindler (1984a, 1984b, 1992) in which the former declared the carnival to have been merely a religious feast with a moral-didactic function, whereas the latter followed Bakhtin in relating it back to pagan festivities. Umberto Eco (1984) preferred the comic to laughter and foregrounded the ludic and noncommittal character of the carnival, which legitimizes parricide but ultimately confirms the official rule. In his eyes, laughter is mostly used as a social sanction for deviation from the norm. Postmodernists such as Hutcheon found fault with Bakhtin's blind spot in relation to the repression and (official) institutionalization of the carnival. Like Peter Burke (1978, 201–202), Allon White and Peter Stalybrass (1986) reduced the carnival to a rest break, allowed by rulers in order to cement the 'normal' violent relationships.

Later, Peter Burke (2000) joined others in criticizing Bakhtin's vague delimitation of the notion of 'people's culture' from (official) 'learned culture' with regard to Rabelais. Jacques Le Goff (1989) agrees with Freud, Bergson, and Bataille, arguing that laughing is a social act with three institutions: the laughing person, the person about whom people laugh and the person towards whom the laughter is directed. Differing with Bakhtin, he reports that in the course of the Middle Ages laughing came under the control of the church and the throne. In the first period (sixth to tenth centuries), it was largely suppressed, because Jesus Christ did not laugh; later, it became increasingly controlled. Although Le Goff welcomed Bakhtin's notion of the culture of laughter, he expressed doubts about the latter's thesis that the Renaissance freed laughter from the control of the church. However, the majority of Western literary critics, not specialists in medieval culture, followed Bakhtin's proclamation of the carnival as an alternative culture, which implies revolutionary potential. Like many others, Michael Gardiner (2002), who took Bakhtin's entire work as a new sociology, interpreted his concept of the carnival as a 'utopian critique' of existing societies (Gardiner 1992). Schümer (2002, 853), on the other hand, complains about Bakhtin's "fundamental ignorance of his subject: carnival". Nevertheless, the Classical philologists Carrière (1979) and Möllendorff (1995) used Bakhtin's model of laughter for their research on the ancient Greek comedies.

The process of Bakhtin's defense of his book on Rabelais as a dissertation at the Institute of World Literature in Moscow (proposed by A. Smirnov) with its Lenin quotations – which were demanded and later deleted – lasted from 1946 to 1952 and had very grotesque carnivalesque traits reconstructed and documented by Sasse (2015). Sasse has also shown how dissident artists in Prague (1975) and Moscow (1991–2006) have used Bakhtin's concept of carnivalization as an argument supporting the demand that art should be free.

In the West, the publication of the translations of the Rabelais book (the first appeared in the USA in 1968) coincided with the students' revolution and stimulated an anti-capitalistic political understanding of Bakhtin's carnival. In fact, Bakhtin's concept introduced a new philosophical outlook on laughter: "Laughter for the first time opens the present, as a subject of representation" (Bakhtin 2008c, 681). Objections are raised from an Orthodox perspective both to Bakhtin's idea of freedom by laughter and to his concept of the (collective) immortality of the people (Shchepenko 2009).

A lasting provocation for Christian religion and its theology is Bakhtin's understanding of the Gospel as a product of carnivalization (Bakhtin 2002a, 151–152). (Orthodox scholars especially criticize the fact that Bakhtin celebrates purgatory with laughter.) Not only does Bakhtin consider the Old Testament as the law and the New Testament as a counter-text, but he regards the appear-

ances and performances of Jesus Christ as carnival acts. In this understanding, Kafka's famous miniature "Before the Law" (1915) is a thoroughly carnivalesque text which stresses not the past and not the future, but the present. A very promising approach for world literature is the application of Bakhtin's concept to cultures outside of the European context (cf. Gates 1988, 50, 110 with regard to double-voiced talk; cf. also Bakhtin's own appeal to Buddhism, Bakhtin 1996d, 115). Just as Sandler (2017, 17) sees Bakhtin remodel his philosophical thinking with the carnival in the field of aesthetics with the notion of "the vision of a free and creating person", we can consider Bakhtin's carnival as a late modern case of the art of religion (Grübel 2013), which is a reply to Solov'ev's and Rozanov's religion of art. Although Aaron Gurevich welcomed Bakhtin's concept of the carnival as a stimulating idea, he also qualified it as a 'scientific myth' (*nauchnyi mif*). Most probably, it is the mental creation of an unsuppressed body (cf. Abramova et al. 1996, 10–13).

We meet Bakhtinian carnivalization in Shakespeare's *Hamlet* ("The time is out of joint", Shakespeare 1984, 950), in Heine's *Börne* (1952, 96; "inverted order of the world", cf. Bakhtin 2002a, 166; 2002b, 346) and in Kharms' proclamation: "One human being thinks logically, many people think 'fluently'" (Kharms 2000, 285). Bakhtin himself saw it, besides in Rabelais, in Poe (Bakhtin 2002b, 346), Gogol', Dostoevskii, Proust (Bakhtin 1996e, 134) and Kafka (Bakhtin 2002d, 461), in Khlebnikov (Bakhtin 2002e, 140–141) and Maiakovskii (Bakhtin 1996a, 52–62; 1996b, 63–67; 2002c, 414), in Joyce (Bakhtin 1996e, 134) and Surrealism (Bakhtin 1996d, 119; Bakhtin 2002e, 50), and in Vaginov (Bakhtin 2002e, 212–213) and Camus (Bakhtin 2002c, 382; Bocharov 2002, 471).

When Aristotle (*Nicomachean Ethics*) labeled the human being a social being that is able to laugh, he condemned laughter as an 'affect of superiority' (as did Hobbes). Nevertheless, he conceded the possibility of laughter coinciding with tears. Bataille (1976, 93), who considered himself a "philosopher of laughter", understood laughter as a phenomenon of non-understanding, surprise and expenditure, contrary to knowledge, logical reason and economy. While he regarded laughter as connected to dying, Bakhtin connected it with immortality. Unlike Bergson, both found in laughter an opportunity to come into immediate contact with other people. Unlike Bataille, and unlike Plessner (1941), Bakhtin separated laughing from weeping in order to sustain the culture of laughter as a possible defense against an overwhelming power. And he has divided laughter from the horrible, which is present, for instance, in the laughing and destroying goddess Maya (Zimmer 1946, 191).

Ultimately, the frequently noted strict opposition of Bakhtin's carnival as an ethical act with its own truth to the truth of epistemological reflection is relativized by Hegel's anticipation of Nietzsche's Dionysm grounding truth in drunken-

ness and dissolving the single individual into general calmness: "The true is thus the Bacchanalian revel, in which no member is not drunk, and, since each, separating himself, also dissolves [himself] immediately, it is also transparent and simple tranquility" (Hegel 1952, 39). It is even more relativized by the confession of Schlegel's narrator in the Romantic novel *Lucinde*, which compresses laughter and tears: "I think of how in our final embrace I burst into tears and laughter at once in the surge of heavy contradictions" (Schlegel 1799, 26). Life implies comic laughter and serious sadness. But, as Bakhtin has shown, without the former it is less than half a life.

References

Abramova, M. A., Leo Anninsky, V. S. Bibler, E. Iu. Genieva, A. Ia. Gurevich, A. N. Zhelokhovtsev, Boguslav Zhylko, Vadim Kozhinov, Vadim Linetsky, V. L. Makhlin, E. M. Meletinsky, Leo Ospovat, N. D. Tamarchenko, Caryl Emerson, and Ken Hirschkop. "Responses to Editors' Questions apropos of the 50-th Anniversary of the Defence by M. M. Bakhtin the Thesis 'F.Rabelais in the History of Realism'." *Dialog. Karnaval. Khronotop* 17. 4 (1996): 5–45. http://nevmenandr.net/dkx/?y=1996&n=4&abs=Anketa (6 February 2022).

Averintsev, Sergej S. "Bakhtin, smekh, khristianskaia kul'tura." *Rossiia, Russia* 6 (1988): 119–130.

Averintsev, Sergej S. "Bakhtin I russkoe otnoshenie k smekhu." *Ot mifa k literature: Sbornik v chest' 75-letiia E. M. Meletinskogo*. Ed. Elena Sergeevna Novik. Moscow: Izd-vo RGTU, 1993. 341–345.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "K voprosam teorii romana: K voprosam teorii smekha. O Maiakovskom." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 5. Eds. S. G. Bocharov and L. A. Gogotishvili. Moscow: Russkie slovari, 1996a. 48–62.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Ritorika, v meru svoei lzhivosti." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 5. Eds. S. G. Bocharov and L. A. Gogotishvili. Moscow: Russkie slovari, 1996b. 63–70.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "K voprosam samosoznaniia i samootsenki." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 5. Eds. S. G. Bocharov and L. A. Gogotishvili. Moscow: Russkie slovari, 1996c. 72–79.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Dopolneniia i izmeneniia k Rable." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 5. Eds. S. G. Bocharov and L. A. Gogotishvili. Moscow: Russkie slovari, 1996d. 80–129.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "O Flobere." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 5. Eds. S. G. Bocharov and L. A. Gogotishvili. Moscow: Russkie slovari, 1996e. 130–137.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Problema rechevykh zhanrov." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 5. Eds. S. G. Bocharov and L. A. Gogotishvili. Moscow: Russkie slovari, 1996 f. 159–206.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Problemy poėtiki Dostoevskogo*. *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 6. Eds. S. G. Bocharov and L. A. Gogotishvili. Moscow: Russkie slovari, 2002a. 5–300.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Dopolneniia i izmeneniia k 'Dostoevskomu'." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 6. Eds. S. G. Bocharov and L. A. Gogotishvili. Moscow: Russkie slovari, 2002b. 301–367.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Rabochie zapisi 60-kh – nachala 70-kh godov." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 6. Eds. S. G. Bocharov and L. A. Gogotishvili. Moscow: Russkie slovari, 2002c. 371–439.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "O polifonichnosti romanov Dostoevskogo." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 6. Eds. S. G. Bocharov and L. A. Gogotishvili. Moscow: Russkie slovari, 2002d. 458–465.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. *Besedy s Duvakinym*. Moscow: Soglasie, 2002e.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Fransua Rable v istorii realizma. Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 4.1. Eds. S. G. Bocharov and B. B. Kozhinov. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kul'tur, 2008a. 11–506.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Tetradi k 'Rable'." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 4.1. Eds. S. G. Bocharov and B. B. Kozhinov. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kul'tur, 2008b. 605–676.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Dopolneniia i izmeneniia k 'Rable'." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 4.1. Eds. S. G. Bocharov and B. B. Kozhinov. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kul'tur, 2008c. 681–732.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Tvorchestvo Fransua Rable i narodnaia smekhovaia kul'tura Srednevekov'ia i Renessansa*: *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 4.2. Ed. I. L. Popova. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kul'tur, 2010. 7–508.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Slovo v romane. Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 3. Eds. S. G. Bocharov and B. B. Kozhinov. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kul'tur, 2012a. 8–179.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Roman vospitaniia i ego zhachenie v istorii realizma." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 3. Eds. S. G. Bocharov and B. B. Kozhinov. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kul'tur, 2012b. 180–217.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *K 'romanu vospitaniia'. Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 3. S. G. Bocharov and B. B. Kozhinov. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kul'tur, 2012c. 218–336.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Formy vremeni i khronotopa v romane. Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 3. Eds. S. G. Bocharov and B. B. Kozhinov. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kul'tur, 2012d. 340–512.

Bataille, George. "Non-savoir, rire, et larmes." George Bataille, *Œuvres complètes*. Vol. 8. Ed. Thadée Klossowski. Paris: Gallimard, 1976. 214–233.

Bocharov, Sergei Georgievich. "Kommentarii." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 6. Eds. S. G. Bocharov and L. A. Gogotishvili. Moscow: Russkie slovari, 2002. 466–731.

Burckhardt, Jacob. *Die Cultur der Renaissance in Italien: ein Versuch*. Basel: Schweighauser, 1860.

Burke, Peter. *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe*. London: Maurice Temple Smith Ltd, 1978.

Burke, Peter. "Learned culture and popular culture in Renaissance Italy." *The Renaissance in Europe: A Reader*. Ed. Keith Whitlock. New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 2000. 73–81.

Carrière, Jean-Claude. *Le carnaval et la politique: Une introduction à la comédie grecque suivie d'un choix de fragments*. Paris: Presses universitaires de Franche-Comté, 1979.

Davydov, Iurii N. "Tragediia kul'tury i otvetstvennost' individua (G. Zimmel' i M. Bakhtin)." *Voprosy literatury* 4 (1997): 91–125.

Eckermann, Johann Peter. *Gespräche mit Goethe in den letzten Jahren seines Lebens*. Ed. Heinz Schlaffer. Munich and Vienna: Hanser, 1986.

Eco, Umberto. "The Frames of Comic 'Freedom'." *Carnival!* Ed. Thomas A. Sebeok. Berlin, New York, NY, and Amsterdam: De Gruyter Mouton, 1984. 1–9.

Eilenberger, Wolfram. *Das Werden des Menschen im Wort: Eine Studie zur Kulturphilosophie Michail M. Bachtins*. Zurich: Chronos, 2009.

Elliot, Shanti. "Carnival and Dialogue in Bakhtin's Poetics of Folklore." *Folklore Forum* 30. 1/2 (1999): 129–139.

Frye, Northrop. "The nature of satire." *University of Toronto quarterly* 14.1 (October 1944): 75–89.

Frye, Northrop. *Anatomy of criticism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1957.

Gates, Henry L. Jr. *The Signifying Monkey: A Theory of Afro-American Literary Criticism*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Gardiner, Michael E. "Bakhtin's carnival. Utopia as critique." *Utopian Studies* 3.2 (1992): 21–49.

Gardiner, Michael E. *Mikhail Bakhtin*. *Sage masters in modern social thought series*. Vol. 1–4. Ed. Michael E. Gardiner. London: SAGE, 2002.

Gjunter, Khans. "Totalitarnaia narodnost' i ee istoki." *Socrealisticheskii kanon*. Eds. Khans Gjunter and Evgenij Dobrenko. St. Petersburg: Akademicheskii proekt, 2000. 377–389.

Goff, Jacques le. "Le Rire au Moyen Age." *Les Cahiers du Centre de Recherches Historiques* 3 (1989): 1–14.

Grois, Boris. "Totalitarizm karnavala." *Bakhtinskii sbornik*. Vol. 3. Ed. Vitalij L. Machlin. Moscow: Labirint, 1997. 76–80.

Grübel, Rainer. "Zur Ästhetik des Wortes bei Michail M. Bachtin." Michail M. Bachtin, *Die Ästhetik des Wortes*. Ed. Rainer Grübel. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1979. 21–88.

Grübel, Rainer. "Rozanovs Ägyptenmythos und Bachtins Karnevalismus: Religionskunst versus Kunstreligion." *Zeitschrift für Slavistik* 38.3 (2013): 253–275.

Gurevich, Aron. *Istoriia istorika*. Moscow: ROSSPÈN, 2004.

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *Phänomenologie des Geistes* [1807]. Ed. Johannes Hoffmeister. Hamburg: Meiner, 1952.

Heine, Heinrich. *Ludwig Börne: Eine Denkschrift*. *Historisch-kritische Gesamtausgabe*. Vol. 11. Ed. Manfred Windfuhr. Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, 1952. 9–132.

Huizinga, Johan. *The Autumn of the Middle Ages* [1919]. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1997.

Hull, Gordon. "Bakhtin's Carnival, Genealogy, History." (25 September 2018) https://www.newappsblog.com/2018/09/bakhtins-carnival-genealogy-history.html (4 March 2022).

Karavkin, Valerii Iosifovich. "Vokrug smekha (K probleme sootnosheniia èticheskogo i èsteticheskogo)." *Rossiiskaia istoria* 5 (2016): 36–47.

Kharms, Daniil. *Sobranie sochinenij v trekh tomakh*. Vol. 2. Ed. V. N. Sazhina. St. Peterburg: Azbuka, 2000.

