

**PERSPECTIVES ON SLAVIC  
LITERATURES**

**Proceedings of the First International "Perspectives on Slavistics"  
Conference  
(Leuven, September 17-19, 2004)**

Edited by  
David S. Danaher  
Kris Van Heuckelom

Pegasus Oost-Europese Studies 6  
Uitgeverij Pegasus, Amsterdam 2007

1845088-1

changes which occurred in the institution of authorship in Russia in the 1820s and 1830s. A totally different kind of literary sensibility entering Russian literature is discussed by Yuliya Minkova. Her paper deals with the early poetry of Osip Mandel'stam and attempts to delineate Impressionist elements in the poet's aesthetic program. Dieter De Bruyn's article focuses on twentieth century literary theory and provides a highly interesting account of the problematic literary critical history of the Polish concept of *autotematyzm* against the background of the ongoing international debate on literary reflexivity. Tine Roesen proposes a new perspective on Dostoevskij's poetics of genre, which allows her to discern overlooked genre-based connections and dissimilarities in Dostoevskij's literary works. Whereas the first contributions to this PoS volume mainly focus on "contextual" approaches to Slavic literatures, the final part of the book is taken up by predominantly language-oriented approaches. Ben Dhooze's article on Andrej Platonov pleads for a text-immanent approach to the author's non-normative language and pays particular attention to "the need for localization" as one of the main principles governing thought processes in Platonov's work. David Danaher, finally, analyzes the use of metaphorical analogy in Tolstoj's *Anna Karenina*, in order to reconsider the value of Cognitive Poetics for the analysis of literary texts.

The present volume would have never been completed without the help and support of some of our colleagues. More particularly, we would like to extend our gratitude to the following reviewers for their critical evaluation of the articles considered for publication: Robert Bird (University of Chicago), Kinga Maciejewska (University of Chicago), Margarita Nafpaktitis (University of Virginia), Thomas Langerak (Universiteit Gent), Jennifer Presto (University of Oregon), Gary Rosenshield (University of Wisconsin-Madison), Thomas Seifrid (University of Southern California), Malyne Sternstein (University of Chicago), and Willem G. Weststeijn (Universiteit Amsterdam).

David S. Danaher and Kris Van Heuckelom

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Elvira M. Grossman NAVIGATING THE NEW LANDSCAPE FOR SLAVONIC/POLISH STUDIES	1
Ellen Ratten FIGHTING FOR PRINCESS RUSSIA: THE POLITICIZATION OF DRAGON-SLAYER AND SLEEPING BEAUTY MOTIFS IN TWENTIETH-CENTURY RUSSIAN LITERATURE	27
Marcin Filipowicz THE LOST BRANCH OF CZECH LITERARY THEORY – AN ANTICIPATION OF FEMINIST LITERARY CRITICISM?	61
Aleksander Flint HOW TO DESCRIBE A CULTURAL MELTING POT? A METHODOLOGICAL PROPOSITION	71
Martine Van Goubbergen THE POLYCHRONIC UNDERLYING CULTURAL PATTERN IN RUSSIAN LITERATURE	79
Yuliya Ilchuk "NE PRODAETSJA VDOCHNOVEN'JE, NO MOZNO RUKOPIS' PRODAT": AUTHORSHIP AND COPYRIGHT IN RUSSIAN LITERATURE OF THE 1820-1830S	91
Yuliya Minkova MANDEL'STAM THE IMPRESSIONIST: TOWARD DEFINING THE POET'S AESTHETIC	107
Dieter De Bruyn THE PROBLEM OF <i>AUTOTEMATYZM</i> IN POLISH LITERARY CRITICISM, OR HOW TO IMMOBILIZE A PERPETUUM MOBILE OF NOTHINGNESS?	127
Tine Roesen DOSTOEVSKIJ'S GENRES – TOWARDS A DIFFERENTIATION	141
Ben Dhooze ANDREJ PLATONOV'S "DEVIATING LANGUAGE": TOWARDS A TEXT-IMMANENT APPROACH	161
David S. Danaher COGNITIVE POETICS AND LITERARINESS: METAPHORICAL ANALOGY IN <i>ANNA KARENINA</i>	183

# “NE PRODAĚTSJA VDOCHNOVEN’JE, NO MOŽNO RUKOPIS’ PRODAT’” AUTHORSHIP AND COPYRIGHT IN RUSSIAN LITERATURE OF THE 1820- 1830S

Yuliya Ilchuk – University of Southern California

## 1 Introduction

The title of my paper refers to Puškin’s poem *Razgovor knigoprodavca s počtom* (“A Conversation between a bookseller and a poet”): “Ne prodaëtsja vdochnoven’je, no možno rukopis’ prodat’” (“Inspiration cannot be sold, but one can sell a manuscript.”). The poet’s response written in prose: “Vy absoljumno pravý” (“You’re absolutely right”) reveals an internal dilemma of Russian romantics who had to adjust to the increasingly mercantile conditions of the literary market. At the same time, the poem indicates a significant shift in the consciousness of Russian writers who started to see themselves as proprietors of their literary works.

