Introduction: Rewriting(s)

Lucy Russell and Eleanor Dobson

University of Oxford and University of Birmingham

In October 2015 the Modern Humanities Research Association (MHRA) held its first postgraduate and early career conference at Senate House, London. The topic was 'Rewriting(s)' and, as the Call for Papers outlined, the intention was to investigate rewriting as a literary mode that occurs across cultures, genres, and time periods, both transforming and preserving root works, whilst revealing the protean natures of text, tradition, genre, authorship, and readership. The conference began with a keynote lecture by the MHRA's President for 2015, Professor Martin McLaughlin, entitled 'Rewriting in the Italian Literary Tradition: Dante to Calvino (but not everything in between)'. McLaughlin traced instances of rewriting throughout Italian literature: from Dante and Petrarch to Calvino and Ken Kalfus, demonstrating how in any text we read 'each sentence [...] may contain ten other texts beneath it'.[1] There followed fifteen papers exploring different models and functions of rewriting across a number of European languages. These were divided into categories including politicised rewritings, palimpsests and traces, rewriting and the author, and translation as rewriting. Drawing on this conference, this volume continues these investigations, with four articles examining manifestations of rewriting in twentieth-century literature, in different genres and languages, from Argentina to Austria.

In his essay 'Highlighting Variants in Literary Editions: Techniques and Goals' (2006), Burghard Dedner states that 'No human author can claim to be totally original', specifying that 'writers who work on an historical subject do not even want to be original'.[2] Dedner provides a number of examples: 'Aischylos' *Oresteia* is probably taken from oral tradition, Shakespeare based his history plays on written chronicles, Goethe copied parts of his *Götz von Berlichingen* from the knight's autobiography'. Last year, 400 years since Shakespeare's death, we witnessed a flurry of interest in his legacy. Dedner highlights the fact that Shakespeare relied upon written accounts of the reigns of particular monarchs for his histories, but it is well known that Shakespeare

[1] Martin McLaughlin, 'Poliziano's *Stanze per la giostra*: Postmodern Poetics in a Proto-Renaissance Poem', in *Italy in Crisis: 1494*, ed. by Jane Everson and Diego Zancani (London: Legenda, 2000), pp. 129–51 (p. 140).

[2] Burghard Dedner, 'Highlighting Variants in Literary Editions: Techniques and Goals', in *Texts in Multiple Versions: Histories of Editions*, ed. by Luigi Giuliani, Herman Brinkman, Geert Lernout and Marita Mathijsen (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2006), pp. 15–31 (p. 17).

Working Papers in the Humanities vol. 11 (2017), 1–8
© Modern Humanities Research Association 2017

also employed other texts for the plots and details of most of his plays extending beyond the histories, a common practice at the period in which he wrote.[3] Might we consider Shakespeare's plays rewritings of these earlier sources? Certainly, Shakespeare's works themselves have been reinterpreted, reworked, and retold countless times: the second essay in this volume addresses Shakespeare in translation in Soviet Russia; other offshoots in the twentieth century include the classic science-fiction film *Forbidden Planet* (1956) (a rewriting of *The Tempest*), the musical *West Side Story* (1957) (a rewriting of *Romeo and Juliet*), and Disney's animated film *The Lion King* (1994) (a rewriting of *Hamlet*).

Dedner's essay evokes Roland Barthes's 'The Death of the Author' (1967), a work in which Barthes famously declares that any 'text is a tissue of quotations'.[4] The author's 'only power', according to Barthes, 'is to mix writings', in other words, to *rewrite* through a process akin to compilation. It seems particularly intuitive to apply Barthes's claims to rewritings of established narratives, stretching across an expanse of time: from the earliest works of poetry in the ancient world, chiefly transmitted orally, in which changes to the text might be a matter of personal preference, misremembering, translation (or mistranslation), through to Angela Carter's takes on classic fairy tales in her *Bloody Chamber and Other Stories* (1979). While Barthes does not appear to recognise authorial originality in manipulating (and rewriting) established narratives, his argument extends to all works of literature, regardless of the existence or non-existence of source material.

This is, evidently, an extreme view, which chimes with the works of those who have striven to establish the lowest number of plots to which all narratives adhere: for these critics, each tale is a 'rewriting', a mere embellishment of one of a list of set formulae. Such theories predate Barthes's essay. The French writer Georges Polti published his proto-structuralist *Les trente-six situations dramatiques* in 1895. The more widely cited notion that there are only seven basic plots is an idea often first attributed to Arthur Quiller-Couch in the early twentieth century; this concept has resurfaced more recently in Christopher Brooker's *The Seven Basic Plots: Why We Tell Stories* (2004). In 1949 the American comparative mythologist Joseph Campbell published *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*, a work suggesting that most mythological heroes participate in narratives which share the same fundamental structure: the 'monomyth', 'the one, shape-shifting yet marvelously constant story'.[5] Although Campbell's work subsequently received much criticism, it has recently found favour with a number of academics.[6] William Foster-Harris, meanwhile, stated in *The Basic*

[3] Shakespeare's plays for which no source for the plot has been established are few: while scholarly opinion differs, these are often held to be *Love's Labour's Lost*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, and *The Tempest*, a mere fraction of his surviving works.

[4] Roland Barthes, 'The Death of the Author', in *Image, Music, Text*, trans. by Stephen Heath (London: Fontana, 1977), pp. 142–48 (p. 146).

[5] Joseph Campbell, *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* (London: Fontana, 1993), p. 3.

[6] Recent critical works reading narratives as monomythical cover a broad range of historical time, as well as media; see, for example: Dennis Quinn, *Edmund Spenser's Faerie Queene and the Monomyth*

Patterns of Plot (1959) that there were 'three variations of the one universal plot': 'happy ending', 'unhappy ending', and the more complex 'literary plot' to which he devotes an entire chapter.[7] While Barthes does not attempt to split narrative types in such a fashion, his insistence that nothing is original but simply a retelling of sources that have come before it resonates with these studies. In Barthes's mind, each 'new' text is built upon a foundation of all of those that have come before it. The individual author is insignificant; the text has been (re)written by culture more broadly.

An opposing attitude is explored, somewhat facetiously, in Jorge Luis Borges's short story 'Pierre Menard, Author of the *Quixote*' (1939), a work which describes a fictional writer — the titular Pierre Menard — who 'rewrites' Cervantes's *Don Quixote* by copying out sections of the text and, in doing so, creates a version of the novel apparently superior to Cervantes's original, 'verbally identical, but [...] infinitely richer'.[8] Borges, an author considered in greater depth in the first essay of this issue, explains how Menard seeks:

> not [...] to compose *another* Quixote, which surely is easy enough — he wanted to compose *the* Quixote. Nor, surely, need one have to say that his goal was never a mechanical transcription of the original; he had no intention of *copying* it. His admirable ambition was to produce a number of pages which coincided — word for word and line for line — with those of Miguel de Cervantes.[9]

The text has been effectively rewritten as it is the product of a different writer living in a different time: 'The archaic style of Menard [...] is somewhat affected. Not so that of his precursor, who employs the Spanish of his time with complete naturalness'.[10] Borges also dwells upon the process of revision to comic effect. 'His drafts were endless', Borges relates; 'he stubbornly corrected, and he ripped up thousands of handwritten pages. He would allow no one to see them, and took care that they not survive him'.[11] There is, of course, comedy in Borges's descriptions of Meynard's 'black crossings-out' and his consignment of his drafts to 'a cheery bonfire'. These drafts, to the average reader of 'Pierre Menard, Author of the *Quixote*', if not to Borges or Meynard, are mere transcriptions of Cervantes's original. There is no need to labour so long over a copy, nor to insist upon the destruction of drafts, which can only be identical to the original, each other, and the final manuscript.

of Joseph Campbell: Essays in Interpretation (Lewiston, NY: E. Mellen, 2000); Donald Palumbo, *The Monomyth in American Science Fiction Films: 28 Visions of the Hero's Journey* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2014).

[7] William Foster-Harris, *The Basic Patterns of Plot* (Norma, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1959), p. 66.

[8] Jorge Luis Borges, 'Pierre Menard, Author of the *Quixote*', in *Collected Fictions*, trans. by Andrew Hurley (London: Allen Lane, 1998), pp. 88–95 (p. 94).

[9] Ibid., p. 91.

[10] Ibid., p. 94.

[11] Ibid., p. 95.

So, while Borges seems to consider the author and his or her cultural context as vital to an understanding of the text, Barthes elevates the significance of the reader's experience to the degree that the reader themselves might be considered a 'rewriter': 'the birth of the reader must be at the cost of the death of the Author', he famously states.[12] These two positions thus demonstrate that there exists a broad range of practices which might also be considered 'rewriting', extending from allusion, intertextuality, and reader response to revision and translation. We can identify processes of rewriting from the earliest recorded literature (held by many to be the Epic of Gilgamesh, or perhaps the Egyptian Book of the Dead) through to works produced since the invention of print and beyond, now including ebooks and hypertexts. And as scholars have become increasingly aware of and interested in the variety of forms which 'rewriting' might take, methodologies with which to interrogate them have emerged and developed.

The field of Genetic Criticism, for example, endorses inspection of the development of the text, from its earliest origins to the final printed or electronic version(s).[13] This approach has found particular favour with scholars focusing on canonical twentieth-century authors such as James Joyce, Ezra Pound, and T.S. Eliot, though it can, of course, be applied to any text which has undergone some form of revision.[14] Often addressing earlier literature, Manuscript Studies uncovers transcriptions with differences that are frequently held to be significant, famously the variations between the Hengwrt and Ellesmere Manuscripts of Geoffrey Chaucer's *The Canterbury Tales* (considered, by some, to be inspired by — perhaps a 'rewriting' of — Giovanni Boccacio's *Il Decameron*). There are eighty-three known manuscripts of *The Canterbury Tales*, a number only superseded by the approximately 130 surviving manuscripts of the Middle English poem, *Prick of Conscience*. The sheer number of these texts suggests their popularity, as they were regularly rewritten for those who desired a physical copy.