Kohler, Gun-Britt. "Karneval und Polyphonie: Tvorčestvo Fransua Rable (Das Schaffen François Rabelais') im Kontext von Bachtins Arbeiten zu Dostoevskij." *Valenzen des Lachens in der Vormoderne (1250–1750)*. Eds. Christian Kuhn and Stefan Bießenecker. Bamberg: University of Bamberg Press, 2004. 32–52.

Lachmann, Renate. "Vorwort." Michail M. Bachtin, *Rabelais und seine Welt: Volkskultur als Gegenkultur*. Trans. by Gabriele Leupold. Ed. Renate Lachmann. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1987. 7–48.

Lachmann, Renate. "Versöhnung von Leben und Tod im Lachen: Der russische Theoretiker Michail Bachtin läßt die Stimmen der Texte laut werden." *Frankfurter Rundschau* 85 (10 April 1990).

Lefranc, Abel. *Rabelais: Études sur "Gargantua", "Pantagruel", "le Tiers Livre"*. Paris: Albin Michel, 1953.

Likhachev, Dmitrii S., and Aleksandr M. Panchenko. *"Smekhovoi mir" Drevnei Rusi*. Moscow: Nauka, 1984.

Makhlin, Vitalii. "Karnavalizaciia." *Literaturnaia ènciklopediia terminov i poniatii*. Ed. Aleksandr Nikolaevič Nikoljukin. Moscow: INION RAN Intelvak, 2001. 338–340.

Möllendorff, Peter von. *Grundlagen einer Ästhetik der Alten Komödie: Untersuchungen zu Aristophanes und Michail Bachtin*. Tübingen: Narr, 1995.

Morson, Gary Saul, and Caryl Emerson. *Bakhtin: Creation of a Prosaics.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1990.

Moser, Dietz-Rüdiger. *Fastnacht, Fasching, Karneval: Das Fest der "verkehrten Welt"*. Graz: Edition Kaleidoskop, 1986.

Moser, Dietz-Rüdiger. "Lachkultur des Mittelalters? Michael Bachtin und die Folgen seiner Theorie." *Euphorion* 84 (1990): 89–111.

Nährlich-Slatewa, Elena. "Das groteske Leben und seine edle Einfassung: 'Das Römische Karneval' Goethes und das Karnevalskonzept von Michail M. Bachtin." *Goethe-Jahrbuch* 106 (1989): 181–202.

Nietzsche, Friedrich Wilhelm. *Nachgelassene Fragmente. Sämtliche Werke: Kritische Studienausgabe*. Vol. 7. Eds. Giorgio Colli and Mazzino Montinari. Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag; Berlin and New York, NY: De Gruyter, 1980.

Paul, Jean. "VI. Programm. Über das Lächerliche." Jean Paul, *Vorschule der Ästhetik*. Ed. Wolfhart Henckmann. Hamburg: Meiner, 1990. 102–123.

Plessner, Helmuth. *Lachen und Weinen: Eine Untersuchung der Grenzen des menschlichen Verhaltens*. Arnhem: Van Loghum Slaterus, 1941.

Popova, Irina. *Kniga M. M. Bakhtina o Fransua Rable i ee znachenie dlia teorii literatury*. Moscow: IMLA RAN, 2009.

Popova, Irina. "Kommentarii i prilozhenie." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. Vol. 4.2. Ed. I. L. Popova. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kul'tur, 2010. 523–696.

Propp, Vladimir. *Russkie agrarnye prazdniki. Opyt istoriko- ètnograficheskogo issledovaniia*. Leningrad: Izd. Leningradskogo unversiteta, 1963.

Pypin, Alexandr Nikolaewich. "Gerder." *Vestnik Evropy* 25. 2.3 (March 1890): 277–321.

Radchenko, D. A."Politicheskoe vyskazyvanie prazdnika: antisanktsionnaia maslenica." *SHAGI/ STEPS* 2.4 (2016): 265–291.

Sandler, Sergei. "Tema karnavala v kontekste filosofii Bakhtina." *Studia Litterarum* 1. 3/4 (2017), 10–25.

Sasse, Sylvia. *Michail Bachtin zur Einführung.* Hamburg: Junius, 2010.

Sasse, Sylvia. "Hintertüren: Dostoevskij, Nietzsche, Bachtin." *Die Welt der Slaven* LVIII.2 (2013), 209–231.

Sasse, Sylvia (ed.). *Das Leben ist ein großer Revolutionär: Michail M. Bachtins Dissertations- verteidigung im Jahr 1946*. Zurich: Edition Schublade, 2015.

Schindler, Robert. "Volkskultur." *Zur Wiederentdeckung des vergesseneren Alltags (16–20. Jh.)*. Eds. Richard van Dülmen and Robert Schindler. Frankfurt/M: Fischer, 1984a. 117–152.

Schindler, Robert. "Karneval, Kirche und die verkehrte Welt. Zur Funktion der Lachkultur im 16. Jahrhundert." *Jahrbuch für Volkskunde: Neue Folge* 7 (1984b): 9–57.

Schindler, Robert. *Rebellion, community and custom in early modern German*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Schlegel, Friedrich von. *Lucinde: Ein Roman*. Berlin: Heinrich Fröhlich, 1799.

Schümer, Dirk. "Lachen mit Bachtin – ein geisteshistorisches Trauerspiel." *Merkur. Deutsche Zeitschrift für europäisches Denken* 56. 641/642 (2002): 847–853.

Scílard, Lena. "Karnaval'noe soznanie." *Russian Literature* XVIII (1985): 151–187.

Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet*. William Shakespeare, *The complete works*. Ed. William J. Craig. London: Henry Pordes, 1984. 941–982.

Shchepenko, Mikhail G. "O podlinnosti teorii narodno-smekhovoi kul'tury Mikhaila Bakhtina." *Razvitie lichnosti* 3 (2009): 116–142.

Shklovskii, Viktor. *Tetiva. O neskhodtstve skhodnovo*. Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1970.

White, Allon, and Peter Stalybrass. *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1986.

Zenkin, Sergej, Sergey Ushakin, and Il'ja Kukulin. "Demon russkoj teorii: dlia chego segodnia nuzhen Mikhail Bakhtin." (2020) https://gorky.media/context/demon-russkoj-teorii-dlya-chego-segodnya-nuzhen-mihail-bahtin/ (4 March 2022).

Zimmer, Heinrich R. *Myths and Symbols in Indian Art and Civilization*. Ed. Joseph Campbell. Washington, D.C: Pantheon Books, 1946.

Irina Wutsdorff
Function

Function is a key term in Central and Eastern European literary theories, especially formalism and structuralism. Its usage is derived from the basic Latin term meaning 'execution, performance of a task', and to this extent it also includes the everyday meaning of 'fulfilling a purpose'. The formalist and structuralist theories emphasise two aspects here: firstly, functions are conceived of in interplay with one another; a 'function' thus refers to the performance of a task within a larger context. Secondly, greater emphasis is placed on execution with a specific aim than on the aim of the task associated with the given function. By considering functions in relation to one another, the emerging structuralist theories participate in a broader intellectual movement of the time: for instance, Ernst Cassirer described the epistemological transition (which can be observed from Leibniz onwards) from 'thing' terms to 'relational' terms as a replacement for the metaphysical category of substance with a concept of function focused on relations and order (Cassirer 2000 [1910], 2004 [1931]). The examinations of function advanced by the Russian formalists and their circles and by Prague structuralism vary, however, displaying diverse approaches and accents. Theoretical approaches to function were developed in the fields of 1) narratology, 2) linguistics and 3) anthropology.

1 Function in narratology

The ethnologist Vladimir Propp, who was close to the Russian formalists, uses the term function in a way similar to the original practical meaning of 'execution', which also considers the relationship between part and whole that usually goes with it: with respect to constantly recurring minute units of action he identifies in the Russian folktale (*Morfologia volshebnoi skazki*, 1928, *Morphology of the Folktale*, 1990), he wrote of functions and in so doing provided an important impulse for narratology. Drawing on Propp, Algirdas Julien Greimas (1984 [1966]) develops a generative system of six actants associated with functions inherent to the actions constituting the plot, providing a universal descriptive key for the basic structure of narrative texts. Claude Bremond (1973) divides Propp's sequence of thirty-one actions into five overarching categories, making the model more flexible in that the functions can be combined in different order. Unlike Propp, his focus is not the order of the action but "The Logic of Narrative Possibilities" (1980, "La logique des possibles narratifs", 1966). Roland Barthes, in his "Intro-

duction à l'analyse structurale des récits" ("Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narrative"), also written in 1966, distinguishes between the level of function (with reference to Propp and Bremond), the level of action (with reference to Greimas) and the level of narration (with reference to Todorov). He considers these levels

> bonded together according to a mode of progressive integration: a function has a meaning only insofar as it takes place in the general line of action of an *actant*; and this action in turn receives its ultimate meaning from the fact that it is being told, that is, entrusted to a discourse which possesses its own code. (Barthes 1975 [1966], 243)

2 Function in linguistics

The main thread running through reflections on function within Central and Eastern European theory refers not to narrative texts, however, but to language. The early Russian formalism of the Society for the Study of Poetic Language (Obshchestvo izucheniia poèticheskogo iazyka, OPOIaZ), which was concerned with futurist poetry written in the artificial *zaum* language, distinguishes between poetic and practical language. Taking as an example Khlebnikov's "formulation of the self-sufficient, 'selfsome,' word" (Jakobson 1997, 179), in his survey of "Noveishaia russkaia poèziia" (1919, "The Newest Russian Poetry", 1997) Roman Jakobson declared that "[p]oetry is language in its aesthetic function", "the communicative function [having] only minimal importance" in it (Jakobson 1997, 179). In this text, Jakobson defines poetry as an "utterance for the purpose of expression" (literally and according to Jakobson's later English version, see below: "an utterance with the set (*ustanovka*) towards expression"), that is "indifferent to the subject of the utterance" (Jakobson 1997, 179). Holenstein (1979) recognises a phenomenological principle in this definition of poetry proposed by Jakobson insofar as the specificity of language with an aesthetic function is associated with a specific attitude of consciousness.

We find a similar definition of poetic language in the "Theses" the Prague Linguistic Circle presented to the First Congress of Slavists of 1929, on which Jakobson worked: "Still, *the organizing idea of art, by which art differs from other semiotic structures, is the direction of receptiveness not on the signified [signifié] but on the sign itself*" (PLC 1983, 98). Here we see the degree to which the focus was on language's execution, on the tensions shaping its organisational structure depending on its different intended uses. As stated at the beginning of the "Theses", language, "[r]esulting from human activity", is, "[s]een from the functionalist viewpoint, [...] a system of purposeful means of expression*" (PLC 1983, 77).

Iurii Tynianov, in his thoughts "O literaturnoi ėvoliutsii" (1927, "On Literary Evolution", 2019), had also urged scholarly analysis to consider the systemic condition, both of individual literary works and of the development of literature. Analysis had to examine both "the interdependence of each element of a literary work (a system) with its other elements and, it follows, with the system as a whole" (Tynianov 2019, 269) and the correlations between the individual elements with other series, including non-literary ones, in order to "proceed from the constructive function to the literary function, from the literary function to the speech function" (Tynianov 2019, 282). The logical progression of this idea was for Tynianov to replace the traditional concept of the 'author's intention' with the "speech function" a work appears to fulfil as it is interrelated with other elements of other series: "The 'orientation' of a literary work (or of a series) is actually its *speech* function, its interrelations with everyday life" (Tynianov 2019, 278).

In their theses on "Problemy izucheniia literatury i iazyka" (1928, "Problems of the Study of Literature and Language", 1981), Jakobson and Tynianov declared a fundamental turn to systemic or structural thinking, insisting that "[t]he literary and extraliterary material used in literature [be] considered from a functional point of view" (Jakobson and Tynianov 1981, 3–4). Instead of strictly separating diachronicity and synchronicity, as had previously been the case, a reciprocal relationship was to be assumed; they considered it essential to "recognize, that every system necessarily exists as an evolution, whereas, on the other hand, evolution is inescapable of a systematic nature" (Jakobson and Tynianov 1981, 4).

All of these models are predicated on a complex interplay between several functions within a system that is constantly changing. An important element here is the idea of the dominant – that is, the notion that one of these functions prevails at a given moment. Since the model is conceived of as dynamic, there are constant shifts in the system's hierarchical structure – a permanent change of dominants. In 1935, Roman Jakobson based a lecture on Russian formalism he gave at Masaryk University in Brno on this concept of the dominant. Later published in English as "The Dominant" (1981b) and recognised as a seminal work, the lecture established that "[t]he dominant may be defined as the focusing component of a work of art: it rules, determines, and transforms the remaining components. It is the dominant which guarantees the integrity of the structure" (Jakobson 1981b, 751).

An important impulse for the concept of function in relation to language was Karl Bühler's *Sprachtheorie: Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache* (1934, *Theory of Language: The Representational Function of Language*, 2011) and his 'organon model' of speech events, in which he ascribed semantic functions to each of the three relational foundations he identified in speech acts:

> It [the language sign] is a *symbol* by virtue of its coordination to objects and states of affairs, a *symptom* (*Anzeichen*, *indicium*: index) by virtue of its dependence on the sender, whose inner states it expresses, and a *signal* by virtue of its appeal to the hearer, whose inner or outer behaviour it directs as do other communicative signs. (Bühler 2011, 35)

Bühler thus takes into consideration an expressive and an appellative (or appeal) function in addition to the (mostly dominant) representational function in every speech situation (Bühler 2011, 37).

The Prague Linguistic Circle aesthete and literary theorist Jan Mukařovský complemented the model two years later with the aesthetic function, foregrounding the utterance itself in a paper he gave 1936 at the International Linguistics Congress in Copenhagen ("Básnické pojmenování a estetická funkce jazyka", 1941, "Poetic Designation and the Aesthetic Function of Language", 1977). Roman Jakobson then expanded the schema in his widely circulated essay "Linguistics and Poetics" (1981a [1960]), based on papers he gave in 1953 and 1956 (cf. Holenstein 1979, 14–15), adding a further two components to form a six-part model: an utterance foregrounding the code in question has a metalingual function, while a phatic function corresponds to making and maintaining contact. What he now renames the poetic function is defined, with recourse to his earlier formalist definition, thus: "The set (*Einstellung)* towards the MESSAGE as such, focus on the message for its own sake, is the POETIC function of language" (Jakobson 1981a, 25).

Jan Mukařovský, however, had already gone a step further by providing a dialectical reason for the aesthetic sign's self-referentiality in his functional model of language: "The aesthetic function which is the cause of this reflexiveness of linguistic activity has appeared in our analysis as the omnipresent dialectic negation of the three basic communicative functions of language, and thereby as a necessary addition to Bühler's scheme" (Mukařovský 1977 [1941], 71).

3 (Aesthetic) function in the context of an anthropological model

From the second half of the 1930s onwards, Mukařovský worked on a model of function related not only to language as a form of human action but also to all forms of man's reference to his environment. He finally summarised his resulting understanding of function thus: "A function is the mode of a subject's self-realization vis-à-vis the external world" (Mukařovský 1978 [1942], 40). This concept of function is, as he stresses, relational: it refers to the relationship between

the acting subject, conceived of as "man in general" (Mukařovský 1978, 39), and an object ("self-realization proceeds from a subject and aims at an object", Mukařovský 1978, 40) and to the conditions under which the subject's consciousness turns to the object (cf. Grygar 1999, 80):

> Precisely the fact that all functions are potentially omnipresent – that every act is accompanied by a whole cluster of functions – leads us to conclude that the question of the fundamental interrelation of functions is not one of hierarchy but of a typology which assigns a place to each function with respect to the others – not under or over them but with respect to them. (Mukařovský 1978, 39)

The classification schema consists of four parts and distinguishes between immediate and semiotic reference (or "ways of self-realization vis-à-vis reality", Mukařovský 1978, 40) and between the subject or the object being in the foreground: the practical function aims directly at an object and its "reorganization" (Mukařovský 1978, 40), while the symbolic function uses signs. The theoretical function, like the practical function, is characterised by immediacy, but foregrounds the (superindividual) subject, since "its general and ultimate goal is the projection of a reality into the subject's consciousness", while "[t]he reality itself, the object of the function, remains untouched" (Mukařovský 1978, 41). "The semiotic function foregrounding the *subject* is the *aesthetic function*" (Mukařovský 1978, 41). Unlike "the theoretical function [, which] strives for a total and unifying *image* of reality, [...] the aesthetic function establishes a unifying *attitude* toward it" (Mukařovský 1978, 42).