In this paper, I give an outline of the historical changes which occurred in the institution of authorship in Russia in the beginning of the nineteenth century. I focus on the production of the author not as a consciousness so much as a representation of authorship based on notions of property and originality. I demonstrate that the idea of copyright and literary property did not contradict, but rather hinged upon Romantic cult of solitary genius. In conclusion, I show that although the copyright law answered the growing need of writers to establish ownership of the products of their labor, it had some negative effects and did not properly protect the integrity of the authors.

## 2 The development of copyright and institution of authorship in Russia

Traditionally, in modern literary scholarship the institution of Romantic authorship is studied as a historical response to enacted copyright law. Historians of copyright, such as Mark Rose (1988) and Abram Rejtlat (2001), establish a one-way connection between the enactment of copyright law and the institution of authorship. Thus, Mark Rose (1993: 4) states that in Great Britain the transformation of writers into authors depended on the classical liberal discourse of property as represented by John Locke:

Before authors could become professionals, however, a certain level of production and consumption of printed materials had to be attained, and this ... did not occur until the eighteenth century.

At the same time, Rejtlat (2001) links deferred development of the institution of authorship in Russia with the economic unprofitableness of domestic literature. Until the eighteenth century the most popular literary products were foreign books, which educated audiences would read in the original or in Russian translation, whereas books written by Russian writers did not enjoy wide popularity. Therefore, as Rejtlat suggests, the need for copyright law, which emerged in the eighteenth century in Russia, was due to an ever-growing demand for national literature.

While not trying to diminish the significance of copyright law in the formation of the institution of authorship in Russia, I venture to suggest that the liberal discourse of property, with its concerns for origins, blended with the nineteenth-century discourse of original genius and together produced the perception of the author as a creator and owner of original works of art.

Michel Foucault, in his essay 'What is an Author?' (1977), located the emergence of the "author" in the cultural context of the eighteenth century, arguing that acknowledgment of an author occurred as an aspect of the penal code: when an author was found legally "responsible" for his writings, he could make claims that they belonged to him and fix his "name" on them. In Russian literature, the concept of the "author" as a proprietor was introduced relatively late – in the first quarter of the nineteenth century. Old Rus' did not recognize the phenomenon of individual authorship since it was the church and later the

state that authorized books. It led to the perception of a written text as collective property that could be re-written, transformed, and then sold by anyone. The manuscripts were circulated anonymously or were "signed" by authoritative figures, such as John Zlatoust, imparting sacred authority to the text. The work of copiers and compilers was valued more than that of the author.<sup>1</sup> This state of affairs changed as Russian society became more secularized. Modernization of culture, technological innovations facilitating the production of books, and an expanding reading audience led to the enactment of copyright law to protect individual authors. Rejtlat (2001) studied the development of copyright law in Russia in the eighteenth century and discovered that until 1780 all acts of book sales and consequently the transfer of the author's right to a publisher or bookseller were recorded in a broker's book. Nevertheless, it was a licensing act rather than copyright since it did not guarantee protection against piracy, unauthorized copying, and profit-making by unlicensed producers. In the beginning of the nineteenth century, it was the censorship committee that regulated all issues of reproduction, inheritance, and transfer of copyright, but still there were no unified laws governing legal procedure in cases involving violation of copyright law.

In fact, the copyright law's inadequacies were not the only factors impeding the development of the institution of authorship. Its development was also affected by the far-from-serious attitude of Russian writers towards their vocation. The literary enterprise was considered to be a trifle, not a way to make a living. Thus, Deržavin sold a collection of his poems in order to satisfy his wife's wish to possess an English park. Puškin gambled away the manuscript of his early poems. Žukovskij and Baťjuškov allowed their friends to publish their literary works without any monetary remuneration. As a consequence of the disinterest shown by writers towards their literary property, publishers earned the most profit. Gnedič, for instance, made thirteen thousand rubles from publishing Baťjuškov's collection of poems, whereas the poet himself earned only two thousand.<sup>2</sup> Throughout the eighteenth century, Russian writers were highly dependent on the patronage of the tsar or the court. They had to dedicate their literary works to a noble patron in the hopes

of securing a pension and other benefits. In the patronage system, authors did not "own" their works. A writer naturally owned his physical manuscript, but the concept of owning a work did not fit the circumstances of a patronized society.