In more recent times, rewritings appear to be more conspicuous than ever. 2009 saw Seth Grahame transform Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice* (1813) into *Pride and Prejudice and Zombies* — a process which involved adapting Austen's original text, the excision of some passages, as well as the introduction of completely new sections — and in 2011 E. L. James's *Fifty Shades of Grey*, developed from a work of fan fiction based on Stephenie Meyer's *Twilight* (2005), found a place on bestseller lists worldwide. In university settings, students compare the original ending of Austen's *Persuasion* to the one that was pub-

[12] Barthes, 'The Death of the Author', p. 148.

[13] Jean-Louis Lebrave has applied a genetic approach to hypertexts, demonstrating its applicability to even the most modern means of constructing, distributing, and encountering literature. See Jean-Louis Lebrave, 'Hypertexts — Memories — Writing', in *Genetic Criticism: Texts and Avant-texts*, ed. by Jed Deppman, Daniel Ferrer, and Michael Groden (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), pp. 218–37.

[14] There is an online journal devoted to studying the works of Joyce genetically. See *Genetic Joyce Studies*, <http://www.geneticjoycestudies.org/>.

lished (the only one to which Austen's readership originally had access). Both versions of Alfred Tennyson's 'The Lady of Shalott' (1833; 1842) are available to those seeking to compare these texts quite literally side-by-side. The 'most significant alteration' to Tennyson's original, as Erik Gray observes, 'regards the phrasing of the curse': in the rewritten version the curse is ambiguous, and its power and legitimacy are called into question.[15] Other significant changes to the poem's final stanza 'softens the harsh ironies and contrasts of the original version', which Gray speculates reflects the alleviation of Tennyson's 'anxiety concerning the reception of the poem'.[16] To take another nineteenth-century example, *The Picture of Dorian Gray* exists in three versions: the version that Oscar Wilde originally submitted to *Lippincott's Monthly Magazine* where the novel was first published, the version that appeared in the magazine in 1890 subsequent to J. M. Stoddard's edits, and the 1891 book edition published by Ward Lock. With critical eyes increasingly alighting upon these competing versions, one is ever more aware that rewriting is a process that can be undertaken by a range of actors: by the original author, a collaborator, an editor, or even a reader.

The essays that comprise this volume respond to burgeoning scholarly attentiveness to all manners of rewriting in twentieth-century literature, across a range of languages and cultures. The authors draw upon methodologies endorsed by Genetic Criticism, Manuscript Studies, and Translation Theory, as well as theorists including Barthes's fellow structuralist, Gérard Genette. Together they demonstrate the versatility and variety of critical approaches to rewritten texts, revealing how rewriting may be interpreted as an exploration of the self on the part of the original writer or rewriter, a reflection of the political or cultural climate in which the rewriting takes place, or an intertextual homage to the work of the author upon whom the rewriter muses.

* * * * *

> The lines chosen by Borges are exactly the same as those in Yeats's original poem but, cut adrift and inserted into a new context, they have the potential to be made new, made Borges's. — Grace Gaynor

Opening this volume, Grace Gaynor (University of Liverpool) sheds light on the technique of rewriting an author's work in the context of an epigraph. Examining two of Jorge Luis Borges's short stories, 'Tema del traidor y del héroe' and 'Biografía de Tadeo Isidoro Cruz (1829–1874)', Gaynor focuses on his epigraphs, here taken from two of W. B. Yeats's poems. She explores

[15] Erik Gray, 'Getting It Wrong in "The Lady of Shalott"', *Victorian Poetry*, 47.1 (2009), 45–59 (p. 51). Also of note is Gray's assertion that there are actually 'three major re-envisionings' of this poem after its original publication in 1833: the 1842 version, 'two rewritings of the story [...] in the 1859 volume, *Idylls of the King*', and 'an unpublished poem in which Tennyson closely echoes the conclusion of "The Lady of Shalott"'; see pp. 48–49.

[16] Ibid., pp. 55–56.

why such rewriting takes place, both referring to Gérard Genette's 'potential functions' of an epigraph and, moving beyond this, highlighting significant changes of emphasis that Borges accomplishes in order to use Yeats's work for his own purposes. Indeed, in examining the reasons why Borges refers not to the titles of Yeats's specific poems cited but to those of their respective poetry collections, *The Tower* and *The Winding Stair*, Gaynor explains how this was due to the associations and structures that these particular images suggested to Borges. As she continues to clarify, this not only takes Yeats's ideas out of their original context, but even affords them new titles, calling into question the authorship of these epigraphs. Finally, returning to Genette's functions and in particular the desire for 'indirect backing', Gaynor underscores how, despite Borges's frequent reference to other writers, his rewriting of Yeats and others was selective: Borges avoided unnecessary works, whilst choosing only his favoured peers to join him in the literary pantheon. Thus, through Borges and his rewriting of Yeats, Gaynor demonstrates how rewriting is, for some authors, a very deliberate technique employed to the advantage both of their work and their reputation.

* * * * *

> In keeping with the educational requirements for culture in the 1920s-30s, Radlova felt that the target audience should be the prime consideration. — Jill Warren

Another example of rewriting whereby one adapts the original for one's own purposes is discussed by Jill Warren (University of Nottingham) in her essay on the translation of *Othello* for the Stalinist stage. Warren here focuses on Anna Radlova's translation, which was used by her director husband, Sergei Radlov, in two highly successful productions in 1935. For a number of reasons this was not an entirely literal translation. Firstly, Warren highlights how Radlova needed to ensure that her translation conformed to the Stalinist regime in order to maintain its position on the stage. Her choice of play itself was judicious: *Othello* was one of the preferred plays in Stalin's Russia as the positive, military figure of Othello was regarded as a more suitable hero than, for instance, the philosophising Hamlet. Beyond such stipulations, however, Radlova also sought to rewrite the romanticised translations inherited from France and Germany so as to deliver a Shakespeare that she believed Russia's otherwise oppressed society needed. Exploring instances of decisions in translation, Warren clarifies, for example, how Radlova and Radlov both advocated simpler and more succinct language: requirements dictated by the needs of the contemporary audience and of the actors, with concision allowing the cast freedom in their performance of the play. Thus, despite Radlova having sought refuge in translation after causing scandal through her poetry, Warren demonstrates how this was an arena similarly influenced by the dangerous

political climate. As the title of this article asserts, Radlova did not simply translate *Othello*, she rewrote it for the Stalinist stage.

* * * * *

> Parallels are drawn between the ways in which the city, the text, and the self more generally are constructed as palimpsests, each conceived as myriad levels of atemporal, imbricated experiences with no one level alone able to render the complexity of life. — Rachel Darling

In our third essay, Rachel Darling (formerly Goldsmiths, University of London) explores Lawrence Durrell's complex novel, *Alexandria Quartet*. She examines not how well-known literary figures rewrite the texts of others or how translators rewrite classics, but rather how Durrell portrays a fictional author's progression through the rewriting of his own and others' ideas. With four books telling the same story, Darling examines how Durrell allows the reader to follow the development of this character, Darley, until the finale of the *Quartet* when he is ready to take up his own pen and begin with 'Once upon a time' at the end of the final book. The structure of the *Quartet* is crucial, as Darling further reveals how, through rewriting the same story four times, Durrell himself investigates the palimpsestic nature of any story, formed by the convergence of different narratives and viewpoints, and, moreover, what this means for the concept of truth. Indeed the character-writer, Darley, through his own writing and rewriting, recognises the co-existence of multiple valid interpretations of place and time: an idea that Darling explores in Durrell's image of the mirror and its ability to reflect the same subject from different angles. Finally, Darling not only brings to light Durrell's demonstration of the palimpsest as an intrinsic part of the authorial process, but further, through its obvious exposition of an author's efforts in rewriting, as a device that casts asunder any unrealistic, modernist ideas of the author as anything above human.

* * * * *

> What Zweig recognises in his most-prized manuscript and what the material experience leads him to figure is that with materiality comes process — a movement of writing behind a final work that constantly destabilizes the authority of any printed work through the mass of potential deviations. — Pardaad Chamsaz

Further concentrating on palimpsests, and in this case the perhaps more traditional model of corrected and annotated manuscripts, Pardaad Chamsaz (British Library and University of Bristol) concludes this volume with a study of Stefan Zweig's collection of Honoré de Balzac's manuscripts and his unfinished biography of this French novelist. Chamsaz explores how Zweig, like Durrell, afforded much significance to the *process* of Balzac's writing and rewriting.

Indeed, he even suggests that Zweig's inability to finish his own biography of Balzac due to his constant revisions demonstrates how Balzac's methods influenced Zweig's own working style. Chamsaz examines the importance of textual materiality to Zweig's thought, as he explains the significance Zweig accorded to reading Balzac's physical manuscripts, especially that of *Une ténébresue affaire*, not least due to his belief there was almost a presence — be it authorial or divine inspiration — left behind in a manuscript. This may imply an overly exalting view of authors, yet Chamsaz further illustrates how Zweig aligns this idea of a presence with an awareness of the humanity of all manuscript creators. Again hinting at a similar idea in Durrell's understanding of rewriting noted above, Chamsaz highlights Zweig's 'moral lesson', with which he reminded his readers of the *human* struggles of rewriting made plain by the markings of a manuscript. Shifting attention from the finished product to the rewriting process itself, as materialised in manuscripts, Chamsaz reveals how it is in this stage that Zweig saw the inspiration and struggle of an author and the coming-to-being of their perpetual working draft.

* * * * *

To conclude, this volume explores many of the different forms that rewriting has taken in twentieth-century literature, from Spanish short stories to Russian translations, English novels, and German biographies. Reminding us of the intertextuality of literature, authors rewrite the works of predecessors and contemporaries for many reasons, from interests of recognition to political motives. Traditions, as McLaughlin demonstrated in his aforementioned keynote address, are based on this continuity. Moreover, rewriting is not simply a technique *employed* in literature but one that has itself garnered interest *within* literary discourse, with Durrell, for example, highlighting the significance of rewriting to the authorial process, demonstrating in turn the human toil behind written creativity. In fact, whether rewriting another author or one's own previous drafts, rewriting is a process without end, rendering even completed manuscripts potential palimpsests of succeeding works. These four articles thus give an insight into many of the various manifestations of this vital literary mode, consequently revealing how literature and literary traditions would not exist as we know them without rewriting(s).