As in the linguistic functions model, aesthetic function enjoys special status in that it is a dialectical negation of all other functions, which nevertheless remain present. Unlike those functions, which can always refer to just a part of reality (and have to), the aesthetic function, precisely in erasing all purposes which are only ever particular, refers to reality as a whole and effects man's attempt to refer holistically to the world around him. To this extent, Mukařovský considers it to provide a humanistic impulse, since it confronts people with the polyfunctionality (actually) befitting them (and which is under threat in the modern world with its focus on monofunctionality).

Here too the idea of synchronous multifunctionality is important – at a given time, several functions are always present in a certain hierarchical order and one of the functions dominates. This idea is related to the concept of a diachronic dynamic – the order, the assignation and the hierarchy of the functions can change over the course of time, the dominant can shift, one element of the whole can in time take over different functions. Mukařovský writes that one of "the very premises of Structuralism" is that a hierarchy is regarded "as a dynamic process, as a constant regrouping" (Mukařovský 1978, 47). The correlations between the

functions he establishes in his typological model "can become tracks along which hierarchical shifts occur in development" (Mukařovský 1978, 47). This is neatly demonstrated within Prague structuralism by the ethnologist Petr Bogatyrev, using the example of folklore and its changing perception, in his studies on, for instance, the Christmas tree (Bogatyrev 2011 [1932–1933]), traditional costume and the folksong (Bogatyrev 2017a, 2017b [1936]; cf. the survey in Holenstein 1979, 25–34).

Even in Prague structuralism's most elaborate version of literary theory, Jan Mukařovský's "Místo estetické funkce mezi ostatními" (1942, "The Place of the Aesthetic Function among the Other Functions", 1978), function is conceived of as execution, as the performance of an intentionally-orientated consciousness, and to this extent has a phenomenological component. For the aesthetic function, that means that it is by no means a characteristic of the object; rather, it is a certain kind of conscious attitude or 'set' that can be stimulated by the object aesthetically perceived or conceived, and to this extent it pertains to both the producer and the recipient. However, few studies have considered the potential connections with reception theory, which also operates with an anthropological perspective. Although Hans Robert Jauß (1982 [1977]) did discuss Mukařovský's conception of the aesthetic function, his criticism was based on a fundamental misreading (cf. Holenstein 1979, 29–30; Striedter 1989, 221–229).

Translated by John Heath

References

Barthes, Roland. "An Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narrative." [1966] *New Literary History* 6.2 (1975): 237–272.

Bogatyrev, Petr. "Der Weihnachtsbaum in der Ost-Slovakei: Zur Frage der strukturellen Erforschung des Funktionswandels ethnographischer Fakten." [1932–1933] Petr Bogatyrev, *Funktional-strukturale Ethnographie in Europa: Texte aus den 1920er und 1930er Jahren zu Brauchtum, Folklore, Theater und Film*. Eds. Klaas-Hinrich Ehlers and Marek Nekula. Heidelberg: Winter, 2011. 121–124.

Bogatyrev, Petr. "Folk Song from a Functional Point of View." [1936] *Theatre Theory Reader: Prague School Writings*. Eds. David Drozd, Tomáš Kačer, and Don Sparling. Prague: Karolinum Press, Charles University, 2017a. 428–441.

Bogatyrev, Petr. "Clothing as Sign: The Functional and Structural Concept in Ethnography." [1936] *Theatre Theory Reader: Prague School Writings*. Eds. David Drozd, Tomáš Kačer, and Don Sparling. Prague: Karolinum Press, Charles University, 2017b. 441–447.

Bremond, Claude. "The Logic of Narrative Possibilities." [1966] *New Literary History* 11.3 (1980): 387–411.

Bremond, Claude. *Logique du récit*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1973.

Bühler, Karl. *Theory of Language: The Representational Function of Language* [1934]. Trans. by Donald Fraser Goodwin and Achim Eschbach. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 2011.

Cassirer, Ernst. *Substanzbegriff und Funktionsbegriff: Untersuchungen über die Grundfragen der Erkenntniskritik* [1910]. Ernst Cassirer, *Gesammelte Werke: Hamburger Ausgabe*. Vol. 6. Ed. Birgit Recki. Hamburg: Meiner, 2000.

Cassirer, Ernst. "Mythischer, ästhetischer und theoretischer Raum." [1931] Ernst Cassirer, *Aufsätze und kleine Schriften (1927–1931)*. *Gesammelte Werke: Hamburger Ausgabe*. Vol. 17. Ed. Birgit Recki. Hamburg: Meiner, 2004. 411–432.

Greimas, Algirdas Julien. *Structural Semantics: An Attempt at a Method* [1966]. Trans. by Daniele McDowell, Ronald Schleifer, and Alan Velie. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1984.

Grygar, Mojmír. *Terminologický slovník českého strukturalismu: Obecné pojmy estetiky a teorie umění*. Brno: Host, 1999.

Holenstein, Elmar. "Einführung: Von der Poesie und der Plurifunktionalität der Sprache." Roman Jakobson, *Poetik: Ausgewählte Aufsätze 1921–1971*. Eds. Elmar Holenstein and Tarcisius Schelbert. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1979. 7–60.

Jakobson, Roman. "Linguistics and Poetics." [1960] Roman Jakobson, *Selected Writings: Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry*. Vol. 3. Ed. Stephen Rudy. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1981a. 18–51.

Jakobson, Roman. "The Dominant." [1935] Roman Jakobson, *Selected Writings*. *Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry*. Vol. 3. Ed. Stephen Rudy. The Hague, Paris, and New York, NY: Mouton Publishers, 1981b. 751–756.

Jakobson, Roman. "The Newest Russian Poetry: V. Khlebnikov." [1919] Roman Jakobson, *My Futurist Years*. Eds. Bengt Jangfeldt and Stephen Rudy. Trans. by Stephen Rudy. New York, NY: Marsilio, 1997. 173–208.

Jakobson, Roman, and Iurii Tynianov [Ju. Tynjanov]. "Problems in the Study of Language and Literature." [1928] Roman Jakobson, *Selected Writings*. *Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry*. Vol. 3. Ed. Stephen Rudy. The Hague, Paris, and New York, NY: Mouton Publishers, 1981, 3–6.

Jauß, Hans Robert. *Aesthetic Experience and Literary Hermeneutics* [1977]. Trans. by Michael Shaw. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1982.

Mukařovský, Jan. "Poetic Designation and the Aesthetic Function of Language." [1941] Jan Mukařovský, *The Word and Verbal Art: Selected Essays by Jan Mukařovský*. Eds. and trans. by John Burbank and Peter Steiner. New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 1977. 65–73.

Mukařovský, Jan. "The Place of the Aesthetic Function among the Other Functions." [1942] Jan Mukařovský, *Structure, Sign and Function: Selected Essays by Jan Mukařovský*. Eds. and trans. by John Burbank and Peter Steiner. New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 1978. 31–48.

PLC [Prague Linguistic Circle]. "Theses presented to the first congress of Slavists held in Prague in 1929." *Praguiana – Some Basic and Less Known Aspects of the Prague Linguistic School*. Ed. Josef Vachek. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1983. 77–120.

Propp, Vladimir. *Morphology of the Folktale* [1928]. 2nd edition. Ed. Louis A. Wagner. Trans. by Laurence Scott. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1990.

Striedter, Jurij. *Literary Structure, Evolution and Value: Russian Formalism and Czech Structuralism Reconsidered*. Partially trans. by Matthew Gurewitsch. Cambridge, MA, and London: Harvard University Press, 1989.

Tynianov, Iurii [Yuri]. "On Literary Evolution." Yuri Tynianov, *Permanent Evolution: Selected Essays on Literature, Theory and Film*. Eds. and trans. by Ainsley Morse and Philip Redko. Boston, MA: Academic Studies Press, 2019. 262–277.

Sylvia Sasse
Hybridity

Hybridity is one of those concepts in cultural studies that have undergone transfer, not only between theories but also, strikingly, between disciplines, from biology to the philosophy of language, whence it was then adopted by cultural and post-colonial studies. Hence it is used in the analysis of language, genres and identities as well as plants, animals and cultures (Kapchan and Strong 1999).

In cultural studies, hybridity is always discussed with reference to Mikhail M. Bakhtin's use of the term. Homi Bhabha, for instance, points to the work of Bakhtin when he describes hybridity as a characteristic of language and culture. Bhabha describes hybridity as a "'third space' which enables other positions to emerge" (Rutherford 1990, 211). Here, he relates the processes of hybridisation not only to language but also to practices of colonisation, which he considers to involve reciprocal processes of appropriation giving rise to a hybrid third quality, the 'third space', belonging to neither the colonised nor the colonised culture.

Bakhtin was yet to be concerned with such third spaces when he spent just nine pages examining linguistic hybridity in his essay "Slovo v romane" ("Discourse in the Novel"), in which he made the distinction between hybridity and the verbs 'to mix' (*smeshivat'sia*), 'to cross' (*skreshchivat'sia*) or 'intersect' (*peresekat'sia*) in language. For in the 1920s and 1930s, hybridisation is principally a term used in botany and eugenics, although it also features in discussions concerning mechanical or organic philosophies of language and formalist or creative theories of heredity. In the individual sciences, the term hybridity is used either to discuss the creation of something new, a third thing, by crossing existing things (as in eugenics or botany) or to describe the evolution of language as a natural or organic process of mixing or crossing (as in linguistics). A constructivist hybridisation that interferes with nature thus complements a natural, organic hybridity.

Bakhtin too participated in this discussion. In "Discourse in the Novel", he asks what hybridisation can mean in the sphere of language: it is "a mixture of two social languages within the limits of a single utterance, an encounter, within the arena of an utterance, within two different linguistic consciousnesses, separated from one another by an epoch, by social differentiation [...]" (Bakhtin 1981, 358). He had already discussed the encounter between two linguistic consciousnesses in his work on dialogism. Scholars often claim that Bakhtin actually used dialogism and hybridity synonymously (Babich 1998, 41). But in fact the two concepts are distinct from one another. We speak of dialogism when two linguistic consciousnesses are not merged or mixed – that is, when, as Bakhtin puts it, "only one language is actually present in the utterance, but it is rendered *in the light*

of another language" (Bakhtin 1981, 362). This second language, he continues, remains outside of the utterance. It is merely referred to, resonating in the utterance – hence the term polyphony – but it is not usurped by it; the two are not mixed.

For Bakhtin, hybridisation is something else; here there is an actual mixture, a new, inseparable combination. Bakhtin makes the fundamental distinction between an "unintentional, unconscious" ("nenamerennaia bessoznatel'naia", Bakhtin 1981, 358) hybridisation and one that is conscious and intentional. "Unintentional, unconscious" hybridisation is "one of the most important modes in the historical life and evolution of all languages" (Bakhtin 1981, 358). While the hybrids emerging from the process of linguistic evolution are double-voiced, they are nevertheless monologic; this hybridity contains a mixture of two "*individualized* language consciousnesses (the correlates of two specific utterances, not merely two languages)" (Bakhtin 1981, 359).

The artistic hybrid, on the other hand, is produced intentionally and consciously. It is double-voiced – that is, dialogic – for here the mixture involves two individualised and no longer impersonal linguistic consciousnesses, two standpoints, he argues. Artistic hybridity is dialogicised, then; there is no unconscious mixing, but an encounter and a battle on the territory of the utterance. Elsewhere too, Bakhtin uses metaphors of combat to describe the dialogic; in "Discourse in the Novel", he even adds: "Two points of view are not mixed, but set against each other dialogically" (Bakhtin 1981, 360).

Here, Bakhtin quite consciously 'combines', then, the dialogic and the hybrid. His notion of artistic hybridity has little to do with the use of the term in botany, in which two different entities create a third with hereditary traits of both. Even when Bakhtin uses the terms 'to cross' or 'to intersect', it is never to connote 'to mix'. Bakhtin thus also establishes that in Dostoevskii's novels, at least two voices can always be heard despite the crossing and entanglement of voices and consciousnesses: "In every voice he [Dostoevskii] could hear two contending voices [...]" (Bakhtin 1984, 30).

Bakhtin's concept of hybridity seems to have been influenced not so much by botanical processes as by a discussion in linguistics and aesthetics – between the phenomenologist Gustav Shpet and the linguist and philologist Viktor Vinogradov, who were themselves influenced by Wilhelm Humboldt's philosophy of language. Both Vinogradov und Shpet use the term hybridity in the context of a discussion about style in the novel, specifically the special artistic quality of the word in the novel. In *Vnutrenniaia forma slova* (1927, *The Inner Form of the Word*), Shpet criticised Humboldt's distinction between prose and poetry, objecting that Humboldt "sanctions the hybrid nature of 'artistic prose'" (Shpet 2007, 458). Shpet argued that it was hybrid because Humboldt assumed that both artistic prose and

poetry take reality as their starting point, although for Shpet a clear distinction can indeed be made between the two genres, one being based on reality and the other on possibility.

After reading Shpet, Bakhtin used the term hybridity, but lent it more positive connotations. For Bakhtin, the novel is no longer a negatively connoted hybrid of the prosaic and poetic word; rather, every word, even if used rhetorically, proves to be hybrid or, in its poetic usage, dialogised, fusing two clearly distinct standpoints, accents or voices in one single utterance.

While Shpet tends to use hybridity with more negative connotations, similarly to how biology used the term from the late eighteenth century onwards to denote the combination of two originally different species or pure breeds, at no point does Bakhtin postulate original identity or purity. Quite on the contrary, he explicitly stresses that hybridisation in language is an organic, natural process and that linguistic evolution also occurs principally via hybridisation, via a creative process in which the utterance serves as a "crucible for this mixing" ("kraterom dlia smesheniia", Bakhtin 1981, 359).

This positive re-semanticisation of the concept of hybridity, begun by Bakhtin and later emphasized by post-colonial studies, does not have anything to do with a loss of original purity; rather, it denotes difference, correlation and co-existence – dialogism in Bakhtin's sense of the term. Referring to cultural processes, Bhabha reads Bakhtin's concept of conscious, intentional hybridity as a subversive practice, as a form of resistance to colonial rule. However, Bakhtin himself does not go as far as that, at least not explicitly, although he would have had every reason to do so with regard to cultural development in the Soviet Union. Rather, he seeks to demonstrate that artistic practices of hybridisation do not ignore organic hybridisation or free themselves from it in a secondary process; they are intended to *depict* it. Bakhtin writes that the artistic hybrid – the semantic hybrid, produces a picture of language as an organic hybrid. The use of language is thus a constant demonstration of the process of hybridisation that can be made visible in artistic language: "Thus there are always two consciousnesses, two language-intentions, two *voices* and consequently two accents participating in an intentional and artistic hybrid" (Bakhtin 1981, 360).

This is taken a step further by Valentin Voloshinov, who had already pointed to theories of hybridisation in linguistics in 1929, in *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. Voloshinov was referring to Nikolai Marr's theory of the crossing of languages, then very much the standard doctrine in the Soviet Union. Marr was of the opinion that languages do not diverge as in the family tree model but are merely crossed with one another, thereby generating new languages (Marr 1926, 268). Voloshinov cites Marr's theory in opposing European linguistics and semasiology: "Formalism and systematicity are the typical distinguishing marks of any kind of

thinking focused on a ready-made and, so to speak, arrested object" (Voloshinov 1973, 78). Marr, in contrast, understood crossing as "the source for the formation of new species" (Marr, quoted in Voloshinov 1973, 76) and established that there was no such thing as an original national or mother tongue anyway. In this understanding, *crossing* (*skreshchenie*) is the key to all theories on the origins of language. Here Voloshinov subscribes, then, to the theory of a pre-existing hybridity of language. On the other hand, Voloshinov does not come to the conclusion that was reached by Marr and that particularly appealed to Stalin – namely that crossing the languages in communist society would result in a single language (Voloshinov 1973, 76). Voloshinov rather uses Marr's language against himself, since hybridisation results in a multiplicity of standpoints – that is, in ambivalence and difference – as Bakhtin would later put it with greater clarity.