That the Russian writers of the beginning of the nineteenth century came to see themselves as owners of literary property can be confirmed by their numerous appeals to the censorship committee with the requests to impose a ban on illegal reproductions of their works. Fonvizin, Krylov, and Deržavin's widow are a few of those who sought the mediation of the censors when unauthorized versions of their works were published. By the beginning of the nineteenth century, the author gradually replaced the "bookseller" (i.e., the publisher) as the chief proprietor of the work. Whereas in Western Europe the question of literary property arose from a commercial struggle between two groups of booksellers regarding the limitation of the copyright term,<sup>3</sup> in Russia the concept of literary property was introduced by a group of Russian writers profoundly dissatisfied with the predatory politics of their publishers. The most scandalous cases of violation of authorial rights are associated with Puškin. In exile, the poet was unable to exert control over the unauthorized publication of his works and sent his father to the censorship committee, asking to confiscate all printed copies of the second edition of *Kavkazskij plennik* (*The Caucasian Prisoner*) illegally issued by a censor named Ol'dekor. However, the committee denied his request, arguing that there was no violation of copyright since the editor published not the poem but its German translation, craftily accompanied with the original.<sup>4</sup> Faddej Bulgarin and Michail Bestužev-Rjumin were not penalized as well when they had part of *Eugenij Onegin* and six of Puškin's poems printed behind his back.<sup>5</sup> Frequent appeals from writers precipitated the reformation of copyright law.

As a result, the Statute of Copyright Law first enacted in 1828 stated that "каждый сочинитель или переводчик книги имеет исключительное право пользоваться во всю жизнь своего изданием и продажею оной по своему усмотрению, как имуществом благоприобретенным." ("Every writer or translator of a book has an exclusive right to possess and sell it as acquired

property at his own discretion.")<sup>6</sup> The new statute served to regulate author-publisher relations, reproduction, and other matters. It also determined that after the death of an author his relatives could enjoy authorial rights for the next twenty-five years. After 1828, each act of transfer of authorial rights, from author to publisher or from one publisher to another, was ratified by the following contract:

1828 года, июня 13 дня я, нижеподписавшийся, 12 класса чиновник Андрей Николаев сын Пеша, даа сие услове московскому ... купцу Василию Васильеву Логинову в том, что я, Пеша, продал ему, Логинову, оригинальные рукописи моего сочинения, ... ценою за тысячу рублей... которые я, Пеша, от него, Логинова, сполна получила, почему он, Логинов, волен вышелоимеованные семь рукописей печатать и перепечатывать сколько и когда и в какой форме он, Логинов, заблагорассудит и право печатания оных рукописей может перепродать и другим; словом, продал я, Пеша, ему, Логинову, в полное его собственное и потомственное владение, а мне, Пеша, и моим наследникам из оных вышеперечисленных оригинальных семи рукописей ... не печатать и права на оное никому на напечатание не давать...<sup>7</sup>

(On June 13, 1828 I, the undersigned, Andrej Nikolaev's son Peše, a clerk of the twelfth class, gave this contract to a Moscow merchant Vasilij Vasil'ev Loginov which confirms that I sold the original manuscripts of my writing, a thousand roubles in value, to him, Loginov, and received all money from him. Therefore, he, Loginov, is free to print and reprint the above-named seven manuscripts in the amount and form he likes, and he can sell the right to print those manuscripts to anyone; in brief, I, Peše, have sold to him, Loginov, [my manuscripts] in his complete and hereditary possession, and I, Peše, and my heirs will not publish the above-named seven original manuscripts and will not transfer the right of publishing to anyone.)

### 3 Commodification of literature: pro et contra

Copyright expedited the process of the commodification of literature and allowed writers to enjoy a measure of financial independence. On the whole, authors of the period based their claims for remuneration not on owning the entire system of production, from composition to distribution, but on the

capitalist relation between labor (investment) and return (profit). Puškin was the first writer in Russia to express the property argument directly, suggesting that “стихотворство... — мое ремесло, отраза честной промышленности, составляющая мне пропитание и независимость...” (“poetry-making is my trade, a field of honest industry providing the poet with sustenance and independence...”)<sup>8</sup> As Greenleaf and Moeller-Sally (1998: 14) suggest, in Russia “the acceptance of the copyright law coincided with professionalization of literature when the man of letters went out of the closed aristocratic circle into a public sphere circumscribed by technology, contracts, and the profit motive”. It would also be fair to say that patronage was disappearing as literature became a profitable enterprise. As Puškin observed in ‘Thoughts on a Road,’ “с некоторых пор литература стала у нас выгодным ремеслом, и публика в состоянии дать более денег, нежели его сиятельство такой-то или его высокопревосходительство такой-то” (“for some time literature has become a profitable trade and the public is able to pay more than some Excellency.”)<sup>9</sup>