‘Cualquier hombre es todos los hombres’ (‘any man is all men’): Jorge Luis Borges, W. B. Yeats and Eternal Return

Grace Gaynor

University of Liverpool

Abstract. This paper considers the presence of W. B. Yeats in the work of Jorge Luis Borges. It focuses particularly on Borges’s use of Yeats’s poetry as epigraphs to two of his short stories, ‘Tema del traidor y del héroe’ (‘Theme of the Traitor and the Hero’) and ‘Biografía de Tadeo Isidoro Cruz (1829–1874)’ (‘A Biography of Tadeo Isidoro Cruz (1829–1874)’). An epigraph presents a unique way of one writer making reference to another, particularly within the broader context of Borges’s propensity to saturate his work with allusions and references to other writers. A consideration of these epigraphs as rewritings of Yeats by Borges is supported by paratextual theory, and further explores ideas of recontextualisation, appropriation, and attributing authorship. Finally, this paper also discusses Borges’s references to Yeats in the context of eternal return, examining the ways in which Borges employs a selective principle in his choice of Yeats.

* * * * *

From Homer to Shakespeare, Jorge Luis Borges densely punctuates his work with vast and various references to other writers.[1] From this mass of writers, the focus of this article is W. B. Yeats, and how the ways in which Borges makes reference to Yeats can be considered rewritings. There is much to be explored in the substance of Yeats’s writing itself and how its themes and preoccupations might be identified as influences on Borges’s writing. However, for the purposes of this article, I will be focusing on Borges’s use of Yeats’s poetry as epigraphs for two of his short stories: ‘Tema del traidor y del héroe’ (‘Theme of the Traitor and the Hero’)[2] and ‘Biografía de Tadeo Isidoro Cruz (1829–1874)’ (‘A Biography of Tadeo Isidoro Cruz (1829–1874)’),[3] which appeared in Borges’s collections,

[1] For the quotation cited in the title of this article, see Jorge Luis Borges, ‘La forma de la espada’, in *Obras Completas* (Buenos Aires: Emecé Editores, 1974), pp. 491–95 (p. 494), and Jorge Luis Borges, ’The Shape of the Sword’, in *Labyrinths: Selected Stories and Other Writings*, ed. by Donald A. Yates and James E. Irby, trans. by Donald A. Yates (UK: Penguin Books Ltd, 2000), pp. 96–101 (p. 99). Further references to *Obras Completas* will be written as *OC*.

[2] Borges, ‘Tema del traidor y del héroe’, in *OC*, pp. 496–98; Borges, ‘Theme of the Traitor and the Hero’, in *Labyrinths,* trans. by James E. Irby, pp. 102–05.

[3] Borges, ‘Biografía de Tadeo Isidoro Cruz (1829–1874)’, in *OC,* pp. 561–63; Jorge Luis Borges, ‘A Biography of Tadeo Isidoro Cruz (1829–1874)’, in *The Aleph,* trans. by Andrew Hurley (UK: Penguin, 2000), pp. 40–43.

Working Papers in the Humanities vol. 11 (2017), 9–16
© Modern Humanities Research Association 2017

Ficciones and *El Aleph,* respectively.[4] Epigraphs are a very particular way of one writer making reference to another, introducing, as I will explore, questions of rewriting and appropriation. I will also be considering these rewritings as adhering to a selective principle within eternal return, further investigating the uncertainty around authorship that arises from this idea.

Commenting on the presence of Yeats in Borges's work, Daniel Balderston suggests that, 'The fact that Yeats is so present and yet so seemingly absent [...] is striking'.[5] One way of exploring this disparity is to assess the number of references there are to Yeats using the online resource, 'Borges Center': a project directed by Balderston and based on his own previous index.[6] This has a 'Finder's Guide',[7] which allows the user to search for explicit or implicit references to keywords in Borges's work.[8] According to the 'Finder's Guide', Borges does not make many references to Yeats in comparison to other writers: that is, thirty-nine times in fourteen works, as opposed to Joyce's appearance ninety-four times.[9] His relative absence is thus evident, yet a consideration of the two epigraphs allows for his contrasting presence to be addressed. Whilst Yeats is not cited frequently, the quality of references in which he does appear — in the epigraphs — creates a strong impression of his presence in Borges's work.

According to Gérard Genette, an epigraph has four potential functions: the first is 'elucidating [...] not the text but the *title*';[10] the second is 'commenting on the text, whose meaning it indirectly [...] emphasizes';[11] the third is stressing 'not what it says but who the author is, plus the sense of indirect backing';[12] and the fourth is marking 'the period, the genre, or the tenor of a piece of writing'.[13] The second and third function apply most aptly to Borges's use of Yeats, in that Borges chooses Yeats to elucidate his stories and, I would argue, as a way of

4 Borges, *Ficciones* (Buenos Aires: Emecé Editores, 1944); *El Aleph* (Buenos Aires: Emecé Editores, 1949).

5 Daniel Balderston, 'The Rag-and-Bone Shop: On Borges, Yeats and Ireland', *Variaciones Borges*, 32 (2011), 41–58 (p. 43).

6 Daniel Balderston, *The Literary Universe of Jorge Luis Borges: An Index to References and Allusions to Persons, Titles, and Places in His Writings* (New York: Greenwood Pub. Group, 1986).

7 Borges Center, 'Finder's Guide' <http://www.borges.pitt.edu/finders-guide> [accessed 17 September 2015].

8 See 'The Rag-and-Bone Shop', where Balderston uses this index to critically analyse instances in which Yeats is mentioned in Borges's work, for example, in a rather long entry for 'William Butler Yeats': Borges, 'Introducción a la literatura inglesa', in *Obras completas en colaboración* (Buenos Aires: Emecé, 1979), pp. 854–55.

9 According to *The Literary Universe* (p. 164), Yeats is referenced twenty-four times in seven works. The increased figures reported by the 'Finder's Guide' is due to the publication of material that has been released since 1986 and the duplication of references that this material created, such as additional collected volumes of Borges's work. Therefore, the 'Finder's Guide' offers a more complete representation of these references.

10 Gerard Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, trans. by Jane E. Lewin (Cambridge: CUP, 1997), p. 156.

11 Ibid., p. 157.

12 Ibid., p. 159.

13 Ibid., p. 160.

legitimising his ideas by aligning himself with Yeats.[14] However, the importance with which I am investing these epigraphs is not necessarily covered by these four functions. Genette suggests that the position of the epigraph might affect how intrinsic it is to the overall work,[15] yet the 'aesthetic of brevity' that Borges employs in his short stories riles against superfluity, rendering the epigraphs both intrinsic and necessary to the story.[16]

The epigraph to 'Tema del traidor y del héroe' takes its lines from Yeats's poem 'Nineteen Hundred and Nineteen' in his collection *The Tower*. The lines chosen are:

> So the Platonic Year
> Whirls out new right and wrong,
> Whirls in the old instead;
> All men are dancers and their tread
> Goes with the barbarous clangour of a gong.[17]

The most striking element of this epigraph is its evocation of Yeats's geometric gyres, which were the foundation of his esoteric work, *A Vision*.[18] The story which Borges tells after the epigraph features a character called Ryan, whose preordained destiny is emphasised by the labyrinthine structure of the narrative. Faucher describes this 'building of the labyrinth', through the repetition of events in 'Tema', as 'the circular coiling away of events and the recoiling of events toward the center':[19] an image which illustrates the strong visual association between movements of history in Borges's labyrinth and the 'whirls out' and 'whirls in' of Yeats's gyre.

It is worthy of note that both of Yeats's collections *The Tower* and *The Winding Stair* were determined to be the result of *A Vision*; 'I put *The Tower* and *The Winding Stair* into evidence to show that my poetry has gained in self-

[14] For a delineation of the way in which Borges situates himself amongst other writers, see James Ramey, 'Synecdoche and Literary Parasitism in Borges and Joyce', *Comparative Literature*, 2, 61 (2009), 47–62.

[15] 'It goes without saying that this change in location may entail a change in role [...] the relationship between the introductory epigraph and text is still prospective [...] the terminal epigraph of Giono's *Un roi sans divertissement* [...] is [...] presented [...] as belonging fully to the text' (Genette, p. 149).

[16] Patricia Novillo-Corvalán, 'Transnational Modernist Encounters: Joyce, Borges, Bolaño, and the Dialectics of Expansion and Compression', *The Modern Language Review,* 108.2 (2013), 341–67 (p. 341).

[17] W. B. Yeats, 'Nineteen Hundred and Nineteen', in *W. B. Yeats Collected Poems,* ed. by Augustine Martin (London: Vintage, 1992), pp. 213–17 (p. 214).

[18] *A Vision* was first published in 1925 (W. B. Yeats, *A Critical Edition of Yeats' 'A Vision' (1925)*, ed. by George M. Harper and Walter K. Hood (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1978)), and republished in 1937 (W. B. Yeats, *A Vision (1937)* (London: Macmillan, 1978)), with significant changes made. My comments on the gyres are relevant to both publications, but for the purpose of this article, I will be referring to the 1937 version, 'A Vision B' (AVB), based on Yeats's claim that in the 1925 version, 'A Vision A' (AVA), he had 'misinterpreted the geometry' (AVB, p. 19) of the geometric symbolism apparently offered by the 'communicator[s]' (AVB, p. 9) through the medium of automatic writing (which originally provided the basis for *A Vision*), suggesting that he had interpreted the geometry more accurately for AVB.