Hybridisation is also examined by formalist literary theory, albeit marginally. Shklovskii writes of the fallacy and nonsense of crossing as an artistic practice, particularly of genres, by citing an example from biology: "A black rabbit breeding with a white rabbit doesn't create a grey rabbit, rather [they come in a series], first a white one, then a black one" (Shklovskii 1990, 349). It is the same with genres: it is not the case that any number of genres emerge, nor can all genres be crossed with one another. Shklovskii opposes crossing because he too thinks of it as mixing and argues for confrontation, for a collision of elements that allows their origin and the peculiarity of their descent to remain visible.

In essence, Voloshinov, Bakhtin and Shklovskii do not vastly differ in their scepticism towards crossing:

> There are not any number of literary genres. Just as the chemical elements do allow all bonding but only that which is simple and divisible and just as there are not different types of rye but only known ways of processing it, different treatments creating certain types, and just as there is not any amount of oil but only a certain amount, there are also a certain number of genres that are connected to a certain crystallography of the subject matter. (Shklovskii 1990, 349)

Bakhtin also thinks of hybridisation in the aesthetic sphere not as mixing but as dialogical and confrontational. Just as for Shklovskii the individual elements should remain visible, for Bakhtin too the individual voices remain audible; they do not merge into a monological voice. Despite their different premises, Bakhtin and Shklovskii are united by similar positions: they categorically reject hybridisation conceived as mixing.

Translated by John Heath

References

Babich, V. V. "Dialog poetik: Andrei Belyi, Gustav G. Shpet i Michail M. Bakhtin." *Dialog, Karnaval, Chronotop* 1 (1998): 5–54.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. "Discourse in the Novel." Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination. 4 Essays*. Trans. by Caryl Emerson and Mikhail Holquist. Ed. Michael Holquist. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1981. 359–422.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Ed. and trans. by Caryl Emerson. With an introduction by Wayne C. Booth. Minneapolis, MN, London: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.

Rutherford, Jonathan. "Interview with Homi Bhabha: The Third Space." *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*. Ed. Jonathan Rutherford. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1990. 207–221.

Shpet, Gustav. "Vnutrenniaia forma slova." Gustav Shpet, *Iskusstvo kak vid znaniia. Izbrannye trudy po filosofii kul'tury*. Moscow: Rosspèn, 2007. 323–501.

Kapchan, Deborah A., and Pauline Turner Strong. "Theorizing the Hybrid." *The Journal of American Folklore* 112. 445 (1999): 239–253.

Marr, Nikolai Ia. *Po ètapam iafeticheskoi teorii: Sbornik statei*. Moscow, 1926.

Shklovskii, Viktor. *Gamburgsky shchet: Stat'i, vospominaniia, èsse*. Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1990.

Voloshinov, Valentin. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. New York and London: Seminar Press, 1973.

Piotr Sadzik
Indeterminacy and Concretization

1 Roman Ingarden

Indeterminacy and concretization are key concepts and two of the most frequently discussed ideas of Roman Ingarden's philosophy of literature and had a powerful impact on many important currents of literary studies in the second half of the twentieth century. Both concepts were first developed in their consistent form in Ingarden's text *Das literarische Kunstwerk. Eine Untersuchung aus dem Grenzgebiet der Ontologie, Logik und Literaturwissenschaft* (1931, *The Literary Work of Art. An Investigation of the Borderlines of Ontology, Logic, and Theory of Language*). They were strictly connected with Ingarden's notion of the stratified structure of the literary work of art which he considers to be composed of four heterogeneous strata: (1) the sounds of words and phonetic formations of the higher order, (2) semantic units (phrases and sentences), (3) schematized aspects (visual, auditory, or other elements which make the represented objects visible), and (4) the objects represented (figures and events). None of these levels exist separately; instead, they create organic unity or polyphonic harmony with the other strata. Some aspects of a work are not fully determined, and cannot comprehensibly express the variety of properties of the objects represented. Thus, every work of art is essentially unfinished and resembles a mere skeleton which demands the activity of the reader/perceiver, who does not receive a sufficient amount of information. This is especially true of some aspects of the characters represented, the plot and the objects' appearance. Hence the reader cannot determine them with complete accuracy. Ingarden calls such gaps the "places of indeterminacy" (*Unbestimmtheitsstellen*) and "schematized aspects" which are filled in ("concretized") in individual acts of reading, according to each reader's inclinations (Ingarden 1960, 316–326).

It is not sufficiently clear whether indeterminacy should be seen as a formal necessity of every work or rather as an effect of its composition, a result of some external intervention (for example censorship or social taboos), a convention or presupposition of a given genre or literary style. Furthermore, the meaning of indeterminacy changed as Ingarden's project evolved. Whereas in *O poznawaniu dzieła literackiego* (1937, *The Cognition of the Literary Work of Art*) the philosopher considered indeterminacy an element which should be removed in particular concretizations and "to concretize" meant "to fill in" (Ingarden 1937, 21), later works such as *Vom Erkennen des literarischen Kunstwerks* (1968) – the extended, German version of *The Cognition of the Literary Work of Art* – examined the broader

meaning of this term. Here, Ingarden asserted that filling in such blanks would sometimes be an illegitimate addition to the work which would preclude other potential readings. Hence some indeterminacies should be left unfilled, since they are important factors of the work's expressivity. Nonetheless, a persistent feature of Ingarden's idea was his conviction that a literary work of art should be distinguished from the concretizations which emerge during individual acts of reading. Ingarden emphasized that we should separate the work of art as an artistic object which is a schematic carrier of information from the aesthetic object constructed in the process of concretization. In this model, rather than being a simple act of reading or passive contemplation, concretization is the process which leads to the formation of an aesthetic object. Ingarden's crucial proposition is thus that concretization is a function of the receiver's aesthetic attitude. The text could be then defined as a potential structure which is 'concretized' by the reader, who always takes it in according to his or her particular perception and perspective. The work of art is a common product of the 'intentional activities of the author' and the 'perceiver', who not only reconstructs the work, but above all actualizes (concretizes) its potential moments (scarcely outlined or totally unmentioned by the author) (Ingarden 1970). As a result, the operations of the reader/perceiver are the consequences of the structural properties of the work itself, which on the one hand requires supplementation, and on the other – controls the way it is read.

Clearly, concretization is the arena for Ingarden's polemic on Husserl's view on *intentionality*. It pertains neither to the schematic work (since it is an effect of the reader's activity) nor to the intentional consciousness of the reader (since it is an effect of the work's structure). This way, it allows philosophers to understand the literary work of art with regard to both its structure and its relation with a perceiver. According to Ingarden, a literary work would be the best example of 'pure' intentionality, since it does not belong to the field of real beings, therefore going beyond the frames of Husserl's transcendental idealism. According to Ingarden, concretization is the reconstruction of the actual properties of the work, the supplementation of its schematic construction, the partial removal of its gaps ('places of indeterminacy', Ingarden 1960, 316–326) and the actualization of its potential moments. Since the object which is formed during this operation emerges only from an individual cognitive experience, there are many different concretizations which may vary from receiver to receiver, sometimes in a rather radical way. For that reason, Ingarden's goal was to determine such ways of reading which would avoid pure subjectivism, but at the same time constitute the literary work as an effect of the perceiver's activity. Thus he considered the limits of concretization. Although possible concretizations are infinitely numerous, our cognitive acts should be based on an accurate, competent and just reconstruction of the work. One could speak of an inappropriate concretization when the filling-in of

the places of indeterminacy crosses acceptable boundaries, or when the perceiver introduces to the work some qualities which are inconsistent with it. However, every way of apprehending the work is only partial, and in order to form a legitimate and important artistic evaluation one has to take into consideration as many aesthetic concretizations as possible.

2 The reception of Ingarden's works

The ideas discussed above have strongly influenced many important currents of literary theory. The first dialogue with Ingarden was initiated by the member of the Prague School of structuralism, Felix Vodička, who borrowed the term 'concretization' from Ingarden (Vodička 1942). Unlike Ingarden, Vodička stressed that various acts of concretization are dependent on literary norms and conventions proper to the particular period of history rather than on the ontological status of a work. Another debate with Ingarden's ideas was opened by Stefania Skwarczyńska, who, taking the notion of indeterminacy as her starting point, developed a somewhat original figure of concealment (*przemilczenie,* Skwarczyńska 1947). If the first term requires represented objects which are in some way an irrelevant yet immanent part of the work, the second points to information which was intentionally omitted by the author. In this case, concealment is an effect of intentional consciousness and not of a structural necessity of the work itself.

Important modifications of Ingarden's ideas were also made in the works of the Polish School of Literary Communication (*communicationism*). Although their vocabulary was sometimes strongly influenced by Ingarden ('subject of creative actions' and 'virtual receiver'; Głowiński 1977), they mixed phenomenological concepts with openly structuralist inspirations and, in consequence, formed a somewhat autonomous model of reading. Głowiński and other members of the Polish School of Literary Communication focused on the functioning of the literary work of art in society, and attempted to overcome – with the help of the term 'concretization' – the division between poetics and the sociology of literature. At the same time, they criticized Ingarden's theory for its strictly ahistorical and anti-social features. Cognition of the literary work of art occurs via a whole range of variables which influence the process of reading/perceiving rather than in laboratory-like isolation as Ingarden suggested. For communicationists, indeterminacy is an idea which evolves and should always be seen in the historical context. Agreeing with Vodička, they maintain that the process of concretization of the places of indeterminacy depends on external factors and social conditions which have a serious impact on the work's structure. The act of perceiving

a literary work is in some way dependent on cultural norms – not only of the period in which the work was written, but also of that in which it is perceived. Thus concretization could give us some important knowledge about "the work in its social environment, the work which would communicate with the reader in various social situations" (Głowiński 1977, 104). For this reason, Głowiński (1977, 115) focused particularly on the fact that concretization opens new perspectives for the "sociology of literature" that were neglected by Ingarden himself. In other words, Głowiński claimed that Ingarden's view of concretization was highly idealistic, since he did not mention any factors which could disturb the process of receiving. Ingarden's idea of concretization seems to be too narrow for communicationists, whose writings suggest that this concept could contribute to a radical revision of literary history.

The most powerful influence of Ingarden's idea on the field of literary theory can be found in reader-response criticism (the Constance School of reception aesthetics), as well as in the way it forms the entire conceptual framework for the works by Hans Robert Jauss and especially by Wolfgang Iser. The core of Iser's theory, expressed in the idea of the 'appellative structure of text' (Iser 1971), is a straightforward development of Ingarden's philosophy of literature. Iser claimed that research on literary works cannot be restricted to the text seen as some finished product, but should focus on the acts of reader activity. The act of reading, then, is the moment of interaction between the text and the reader. The text delivers a schematic scenario or a skeleton and in some ways is in control of the process of reading, whereas the reader activates the text (Iser 1976). However, in other aspects Iser's propositions were strongly polemical against Ingarden. If concretization is merely a process of filling in, or simply rejecting the blanks of indeterminacy, then it leads to a harmony which completely fails to grasp the dynamic structure of literature, and modernist narratives in particular. In other words, Ingarden maintained a belief in the necessity of an appropriate way of reading which fit into the scenarios determined by the text itself. Iser, in turn, sought to find a paradigm of reading in which the reader could create objects which were not anticipated by such initial premises (but which were not totally subjective either).

The main polemic developed around Ingarden's concept of a polyphonic harmony, which to Iser seemed to be a figure of exaggerated ideal unity (Iser 1971). The role of the reader would be too narrow if we were to limit his or her task to the realization or reconstruction of the harmony already pre-existing in the work itself. Iser wanted to privilege the reader's activity and creativity, which for Ingarden functioned rather in a constant tension with the stratified skeleton of the work of art. However, Iser neglected the fact that Ingarden's harmony meant something different than the unified form of all components of the work. Ingarden

spoke rather of the appropriateness characterizing successful concretizations which do justice to the work, and not about the passive and static reconstruction of the ideal scenario structured by the work itself. Other axes of debate could be drawn along the problem of the contextual historicity of the phenomenon of indeterminacy, which was emphasized by Iser and had been neglected by Ingarden (Iser 1972). The degree of indeterminacy changes as history progresses. In consequence, the intensity of indeterminacy depends on the work's place in the evolution of literary styles and genres. Literary works exist only in history and their actualizations depend on the variability of readers' perspectives, on differences in the cultural contexts of the era, etc. While Ingarden focused more on the general and structural properties of a work of art, Iser attempted to create the tools to revise literary history. Consequently, Iser's theory could only be applied to literary studies, whereas for Ingarden indeterminacy was part of the phenomenology of perception as its branch of aesthetics.

Similarly to Polish structuralists, the Constance School of reception aesthetics emphasized that the work of art should be seen as an object existing in its "concretizations" and inscribed in the temporary horizon of its era (Jauss 1999, 6). Such dependence on the historical context allowed scholars to examine the dialectic of the work and its reception not only, as Ingarden suggested, as the structural and general property of literature, but as the property of a particular work which functions in the determined context of the time in which it is perceived. Thus the degree of indeterminacy is variable and strictly connected with the place the work occupies in the history of literature. (Modern texts include places of indeterminacy which cannot be removed.)

References

Ingarden, Roman. *Das literarische Kunstwerk: Eine Untersuchung aus dem Grenzgebiet der Ontologie, Logik und Literaturwissenschaft*. Halle: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1931.

Ingarden, Roman. *O poznawaniu dzieła literackiego*. Lviv: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1937.

Ingarden, Roman. *O dziele literackim: Badania z pogranicza ontologii, teorii języka i filozofii literatury*. Trans. by M. Turowicz. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1960.

Ingarden, Roman. *Vom Erkennen des literarischen Kunstwerks*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1968.

Głowiński, Michał. "O konkretyzacji." Michał Głowiński, *Style odbioru. Szkice o komunikacji literackiej*. Cracow: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1977. 93–115.

Iser, Wolfgang. *Die Appellstruktur der Texte: Unbestimmheit als Wirkungsbedingung literarischer Prosa*. Konstanz: Konstanz Universitätsverlag, 1971.

Iser, Wolfgang. "Indeterminacy and the Reader's Response in Prose Fiction." *Aspects of Narrative*. Ed. Joseph Hillis Miller. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1972. 1–45.

Iser, Wolfgang. *Der Akt des Lesens: Theorie ästhetischer Wirkung*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1976.

Jauss, Hans Robert. *Historia literatury jako prowokacja*. Trans. by M. Łukasiewicz. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Instytutu Badań Literackich, 1999.

Skwarczyńska, Stefania. "Przemilczenie jako element strukturalny dzieła literackiej." Stefania Skwarczyńska, *Z teorii literatury: cztery rozprawy*. Lodz: Poligrafika, 1947. 7–45.

Vodička, Felix. "Literárni historie. Jeji problémy a úkoly." Felix Vodička, *Čtêni o jazyce a poezii*. Eds. Bohuslav Havrânek and Jan Mukařovský. Prague: Družstevni práce, 1942. 307–400.

Schamma Schahadat
Literary Evolution

Literary evolution is a concept that was introduced to modern literary theory by the Russian formalists (see Igor Pilshchikov's chapter on Russian formalism in this volume), although the term had arisen previously, for instance in Ferdinand Brunetière's *Évolution des genres dans l'histoire de la littérature* of 1890, in which the influential positivist critic "took a warm interest in Darwin's evolutionary doctrine" (Juvan 2014, 304). While the Russian formalists were less interested in biology than in the functioning of the literary work, they were, of course, not the only ones concerned with the question as to how literary periods develop and change. However, what is special about their theory is that they were searching for a mechanism that defines literary change without relying on the content of the works. For Iurii Tynianov, who touches upon literary evolution in most of his texts in one way or another, it is precisely the shifts or the changes that can be observed in literary evolution that explain the literariness of the literary work. Only when we see the shifts that occur in the literary system can we recognize the 'literary fact'.