At the same time, the process of commodification of literature entailed a fierce discussion among Russian writers in the 1830s about how to reconcile the elevated status of an inspired, disinterested poet with his new role as a profit-seeking author. As a result of the debates around *литературные вопросы* — ‘the commercial question’ — the Russian writers split into two camps: Ševyurev, Venevitinov, and Raič on the one hand, and Puškin, Polevoj, Gogol’, and Belinskij on the other. Stepan Ševyurev in his article ‘Literature and Commerce,’ published in *Moskovskij Nabljudatel’* (*Moscow Observer*) in 1835, blamed the writers of prose fiction for the decline of letters. He delineated a world in which literature had acquired the easy liquidity and exchangeability of money:

... звание литератора сделалось у нас не только почетным званием, но и званием выгодным... Литератор есть уже капиталист, которого умственный капитал... неожиданно дает несбыточные проценты! — Одним словом, литератор у нас получил собственность... Литератор в своей славной бедности был честнее и вдохновеннее. Он имел жажду к славе... и не имел жажды к деньгам... (1835: 21-2)

(... the vocation of the Man of Letters has become not only an honourable title, but also a profitable one... the Writer is already a capitalist whose intellectual capital unexpectedly gives unheard-of interest! — In a word, the writer now has property... In his glorious poverty, the writer was more moral and inspired. He had a craving for glory... and had no thirst for money...)

For those brought up in the aristocratic tradition of polite letters, the conception of an author as a professional who writes for money was profoundly distasteful. “The only reward of a poet is Glory,” proclaimed Izmajlov. When Smirdin offered a monetary reward to Raič for his poems, the poet replied proudly: “I am a poet and do not sell my inspiration.”<sup>10</sup> It is curious that Raič was responsible for the creation and proliferation of the myth of Puškin who, after all, repented of profiting from his “inspirations.” In the ‘Lyrical poems of Aleksandr Puškin,’ Raič revealed Puškin’s confessions, but the histrionic mode of the discourse makes his recollection rather unreliable:

Я всякий раз чувствую жестокие угрызения совести, — сказал он мне однажды в открытом со мною разговоре, — когда вспоминаю, что я, может быть, первый из русских, кто начал торговать поэзией. Я, конечно, выгодно продал «Бахчисарайский фонтан» и «Евгения Онегина»; но к чему это поведал нашу поэзию, а может быть, и всю нашу литературу? Уж конечно, не к добру. Признаюсь, я завидую Державину, Дмитриеву, Карамзину: они бескорыстно и безукоризненно для совести подвизались на благородном своем поприще, на поприще словесности, а я! Тут он тяжело вздохнул и замолчал.<sup>11</sup>

(Every time I feel severe remorse — he [Puškin] said to me in a confidential conversation — when I realize that I was, perhaps, the first Russian to start selling poetry. Sure, I sold *The Fountain at Bakhčisaraj* and *Evgenij Onegin* for a profit, but to where will it lead our poetry and all our literature? No good will come of it. I confess that I envy Deržavin, Dmitriev, Karazin, because they unselfishly and without remorse pursued their lofty occupation — the world of letters, but me! There he sighed heavily and fell silent.)

While Ševyurev, Raič, Izmajlov, and others experienced extreme anxiety in relation to the machinery of production and resisted the benefits and rewards

of an open-market system, the advocates of the "commercial trend" promulgated the right of the writer to profit from his/her labor. In his essay, 'One Hundred Russian Men of Letters,' Belinskij wrote:

Плата за честный труд нисколько не унижительно: унизительно злоупотребление трудом... Гораздо честнее продать свою статью журналисту или книгопродавцу, нежели кропать стишонки в честь какого-нибудь мецената и покровителя, как это делалось в невинное и бескорыстное время нашей литературы, когда подобными одами любивалась чести играть роль поэта в боярских палатах, получали места и выходили в люди. (1955, 7: 75)

(Remuneration for honest labor is not degrading at all: the misuse of labor is degrading... It is more fair to sell one's own article to a journalist or book-seller than to write doggerel in honor of some patron or sponsor, as was done in the guiltless and unselfish time of our literature when, thanks to such odes, one was afforded the honour of playing a fool in boyards' palaces, received posts, and got on in the world.)

#### 4 The genius artist as a producer of commodity

Thanks to the advocates of the "commercial trend," the labor of the writer invested into his/her work was equated with ownership. Moreover, since the work of "true original genius" took longer to produce, it was assumed that the "original" author had an even greater right to profit than other authors did. Rose emphasizes that it was the concept of the author as the originator that underwent a major aesthetic realignment in which such concepts as "art," "genius," and "originality" were transvalued. He believes that Romanticism's sacralization of the author and the cult of genius arose reactively "out of a resistance to the consumerism and the commodification of the literary market" (1988: 51). In my view, the connection between the Romantic ideology of "authorship" and Russian copyright doctrine is so organic and interdependent that it would be false to pose the question in terms of cause and effect. The Romantic aesthetics of the genius author perfectly suited the needs of a newly formed profitable profession of letters.