[19] Kane X. Faucher, 'Modalities, Logic and the Cabala in Borges', *Variaciones Borges*, 13 (2002), 105–56 (pp. 108–09).

possession and power'.[20] The epigraph to Borges's 'Biografía de Tadeo Isidoro Cruz' ('I'm looking for the face I had | Before the world was made') comes from 'A Woman Young and Old';[21] a poem from *The Winding Stair*. Borges is seemingly drawn, in his choice of epigraphs, to the poetry which is derived from *A Vision*, and the specifically 'geometric symbolism' prevalent within this work.[22] As epigraphs, they do not only thematically inform Borges's stories, but provide geometric structures which extend beyond the paratext. Indeed, the overarching structure of the gyre, which is determining time and history, is introduced in the epigraph to 'Tema' and then pervades throughout the story that follows. Borges recontextualises both the lines from 'Nineteen Hundred and Nineteen' and their associated imagery and, by doing so, draws attention to the themes and images that are emphasised in these lines, which may not otherwise have prevailed if the poem was read as a whole.

The historical contexts into which Borges places Yeats's poetry are not obviously similar to the original contexts of the poetry. 'Nineteen Hundred and Nineteen', for example, was written in reaction to the violence committed by the Black and Tans at Gort in Galway during the year 1919,[23] an event not explicit in 'Tema'. However, it is not Yeats's historical preoccupations that Borges chooses to glean from the lines of poetry chosen as an epigraph. In the original poem, Yeats's evocation of the gyre is entrenched in a particular moment in history, yet it also gestures outwardly towards the abstract, otherworldly machinations of the cycles of time outlined in *A Vision*, a gesture which Borges casts back towards his own story, bereft of its specific historical context. Therefore, it is not only Yeats's thematic ideas that Borges recontextualises, but the abstract notions of history that are emphasised by the gyre and refracted back towards 'Tema', such as 'the concept of recurring history and the theme of men acting according to a 'prefigured' scheme'.[24]

Using epigraphs in such a way tends to establish 'a context and a sense of literary community',[25] and indeed there is nothing remarkable about the way in which Borges does this. However, it is Borges's recontextualisation of particular themes, images, and notions of history from Yeats's poetry that calls into question whether these epigraphs can still be considered as having been written by Yeats, or whether they have been rewritten out of recognition by Borges. The lines chosen by Borges are exactly the same as those in Yeats's original poem but, cut adrift and inserted into a new context, they have the potential to be made new, made Borges's.

[20] AVB, p. 8.
[21] Yeats, 'A Woman Young and Old', in *W. B. Yeats Collected Poems*, pp. 280–87 (p. 280).
[22] AVB, p. 13.
[23] See Michael Wood, *Yeats and Violence* (New York: OUP, 2010) for further explanations of Yeats's depiction of violence in 'Nineteen Hundred and Nineteen'.
[24] Evelyn Fishburn and Psiche Hughes, *A Dictionary of Borges* (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co Ltd, 1990), p. 244.
[25] David Leon Higdon, 'George Eliot and the Art of the Epigraph', *Nineteenth Century Fiction,* 25 (1970), 127–51 (p. 131).

This is reminiscent of Borges's story 'Pierre Menard, autor del Quijote' ('Pierre Menard, Author of the *Quixote*')[26] in which the character Pierre Menard attempts to rewrite Cervantes' *Don Quixote* in a self-imposed forgetfulness towards the original text. When lines from the two versions of the story are compared, they appear at first to be identical, with both Cervantes and Menard writing 'la verdad, cuya madre es la historia, émula del tiempo, depósito de las acciones, testigo de lo pasado, ejemplo y aviso de lo presente, advertencia de lo por venir' ('truth, whose mother is history, rival of time, depository of deeds, witness of the past, exemplar and advisor to the present, and the future's counsellor'). However, the narrator suggests that they are different because of the contexts in which both authors understand the definitions and connotations of the language they use, 'Menard, contemporáneo de William James, no define la historia como una indagación de la realidad sino como su origen' ('Menard, a contemporary of William James, does not define history as an inquiry into reality but as its origin').[27] Menard does not simply appropriate the words of Cervantes; this rewriting is an organic and literal recreation of a text. Here, Borges provides us with an example of how complicated attributing authorship is when a text is rewritten, particularly when identical language does not serve as sufficient evidence for verisimilitude.

Just as the gyre in the epigraph to 'Tema' sets up the labyrinthine structure of the narrative that follows, so too does the epigraph to 'Biografía'. Borges attributed this epigraph to the collection *The Winding Stair* rather than the poem 'A Woman Young and Old'. Here, the image of the winding stair serves a purpose that the title of the poem does not, in that it alludes to the systemisation of time that occurs within the story, whose themes include ideas of history and destiny. One of Borges's translators, Norman Thomas Di Giovanni, once asked Borges why he credited this epigraph to the collection rather than the poem. Borges replied that, 'it made me think of the library, with the winding staircases at hand'.[28] Di Giovanni suggests that this is 'a lapse on Borges's part',[29] as the library he referred to was the Biblioteca Nacional de la República in Argentina, of which he became director in 1955, eleven years after the story was written. By making this alteration, Borges not only rewrites the title of the poem, he also suggests that the title of the collection of poetry, *The Winding Stair,* so effectively captures the essence of each of its poems, that any line in the collection can subscribe to this image.

If Borges's explanation for this authorial decision is based upon an experience which, according to Di Giovanni, he had not yet had, then his motivations for rewriting the title remain open for speculation. If it did not capture the memory

[26] Borges, 'Pierre Menard, autor del Quijote', in *OC,* pp. 444–50; Borges, 'Pierre Menard, Author of the *Quixote*', in *Labyrinths,* trans. by James E. Irby, pp. 62–71.

[27] 'Pierre Menard, autor del Quijote', p. 449; 'Pierre Menard, Author of the *Quixote*', p. 69.

[28] Norman Thomas Di Giovanni, *Borges on writing,* ed. by Norman Thomas di Giovanni and others (United States: Dutton & Co, 1973), p. 119.

[29] Ibid., p. 119.

of this physical winding staircase, then it must have appealed to him as an abstract symbol, for reasons he cannot recall or does not admit when asked about it years later. Yeats's account of the winding stairs at his own home, the tower Thoor Ballylee, might offer some insight into the symbolic appeal of this image: 'this winding, gyring, spring treadmill of a stair is my ancestral stair; that Goldsmith and the Dean, Berkeley and Burke have travelled there'.[30] Here, Yeats uses this image to position himself amongst writers and philosophers, infusing the winding stairs with a sense of history and memory. It is therefore an appropriate image to evoke at a moment in which Borges is choosing to situate himself within Yeats's thought.

The same occurs in 'Tema', where he attributes his epigraph not to the poem 'Nineteen Hundred and Nineteen', but to the collection of Yeats's poetry, *The Tower*. The tower appealed to Borges like the winding stair did, as a highly symbolic image associated strongly with Yeats, and particularly with memory. Indeed, just as 'Tema' is preoccupied with memory, so too does Yeats's poem, 'The Tower', evoke 'images, in the Great Memory stored',[31] making the tower an apt image for the epigraph to this story.[32] To understand this further, one must look back to Borges' work, *Atlas*,[33] and to his entry on 'Ireland' (in which he also mentions Yeats) that he illustrates solely with images of an early medieval Irish round tower. Borges describes this round tower as 'The most vivid of my impressions of Ireland' where 'the monks [...] saved Latin and Greek, that is, culture, for our inheritance'.[34] In 'Tema' this image of the round tower as a receptacle for the preservation of the memory of Latin and Greek culture is reflected again in the symbolic impact of the destruction of the Irish round tower of Kilgarven,[35] an event which represents the unravelling of time and memory within the story.

To return to 'Biografía', Thomas Rice commented that this story 'despite its epigraph from Yeats, owes more to Joyce'.[36] A consideration of the epigraph as a rewriting of Yeats by Borges already throws the notion of authorship into an ambiguous state. This remark goes further. Borges himself explores the idea that even an explicit reference to one writer might mask an affinity to another

[30] Yeats, 'Blood and the Moon', in *W. B. Yeats Collected Poems*, pp. 244–46 (p. 245).

[31] Yeats, 'The Tower', in *W. B. Yeats Collected Poems*, pp. 200–06 (p. 203).

[32] For Borges's comments on Yeats in relation to notions of great memory and personal memory, see Borges and Osvaldo Ferrari, *Reencuentro: Diálogos Inéditos* (Buenos Aires: Sudamericana, 1999), p. 195.

[33] Jorge Luis Borges and María Kodama, *Atlas*, trans. by Anthony Kerrigan (London: Viking, 1986). This book was the product of a trip in which Borges and María Kodama travelled around the world choosing particular images associated with the places to which they had travelled, and writing a small section on each location.

[34] *Atlas*, p. 16.

[35] 'Tema del traidor y del héroe', p. 497. This event is anticipated by Caesar's wife, Calpurnia, who saw the destruction of the tower in her dreams ('La mujer de César, Calpurnia, vio en sueños abatida una torre').

[36] Thomas J. Rice, 'Subtle Reflections of/upon Joyce in/by Borges', *Journal of Modern Literature*, 4 (2000), 47–62 (p. 51).

in 'Pierre Menard', when he says, 'Atribuir a Louis Ferdinand Céline o a James Joyce la *Imitación de Christo* ¿no es una suficiente renovación de esos tenues avisos espirituales?' ('To attribute the *Imitatio Christi* to Louis Ferdinand Céline or to James Joyce, is this not a sufficient renovation of its tenuous spiritual indications?').[37] The remark from Rice suggests that Borges did not attribute his epigraph correctly, that he misinterpreted the 'spiritual indications' of his own work, and that he ought to have used an epigraph from Joyce, or kept the lines from Yeats, but attributed them to Joyce instead.