Iurii Tynianov's article "O literaturnoi ėvoliutsii" ("On Literary Evolution") from 1927 was, as Striedter writes, "the first explicit treatment of the theme" (Striedter 1989, 59), a theme that had been present in the formalists' texts and discussions for some time and reached its peak on December 16, 1928, when Tynianov gave a paper on literary evolution in Prague for the members of the Prague Linguistic Circle, following an invitation from Roman Jakobson (Kubíček 2018, 181). The discussions around Tynianov's paper proved, as Kubíček writes, that formalism was not enough to describe the structure of literature and language, and they finally resulted in Jakobson's and Tynianov's joint paper "Problemy izucheniia literatury i iazyka" ("Problems of Literary and Linguistic Studies"), which called for a programmatic departure from early formalism toward structuralism: "There can be no compromise with academic eclecticism, or the scholastic 'formalism' which replaces analyses by mere enumeration of terminology and cataloguing of phenomena" (Jakobson and Tynianov 1966). The "evolution of literature" proves to be a pivotal point for literary and linguistic theory:

> The evolution of literature cannot be understood if it is clouded by problems which interfere episodically from outside the system – problems of literary (so-called influences) or extra-literary genesis. The materials used in literature, whether they are literary or extra-literary, can only be the object of scientific investigation if they are considered in terms of their function within the work. (Jakobson and Tynianov 1966)

We will return to Tynianov's theory of literary evolution in detail later; first it has to be read against a teleological and historical perspective of literary history which argues in terms of decay or progression. The German literary historian Georg Gottfried Gervinus, for example, who from 1835 to 1842 wrote the first *Geschichte der poetischen Nationalliteratur der Deutschen* (*History of the poetic national literature of the Germans*), understood the history of German literature as a history of decay; here he followed Heine's and Hegel's notion of the "end of the artistic period" and diagnosed the literature after Classicism as an eclipse (Jauß 1970b, 150). On the other hand, the German Romance scholar, Ernst Robert Curtius, in his book *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter* from 1948 (*European Literature and the Middle Ages*, 2013), takes the "crisis of European culture" that became "obvious" in World War I as the starting point for his question: "How do cultures, and the historical entities which are their media, arise, grow, and decay?" (Curtius 2013, 4). Summarizing – and approving of – the British historian Arnold Toynbee, Curtius perceives individual cultures to be connected "genealogically"; one culture may be "the daughter culture of another" (Curtius 2013, 6). Curtius – like Toynbee – proceeds very organically, comparing cultures to "men climbing a steep cliff – some remain behind, others climb higher and higher" (Curtius 2013, 6). Curtius further observes that unlike Oswald Spengler, Toynbee states that the movement of culture is not "a fatally predetermined course"; rather, if not necessarily "progress", it is an "ascent" (Curtius 2013, 6). With his concept of European literature, Curtius argues against literary history writing of the nineteenth century like that of Gervinus, who focused on the history of a national literature; in opposition to Gervinus' history of German literature as a history of decline, Curtius proposes a European literary history climbing ever higher.

While Gervinus and Curtius described the history of literature as a family relationship, the typological perspective – which also holds true for the Russian formalists – detected conflicts in the course of cultural or literary history instead of a harmonious family genealogy. The theoreticians arguing from a typological instead of a teleological or historical standpoint detect the origin of literary antagonism in antiquity; this antagonism has constantly been repeated and forms a "pattern of literary polemics" in which the "elders" and the "innovators" are competing with each other (Jauß 1970a, 70), which regularly entails a change in the course of literary history, an evolution in which one school is supplanted by its opposite. In art history, Heinrich Wölfflin and Gustav René Hocke were proponents of this typological approach, differentiating between linear and pictural or Attic and Asiatic styles (see Jensen 1993, 9; Wölfflin 1915, 20–79; Hocke 1959, 12–13) that take regular turns: the Renaissance and the Baroque, Neoclassicism and Romanticism, Realism and Symbolism. Dmitrii Likhachev, a specialist in Old Russian literature, applied these typological models to literature, distinguishing

between a "pervichnyi" and a "vtorichnyi", a primary and secondary literary style. While the primary style is simple, close to reality, and ideological (like Classicism or Realism), the secondary style is complicated, decorative, and irrational (like Romanticism or Symbolism) (Likhachev 1998).

The Russian formalists based their idea of literary evolution on a binary model; later Wölfflin, Hocke, and Likhachev chose a similar approach. Unlike these thinkers, however, the formalists did not fill the two antagonistic types with any content; instead, they detected repeating agonal shifts between literary periods. The basic idea, which has its origin in early formalism in the 1910s and was further developed in the 1920s, originates from the key formalist term of automatization (*avtomatizatsiia*): each literary period begins with devices of estrangement that ultimately exhaust themselves; what originally launched the new period, deautomatization (*deavtomatizatsiia*), in turn becomes automatized, and a new period – the opposite of the old one – moves into the center. New devices take up the task or function of deautomatization: "if such a disruption is canonized, it will lose its power as a device of deceleration [as a device that makes language difficult]" (Shklovsky 2015, 173). Boris Ėikhenbaum summarized this process: "Art produces the canon in order to overcome it" (Ėikhenbaum in *Problemy poėtiki Pushkina*, quoted in Hansen-Löve 1978, 374).

One of the changes later formalism made in regard to the earlier theories was to move from synchrony to diachrony and from literature as a closed system to literature as one series in relation to other (cultural) series (Hansen-Löve 1978, 377). So while early formalism was concerned with the replacement of old, automatized devices with new, unusual, strange ones, later formalism extended this idea to the constant transfer of old, automatized, canonized genres and systems from the literary series to the literary everyday (*byt*) and vice versa (Hansen-Löve 1978, 383).

In "On Literary Evolution", Tynianov describes literary history (or literary evolution) as a "shift between systems", *smena sistem*, understanding literature as one system interacting with other systems (or series, *riady*): "The most important concept for literary evolution is, in fact, the 'shift' between systems", he writes (Tynianov 2019, 269).

With the aim of explaining literary evolution, Tynianov states: "All of its terms [i. e. the terms of literary history] must be reevaluated, beginning with the term 'literary history'" (Tynianov 2019, 268). He introduces new terms, some used in earlier essays, in order to offer a new perspective on literary history: evolution (as an intrinsic development of literature), genesis (as extrinsic, i. e. in relation to non-literary practices), literary series (*literaturnyi riad*), system and shift of systems, function, literary genre, and literary fact (*literaturnyi fakt*) (on the difference between 'evolution' and 'genesis' see Igor Pilshchikov's chapter on Russian formalism in this volume). Literary evolution is the key term and concept that Tyni-

anov turns against the "individualist psychological approach" and the "genesis of literature" (Tynianov 2019, 267). Literary evolution, for Tynianov, has to be seen from two perspectives: from that of the literary series and from that of neighbouring series such as "cultural, social, and 'real life' series" (Tynianov 2019, 267) which interact with the literary series. Here, Tynianov leaves the early formalist methodology which concentrated on the literary work alone, independently from its context. Instead he transforms literature into a system: literature as a work with "individual elements [...], such as plot or style, rhythm and syntax" (Tynianov 2019, 269) as well as literature as a whole are systems in which individual elements are "*all interrelated with one another* and exist in interaction" (Tynianov 2019, 269; italics in the original). The interdependence of these elements is governed by their function. Function, Tynianov explains, is a "complicated concept" (Tynianov 2019, 270), since it has to be viewed in its specific contexts – the same element may acquire a new function in a new context; this, however, will only become visible if one sees this element not only in its synchronic, but also in its diachronic perspective. The benefit of this perspective is that the shifts between the systems and hence literary evolution is laid bare.

One of Tynianov's examples clarifying this mechanism is the use of archaisms. He shows how the function of archaisms depends on the system in which they are used: while in Lomonosov's system they mark the high style of his poetics, in Tiutchev's system they acquire an "ironic function" (Tynianov 2019, 270). The immanent method, the studying of "a work of literature [...] as a system without reference to its interdependence with the system of literature" (Tynianov 2019, 271), does not provide any information about the literary evolution and has to be countered by the systemic and diachronic approach. "Strictly speaking, there can be no study of literary phenomena outside of their interrelations" (Tynianov 2019, 274).

The last two terms mentioned above, literary genre and literary fact, are closely interrelated and especially important for understanding literary evolution. In different literary periods, Tynianov argues, non-literary and literary genres may change places and acquire or lose the status of a literary fact. In his essay "O literaturnom fakte" ("Literary Fact") from 1924, he explains this process in detail. Tynianov's point of departure is that genre "is not a constant, immobile system" and that it "shifts" (Tynianov 2019a, 155). One striking example he gives to prove his point is the genre status of the letter: in the first half of the eighteenth century, the letter belonged to everyday life, *byt*. "Letters did not meddle with literature. They borrowed a good deal from the style of literary prose, but were themselves a long way from literature" (Tynianov 2019a, 165). The central position in the literary system at this time was occupied by poetry, the predominant genre being the ode, which then moved into everyday life before finally, in the age of Karamzin,

collapsing (Tynianov 2019a, 165). "Minor forms and intimate emotions appeared, and the psychological replaced the allegorical" (Tynianov 2019a, 165), Tynianov writes, and these minor forms, the letter being one of them, turned into literature (Tynianov 2019a, 166). However, these movements do not follow a linear development, they are disjointed: "'Not gradual evolution, but a leap; not development, but shift'" (2019a, 154; emphasis in the original). And, if one takes his article on parody from 1921 into consideration, this shift of systems or genres is not only dynamic, but agonal, as he demonstrates for the shift from Gogol' to Dostoevskii:

> Discussions of "literary tradition" or "succession" usually assume a more or less straight line linking the youngest representative of a given branch of literature with the eldest. However, things are actually much more complicated. Instead of a continuation of the straight line, there is something more like a departure, a reaction against something – a struggle. (Tynianov 2019b, 27)

Tynianov developed his theory on literary evolution over the course of many years, moving from the formula of the work as a sum of its devices to the work as a system. In order to explain the literariness of a work or to answer the question of the nature of literariness, which was the central question for the formalists, he needed the diachronic perspective. Only when we understand literary evolution, he argued, can we understand literariness. And it is no coincidence that he wrote his articles in the aftermath of the Russian Revolution, itself a shift of systems. Èikhenbaum quotes Shklovskii in his *Teoriia formal'nogo metoda* (*Theory of the Formal Method*): "Each new literary school heralds a revolution, something like the appearance of a new class" (Shlovksii, quoted in Eichenbaum 1965, 135; also quoted in Striedter 1989, 64). Formalism itself was revolutionary; it originated in a revolutionary context and regarded literary evolution as revolutionary, as moving in leaps.

The effect of formalist ideas on literary theories in the twentieth century is uncontested, and this also holds true for the concept of literary evolution. Traces of the formalist theory of evolution can be found in Slavic as well as in Western thinking, for example in works by the Czech literary historian Felix Vodička, a second-generation member of the Prague Linguistic Circle. While the Prague School's dependence on Russian formalism has been emphasized or rejected, depending on the point of view of the critic (see Striedter 1976, XI–XII), structuralism and with it the Prague School were, without doubt, the historical successors to Russian formalism (see Striedter 1976, IL; Meyer 1995, 43; Grob 2017, 102). In his article "Literární historie, její problémy a úkoly" ("Literary History: Its Problems and Tasks") from 1942 (translated into German as "Die Literaturgeschichte, ihre Probleme und Aufgaben", Vodička 1976), Vodička argues that literary works are part of a historical series: "literary works cannot be analyzed as

singular phenomenon, but [can only be analyzed] in their particular historical context" (Vodička 1976, 35). Thus the literary historian has the task of noting the changes in the work's development, of detecting them "as a dynamic component in a process of development" (Vodička 1976, 36). Vodička uses the formalist terminology (series, *riad*, 34, 35; and "fact" as in "literary fact", 46) in order to propose his own view of literary evolution as "the structural analysis of literary works, the registration of changes in their development, the recognition of evolutionary trends and the establishment of the evolutionary value of individual literary phenomena" (Vodička 1976, 45). However, not only does Vodička further develop Tynianov's evolutionary theory into a structuralist direction, but he also borrows the notion of "concretization" from the Polish phenomenologist Roman Ingarden when he defines one of the main tasks of the literary historian as the "study of the concretization of literary works" (Vodička 1976, 63), "borrow[ing] the term 'concretization' from [...] Ingarden, divorc[ing] it from the systematic context of phenomenological aesthetics, and modif[ying] it in a way that allows him to relate it to Mukařovský's conception of the work of art as a sign in an aesthetic function", as Striedter writes (1989, 123). Vodička pursues his argument for the "historicity of every concretization" (Striedter 1989, 125). And, as Thomas Grob shows in an overview of Slavic evolutionary models, Vodička also redefines the formalist terminology he employs: "structure" and "function" no longer mean "correlation", but "inner consistency, unifying hierarchization and teleology" (Grob 2017, 105). In the changing political and ideological context of the 1940s, Vodička adapts the formalist terms "in order to save the last remains of an autonomy aesthetics [*Autonomieästhetik*]" (Grob 2017, 105).

Although close to Russian formalism in many aspects, American New Criticism was decidedly anti-historian and did not adopt the diachronic thread of formalist theory; Victor Erlich, for example, in his discussion of Russian formalism and New Criticism states: "The Slavic Formalists had, if anything, too much historical sense" (Erlich 1955, 221; also quoted in Striedter 1989, 70). However, other Western theory trends refered to Tynianov's ideas on literary evolution, e. g. Hans Robert Jauß in his *Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory* and Harold Bloom in his books on the "anxiety of influence" and on "misreading". Jauß explicitly quotes Iurii Tynianov's *On Literary Evolution* (and also, in another context, Boris Tomashevskii, Jauß 1970, 14), calling it "one of the most significant beginnings in the renovation of literary history" (Jauß 1970, 25). However, he adapts Tynianov's theory for his own purposes, for the development of reception theory, and thus proposes including a "mutual mediation" (Jauß 1970, 25) in this dynamic interaction between old and new elements which change the literary system.

> Founding 'literary evolution' on an aesthetics of reception not only restores its lost direction by making the position of the literary historian the temporary term of this process. This procedure also emphasizes the fundamentally historical dimension of literary experience by stressing the variable distance between the immediate and potential meaning of a literary work,

he concludes (Jauß 1970, 26).

Harold Bloom is less explicit in regard to the Russian formalists, but his *Anxiety of Influence* (1973) and *A Map of Misreading* (1975) take up Tynianov's idea of the agonal relationship in the course of literary evolution: "The dialectic of cosmic love and hate governs poetic incarnation", he argues (Bloom 1975, 10). He puts the "act of misreading" of the great predecessors at the centre of the poet's development and thus at the centre of literary evolution; only in a dialectic of imitation and rejection can the younger poet compensate for his belatedness. Although Bloom is quite different to the Russian formalists with his references to Freud and to the Jewish tradition, the agonal relationship between the younger and the older poet is still reminiscent of the formalist theory of parody, of the relationship between Dostoevskii and Gogol' as traced by Tynianov's essay.

References

Bloom, Harold. *A Map of Misreading.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Curtius, Ernst Robert. *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*. Trans. by Colin Burrow. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2013.

Èikhenbaum, Boris [Eichenbaum, Boris]. "The Theory of the 'Formal Method'." *Russian Formalist Criticism: Four Essays.* Ed. and trans. by Lee T. Lemon and Marion J. Reis. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press 1965. 99–139.

Erlich, Victor. *Russian Formalism.* De Hague: Mouton, 1955.

Grob, Thomas. *Russische Postromantik: Baron Brambeus und die Spaltungen romantischer Autorschaft*. Frankfurt/M.: Peter Lang, 2017.

Hansen-Löve, Aage. *Der russische Formalismus*. Vienna: Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1978.

Hocke, Gustav René: *Manierismus in der Literatur: Sprach-Alchimie und esoterische Kombinationskunst*. Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1959. 12–13.

Jakobson, Roman, and Iurii Tynianov [J. Tynianov]. "Problems of Literary and Linguistic Studies." *New Left Review* 1.37 (May/June 1966). https://newleftreview.org/issues/i37/articles/r-jakobson-j-tynyanov-problems-of-literary-and-linguistic-studies (4 February 2022).