Like many European Romantics, Russian contemporaries also distinguished the principle of originality as an imperative quality of a genius poet, but put it in

third place in a triad after the principle of universality and nationality.<sup>12</sup> Ludwig Jakob in his draft 'The Course of Philosophy for Russian Gymnasiums' (1811) followed a neoclassical conception of genius and emphasized that "genius creates works of beauty in imitation of nature."<sup>13</sup> Alexander Galic in his 'Essay on the Beautiful' perceived the creative source in a genius and emphasized the principle of originality in him/her.<sup>14</sup> Similarly, Ivan Kroneberg in 'Materials for the History of Aesthetics' discerned originality as the first essential quality of a genius.<sup>15</sup> It was generally believed that a genius artist should be able to embrace the universal truth and then realize it in various genres.

The European Romantics affected by the cult of original genius announced that silent borrowing was not only immoral, but something much worse – proof of the artist's limited originality. Although Romanticism made a cult of the past by imitating the Classics and forging artifacts from the admired past, the attitude of the West European Romantics toward borrowing was in fact extremely harsh. "Hang the plagiarist!" was a cry heard in Elizabethan times directed at a trespassing contemporary. But in Russia the attitude towards imitators has never been negative. Until the 1820s an imitation was not treated pejoratively. An imitator did not even try to hide the marks that identified the original, nor did he make the original his own act of writing. Discussing Puškin's so-called Southern poems, the Russian critics Venevitinov and Kireevskij admitted that although the poet had indeed imitated Byron, his poems were imprinted with his creative originality. Later, when Puškin was declared a national genius, the critics replaced imitation with the concepts of "influence" and "source material."<sup>16</sup> Imitation was devoid of negative connotations; quite the contrary, it became a synonym of a poet's erudition and his assiduousness in mastering the world's best examples. Nikolaj Ostolopov defined imitation as such:

Подражать... поэту - не значит перевести его или рабски списывать; это значит... взять мысль его и преобразить ее с вольностью, по-своему; это значит... образовать свой ум, язык, учиться оборотам, изображениям, гармонии подлинника и, обогатив память красотами его, ... упражняться в том же самом роде... Подражания похвальны; нужно только избрать образец изящный. (1820: 361, 368)

(To imitate a poet does not mean to translate him or slavishly copy; it means... to take his thought and introduce it with an artistic licence, in one's own way. It means... to educate one's mind, language, to learn turns of speech, images, and harmony from the original, and, having enriched one's memory with the original's beauty, ... to practice something to that effect. Imitations are praiseworthy; one needs only to find a refined model.)

As the reading audience grew and literary markets expanded, more emphasis was placed on originality and self-expression. Evident imitations became regarded as second-rate commodities and did not have as much success as original works. It is noteworthy that Puškin's attitude to imitations changed dramatically in the 1830s. In his early correspondence and essays the poet repeatedly maintained that imitation had never been a vice and that even Greek and Latin geniuses, such as Virgil, Horace, and Tibullus, chose to follow the path of imitation.<sup>17</sup> However, in 1830, Puškin clearly distinguished between "genius" and "talent," describing the imitative art of the latter through the metaphor of a path – "таинство по пятам увлекающего свой век Гения." ([one who is] "treading on the heels of a genius who is captivating his/her epoch."). Therefore, in order to reconcile the elevated status of a genius poet with an inclination towards imitation, the differentiation between "genius" and "talent" were introduced into practice.

Romantics not only equated genius with a creative nature, they reverently worshipped the profession of letters. As V. Insarskij recalled, "a man writing books seemed a divine creature superior to mere mortals, and his personality was surrounded by poetic legends... At that time it was good luck to see an author" (1894: 9-10). Just as the personality of an "original genius" was valued, his/her literary products were considered intrinsically precious. The value of "great and original" art is self-unfolding and originates in self-defining, individual acts of consciousness; therefore the literary works of a genius cannot be valued in any terms but their own. The genius author participates in a symbolic economy of authorial reputation, status, and prestige, which should understandably be accompanied by the expectation of material benefits. Due to high demands placed on a creative personality, it would seem that the

immateriality of a genius and his status as a profitable author must have clashed, but this did not occur. As Michail Vajskopf (2003) wittily notes, the "literary aristocrats" – Karamzin and later Vjazemskij – already combined the status of a bookseller with that of a poet within themselves, but still they strictly distinguished between these two roles and did not think of that union within one individual. Puškin, however, reconciled the new utilitarian status of a profitable author with the romanticized notion of a genius poet, and thus realized the merger of the two roles within one individual.