The comment by Rice may appear to undermine Borges's particular choice of Yeats for his epigraphs. Yet it also has implications for a consideration of these epigraphs in the context of eternal return.[38] According to this concept, Borges was rewriting all of his literary predecessors, including both Yeats and Joyce. However, whist Borges's abundant use of references to other writers and philosophers in his writing creates an impression of multiple authorship, he was also highly selective about the writers that he chose. In *The Will to Power*, Nietzsche discussed 'endless recurrence' as 'a selective principle, in the service of strength'. He furthered this qualitative approach when he exclaimed 'everything becomes and recurs eternally — escape is impossible! — Supposing we could judge value, what follows?'.[39] In 'Pierre Menard', Menard says, 'El Quijote [...] me interesa profundamente pero no me parece ¿cómo lo diré? inevitable [...] el Quijote es innecesario. Puedo premeditar su escritura' ('The *Quixote* [...] interests me deeply, but it does not seem — how shall I say it? — inevitable [...] the *Quixote* is unnecessary. I can premeditate writing it').[40] Borges himself applies a distinct separation between texts that are 'unnecessary' and those that will return 'inevitably' by referencing in his work the writers that he selectively returns. In this sense, Borges's rewriting of Yeats through his epigraphs presents a purposeful exhumation of Yeats from the revolutions of eternal return, as well as an attempt to safe-guard symbols particular to Yeats, such as the tower, the gyre, and the winding stair.

In a review of Borges entitled 'A Modern Master',[41] Paul de Man uses lines from Yeats's poem 'The Statues' as an epigraph.[42] This decision to mimic Borges's use of Yeats's poetry as an epigraph, but to re-write Borges's choice by selecting a different poem by Yeats, creates the impression that De Man is rewriting Borges rewriting Yeats, continuing the illusion of an eternal cycle of

[37] 'Pierre Menard, autor del Quijote', p. 450; 'Pierre Menard, Author of the *Quixote*', p. 71.

[38] For an explanation of this concept of eternal return (e.g. 'The image of cycles in which the universe returns to re-enact exactly the same course of events'), see Simon Blackburn, *The Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy* (Oxford: OUP, 2008), p. 161. Oxford Reference Online.

[39] Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche, 'Plan for an unfinished book: The Eternal Recurrence', in *The Will to Power*, ed. and trans. by Walter Kaufmann (New York: Vintage Books, 1968), p. 1058.

[40] 'Pierre Menard, autor del Quijote', pp. 447–48; 'Pierre Menard, Author of the *Quixote*', p. 71.

[41] Paul De Man, 'A Modern Master', *The New York Review of Books*, 8.7 (1964), 8–10.

[42] The lines he chose were: 'Empty eyeballs knew | That knowledge increases unreality, that | Mirror on mirror mirrored is all the show'. Yeats, 'The Statues', in *W. B. Yeats Collected Poems*, pp. 349–50 (p. 350).

rewriting and reinforcing Borges's apocryphal line, 'cualquier hombre es todos los hombres'.[43] The notion that any man is all men typifies Borges's explorations of the sanctity of individual authorship, or rather the lack thereof. However, for de Man, the epigraph simply being by Yeats is sufficient to set a thematic tone for a discussion of Borges, as it is 'not what it says but who the author is'.[44] Not only does this go some way towards reasserting the authorship of Yeats, it also illustrates Ronald Christ's observation that 'Borges' writing is instinct with its own criticism [...] critics have, therefore, imitated him in writing about him'.[45] Like Borges, de Man's illusion of multiple, or rather eternal authorship is once more shown to be highly selective. This in turn reveals both authors as desirous of Genette's third function: the 'indirect backing' of the epigraph. It is in his choice of epigraphs that Borges, like de Man after him, selects 'his peers and thus his place in the pantheon'.[46]

43 'La forma de la espada', in *OC*, p. 494. See the title of this article for its translation.
44 Genette, p. 159.
45 Ronald Christ, 'A Modest Proposal for the Criticism of Borges', in *The Cardinal Points of Borges,* ed. by Lowell Dunham and Ivar Ivask (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1971), pp. 7–15 (p. 7).
46 Genette, p. 160.

Rewriting *Othello* for the Stalinist Stage: The Case of Sergei and Anna Radlov

Jill Warren

University of Nottingham

Abstract. Anna Radlova was one of the first to undertake the translation of Shakespeare into Russian in the Stalinist period, whilst *Othello* was the most popular of Shakespeare's plays in the Soviet Union in the 1930s–40s. Radlova's translation of *Othello* was used by her director husband, Sergei Radlov in two highly successful productions in 1935, at his studio-theatre in Leningrad, and the Malyi Theatre in Moscow. For Radlova, the translator was first and foremost a communicator, a mouthpiece through which the greats of foreign literature and drama could speak to the Soviet people. She argued the need for new Russian-language versions of Shakespeare, which could be truly understood and appreciated by Soviet audiences. Radlov, meanwhile, contended that as a soldier embodying all the best qualities of the Renaissance period, Othello was the ideal hero for the Soviet stage. This article uses translation theory in order to investigate the ways in which the play was shaped by the boundaries of socialist realism, and explores the tactics adopted by a translator and director in order to ensure that Shakespeare's play remained on stage under the increasingly repressive political regime.

* * * * *

In December 1935, the respected producer and director Sergei Radlov was invited to stage a production of *Othello* at the Malyi Theatre in Moscow. He chose to direct the play using the translation undertaken by his wife, Anna Radlova. Published in 1929, this translation was the first version of *Othello* to be completed in the newly Soviet Russia. The pamphlet produced by the theatre to accompany the production hailed it as a 'resurrection' of *Othello*, and promoted the fact that Radlova's new translation was an essential part of this innovative interpretation: 'Отказ от традиционных переводов *Отелло* позволяет во многом по-новому понять основные положения трагедии и по-новому осветить отдельные её образы'.[1] The production's première on 10 December 1935 generated considerable discussion in the press, much of which centred on the translation, and was highly critical of Radlova's work. In contrast, public reaction to the production was extremely positive, with leading actor Aleksandr

[1] *'Otello' v Malom teatre — postanovka 1935 g.* (Moscow: Publishing House of the Museum of the State Academic Malyi Theatre, 1935), p. 11. [Rejection of the traditional translations of Shakespeare allows the fundamental aspects of the tragedy to be understood in many new ways, and throws new light on individual characters].

Working Papers in the Humanities vol. 11 (2017), 17–29
© Modern Humanities Research Association 2017

Ostuzhev receiving thirty-seven curtain calls on the first night.[2] There was huge demand for tickets, and consequently *Othello* became an essential part of the Malyi Theatre's repertoire in the 1930s.

Using modern translation theory, this article examines the reasons behind this divided reaction, and how this particular translator and director shaped their 'rewriting' of *Othello* for the new political climate of the Stalinist 1930s. In spite of the eminence of her translation in the 1930s, little critical work on Radlova, her life, her poetry or her translations now exists. The most likely reason for this lack is that like many of their generation, Radlova and her husband suffered arrest and imprisonment at the hands of the Stalinist regime, leading to a ban on the publication or discussion of their work which lasted many years.[3] While the work of Sergei Radlov has been more fully explored,[4] their work has rarely been considered together; the working relationship between this translator and director of Shakespeare has never been fully investigated, and this article hopes to go some way to addressing this lacuna.

The Radlovs and their work

Born in 1891 in St Petersburg, Anna Radlova began her creative working life as a poet. Between 1918 and 1923, she published three volumes of poetry and a play.[5] Replete with biblical motifs and references to classical literature and mythology, Radlova's verse exhibited a high degree of religious intensity as well as a strongly pacifist stance, which did not find favour with those in power. Commenting on Russian women writers, Olga Muller Cooke notes a change of theme over Radlova's three collections of poetry: 'Whereas *Honeycomb* [1918] has an obviously personal feminine voice, the second and third volumes read as universal denunciation of the Bolshevik revolution'.[6] For example, if the Angel of Rebellion in the following lines from the poem 'Petersburg' (1920) is seen as a metaphor for the spirit of Revolution sweeping the city, bringing about civil war, it is not difficult to identify why Radlova's writing might have

[2] David Zolotnitsky, *The Shakespearean Fate of a Soviet Director* (Luxembourg: Harwood Academic Publishers, 1995), p. 131.

[3] In March 1942, the Radlovs and their theatre company were evacuated to Piatigorsk. The Nazis invaded the city five months later, and the Radlovs were caught behind enemy lines. Their theatre company performed in enemy prisoner-of-war camps across Europe for the remainder of hostilities. When war ended, they willingly chose to return to the USSR, but rumours about their true loyalties were beginning to circulate. They were arrested and taken to the Lubianka, and sentenced to nine years in a labour camp. Radlova died after 3 and a half years of imprisonment. Radlov survived his term and was released in 1953, and rehabilitated a year later. He chose to relocate to Latvia, where he continued to stage productions of Shakespeare. He died on 27 October 1958.

[4] Most notably by David Zolotnitsky, whose work includes a complete study of Radlov's directorial career. See n. 2.

[5] The volumes of poetry were entitled *Soty* (*Honeycomb*, 1918); *Korabli* (*Ships*, 1920); and *Krylatyi gost'* (*The Winged Guest*, 1922). Radlova's play, *Bogoroditsyn korabl'* (*The Ship of the Virgin Mother*), was published in 1923. Her final work in prose, *Povesti o Tatarinovoi* (*Tales of Tatarinova*), was written in 1931, but not published until 1996.