Jauß, Hans-Robert. "Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory." Trans. by Elizabeth Benziger. *New Literary History* 2.1 (Autumn 1970). 7–37. (Jauß 1970)

Jauß, Hans-Robert: "Schlegels und Schillers Replik auf die 'Querelle des Anciens et des Modernes'." Hans-Robert Jauß, *Literaturgeschichte als Provokation*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp 1970a. 67–106.

Jauß, Hans-Robert: "Literaturgeschichte als Provokation der Literaturwissenschaft." Hans-Robert Jauß, *Literaturgeschichte als Provokation der Literaturwissenschaft*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp 1970b, 144–207.

Jensen, Peter Alberg. "Zum Problem der primären und sekundären Stile." *Wiener Slawistischer Almanach* 32 (1993): 9–20.

Juvan, Marko. "Taking Darwin Metaphorically and Literally: Genres and Sciences in a Survival Struggle." *Neolithicon* 41.2 (2014): 303–315. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/267216018_Taking_Darwin_Metaphorically_and_Literally_Genres_and_Sciences_in_a_Survival_Struggle (25 January 2022).

Kubíček, Tomáš. "L'évolution littéraire selon Tynjanov et Jakobson au tournant des années 1920–1930." Trans. by Nelly Valtat and Laurent Vallance. *Communications* 2.103 (2018): 181–196.

Likhachev, Dmitrii. *Razvitie russkoi literatury X–XVII vekov: Ėpokhi i stili*. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 1998.

Meyer, Holt. "Exkurs: Formalismus und Strukturalismus." *Einführung in die Literaturwissenschaft*. Eds. Miltos Pechlivanos, Stefan Rieger, Wolfgang Struck, and Michael Weitz. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1995. 43–48.

Shklovsky, Viktor. "Art, as Device." Trans. and introduced by Alexandra Berlina. *Poetics Today* 36.3 (2015): 151–174.

Striedter, Iurii [Yuri]. "Einleitung." Felix Vodička, *Die Struktur der literarischen Entwicklung*. Ed. Forschungsgruppe für strukturale Methoden in der Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft an der Universität Konstanz. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1976. VII–CIII.

Striedter, Iurii [Jurij]. *Literary Structure, Evolution, and Value: Russian Formalism and Czech Structuralism Reconsidered*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989.

Tynianov, Iurii [Yuri]. "On Literary Evolution (1927)." Yuri Tynianov, *Permanent Evolution: Selected Essays on Literature, Theory and Film*. Ed. and trans. by Ainsley Morse and Philip Redko. Boston, MA: Academic Studies Press, 2019. 267–282.

Tynianov, Iurii [Yuri]. "Literary Fact (1924)." Yuri Tynianov, *Permanent Evolution: Selected Essays on Literature, Theory and Film*. Ed. and trans. by Ainsley Morse and Philip Redko. Boston, MA: Academic Studies Press, 2019a. 153–172.

Tynianov, Iurii [Yuri]. "Dostoyevsky and Gogol. (Toward a Theory of Parody) (1919/21)." Yuri Tynianov, *Permanent Evolution: Selected Essays on Literature, Theory and Film*. Ed. and trans. by Ainsley Morse and Philip Redko. Boston, MA: Academic Studies Press, 2019b. 27–63.

Vodička, Felix. "Die Literaturgeschichte, ihre Probleme und Aufgaben." Felix Vodička, *Die Struktur der literarischen Entwicklung*. Ed. Forschungsgruppe für strukturale Methoden in der Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft an der Universität Konstanz. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1976. 30–86.

Wölfflin, Heinrich. *Kunstgeschichtliche Begriffe: Das Problem der Stilentwicklung in der neueren Kunst*. Munich: Hugo Bruckmann, 1915.

Bernd Stiegler

Montage

The term *montage* has three meanings: firstly, in film it denotes a way of sequencing exposed pictures. Secondly, in photography, art and literature it describes the use of pictures, texts and other elements for a new composition. And thirdly, in German, *Montage* is also used for 'assembly', in the sense of the industrial or technical process of fitting together prefabricated materials. Montage thus connects very diverse epistemic and media images. In the literature to date, aesthetics and technology are generally considered separate spheres. At the same time, film montage itself is often distinguished from aesthetic montage, even though it doubtlessly belongs to the realm of the aesthetic. We thus have three fields with different definitions and significant distinctions. Aesthetic montage – e. g. in the form of photo montage – has often been understood as criticism of industrial montage and capitalist rationalisation and the principle of artistic montage has been conceived as diametrically opposed to the technical process. A prime example is the work of John Heartfield (which has been discussed at length by, for instance, Siepmann 1997; Mülhaupt 2009; Zervigón 2012; Kriebel 2014). While the one process of montage "puts together pieces of similar material to form a functional whole", the other tears heterogeneous materials "from their original and functional contexts in order to artistically work them into a new context" (Ott 1987, 732). The literature on the subject perpetuates this distinction between functional, technical and film montage and dysfunctional, aesthetic montage. On the one hand, theories originating from literary studies in particular emphasise the constitutive foreignness of the elements assembled in a montage. On the other hand, theories of montage in the field of film seek to develop narrative techniques to which this identification of 'foreign material as a constitutive trait' of montage does not apply, since it is a case of nothing other than cutting up and assembling filmic material – specifically, roles of exposed film. This double logic is characteristic of the theory of montage: one the one hand, Erika Billeter, drawing on Max Ernst, conceives of collage as the "meeting of realities of entirely different natures" (Kreuzer 1982, 9) and Hanno Möbius firmly rejects a "new unity in the sense of separateness" (Möbius 2000, 288). On the other hand, Russian montage theory in particular has developed diverse theories in order to employ montage as an aesthetic principle in the sense of having a deliberate and controlled impact on the viewer. The mid-1910s saw the Kuleshov effect (Kuleshov 1974), in which the director combined an identical shot of the famous actor Ivan Mozzhukhin with a number of very different motifs in such a way that the meaning of the first seemed to change, setting in motion a whole series of different theories and

practices of montage aiming to manipulate the audience's perception, association and thoughts. The technical and aesthetic techniques of montage were to be used to virtually create a calculated effect, a new attitude and political stance, thereby conditioning the viewer. Eisenstein (1998; 2008), Pudovkin (1949), Vertov (1984) and other directors developed different strategies and programmatic conceptualisations of montage, explicitly referring to Bekhterev's reflexological theory and Pavlov's conditioning (Vöhringer 2007). Only Eisenstein developed separate, independent methods, generally termed the montage of attractions, dialectical, tonal, metric, rhythmic, vertical and overtone montage, to which he devoted separate theoretical essays (Bordwell 2005; Lenz 2008). However, the same also holds for film in Western Europe and the USA (Dmytryk 1984), despite its different ideological precursors and different practices and theories. Eisenstein refers explicitly to the American film pioneer Griffith. As early as the 1910s, and to a greater extent in the 1920s, there developed filmic montage techniques that despite their many aesthetic and ideological differences all aimed to produce deliberate, calculated effects. If we are to do justice both historically and theoretically to the sudden emergence of theories of montage from the 1910s onwards, we must let go of this categorical distinction between technical, aesthetic and filmic montage. Rather, the fields overlap and are dependent on each other (Stiegler 2016). The same holds for the extremely potent concept of the 'New Man', who was to be technically constructed anew, as was the consensus among theorists and practitioners, especially in the 1920s: the psychotechnicians (from Münsterberg to Gastev) and writers (from Tret'iakov to Ėrenburg), engineers and film-makers, architects (from Gropius to Le Corbusier) and photographers, Taylorists (from Gilbreth to Schlesinger) and artists (from Rodchenko to van Doesburg). This idea was a key metaphor in cultural diagnoses, societal visions and media theories, and certainly in theories of montage too. Unlike in the traditional conceptions of man as a machine encountered in La Mettrie, for instance, the metaphor also extends to concrete social practice. It forms the background to the newly emerging filmic montage practices (and not only those of the Russian avant-garde films), the science of work and psychotechnology that were then spreading throughout the world, broad sections of the artistic movements of the age and not least to political theories between National Socialism and Stalinism.

Here, montage must be understood as a process not only encountered in and associated with different spheres, but also capable of neutralising political differences. Technology and montage form a purportedly neutral zone from which to tackle the eminently political agenda of reshaping society and man. Remarkably, this takes place in extremely different political camps, but also in a plethora of very heterogeneous epistemological fields. For instance, Taylorism and the German science of work (*Arbeitswissenschaft*) were broadly received and

implemented in Soviet Russia. Between the United States, Europe and Russia, technology formed a kind of zone of exchange that was thought to guarantee ideological and political neutrality. Montage and the imagined 'New Man' are almost global phenomena in which aesthetics and technology are systematically interconnected. Technology appears to be nothing more than mere construction and optimisation beyond political camps and montage seems to be its concrete realisation. If, however, we wish to understand montage historically, aesthetically and epistemologically, then we must conceive of it as a conscious and targeted construction. Even the ostensibly chaotic montage techniques of Dadaism and Surrealism are quite deliberately constructed. Moreover, the montage practices of art and aesthetics cannot be imagined without the assembly techniques of industry, just as, conversely, the Taylorist rationalisation processes of a Frank Bunker Gilbreth (2012) seek to devise a new, technical kind of art of living that is by no means limited to industrial production techniques. And in a different way, the filmic montage techniques developed in the 1910s and especially in the 1920s go back to theories of rationalisation and Taylorism, but also psychological conditioning. In particular, Hugo Münsterberg consistently combined them in his book *The Photoplay* (Münsterberg 1916).

The same holds for the aesthetic and political strategies of photo montage, which themselves aim to have calculated effects and without exception seek to propagate ideological convictions. Even the apparent anarchy of Dadaist photo montages (Adkins 2009; Hausmann 2016) is manifested against the backdrop of detailed theories of perception that seek to aesthetically realise and visually process the programme of a 'new seeing'. Raoul Hausmann spells them out in many of his texts. In Italian fascism (Baltzer 2015), Soviet Russia (Margolin 1997; Tupitsyn 2004) and in the field of advertising, to name just three very different areas, we encounter different montage techniques that seek to make reception aesthetically calculable. In montage, technology and aesthetics are necessarily combined.

Translated by John Heath

References

Adkins, Helen. *Erwin Blumenfeld: In Wahrheit war ich nur Berliner. Dada-Montagen 1916–1933*. Ostfildern: Hatje-Cantz, 2009.

Baltzer, Nanni. *Die Fotomontage im faschistischen Italien: Aspekte der Propaganda unter Mussolini*. Berlin and Boston, MA: Akademie, 2015.

Bordwell, David. *The Cinema of Eisenstein*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2005.

Dmytryk, Edward. *On Film Editing: An Introduction to the Art of Film Construction*. Boston, MA, and London: Focal Press, 1984.

Èisenshtein [Eisenstein], Sergei M. *Eisenstein Reader*. London: British Film Institute, 1998.

Èisenshtein, Sergei M. [Eisenstein, Sergej]. *Die Methode*. 4 Vols. Ed. Oksana Bulgakowa. Berlin: Potemkin Press, 2008.

Gilbreth, Frank Bunker, and Lillian Moller. *Die Magie des Bewegungsstudiums: Photographie und Film im Dienst der Psychotechnik und der Wissenschaftlichen Betriebsführung*. Ed. Bernd Stiegler. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 2012.

Hausmann, Raoul. *Photographisches Sehen: Schriften zur Photographie 1921–1968*. Ed. Berlinische Galerie, Musée départemental d'art contemporain de Rochechouart, and Bernd Stiegler. Paderborn: Wilhelm Fink, 2016.

Kreuzer, Helmut. "Zur Avantgarde- und Montage-Diskussion – und zu diesem Heft." *Montage*. Ed. Helmut Kreuzer. Special Issue of *Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik* 46 (1982). 7–18.

Kriebel, Sabine T. *Revolutionary Beauty: The Radical Photomontages of John Heartfield*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 2014.

Kuleshov, Lev. *Kuleshov on Film: Writings*. Ed. and trans. by Roland Robert Levaco. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1974.

Lenz, Felix. *Sergej Eisenstein: Montagezeit, Rhythmus, Formdramaturgie, Pathos*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 2008.

Margolin, Victor. *The Struggle for Utopia: Rodchenko, Lissitsky, Moholy-Nagy 1917–1946*, Chicago, IL, and London: University of Chicago Press, 1997.

Möbius, Hanno. *Montage und Collage*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 2000.

Mülhaupt, Freya (ed.). *John Heartfield: Zeitungsausschnitte Fotomontagen 1918–1938*. Ostfildern: Hatje-Cantz, 2009.

Münsterberg, Hugo. *The Photoplay: A psychological study*. New York, NY, and London: Appleton, 1916. http://vlp.mpiwg-berlin.mpg.de/library/data/lit38804/index_html?pn=1 (17 February 2022).

Ott, Ulrich (ed.). *Literatur im Industriezeitalter: Eine Ausstellung des Deutschen Literaturarchivs im Schiller-Nationalmuseum Marbach am Neckar*. Vol. 2. Marbach 1987.

Pudovkin, Vsevolod I. *Film Technique and Film Acting: The Cinema Writings of V. I. Pudovkin*. New York, NY: Bonanza Books, 1949.

Siepmann, Eckhard. *Montage: John Heartfield: Vom Club Dada zur Arbeiter-Illustrierten Zeitung*. Berlin: Elefanten Press, 1977.

Stiegler, Bernd. *Der montierte Mensch: Eine Figur der Moderne*. Paderborn: Wilhelm Fink, 2016.

Tupitsyn, Margarita. *Gustav Klutsis and Valentina Kulagina: Photography and Montage after Constructivism*. Göttingen: Steidl, 2004.

Vertov, Dziga. *Kino-Eye: The Writings of Dziga Vertov*. Ed. Annette Michelson. Trans. by Kevin O'Brien. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1984.

Vöhringer, Margarethe. *Avantgarde und Psychotechnik: Wissenschaft, Kunst und Technik der Wahrnehmungsexperimente in der frühen Sowjetunion*. Göttingen: Wallstein, 2007.

Zervigón, Andrés Mario. *John Heartfield and the Agitated Image: Photography, Persuasion, and the Rise of Avant-Garde Photomontage*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2012.

Susanne Strätling
Novoe zrenie / Neues Sehen / New Vision

New Vision is an aesthetic concept that emerged in the 1920s simultaneously in both literature and the visual arts. Across the media, New Vision intended a critique of classical realistic representation and a break with habitual patterns of perception. As a genuinely pan-European movement it had institutional hubs in Weimar and Dessau (Bauhaus), St Petersburg (State Institute of Artistic Culture [Gosudarstvennyi institut khudozhestvennoi kul'tury, GINKhUK]), and Moscow (Institute of Artistic Culture [Institut khudozhestvennoi kul'tury, INKhUK] and Higher State Artistic and Technical Studios [Vysshiye khudozhestvenno-tekhnicheskie masterskie, Vkhutemas]) – as well as in Łódź (Association of Polish Artists and Designers [Związek Zawodowy Polskich Artystów Plastyków], Karol Hiller, Władysław Strzemiński) and Leiden (De Stijl). While transatlantic ideas made a decisive impact on New Vision through straight photography (Alfred Stieglitz, Edward Weston), New Vision in turn had a formative influence on Modernist art in the United States via protagonists such as the Hungarian constructivist László Moholy-Nagy, who in the years 1923–1928 worked at the Bauhaus school in Weimar and then Dessau to become the first director of the New Bauhaus established in Chicago in 1937. It was canonized as an international avant-garde movement with the 1929 Werkbund exhibition *Film und Foto* (called *FiFo*) in Stuttgart, featuring almost 200 artists and subsequently showing in Zurich, Berlin, Gdańsk, Vienna, as well as sections of the exhibition in Tokyo and Osaka.