### 5 Author's name as commodity

Romanticism indeed had elevated the notion of author. In the Romantic tradition of literary criticism the *author* was not simply any published writer, but a special writer whose works were thought to have achieved a superior value as aesthetic objects and which could be assigned a canonical status. Under such high demands for authorship, the author's name served to enhance the meaning or value of a literary text. At the same time, the copyright fortified the link between the name of the author and his/her property – the text. Once the manuscript became a commodity to be sold and the author received legal protection as the proprietor of intellectual property, the value of the commodity in the literary market extended itself back to the author as the origin of its value. David G. Kropf (1994) rightly asserts that the new copyright law of 1828 had the negative effect of fixing or "typecasting" the writer as a particular kind of author:

Combined with other authorizing 'machines,' such as censorship and criticism, copyright came to stabilize the writer's identity, with the result that a serious writer such as Puškin came to be associated with specific genres, styles, and subject matters. (1994:73)

Žirmunskij, for example, observed that around 1828 – the year in which the copyright reforms went into effect – the publication of imitations of Puškin's early poems and *Evgenij Onegin* increased significantly.<sup>18</sup> In fact, a number of second-rate writers driven by the desire to profit from sales in the literary market signed their doggerels with the name "Puškin." In 'Notes of a



Madman, Gogol', describing Popruščin's literary tastes, makes him record "presumably" Puškin's poem:

Переписал очень хорошие стишки: [I] copied very good lines:

Душеньки часок не видал, Having not seen my darling for an hour

Думал год уж не видал; I felt like I have not seen her for a year;

Жизнь мою возненавидя, Having my life

Льзя ли жить мне, я сказал. Can I live, I said.

Должно быть, Пушкина сочинение. It must be Puškin's poem.<sup>19</sup>

There is no doubt that Gogol' was aware that a lot of second-rate poets signed their works with the name "Puškin." In his letter from *Selected Pages*, Gogol' wrote ironically apropos of this:

Ни один поэт в России не имел такой завидной участи, как Пушкин. Ничья слава не распространялась так быстро... Его имя уже имело в себе что-то электрическое, и стоило только кому-нибудь из асоужих марателей выставить его на своем творении, уже оно расходилось повсюду (Под именем Пушкина рассеивалось множество самых нелепых стихов. Это обыкновенная участь таланта, пользующегося сильною известностью... Таким образом начал наконец Пушкину приписывать: "Лекарство от холеры", "Первую ночь" и тому подобные.) (2000: 71)

(No poet in Russia had such enviable luck as Puškin. No one's fame spread so fast... His name itself contained something electric; and once an idle scribbler put it in front of his work, it was sold out far and wide. (Under the name Puškin a great number of the most absurd poems circulated. This is the common fate of a far-famed talent... Thus one began to attribute to Puškin "Medicine from Cholera," "First Night," and so on.)

The imitators of Puškin strove not to follow his authority by means of generic norms or style, but rather sought to become parasites on his commercial success. They were driven by the social force of authorization and cannot be equated to plagiarists since they did not hide the original, but aimed to make a relationship with the original apparent. Under the liberal regime of the marketplace, the author's name came to function metonymically as his/her

works were published and a discourse regarding them emerged. The proper name began to refer not only to the concrete empirical person, but to the mode of writing associated with the name. What occurred with the name "Puškin" is fragmentation; the bearer of the name got cut off from its referent and was left to its fate.

Another paradox that makes the connection of authorship with copyright controversial is the proliferation of books published anonymously after 1828. According to Rejtblat's calculation, over a third of all books (over 450 items) registered in 1831-1846 in the index book of Smirdin's library and the bibliographical section in the periodicals, were published anonymously or pseudonymously. Even if we do not know the ratio of attributed texts to anonymous ones in the early nineteenth century, the proportion established by Rejtblat is striking. It might seem that in the age of Romanticism, when the rise of the Individual occurred, it was unreasonable and unprofitable for a writer to hide his/her authorship. However, anonymity did not disappear with the emergence of commercial culture. I would argue that the author-function, as defined by Foucault in his essay 'What is the author?', may be applied to anonymous works as well as those that were signed. I think that filiation exists even when the author remains unknown (as in anonymous texts) or is fictitious (as in a pseudonym) because the signature "Russkaja Šaxerezada" or *Povesi pokojnogo Gricko. Izdaniye ego drugom P.* creates the relation of filiation without needing a real name to do so. This problem has its source in what Peggy Kamuf (1988: 66) has called the "pseudonymous regime of the text's signature":

Between the law of the proper name and the space of reading, the author designated by the signature is "there as anonymous party." The author is positioned by a certain effaceability of his/her name with regard to the text it signs.