[6] Olga Muller Cooke, 'Anna Radlova', in *Russian Women Writers*, ed. by Christine Tomei, 2 vols (New York: Garland Publishing, 1999), II, pp. 753–61, (p. 754).

raised questions with the authorities: 'Как пролетал над городом, вселенской тревогой дыша, | Огнекрылил, огнеликий Ангел Мятежа, | Как слепил он глаза испуганным и раненым, | Как побеждали, как падали под крылатым знаменем'.[7]

Although her style of writing was praised by some prominent literary figures, such as Mikhail Kuz'min and Prince D. S. Mirsky, Radlova came in for sharp criticism from other commentators. Amongst them was Osip Mandelstam, who made a scathing reference to the 'dubious solemnity' of her work in his essay, 'Literary Moscow'.[8] By the end of the 1920s, Radlova sought refuge in translation. Many writers of her generation who were viewed as 'politically questionable' by the authorities and so unable to publish were forced to turn to translation in this way.[9] While it provided them with a suitable profession, those in power could still heavily censor their output. The mass production of re-writings of foreign literature, however, provided the USSR with the welcome benefit of appearing international.[10]

As translation theorists Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere have identified, every translation is a rewriting of an original text, shaped by the environment in which the rewriting process takes place: 'All rewritings, whatever their intention, reflect a certain ideology and a poetics and as such manipulate literature to function in a given society in a given way'.[11] In order to understand a translator's decisions, therefore, it is important to appreciate the context in which they were working. Between 1929 and 1938, Radlova translated five of Shakespeare's tragedies: *Romeo and Juliet*, *Othello*, *Macbeth*, *Richard III*, and *Hamlet*. Her translations were performed throughout the 1930s, the period which saw the introduction of socialist realism as the only acceptable method for creative output. From its announcement at the first congress of the Union of Soviet Writers in 1934, all forms of art officially had a sole purpose: 'the ideological remoulding and education of the working people in the spirit of socialism'.[12] In order to preserve their membership of the Union, and therefore

[7] Anna Radlova, *Korabli* (St Petersburg: Alkonost, 1920), p. 20. Cooke provides the following literal translation of these lines: 'How the goldenwinged, goldenfaced Angel of Rebellion, | Flew over the city, breathing universal alarm, | How he blinded the eyes of the wounded and frightened, | How they conquered, how they fell under the winged banner'; see Cooke, 'Anna Radlova', pp. 757–58.

[8] Osip Mandelstam, 'Literary Moscow', in *Osip Mandelstam: Selected Essays*, trans. by Sidney Monas (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1977), p. 134.

[9] Boris Pasternak, Anna Akhmatova, Osip Mandelstam, and Mikhail Zoshchenko were some of the most prominent writers who translated out of necessity.

[10] One example of a venture which recruited hundreds of writers and translators in the 1920s was the ambitious *Vsemirnaia Literatura* (World Literature) project, which was launched with Lenin's full support. Overseen by the Commissar of Education, Anatolii Lunacharskii, and the writer Maksim Gor'kii, the project involved hundreds of writers and translators, whose task it was to assess all existing translations of foreign literature, and then re-translate anything felt to be substandard.

[11] Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere, 'Preface' in *Translation, History and Culture*, ed. by Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere (London: Cassell, 1990), p. ix.

[12] Andrei Zhdanov, 'Soviet Literature — The Richest in Ideas, The Most Advanced Literature', in *Soviet Writers' Congress, 1934: The Debate on Socialist Realism and Modernism in the Soviet Union* (London: Lawrence & Wishart Ltd, 1977), pp. 15–24 (p. 21).

their right to publish, all writers and translators had to adopt this new credo. Shakespeare was posited by those in authority as an ideal dramatic model for Soviet writers to emulate,[13] but in re-translating his plays, Radlova would still have had to ensure that her interpretations fitted in with the new ideology.

Radlova was married to Sergei Radlov, a producer and director who had trained under Vsevolod Meierkhol'd at his Borodinskaia studio. Radlov had begun his career working for TEO (Teatral'nyi otdel'), the Theatre Department attached to the People's Commissariat for Education, staging mass propagandist pageants. In 1919, he formed his own comic troupe of actors and performers known as the 'Theatre of Popular Comedy' (Teatr narodnoi komedii). Here he experimented with improvisation and circus elements, inviting professional artistes such as the celebrated clown, Georges Delvari, and the acrobat Serge (Sergei Diaghilev), into his troupe.[14] When, for financial reasons, the Popular Comedy closed in 1922, Radlov founded his own studio-theatre in St Petersburg, becoming one of the most prominent directors of the 1920s-30s. Shakespeare was central to Radlov's directorial oeuvre, and his wife's translations formed the cornerstone of his repertoire. He seems to have had a particular preference for *Othello*: 'Постановка этой пьесьи была моей заветной мечтой'.[15] Before accepting the Malyi Theatre's invitation to direct, he had already staged three productions of the play, at the Aleksandrinskii Theatre in St Petersburg in 1927, at his Molodoi (Young) Theatre in 1932, and again at his renamed Studio-Theatre in April 1935.[16]

Radlov's preference for *Othello* may have been influenced by the fact that though Soviet writers were encouraged to learn from Shakespeare, not all of his plays fitted with the new political model. It was widely known that Stalin detested *Hamlet*, finding the protagonist far too hesitant and far too philosophical for the socialist realist doctrine, and so, tacitly, the play had been removed from most theatres' repertoires.[17] *Macbeth*, which also contains a regicide, was similarly unpopular with the authorities. In contrast, *Othello* was by far the most popular of Shakespeare's plays in the 1930s, with over one

[13] Most notably by the writer Maksim Gor'kii who, in a speech on dramaturgy in 1932, called on all Soviet writers to learn from Shakespeare.

[14] Konstantin Rudnitsky, *Russian and Soviet Theatre: tradition and the avant-garde*, trans. by Roxane Permar, ed. by Lesley Milne (London: Thames and Hudson, 1988), pp. 57–58.

[15] Sergei Radlov, 'Kak ia stavliu Shekspira', in *Nasha rabota nad klassikami*, ed. by A. A. Gvozdev (Leningrad: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1936), pp. 11–70 (p. 18). [A production of this play was my cherished dream].

[16] Radlov did not look back favourably on his Aleksandrinskii production. He attributed much of his dissatisfaction to fact that the theatre refused to commission a new translation, and so he was forced to use Petr Veinberg's translation from 1864. By 1932, he was able to use his wife's new translation, and consequently was much happier with the results; see Radlov, 'Kak ia stavliu Shekspira', p. 18.

[17] Eleanor Rowe, *Hamlet: A Window on Russia* (New York: New York University Press, 1976), p. 134. Rowe explains that in 1941, a remark from Stalin put an end to rehearsals for an impending production of *Hamlet*, and that subsequently, the staging of the play was implicitly banned.

hundred more productions of the play staged than its nearest rival, *Romeo and Juliet*.[18]

There are several reasons why *Othello* fitted easily into the new political boundaries for theatre. Discussing the Soviet novel, Katerina Clark notes that '[t]he "positive hero" was a defining feature of Soviet socialist realism. The hero was expected to be an emblem of Bolshevik virtue, someone the reading public might be inspired to emulate'.[19] On stage, Othello, the soldier, who fights for his adopted country and the woman he loves, was therefore a more suitable hero than Hamlet the philosopher. As Inna Solovyova notes, during the 1930s there was a new emphasis in the theatre on clarity, and truth to life.[20] The nature of tragedy had to be very specific. In his article on Shakespeare and socialist realism, Arkady Ostrovsky describes how, in the 1930s, the source of tragedy could be an accident, a misunderstanding, or a mistake as in *Othello* or *Romeo and Juliet*, but not the conflict or guilt of the protagonist in *Hamlet* or *Macbeth*.[21] Evil had to come from elsewhere, not from within. Othello emerges as the most fitting hero — he is manipulated by Iago rather than being innately capable of wrongdoing himself. Much of the play's plot hinges on untruthful reports of events and the need for evidence, inevitably striking chords with audience members living through the purges of the 1930s.

With each production of *Othello* that he directed, Radlov developed and re-shaped his interpretation. He argued that understanding the time from which the plays originated was essential for ensuring that their true spirit could be portrayed on the Soviet stage.[22] He wanted his productions to reflect what he saw as the 'original' Shakespeare, and for his plays to be accessible for working people.[23] Using his wife's translation in 1932 he had stated that this new version of the play enabled him to produce a truly realistic Shakespeare: 'у меня в руках имелся новый превосходный перевод Анны Радловой, в сущности, всем своим живым мастерством предопределивший переход к реалистической трактовке Шекспира'.[24]

[18] Arkady Ostrovsky, 'Shakespeare as a Founding Father of Socialist Realism: The Soviet Affair with Shakespeare', in *Shakespeare in the Worlds of Communism and Socialism*, ed. by Irena Makaryk and Joseph G. Price (Toronto: University Press, 2006), pp. 56–83 (p. 61).

[19] Katerina Clark, *The Soviet Novel*, 3rd edn (Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2000), p. 46.

[20] Inna Solovyova, 'The theatre and Socialist Realism, 1929–1953', trans. by Jean Benedetti, in *A History of Russian Theatre*, ed. by Robert Leach and Victor Borovsky (Cambridge: University Press, 1999), pp. 325–57 (p. 338).

[21] Ostrovsky, 'Shakespeare as a Founding Father of Socialist Realism', p. 62.

[22] Radlov, 'Kak ia stavliu Shekspira', p. 18.

[23] Moscow, Bakhrushin Theatre Museum Library, S.E. Radlov, 'Shekspir i sovremennost', speech given to the *Tea-klub* (Theatre Club), 10 October 1933, p. 2.

[24] Radlov, 'Kak ia stavliu Shekspira', p. 20. [I had in hand the excellent new translation by Anna Radlova, which in essence, with all its vivid mastery, predetermined the transition to a realistic interpretation of Shakespeare].

Anna Radlova's translation of *Othello*

A much discussed topic amongst theatre translation theorists is the contrast in demands made of a translation when it is intended for performance, as opposed to reading. As Bassnett comments, '[p]lays, we are informed, must be transformed, must be translated in order to be "performable"'.[25] This question is also raised in studies of Shakespeare in translation. In his work on the history of *Hamlet* in Russia, Alexei Semenenko posits that there are two parallel canons of the play in Russian: 'there were simultaneously two canonical translations in each period which co-existed more or less peacefully due to the fact that they occupied different media: literature and the theater'.[26] Semenenko's research does not include assessment of *Othello*, as yet a neglected element of the Russian Shakespeare tradition. However, his work highlights the importance of analysing the influence of existing translations on those which follow, as well as how different trends in translation style prove popular with readers and audiences over time. Given more space than the current article allows, it would be interesting to draw comparisons between Radlova's work and other translations of *Othello*, in order to illuminate the different tactics used. Of particular importance for appreciating the reception given to Radlova's work are the translations of Petr Veinberg, whose version of *Othello* was first published in 1864, but remained a popular choice onstage and in anthologies until the time Radlova was working,[27] and the translations of two of Radlova's contemporaries, Boris Pasternak (whose translation was published in 1945) and Mikhail Lozinskii (licensed for performance in 1948). The translations of Pasternak and Lozinskii fall on opposing sides of Semenenko's twentieth-century canon of *Hamlet.* An advocate of literalism, Lozinskii was an eminent translator of verse who was awarded the Order of Stalin for his translations of Dante in 1946. He argued that a translation should be like a transparent window, allowing a clear and undistorted view of the original.[28] In contrast, Boris Pasternak took a free approach to translation, believing that each should be appreciated as a work of art in its own right.[29] His translations

[25] Susan Bassnett, *Reflections on Translation* (Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 2011), p. 100.