The key notions of New Vision are summed up in a review of *FiFo* by the architect and Werkbund member Gustav Stotz:

> A new optic has developed. We see things around us differently than before, without painterly aims in an impressionistic sense. Also things are important to us today which were hardly noticed before, i. e. shoe trees, a gutter, spools of thread, material, machines, and so forth. They interest us in their material substance, in their simple thingness. (Stotz 1929, 154)

Even if the concept of New Vision is most closely associated with photography, the first to articulate the principle of New Vision were the literary theorists of early Russian formalism. Formalism, in the context of the poetics of defamiliarization (see Erik Martin's chapter on *ostranenie* in this volume), coined the term 'New Vision' in reference to the devices of estrangement in presentation and perception. In his seminal essay "Iskusstvo kak priem" (1917, "Art as Technique"), Viktor Shklovskii asserted that defamiliarization aesthetics is based on the antagonism between *seeing* (*videnie*) and *recognition* (*uznavanie*): "The purpose of art is to impart a sensation of things as seeing and not as recognition" (Shklovskii 1917, 8).

As an artistic technique that wrenches things from their usual context, defamiliarization increases the difficulty of poetic language, resulting in an impeded perception of aesthetic objects that opens up new perspectives on art and life. The formalist concept of seeing results from this unexpected and alienated mode of apprehension through cognitive *misconception* (*neuznavanie*). As a re-framed form of sight it is oriented toward a sharpened awareness for the processes of making and discerning aesthetic objects by reason of their technical and physical qualities. Seeing is a particular perception that lies between intensified *sensual experience* (*oshushchenie*) and an emphatic first-time encounter.

To more precisely define the quality of seeing in the sense of perceiving and producing difference, Shklovskii introduced, ten years later, the poetic agenda of New Vision. In his article "O pisatele" (1927, "The Writer") he states that the writer "has to be a person, who sees things anew" (Shklovskii 1927, 30). Shklovskii returned to this concept more explicitly in his late works on literature and cinematography (*Za sorok let*, 1965, *Forty years later*), namely in the film adaption of Chekhov's novella *Dama s sobachkoj* (1899, *The Lady with the Dog*), and in the last pages of his late *Povesti o proze* (1966, *Stories on Prose*) with a brief chapter entitled "On New Vision" ("O novom videnii"), which was dedicated to the imagery in Sholokhov's epic novel *Tikhij Don* (1925–1932, *And Quiet Flows the Don*). Here, Shklovskii pointed out a double bind specific to New Vision. Although New Vision emphasizes the possibility (and necessity) of seeing things from a different perspective, from a novel and unexpected angle, what is seen at no point translates into a coherent, comprehensible, consistent image: New Vision is per se iconoclastic, it disarticulates forms and frames.

The early formalist juxtaposition of seeing (anew) and recognition in literary theory has two main objectives:

Firstly, it addresses poetic aspects of perception and production within the conceptual framework of optics. From this (new) point of view, literature is no longer considered a verbal art but becomes a visual art that is leveled at the eye. The theory of New Vision therefore regards all forms of art and media, including the written, primarily as optical. Formalism had already anticipated the pivotal significance of the image in literature. However, the iconoclastic nature of New Vision categorically precludes any immediate reference to the literary image of the inner eye of the imagination. In his essay "O khudozhestvennom slove" (1987 [1921], "On the artistic word"), Boris Èikhenbaum conceded that

> [...] perhaps people exist whose visual imagination is so strongly developed that they 'see' words, that is, that they can create all kinds of images with their inner eye. But this is a psychological idiosyncrasy and has nothing to do with poetry. [...] Ideas evoked by speaking or words are not visual ideas. (Èikhenbaum 1987 [1921], 337)

This verdict on visual idealism in poetics is in keeping with the avant-garde emphasis on object-oriented art. El Lissitzky explicitly summed up the specific material visuality in literature in the first thesis of his Merz manifesto "Topographie der Typographie" (1923, "Topography of Typography"): "The words on a printed page are read and not listened to" (Lissitzky 1923). Each and every problem related to texts being heard or read thus becomes a problem of the visibility of writing. Because literature, along with other (aesthetic) phenomena, is now identified as "optical wave motion" (Lissitzky 1925, 152), Moholy-Nagy called for a "new culture of seeing" (Moholy-Nagy 1925a, 348) in regard to books, making reading an experience of New Vision. His call resonated with Dada and constructivist posters and book art, for example in John Heartfield's montages combining photos and text or Lissitzky's book-art object for Vladimir Maiakovskii's poem "Dlia golosa" ("For the voice"), which was published in 1923 in Berlin.

Secondly, the objectives of New Vision establish the eye as the primary organ of aesthetic experience. Wholly consistent with the "scopic regime of modernity" (Jay 1988), art – manifest in a diversity of media – privileges the sense of sight in qualitatively different ways. Thus, under the auspices of the Modernist visual turn, retinal processing determines the aesthetic status of an object. The triumph of the new visual media leads to an apotheosis of the eye, with film and photography, now mass-reproducible, at the forefront. In this way, the avant-garde aesthetics of New Vision continues in the tradition of a well-established cultural ocularcentrism that, since antiquity, regards the eye as the privileged organ of art and knowledge. However, in contrast to the classical 'nobility of sight' (*Adel des Sehens*; see Hans Jonas 2010), Modernist New Vision is no longer at the command of a disembodied, rationalistic aesthetic with its idealistic eye of cognition and of theoretical contemplation. Rather, New Vision stands at the crossroads of at least three optical dispositifs, each creating their own visual subcultures: a) modern knowledge of the psychophysics of seeing; b) modern technologies of vision and electromechanical augmentations of the eye; and c) modern utopias of omni-visibility prompted by the dissolution of the visible into currents and rays.

Re a) Theories of optical perception strongly influence the New Vision theorem, especially those advanced by Hermann von Helmholtz and those of empirical experimental psychology in the wake of Gustav Fechner or Wilhelm Wundt, the latter a former student of Helmholtz. Helmholtz's studies on the anatomy of the eye and on the physiology of facial perception – as well as Wundt's research on the psychological intensity of neural stimuli and the so-called 'Wundt illusion' – inspired many artists of the Modernist period to experiment aesthetically and scientifically with the perception of color, form, and light. Series of experiments and extensive test studies on light stimuli, optic nerves, as well as central and peripheral stimuli were, for example, carried out by the painter and art theorist

Mikhail Matiushin, head of the department of organic culture at Leningrad State Institute of Artistic Culture (GINKhUK). The methods used were derived not only from those of Helmholtz but also especially from Wilhelm Ostwald's *Farbenlehre* (1918–1923, *Color theory*), which was translated into Russian in 1926 (Matiushin 1932). Artistic research on the psychophysics of vision also led to a synesthetic optic. Wassily Kandinsky, who was intimately acquainted with Wundt's writings, initiated research in this field during his brief functions in 1920 as the first director of the Moscow Institute of Artistic Culture (INKhUK) and in 1921 as the initiator of the physico-psychology department at the State Academy of Art Studies (*Gosudarstvennaia akademiia khudozhestvennykh nauk*, GAKhN), yet could only establish his psychophysical investigations of perception of color, form, sound, and space while a Bauhaus teacher from 1922 to 1933.

Re b) In film and photography, the eye fetishism of the avant-garde was inseparably related to attempts at compensating for the deficiencies in the human eye by means of technical devices. Reciprocally superimposing the human and the camera lens as expressed, for example, in the metaphors *kino-glaz* (1924, 'camera eye', Dziga Vertov) or *Foto-Auge* (1929, 'photo eye', Franz Roh and Jan Tschichold) was part of the great avant-garde utopia of the transformation of the human body into a machine. At the same time, the camera as an eye prosthesis of this body and as a new way of seeing also engendered a new visual language. Vertov had his *kino-glaz* say: "I am kino-eye. I am a mechanical eye. I, a machine, show you the world as only I can see it. [...] My path leads to a fresh perception of the world. I decipher in a new way a world unknown to you" (Vertov 1923, 135). The literary theorist Osip Brik reacted by stating the following: "Vertov is right. The camera can act in an autonomous fashion. It can see things that man is not accustomed to seeing. [...] The ordinary human field of vision must be abandoned" (Brik 1926, 22). The technogenic perfection of human perception went hand in hand with shaping it. The constructivist Aleksandr Rodchenko, one of the participants at *FiFo* in 1929, postulated that

> [...] to teach people a new way of seeing [...] [requires that] everyday, familiar objects be revealed to them from surprising angles and in unexpected circumstance. [...] We must [...] unlock the world of the visible. We must revolutionize our visual thinking. We must draw back the curtain from our eyes. (Rodchenko 1928, 38)

In this vein, New Vision does not just imply an altered, more intense way of seeing confined to the logics of defamiliarization. Rather, it refers to a depersonalized, objective, neutral, even pure way of seeing: "For this reason we have in the camera the most reliable tool in our possession for regaining a truly objective way of seeing" (Moholy-Nagy 1925b, 26). Moholy-Nagy, in his essay "fotografie: die objektive sehform unserer zeit" (1936, "Photography: The objective mode

of vision in our times"), differentiated between eight kinds of objective photographic vision: seeing abstractly, precisely, quickly, slowly, more, simultaneously, and differently. Together they represent one ideal of vision: seeing everything everywhere. The integration of a technogenic eye into an organic body pursues a radical policy of panopticism.

Re c) New Vision expands the hitherto known horizons of visibility with the phantasm of ubiquitous and total surveillance. Just as the telescope, microscope, and daguerreotype had remapped the domain of vision in earlier days, Modernism in the twentieth century faced the influence of new technologies that provide access to previously concealed sights. Especially film as the most prominent among the new developments in image media cultivates transgressions of vision, promising to explore the realms of the "optical unconscious" (Benjamin 1977, 162). Furthermore, the fascination for a boundless vision also precipitates in the search for optical media and forms of seeing that are thought to make the occult spheres of the invisible accessible. The scientific discovery of a new type of radiation (X-rays) or new sources and kinds of energy triggered intensive research in the area of thoughtography (also called psychic photography), which was intensively explored throughout Europe. For example, in 1913 Louis Darget sent his essay "Exposé des differents méthodes" ("Exposé on various methods"), together with several photographic prints, to Kandinskii, who experimented with techniques in producing spiritualistic vision himself.

However, the modernist project to integrate extra-retinal phenomena into the field of vision did not necessarily require film or photography technology. Inspired by ideas of omni-visibility, Matiushin founded the *Zorved* Group (acronym derived from *zorkoe vedenie*, i. e. sharp sighted knowledge) in 1923 with his laboratory at GINKhUK. *Zorved* studied ways of expanding the horizon of vision to encompass 360 degrees:

> Latest results in research have proven that the centers of the brain processing spatial impressions, light, color, and form are at the rear of the skull. A series of experiments and observations made by 'Zorved' artists clearly lead to the conclusion that the visual cortex at the occiput responds to spatial stimuli. (Matiushin 1923, 15)

To explore this, Matiushin asked his students to see in terms of "breadth" and – without moving their bodies – allow their "eyes follow the shape of the object under observation" (Matiushin, quoted and trans. in Klotz 1991, 44).

The conceptual spectrum of New Vision clearly demonstrates the ambivalence of the visual turn of the Modernist era, revealing the field of vision to be a highly contested terrain. New Vision is not only on the lookout for enhanced or augmented visual impressions that have been optimized and upgraded by technical devices or psychophysical training. Not least, the visual turn displays, again

and again, an alienated or obscured vision. The writer and theorist Sergei Tret'-iakov (1928) coined the metaphor 'steamy glasses' (*neprotertye ochki*) to describe this kind of handicapped seeing under difficult conditions and from unusual points of view. Yet, the limits of Modernist optical fetishism have nowhere been as impressively and painfully exhibited as in the film *Un chien andalou* (1929, *An Andalusian Dog*) by Luis Buñuel and Salvador Dalí, with its close shot of slicing through an open eye. These optic counter-narratives witness the "denigration[s] of vision" (Jay 1994) in Modernist aesthetics. They reveal a concept of New Vision not in the shape of an apology but as a critique of visibility. Modernist New Vision revels in excessive sights while also engaged in an iconoclasm that generates new modes of blindness.

References

Benjamin, Walter. "Das Kunstwerk im Zeitalter seiner technischen Reproduzierbarkeit." Walter Benjamin, *Ausgewählte Schriften*. Vol. 1: *Illuminationen*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1977. 136–169.

Brik, Osip. "Chego ne vidit glaz." *Sovetskoe foto* 2 (1926): 22–23.

Èikhenbaum, Boris. "O khudozhestvennom slove." [1921] Boris Èikhenbaum, *O literature: Raboty raznykh let*. Eds. E. A. Toddes, M. A. Chudakova, and A. P. Chudakov. Moscow: Sovetskij pisatel', 1987. 331–343.

Jay, Martin. "Scopic Regimes of Modernity." *Visioning Visuality*. Ed. Hal Foster. Seattle, WA: Bay Press, 1988. 3–23.

Jay, Martin. *Downcast Eyes: The Denigration of Vision in Twentieth-Century French Thought*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1994.

Jonas, Hans. "Der Adel des Sehens: Eine Untersuchung zur Phänomenologie der Sinne." Hans Jonas, *Organismus und Freiheit*. Freiburg, Berlin, and Vienna: Rombach, 2010. 243–275.

Klotz, Heinrich. *Matjuschin und die Leningrader Avantgarde*. Stuttgart: Oktogon, 1991.

Lissitzky, El. "Topographie der Typographie." *Merz* 4 (1923): 47.

Lissitzky, El. "Typographische Tatsachen." *Gutenberg-Festschrift*. Ed. Aloys Ruppel. Mainz: Verlag der Gutenberg-Gesellschaft, 1925. 152–54.

Matiushin, Mikhail. "Ne iskusstvo, a zhizn'." *Zhizn' iskusstva* 20 (1923): 15.

Matiushin, Mikhail. *Spravochnik po tsvetu: Zakonomernost' izmeniaemosti tsvetovykh sochetanii*. Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo izobrazitel'nykh iskusstv, 1932.

Moholy-Nagy, László. "Kunstbetrachtung = Weltbetrachtung." *Offset-, Buch- und Werbekunst: Das Blatt für Drucker, Werbefachleute und Verleger* 6 (1925a): 343–349.

Moholy-Nagy, László. *Malerei, Fotografie, Film*. Bauhaus Buch Nr. 8. Munich: Langen, 1925b.

Moholy-Nagy, László. "fotografie: die objektive sehform unserer zeit." *Telehor: Internationale Zeitschrift für visuelle Kultur*. Special Issue 1–2 (1936): 120–122.

Ostwald, Wilhelm. *Die Farbenlehre*. 5 Vols. Leipzig: Unesma, 1918–1923.

Rodchenko, Aleksandr. "Puti sovremennoi fotografii." *Novyi LEF* 9 (1928): 31–39.

Shklovskii, Viktor. "Iskusstvo kak priem." *Sborniki po teorii poeticheskogo iazyka*. Vol. 2. Ed. Viktor Shklovskii. Petrograd: Tipografiia 3. Sokolinskogo, 1917. 2–14.

Shklovskii, Viktor. "O pisatele." *LEF* 1 (1927): 29–33.

Shklovskii, Viktor. *Za sorok let*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Iskusstvo, 1965.

Shklovskii, Viktor. *Povesti o proze*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1966.

Stotz, Gustav. "Werkbund-Ausstellung 'Film und Foto', Stuttgart 1929." *Das Kunstblatt* 13 (Mai 1929): 154.

Tret'iakov, Sergei. "Skvoz' neprotertye ochki." *Novyi LEF* 9 (1928): 20–24.

Vertov, Dziga. "Kinoki: Perevorot." *LEF* 3 (1923): 135–143.

Sylvia Sasse
Theatricality

"Theater without theatricality is rabbit stew without the rabbit" writes Nikolai Evreinov (1879–1953) in "The Theatre For Oneself" (*Teatr dlia sebia*). "The kind of food that when you try some, it doesn't satisfy your hunger, it only makes you crave normal food" (Evreinov 2002a, 285). This culinary metaphor contains not only a polemic against Konstantin Stanislavskii's naturalist theater, but also the kernel of a theory of the theater that Evreinov would develop in the first decades of the twentieth century, and which still makes itself felt today, in theater studies and beyond.