Monika Greenleaf and Stephen Moeller-Sally explain the proliferation of anonymous texts by the explicit anxiety of authorship experienced by the literary elite. It was caused by the commodification of literature, "for the printing press threatened to drown the originality they associated with literature in a potentially infinite reproduction of texts" (1998:14). Before 1828,

publishers had every right to register and publish a manuscript, and the text, once registered, belonged to the publisher of record. What this meant in practical terms is that previously unregistered manuscript texts were often printed without the writer's knowledge or even against his/her will, though without attribution. But writers at the beginning of the nineteenth century sometimes chose anonymity because of reasons pertaining to genre. Some genres, mostly poetic, such as memorial poems, satires, and epigrams, were required to be unsigned. The writers of obituaries could not reveal their identity because the object of the poem was to glorify the dead, not the poet himself. In this case anonymity was a simple matter of decorum. In general, anonymous publications had less to do with fear of censure, punishment, or shame than with the ordinary gratifications of artistic performance. They reflect the modesty topos, demonstrating the writer's lack of pride in the text being circulated. The writers, such as young Gogol', who was unknown to a broad readership, waited to obtain favorable reviews from avowed writers, or at least from a significant number of readers, before publicly displaying actual authorship.

The spiritualization of authorship as "genius" became a central feature of the Romantic movement. It ensured that, although writers were under pressure to be considered merely as commodity producers, they also acquired the status of what Mark Rose has called "mystified figure[s] of special authority" — "the aristocrats of productive society." If genius was designed to give authors a special and mysterious importance, copyright was the mechanism which secured genius against plagiarism and piracy. The copyright law answered the growing need of writers to establish ownership of the products of their labor, but the discourse surrounding the profitable authors was characterized by repugnance to the consumer society. Despite the number of benefits that copyright potentially guaranteed for writers, it pigeonholed writers into certain kinds of identities and thereby narrowed their literary possibilities.

Of course, the new copyright law could not resolve all issues of authorship. "Originality," the enabling concept that underlies the notion of the proprietary author, turned out to be in practice a problematic term. However, it became

evident to Poststructuralists that texts permeate and enable each other thereby making the idea of literary property something difficult to sustain. The naive writers at the beginning of the nineteenth century still believed in the unique individual who created something original and was thereby entitled to reap a profit from his/her labor.

## Notes

- 1 For further information, see Vinogradov (1961: 43) and Lichačev (1954: 26).
- 2 See Todd (1996: 99).
- 3 Martha Woodmansee (1984: 445) examined how the concept of "intellectual property" arose in Germany in the eighteenth century.
- 4 See Gessen (1930: 44).
- 5 For more information on the relationship between Puškin and Bulgarin, see Lotman (1983: 165-168). The literary tension between Puškin and Bestužev-Rjumin is documented by Puškin himself in *Poľnoe sobranie* (1979, 7: 93).
- 6 Cited in Rejtibat (2001: 111-12).
- 7 Cited in idem: 112.
- 8 In his letter to A.I. Kaznačev from May 22, 1824 in *Poľnoe sobranie* (Puškin 1979, 10: 71).
- 9 Cited in Grac *et al.* (1929: 270).
- 10 Idem: 274.
- 11 Cited in Raič (1998: 368).
- 12 N.N. Mazur (2001) examines in detail the polemics surrounding the problem of genius.
- 13 See Kamenskij (1974: 110).
- 14 Idem: 219.
- 15 Idem: 296.
- 16 For a discussion of the Puškin imitations of the 1820s, see V.M. Žirmunskij (1978: 239-92).
- 17 In his letter to A. Bestužev from June 1825 in *Poľnoe sobranie* (Puškin 1979, 10: 114).
- 18 V.M. Žirmunskij (1978: 397-402) lists three imitations for the year 1825, two for 1826, seventeen for 1828, nine for 1829, and eight for 1830.
- 19 Masanov (1963: 128-33) examined in detail various falsified publications of the poetry attributed to Puškin and came to the conclusion that the forgeries were circulating both in manuscripts as "sočinenija, prezrevšie pečat'" as well as in almanacs and collections of poems published legitimately. For example, in the almanac *Evterpa, ili sobranie novykh romanov, ballad i pesen izvestnykh i ljubimykh russkikh poetov*, which came out in 1831 in Moscow, there are poems issued from Puškin's pen as well as poems falsely attributed to the poet ("Ja pal pred altarem prekasnoj," "Svad'ba," and others).

## References

- Belinskij, V.G. 1955. *Poľnoe sobranie sočinenij*. Moskva.
- Foucault, M. 1977. 'What is an Author?,' in: *Languages, Counter-memory, Practices: Selected Essays and Interviews*. Trans. D.F. Bouchard & Sh. Simon. New York.
- Gessen, S.Ja. 1930. *Knigoprodavci' Aleksandr Puškin: literaturnye dočiny Puškina*. Leningrad.
- Gogol', N.V. 2000. 'Neskol'ko slov o Puškine,' in: V.M. Markovič (ed.), *Puškine: Pro et Contra. Lěnov' i tvorčestvo Aleksandra Puškina v ocenke russkikh myslytelej i issledovatelej*. Antologija. Vol. 1. Sankt-Peterburg.