[26] Alexei Semenenko, 'No text is an island: Translating *Hamlet* in twenty-first-century Russia', in *Contexts, Subtexts and Pretexts: Literary translation in Eastern Europe and Russia*, ed. by Brian James Baer (Amsterdam: John Benjamin's Publishing Company, 2011), pp. 249–63 (p. 250).

[27] For example, Stanislavskii chose to use Veinberg's translation in his Moscow Art Theatre production in 1930. He subsequently published Veinberg's text alongside his unfinished production plan for *Othello* in 1945, further strengthening the canonisation of Veinberg's translation in the minds of audiences and critics alike. See K. S. Stanislavskii, *Rezhisserskii plan* Otello (Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1945).

[28] Iuri Chekalov, 'Perevody "Gamleta" M. Lozinskim, A. Radlovoi i B. Pasternakom v otsenke sovetskoe kritiki 30-kh godov', in *Shekspirovskie chteniia*, ed. by A. Anikst (Moscow: Nauka, 1990), pp. 177–200 (p. 177).

[29] Boris Pasternak, 'Zametki perevodchika', in *Sobranie sochinenii v piati tomakh*, 5 vols, ed. by A. A. Vosnenskii (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literature, 1989–1992), VI, pp. 392–95 (p. 393).

of Shakespeare, among the most popular and most frequently performed in Russia, have been criticised for their lack of faithfulness to their source texts. The fact that Radlova was married to a theatre director who went on to stage her translations may have influenced her approach to Shakespeare, and enabled her to use translation tactics more suitable for the stage. Comparisons with those translations which preceded and followed her work allow an assessment as to how far this was the case.

'Rude am I in my speech': the language of Radlova's translation

In their speeches and articles on Shakespeare, both husband and wife had similar principles. They both believed that the Soviet era called for a fresh approach to Shakespeare, and were extremely critical of existing translations. Shakespeare had first entered the Russian cultural sphere through adaptations drawn from French and German versions of his plays. The traditions of Neoclassism and Romanticism had therefore shaped the earliest Russian rewritings of his works. These previous translators had elevated Shakespeare's language, and romanticised the earthier nature of his imagery. As Radlova termed it, these translators were guilty of 'затягивая шекспировскую «варварскую» музу в железный корсет расиновской жеманницы' (lacing Shakespeare's barbarian muse into the iron corset of a Racinian prude).[30] She wanted a return to a 'realistic' Shakespeare, a return to the richness of everyday speech: 'Мы будем драться за нефальсифицированного, за подлинного, нежного и грубого реалистического Шекспира.'[31]

In keeping with the educational requirements for culture in the 1920s-30s, Radlova felt that the target audience should be the prime consideration. She aimed to make Soviet actors able to perform Shakespeare's language and for audiences not to need dictionaries and commentaries to appreciate his plays.[32] It is perhaps this element of her translation 'policy' that is most evident in her work, as she frequently includes simpler language and explanations than are present in Shakespeare's text. For example, Desdemona's insistence that she does not want to return to live at her father's house following her marriage, 'Nor would I there reside' becomes the simpler 'Я не хочу там жить' (I don't want to live there),[33] while a description of 'distempering draughts' becomes the more transparent 'крепких вин' (strong wines).[34]

Reviewers of Radlova's translation also noted her concern for the actors. As theatre translation theorists such as Patrice Pavis have observed, the text is only one element of a theatrical performance, and an actor will supplement their role

30 Anna Radlova, 'Kipiachennyi dukh', *Sovietskoe Iskysstvo*, 26 February 1933, p. 3.
31 Moscow, Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv literatury i isskustv (RGALI), f. 614, op. 1, d. 264, l. 1–8. (l.8). [We will fight for the unfalsified, the original, tender and coarse, realistic Shakespeare].
32 Anna Radlova, 'Perevody Shekspira', *Literaturnaia* gazeta, 4 December 1935, p. 4.
33 Vil'iam Shekspir, *Otello*, trans. by Anna Radlova (Leningrad: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1939), <http://www.lib.ru/SHAKESPEARE> [accessed 01 October 2016], I. 3.
34 Ibid, I. 1.

'with all sorts of aural, gestural, mimic and postural means'.[35] Commenting on the production's use of Radlova's translation, the critic Iosif Iuzovskii asserted that the language Radlova uses is often very condensed, giving the actors space to perform: 'Она приглашает актера к творческой инициативе'.[36] In other words, the concise nature of Radlova's text allows the actors to have maximum input, employing many of the 'supplementary means' to which Pavis refers in order to exemplify meaning, rather than the verbal text driving the action. Similarly, S. Ignatov praised Radlova for the succinct yet expressive nature of her language: 'переводчица удалось найти язык очень сжатый выразительный несомненно помогающий актеру не декламировать, а лепить словесную ткань роли'.[37] However, Iuzovskii also implored Radlova to consider her audience as well as her actors. He stated that her lines are sometimes too compact, so that one has to return to an older translation in order to understand their meaning, and that he would rather sacrifice this density so as not to have the audience left guessing at riddles.[38]

It was the coarseness of Radlova's translation, however, which caused most discomfort amongst critics, as she was certainly not afraid to reflect the bawdier side of Shakespeare's language. As an example, the word 'whore' appears thirteen times in Shakespeare's text, once used by Emilia as a verb, to 'bewhore' (to call someone a whore).

OTHELLO Villain, be sure thou prove my love a whore![39]
ОТЕЛЛО Подлец, ты должен доказать, что **шлюха**
Моя любовь[40]

In the above example, Radlova translates the word 'whore' literally, using the word 'шлюха' throughout her translation. This may have been seen as shocking by some audience members, since previous translators had chosen not to render this word literally. Petr Veinberg, whose 1864 version of *Othello* had remained the most performed before Radlova's, removed all incidences of this word from his text, using alternatives (in this case, 'разврат', meaning debauchery) which were described by one 1930s editor as 'decently biblical'.[41]

ОТЕЛЛО Мерзавец, ты обязан
Мне доказать **разврат** моей жены[42]

[35] Patrice Pavis, *Theatre at the Crossroads of Culture*, trans. by Loren Kruger (London and New York, 1992), p. 144.
[36] I. Iuzovskii, 'Na spektakle v Malom teatre', *Literaturnaia gazeta*, 69, 15 December 1935, p. 3. [She invites the actor to have creative initiative].
[37] S. Ignatov, 'Torzhestvo aktera *Otello* v Malom teatre', *Teatr i dramaturgiia*, 2 (1935), 63–69 (p. 63). [the translator has been successful in finding very succinct and expressive language, undoubtedly helping the actor not to recite but sculpt the oral fabric of the role].
[38] Ibid. [We would immediately sacrifice this compactness because of the loss of clarity of meaning].
[39] William Shakespeare, *Othello*, ed. by Michael Neill (Oxford: University Press, 2006), III. 3. 361.
[40] Shekspir, *Otello*, trans. by Radlova, III. 3. 167–68.
[41] A. A. Smirnov, 'O russkikh perevodakh Shekspira', *Zvezda*, 4 (1934), 165–72 (p. 169).
[42] Vil'iam Shekspir, *Otello, venetsianskii mavr*, trans. by Pëtr Veinberg, <www.lib.ru/SHAKESPEARE> [accessed: 1 October 2016], III. 3.

Some critics welcomed the fact that Radlova had brought Shakespeare down from the heights to which Romanticism had elevated him, although others felt she had gone too far.[43] Pasternak and Lozinskii do use the word 'шлюха', but also some of the softer alternatives favoured by Veinberg, arguably making Radlova's the strongest language used. Nevertheless, Radlov defended his wife's translation choices vehemently, arguing that these 'harsh' words had been used by Shakespeare because they brought his art closer to real life: 'А для чего они нужны Шекспиру? Потому что он ими приближает искусство к реальной жизни, к реалным людям'.[44]

'Valiant Othello': the ideal hero?

Translation theorist Lawrence Venuti argues that translations 'position readers in domestic intelligibilities that are also ideological positions, ensembles of values, beliefs, and representations that further the interests of certain social groups over others'.[45] Given the precarious nature of Radlova's position as a translator, it seems likely that there would be evidence within the text that the new policies of the regime were having an effect on the translation.