For Evreinov, theatricality is not limited to the theater; indeed he seeks to expand the concept of theatricality beyond the theater, to include all areas of life. He sees theater everywhere, he writes of a theatrocracy, of a natural human instinct to transform oneself and to play roles. This instinct is the material that the theater works with and enacts. An engagement with the theatricality of everyday life means, in Evreinov's view, an historical analysis of the mostly negative ideas associated with the theater. Evreinov sees theatricality being rolled back from everyday life and restricted to the theater, where there is more going on than what Aristotle's notion of catharsis describes: the audience vicariously experiences the negative emotions portrayed on the stage, in order to be freed from them. He sees play itself being vicariously displayed on the stage. In other words: the theater allows the audience to identify, for a short time, with play itself, in order to then set it aside and be authentic during everyday life. In the late nineteenth century, in his account, theatricality is banished even from the theater, to be replaced by realistic and naturalistic theater. It is this repression that ultimately leads to a tremendous appetite for theatre, as Evreinov points out with his culinary comparison that follows the logic of the forbidden fruit.

If we take up this long-neglected thread of Evreinov's theory, we can find a number of quite different connections, some of which have an explicit connection to Evreinov, while others lead to another time period and to other theoretical interests in the theatricality of life. The performance studies initiated by Richard Schechner in New York in 1967 can be read in essence as a moment in which the concepts floated by Evreinov led to a genuine renewal of theater studies, by giving it an eye towards everyday life. Like Evreinov, Schechner set out to investigate performances that do not take place only in the theater: rituals, games, political events, festivals, etc. Schechner, however, unlike Evreinov, draws on other disciplines, especially ethnology and anthropology. He refers to Evreinov's work as a director when he looks for examples of the ripping of the boundaries between

reality and fiction. In this connection, he names Evreinov's mass spectacle *The Storming of the Winter Palace* (*Vziatie Zimnego Dvortsa*) (Schechner 2009, 126).

Schechner, like the ethnologist Victor Turner, whose 1982 work *From Ritual to Theatre: the Human Seriousness to Play* paved the way for a synthesis of ritual and experimental theater, was decisive in the development of an anthropology of the theater in the spirit of Evreinov's ideas. Evreinov himself saw theater both as an everyday practice, and as an anthropological category. Yet the concept of theatricality did not take as firm root in the years that followed as that of performance. Marvin Carlson even speaks of performativity and theatricality as opposing concepts (Carlson 2002; cf. Reinelt 2002). The consequence of this, despite the attempt by Elizabeth Burns to put theatricality front and center in her 1972 study, *Theatricality,* can be seen in the current social anthropology and interaction theory studies of the theater of the everyday. Burns' study is an answer to Erving Goffman's 1956 book *The Presentation of the Self in Everyday Life.* Goffman's interest is limited to those scenarios where a single person appears before others, not, as in Evreinov, including the theater one enacts for oneself. For Goffman, the self is created through its presentation to an audience, taking shape only through the confirmation of others, not only the actor (Goffman 1959). Burns builds on this idea, saying that the idea of theatricality does not refer to some behavior or expression as such, but rather "attaches to any kind of behavior perceived and interpreted by others and described (mentally or explicitly) in theatrical terms" (Burns 1972, 5). A concept of theatricality thus characterized by dialogic perception is not what Evreinov has in mind. He is not interested in the self being observed by and taking shape before actual others, but rather for the imagination of the self as an act of self-reflection.

It was the theater studies of the German-speaking world of the 1990s, especially the work of Erika Fischer-Lichte, that first conceived of theatricality and performativity as concepts not opposed to one another, likewise incorporating Evreinov's concept of theatricality in the scholarship on performativity (Fischer-Lichte, 2004). The turn was made possible by the republication of Evreinov's works in Russia, and the subsequent translation into German of his central works on the theory of the theater (recent scholarly works devoted to Evreinov's theory of the theater include Carnicke 1989, Dzhurova 2020, and Lukanitschewa 2013).

Evreinov's conception of the theater can only be understood against the backdrop of the theater debates of his time. Evreinov's broad understanding of the theater is intended to challenge not only his opponent Stanislavskii, but also Edward Gordon Craig, Vsevolod Meyerhold and Stanisław Ignacy Witkiewicz. Even though each of these three was opposed Stanislavskii's *naturalism*, Evreinov went so far as to reject any distinction between the authentic – that is, the naturalistic – and the theatrical. Craig, Witkiewicz, and Meyerhold tried to overcome

Stanislavskii's call for naturalism and the rejection of any kind of mask primarily through a commitment to a completely artificial theater: Craig by using the marionette as a sublimated, impersonal actor; Meyerhold through biomechanics, an anti-psychological, purely physical training method for actors, and Witkiewicz with his call for a 'pure' metaphysical and artificial theater that bears no relation to real life. Evreinov counters all this by observing that theatricality is itself naturalistic. He equates naturalism and theater, and goes farther: it is the so-called 'naturalism' that is the hardest role to play: "Oh, this same old naturalism! This laughable, this preposterously naïve naturalism! We cracked it ages ago, and Oscar Wilde even said it – this is the hardest role of all." (Evreinov 2002a, 154)

This equivalence between nature and theater is absolutely fundamental for Evreinov. He develops an idea of theater that he follows Nietzsche in calling a 'will to theater', while, with an eye on the psychological research on play going on at the turn of the twentieth century, also speaking of a "theater-drive". This original theater-drive – Evreinov also calls it a "transformation-drive" ("instinkt preobrazhenia") or "theatricality-drive" ("instinkt teatral'nosti") (Evreinov 2002b, 43), with which he rounds out the *self-preservation-drive*, the *death-drive*, and the *sex-drive* that were so well-represented in the literature around 1900 – is, according to Evreinov, 'pre-aesthetic', and therefore inherent in every individual human, and even plants and animals. Everyone plays at theater, whether through mimicry, through play-fighting, or through courtship displays. Evreinov defines this drive as "the instinct for meeting images from the external world with artificial images concocted through a pre-aesthetic drive to transform observable nature." (Evreinov 2002a, 118) The essence of this drive is therefore its creative, transformative process, which is not contained in a mere imitation game nor in playful desire. The theater-drive is not only something a human instinctively follows, but also something that shapes a human being, even defines what it is to be human. The essence of human being consists in this longing to transform the perceived world and a yearning to be different. This does not negate individuality, it only ceases to take individuality as its basic measure. Evreinov writes: "The main thing is not to be yourself! That is the theatrical imperative of the human soul" (Evreinov 2002a, 156).

Following Jacques Rancière's attempt, in the spirit of the theater-skeptical Plato, to divide ideas about the audience in twentieth-century theater into two groups, exemplified by Bertolt Brecht (*maximum distancing*) and Antonin Artaud (*maximum involvement*), Evreinov's theater of theatricality offers a third, anti-Platonic model for the relationship between the audience and the actor in the theater. We could call this a 'self-examination of the theater', in the theater of everyday life, concentrating on the reciprocal relationship between observing and acting. In Evreinov's "Theater For Oneself" we can find Rancière's plea for an "eman-

cipation of the spectator" (Rancière 2021, 17) at work, a plea not to turn viewers into actors or actors into viewers, but to take viewing as a 'normal situation', as an everyday practice, as an action, which can be best researched in the theater, or in life, which is always theater anyway.

Evreinov's conception of theater doesn't stop at the book or the text, as can be seen in his 1912 text "Theater as Such". There, Evreinov presents himself as a writing fool: "Tra-ta-ta…I proclaim before you as a clown today, and as a holy man tomorrow … For I am proclaiming the saving grace of the holy – theatricality! I proclaim, the apostle in the merry rags of a fool!" (Evreinov 2002b, 34). In "Theater For Oneself" he says it explicitly: "Books are theater!" (Evreinov 2002a, 115).

Theater also applies to theory, which for Evreinov is not only something aesthetic, but also an act, a theatrical act. So one can never be quite sure in his texts whether Evreinov speaks as a 'fool', or as a 'serious' theoretician, whether his claims are meant ironically or not. The provocative destabilization of words means we must read the theatrical as a semantic level of the text. Evreinov compels his reader not to forget the performative aspect even of his theoretical texts. Theatricality for Evreinov is therefore also an implicit level of the text, one that largely determines the meaning of the words.

Translated by Andrew Hamilton

References

Burns, Elizabeth. *Theatricality: A Study of Convention in the Theatre and in Social Life*. London: Longman, 1972.

Carlson, Marvin. "The Resistance of Theatricality." *SubStance* 31.2/3 (2002): 238–250.

Carnicke, Sharon M. *The Theatrical Instinct: Nikolai Evreinov and the Russian Theatre of the Early Twentieth Century*. New York, NY, Bern, Frankfurt/M. et al.: Peter Lang, 1989.

Dzhurova, Tat'iana. *Kontseptsiia teatral'nosti v tvorchestve N.N. Evreinova*. St. Petersburg: Izdatel'stvo SPbGATI, 2010.

Evreinov, Nikolai. "Teatr dlia sebia". Nikolai Evreinov, *Demon teatral'nosti*. Eds. A. Iu. Zubkov and Vadim I. Maksimov. Moscow and St. Petersburg: Lentnii sad, 2002a. 113–406.

Evreinov, Nikolai. "Teatr kak takovoi." Nikolai Evreinov, *Demon teatral'nosti*. Eds. A. Iu. Zubkov and Vadim I. Maksimov. Moscow and St. Petersburg: Letnii sad, 2002b. 29–96.

Fischer-Lichte, Erika (ed.). *Theatralität als Modell in den Kulturwissenschaften*. Tübingen and Basel: Francke, 2004.

Goffman, Erving. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York, NY et al.: Doubleday, 1959.

Lukanitschewa, Swetlana. *Das Theatralitätskonzept von Nikolai Evreinov: Die Entdeckung der Kultur als Performance*. Tübingen and Basel: Francke, 2013.

Rancière, Jaques. *The Emancipated Spectator*. 2nd edition. Trans. by Gregory Elliott. London and New York, NY: Verso, 2021.

Reinelt, Janelle. "The Politics of Discourse: Performativity meets Theatricality." *SubStance* 31.2/3 (2002): 201–215.

Schechner, Richard. *Performance Studies: An Introduction*. 2nd edition. New York, NY, and London: Routledge, 2009.

Contributors

Prof. Dr. **Veronika Ambros**, University of Toronto (II.9. Semiotics of Drama and Theatre: The Prague School Model)

Prof. Dr. **Robert Bird †**, University of Chicago (II.4. Hermeneutics in Russia)

Prof. Dr. **Craig Brandist**, University of Sheffield (II.1. The Institute for the Comparative History of the Literatures and Languages of the West and East (ILIaZV), II.6. Sociological and Marxist Literary Theory in Colonial Context, II.8. Bakhtin Circles, III. From Literary Theory to Cultural Studies)

Prof. Dr. **Tamara Brzostowska-Tereszkiewicz**, Polska Akademia Nauk, Warsaw (III. Translation Studies (From Theories of Literary Translation to a Paradigm of Modernity))

Prof. Dr. **Gesine Drews-Sylla**, Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg (III. Russian Theory in Africa: From Marxism to the Bakhtinian Postcolony)

Dr. **Patrick Flack**, Université de Fribourg (II.3. Phenomenology in German-Speaking Areas and in Russia)

Prof. Dr. **Tomáš Glanc**, Universität Zürich (II.9. Transfer as the Key: Understanding the Intellectual History of the Relationship between Formalism and Structuralism from the Perspective of the Prague Linguistic Circle)

Prof. (em.) Dr. **Rainer Grübel**, Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg (II.8. Bakhtin's Philosophy of Literature and its Relation to Literary Theory, Literature and Culture, II.9. Russian Structuralism and Semiotics in Literary Criticism and its Reception, IV. Carnival, Carnivalism and Bakhtin's Culture of Laughter)

Prof. Dr. **Ken Hirschkop**, University of Waterloo (II.8. The (Re)discovery of Bakhtin in Anglophone Criticism)

Prof. (em.) Dr. **Renate Lachmann**, Universität Konstanz (I. The Migration of Concepts, II.2. Jurij Striedter's Reading of Russian Formalism)

Dr. habil. **Lena Magnone**, Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg (II.5. Psychoanalysis and Literature in Poland)

PD Dr. **Erik Martin**, Europa Universität Viadrina Frankfurt/Oder (IV. Alienation/Defamiliarisation/Estrangement (*ostranenie*))

PD Dr. **Michał Mrugalski**, Humboldt Universität Berlin (I. Introduction, II.1. Journal and Society of Aesthetics and the General Science of Art, II.2. Formalism in Poland, II.6. Marxism in Poland, II.7. Siegfried Kracauer and Walter Benjamin. Precursors of the Frankfurt School in Transference with the Slavic Body of Thought, II.9. Structuralism and Semiotics in Poland,

III. The Eastern European Origins of the Contemporary Activist Humanities: The Tragic Template of Socialist Kantianism at the Turn of the Twentieth Century)

Dr. **Jessica E. Merrill**, Columbia University New York (II.2. The North American Reception of Russian Formalism)

Prof. Dr. **Alexander Nebrig**, Heinrich Heine Universität Düsseldorf (II.2. Formalism in Germany)

Dr. **Valentin Peschanskyi**, Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster (I. A Case Study of a Migrating Term: Intertextuality)

Prof. Dr. **Igor Pilshchikov**, University of California, Los Angeles (II.2. The Four Faces of Russian Formalism)

Prof. Dr. **Nikolaj Plotnikov**, Ruhr-Universität Bochum (II.1. The State Academy of Art Studies in Moscow (RAKhN/GAKhN))

Dr. **Josh Robinson**, Cardiff University (II.6. Realism and Modernism, Aesthetics & Politics: Lukács, Brecht, Adorno)

Piotr Sadzik, M.A., Uniwersytet Warszawski (II.3. Phenomenology in Poland, IV. Indeterminacy and Concretization)

Prof. Dr. **Sylvia Sasse**, Universität Zürich (II.5. 'Aesthetic Reaction' and 'Verbal Reaction': Reader-response Criticism from Vygotskii to Voloshinov, IV. Hybridity, IV. Theatricality)

Prof. Dr. **Schamma Schahadat**, Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen (I. Introduction, I. Migrants of Theory, II.4. Poetics and Hermeneutics, IV. Literary Evolution)

Prof. (em.) **Dr. Peter Steiner**, University of Pennsylvania (II.2. Herbartian Aesthetics in Bohemia)

Prof. Dr. **Bernd Stiegler**, Universität Konstanz (IV. Montage)

Prof. Dr. **Susanne Strätling**, Freie Universität Berlin (IV. *Novoe Zrenie* / *Neues Sehen* / New Vision)

Dr. **Francesco Tava**, University of the West of England Bristol (II.7. Tragic Realism: On Karel Kosík's Insights into Kafka)

Dr. habil. **Serge Tchougounnikov**, Université de Bourgogne, Dijon (II.5. The Psychologisation of the Central and Eastern European Humanities: Mechanisms and Consequences of the Psychological Turn)

Prof. Dr. **Galin Tihanov**, Queen Mary University of London (III. Semantic Paleontology and Its Impact)

Prof. Dr. **Dirk Uffelmann**, Justus-Liebig-Universität Gießen (III. Postcolonial Studies: Processes of Appropriation and Axiological Controversies)

Prof. Dr. **Danuta Ulicka**, Uniwersytet Warszawski (I. Spaces of Theory, II.1. Institute of the History of the Arts)

Prof. Dr. **Josef Vojvodík**, Univerzita Karlova Praha (II.3. Phenomenology in Czechoslovakia (Jan Patočka, Přemysl Blažíček), II.4. Hermeneutics in the Czech Context (F. X. Šalda, Václav Černý, and Dimitrij Tschižewskij [Dmytro Chyzhevsky]))

Prof. Dr. **Irina Wutsdorff**, Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster (I. Introduction, I. Translation of Theories – Theories of Translation, II.9. Approaches to an Anthropologically-Oriented Theory of Literature and Culture in the Czech Avant-Garde and the Aesthetics of Prague Structuralism, IV. Function)

Prof. Dr. **Aleksei Zherebin**, Rossiskii gos. ped. universitet im. A. I. Gertsena, S. Peterburg (II.5. Psychoanalysis and Literature, Psychology of Art (Jung's Archaic Images and the Russian Jungians, Lou Andreas Salomé, Lev Trotskii and the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society))

Index of Names