- Greenleaf, M. & S. Moeller-Sally. 1998. *Russian Subjects: Empire, Nation, and the Culture of the Golden Age*. Evanston, Moskva.
- Gric, T., V. Trenin & M. Nikitin. 1929. *Slovesnost' i kommercija*. Ed. V. Šklovskij & B. Ejchenbaum. Moskva.
- Inarskij, V.A. 1894. *Zapiski*. Sankt-Peterburg.
- Kamenskij, Z.A. (ed.). 1974. *Russkie estetičeskie traktaty pervoj treťi XIX veka*. Vol. 2. Moskva.
- Karnuf, P. 1988. *Signature Pieces: On the Institution of Authorship*. Ithaca & London.
- Kropf, D.G. 1994. *Authorship as Alchemy. Subversive Writing in Pushkin, Scott, Hoffmann*. Stanford.
- Lichacev, D.S. 1954. *Itogi i perspektivy izučeniya drevnerusskoj literatury v svete zdan' postroeniya istorii literatury*. Vol. XIII, № 5. Moskva.
- Lotman, Ju.M. 1983. *Aleksandr Sergejevič Puškin*. Leningrad.
- Masanov, Ju.I. 1963. *V mire pseudonimov, anonimov i literaturnykh poddelok*. Ed. P.N. Berkov. Moskva.
- Mazur, N.N. 2001. 'Puškin i "moskovskie junosti": vokrug problemy genija,' in: D.M. Bethea (ed.), *Puškinskaja konferencija v Sjenforde: materialy i issledovanija*. Moskva.
- Ostolopov, N.F. 1820. 'O podražanii,' in: *Blag* 9/6.
- Puškin, A.S. 1979. *Polnoe sobranie sočinenij v 10-ti tomach*. Leningrad.
- Raič, S. 1998. 'Literaturnye stichovorenija A. Puškina,' in: *Puškin v nepomnanijach sovremennikov*. Vol. 1. Sankt-Peterburg.
- Rejblat, A.I. 2001. *Kak Puškin vyšel v genii: istoriko-sociologičeskie očerki o knižnoj kul'ture Puškinskogo epochi*. Moskva.
- Rose, M. 1988. 'The Author as Proprietor: Donaldson vs. Becket and the Genealogy of Modern Authorship,' in: *Representations* 23.
- Rose, M. 1993. *Authors and Owners. The Invention of Copyright*. Cambridge & London.
- Ševyrev, S. 1835. 'Literatura i kommercija,' in: *Moskovskij Nabiljudatel'* 1. Moskva.
- Todd, W. 1996. *Literatura i obščestvo v epochu Puškina*. Sankt-Peterburg.
- Vajskopf, M. 2003. *Piša-trajka i koleznica dšvi*. NLO, vol. XXXVI. Moskva.
- Vinogradov, V.V. 1961. *Problema avtoritva i tvorija stilej*. Moskva.
- Woodmansee, M. 1984. 'The Genius and the Copyright: Economic and Legal Conditions of the Emergence of the 'Author',' in: *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 17/4, 425-448.
- Žirmunskij, V.M. 1978. *Božron i Puškin*. Leningrad.

# MANDEL'STAM THE IMPRESSIONIST I: TOWARD DEFINING THE POET'S AESTHETIC

Yuliya Minkova – University of Southern California

Critics often describe Osip Mandel'stam as a nostalgic poet and writer. This stance is not surprising when applied to a man who was born at the turn of the twentieth century, lived through wars and revolutions, gradually became an internal exile in his country, was twice arrested by the government, and died *en route* to a labor camp. The intertextual branch of the structuralist approach to poetics has similarly encouraged a reading that allows identifying a longing for the past in Mandel'stam's poems. At the same time, he was a Modernist, a product of a culture that arose from feelings of uncertainty that often accompany historical change. In her 1996 book on Mandel'stam, Clare Cavanagh compares him to such Western Modernist writers as Ezra Pound, T.S. Eliot, James Joyce, Marcel Proust, and Franz Kafka, and she argues that it was a desire for cultural belonging, which was fostered by both the Modernist environment and his Jewish origin, that propelled his art.

Projecting desires into literature is a conspicuously Modernist device and represents the artistic impulse behind Modernist nostalgia. It is the desire to resolve life's inner tensions that contributes to the creation of literary spaces where these tensions may be worked out with the help of the imagination. According to Joseph Frank, it is the mythical, timeless world that is the content of modern literature, with the spatial metaphor as its preferred idiom (1963: 60). Frank goes on to explain that this shift toward spatial form in literary work testifies to a feeling of disconnectedness from the organic world felt by modern writers, as well as their impulse toward spiritualization.

In this article, I will look at the ways in which Mandel'stam approaches and resolves nostalgia in an early poem where nostalgia takes the guise of aesthetic