Radlova's 'rewriting' of Othello's description of how he and Desdemona fell in love with one another is one which generated many columns of discussion in the press. One of the reasons for this was because it was strikingly different from Veinberg's translation (1864), which was best known at the time. Shakespeare's original lines are as follows:

OTHELLO She loved me for the dangers I had passed,
And I loved her that she did pity them.[46]

Veinberg had translated this as:

ОТЕЛЛО Она меня за **муки** полюбила,
А я ее — за состраданье к ним.[47]

Here, Veinberg gives 'dangers' as 'муки', which literally means 'torments'. According to the writer and critic Kornei Chukovskii, Veinberg's translation of these lines was so popular that it had become a saying in its own right, and, along with other critics, he wrote of his surprise that Radlova had deviated from this 'gem' of translation.[48] It should be noted, however, that Radlova was

[43] Ignatov praised Radlova for removing the 'слащавость' (saccharine aspects) of Veinberg's nineteenth-century re-writing of the play, while Iuzovskii argued that Radlova had re-instated the physicality of Shakespeare's language to such an extent that it was too graphic to be used on stage. See Ignatov, 'Torzhestvo aktera *Otello* v Malom teatre', p. 63; Iuzovskii, 'Na spektakle v Malom teatre', p. 3.
[44] Radlov, 'Vstupitel'noe slovo S. E. Radlova k p'ese Shekspira *Otello*', RNB, f. 625, d. 127. [And why were they necessary for Shakespeare? Because with them he brings art closer to real life, to real people].
[45] Lawrence Venuti, *The Scandals of Translation* (London: Routledge, 1998), p. 78.
[46] Shakespeare, *Othello*, I. 3. 1.
[47] Shekspir, *Otello*, trans. by Pëtr Veinberg, I. 3.
[48] Kornei Chukovskii, 'Astma u Dezdemony', *Teatr*, 2 (1940), 98–109 (p. 103).

not the only twentieth-century translator who chose to do so. Boris Pasternak's Desdemona fell in love with Othello for his 'тревожн[ая] жизн[ь]' (troubled life),[49] whereas Lozinskii's Othello attributes his wife's feelings to the fact that he has 'жил в тревогах' (lived in anxiety).[50] The militaristic nature of Radlova's departure from Shakespeare's original wording made her translation conspicuously different:

> ОТЕЛЛО Она за **бранный труд** мой полюбила,
> А я за жалость полюбил ее.'[51]

'Бранный труд' translates literally as 'martial labour'. Both Radlova and her husband defended her translation by stating that Othello was first and foremost a soldier. In Elizabethan times, soldiers and adventurers were looked up to in much the same way that aviators were in the 1930s, so it was natural that Desdemona found this element of his character attractive. Radlova's choice of wording certainly emphasises the militaristic nature of her hero. The phrase 'бранный труд' appears in patriotic war songs and poems, such as those written later about the Leningrad Blockade during the Second World War.[52] Whilst perhaps not overtly socialist realist then, it does seem to be part of the kind of patriotic and heroic discourse with which Radlova and her director would want their new type of hero to be associated.

Radlov was keen to emphasise the fact that he did not see Othello as an overtly jealous character. Instead, he stated that he interpreted *Othello* 'как пьесу не о ревности, а о большой любви' (as a play not about jealousy, but about great love).[53] As far as Radlov was concerned, the key was not how quickly Othello becomes jealous, but rather how ingenious Iago has to be to destroy the trusting relationship between Othello and Desdemona. He dismissed previous portrayals of Othello as a savage as simply pre-revolutionary prejudice.[54] Here, Radlov was drawing on an idea already in existence within the Russian tradition. The poet Aleksandr Pushkin, who played a significant role in the assimilation of Shakespeare into Russian culture, had interpreted Othello as a character who was 'not jealous, but trusting'.[55]

For Radlov, Othello clearly embodied all the best qualities of Renaissance man, from an era to which, as Ostrovsky argues, Soviet culture saw itself a direct heir.[56] In the 1930s, drawing parallels between the two periods was common.

49 Vil'iam Shekspir, *Otello*, trans. by Boris Pasternak, in *Tragedii* (Moscow: Eksmo, 2010) I. 3.
50 Vil'iam Shekspir, *Otello*, trans. by Mikhail Lozinskii, <http://www.lib.ru/SHAKESPEARE> [accessed 1 October 2016], I. 3.
51 Shekspir, *Otello*, trans. by Radlova, I. 3.
52 For example, the term appears in Ol'ga Berggol'ts, 'Pesnia o Leningradskoi materi', <http://blokada.otrok.ru/poetry.php?t=6> [accessed 1 October 2016].
53 E. P., '*Otello* v Malom teatre', *Literaturnaia gazeta*, 9 December 1935, p. 5.
54 Radlov, 'Kak ia stavliu Shekspira', p. 51.
55 Aleksandr Pushkin, quoted in Catherine O'Neil, *With Shakespeare's Eyes: Pushkin's Creative Appropriation of Shakespeare* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2003), p. 135.
56 Ostrovsky, 'Shakespeare as a Founding Father of Socialist Realism', p. 61.

As Jerry Brotton describes, for many, the Renaissance represented the birth of modern man: 'a break from the Middle Ages, creating a modern understanding of humanity and its place in the world'.[57] It was a time of great advances in education, philosophy, exploration, and scientific discovery. Likewise, in Russia in the 1930s, Stalin's brand of socialism was promoted as the only way forward to a better life, whilst the principles of socialist realism ensured a programme of mass education through the arts.[58]

'Your son in law is far more fair than black': translation of racial references

Many of the racial references within Shakespeare's play rely on wordplay and double entendres, creating problems for any translator. In Act II, Scene 1, for example, an exchange between Iago, Desdemona and Emilia contains a lot of play on the word 'fair' meaning 'fair-skinned' as well as 'pretty', and black meaning 'ugly'. The fact that the Russian language does not provide quite so many opportunities for double meanings on this subject inevitably means that some translation loss is incurred. However, in addition to incidences of loss throughout her translation, Radlova also alters some of the key expressions in the play which refer to race. In doing so, she creates a different effect, providing a further example of how the Radlovs were able to ensure that their rewriting of *Othello* was politically relevant.

Returning to Iago's description of the consummation of Othello and Desdemona's marriage, arguably one of the key black/white images in the play, Radlova removed the word 'white' completely.

IAGO Even now, very now, an old black ram
Is tupping your white ewe.[59]

ЯГО Сейчас, сию минуту, старый черный
Баран овечку вашу кроет [...]'[60]

Radlova's choice here could be determined by the rhythm of the lines, as there are four stresses in each. As stated earlier, Radlova, like Lozinskii, paid great attention to reproducing the structure of Shakespeare's text, and strove to achieve equilinearity (the same number of lines in the target text as in the source).[61] However, other racial references later in the play are also altered in her

[57] Jerry Brotton, *The Renaissance Bazaar* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), pp. 21–22.

[58] Radlov's greater emphasis on the scheming skills of Iago is a further example of his accentuation of elements of the play's plot which best suited the ideology of the new Soviet epoch. As Lois Potter notes, 'Iago's obsession with money and his ruthless individualism made him an obvious representative of the rising capitalist culture of the Renaissance', and therefore he was an ideal villain in the new Communist world. See Lois Potter, *Othello: Shakespeare in Performance* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), p. 100.

[59] Shakespeare, *Othello*, I. 1. 88–89.

[60] Shekspir, *Otello*, trans. by Radlova, I. 1. [Now, this minute, an old black | ram is covering your ewe].

[61] Radlova was heavily criticised for her devotion to equilinearity by Kornei Chukovskii. In defence of her work, Radlova later claimed that it had been the commissioning publishing house which had

translation. In Act III, Shakespeare's Othello laments that his skin colour could be the reason for some of his perceived inadequacies.

> OTHELLO [...] Haply, for I am black
> And have not those soft parts of conversation
> That chamberers have[62]

Possibly because 'haply' can mean 'perhaps', Radlova has rewritten these lines as questions:

> ОТЕЛЛО [...] Черный я?
> Я не умею гладко говорить,
> Как эти шаркуны?[63]

A questioning tone would certainly emphasise Othello's distress here, and his fear that Desdemona has left him because of his race. Ostrovsky notes that all the critics remembered the anguish with which Ostuzhev delivered this line.[64] When interviewed about his role, Ostuzhev stated that he chose to emphasise the nobility of the 'black' Othello in sharp contrast to the 'белый негодяй' (white villain) Iago, 'белая проститутка' (white prostitute) Bianca and the'белая бездарность' (white nonentity) Roderigo.[65] Ostuzhev argued that this contrast provided a clear protest against the fascism which was gaining in popularity in other parts of Europe, and that it was only in an all-encompassing society such as the Soviet Union that the character and tragedy of Othello could be fully appreciated.

> Весь советский народ, как и я, любит Отелло, потому, что мы любим человека. Вся наша жизнь, наша чудесная советская действительность представляет собою необычайно целеустремленную, последовательную линию осуществления заботы о человеке, о людях, любви к ним.[66]

insisted on equilinearity, and that in her later translations, such as *Hamlet*, she no longer regarded it as the highest priority. Anna Radlova 'O perevode', in *Leningradskii Gosydarstvennyi teatr p/r zasl. art. S. E. Radlova — Gamlet* (Leningrad: Leningradskii Gosydarstvennyi teatr p/r zasl. art. S. E. Radlova, 1938), pp. 22–30 (p. 26).

62 Shakespeare, *Othello*, III. 3. 266–68.

63 Shekspir, *Otello*, trans. by Radlova, III. 3.

64 Ostrovsky, 'Shakespeare as a Founding Father of Socialist Realism', p. 71. Radlov's decision to cast Ostuzhev in the title role caused controversy amongst members of the Malyi Theatre company, as the actor was 61 at the time and, having suffered the loss of his hearing, had not taken on a significant role since 1929; see Zolotnitsky, *The Shakespearean Fate of a Soviet Director*, p. 131. Ostrovsky argues that critics were quick to point out the discrepancy between Ostuzhev's interpretation of the role and the language of Radlova's translation. However, Ostuzhev later defended the production's use of Radlova's translation, stating that her work had 'brilliantly corrected' the faults of previous translations, and had provided him with a renewed sense of the important elements of Shakespeare's texts; see V. D. Tizengauzen, 'Ostuzhev ob Otello', in *Ostuzhev-Otello: sbornik*, ed. by V. L. Finkel'shtein (Leningrad, Moscow: Vseros. teatral'noe ob-vo, 1938), pp. 19–36 (pp. 35–36).

65 Tizengauzen, 'Ostuzhev ob Otello', p. 29.

66 Ibid, p. 35. This interview is also published in an English translation: Avril Pyman, 'Alexander Ostuzhev on *Othello*', in *Shakespeare in the Soviet Union*, ed. by Roman Samarin and Alexander Nikolyukin (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1966), pp. 150–64. Pyman provides the following translation: 'The Soviet people love Othello, as I do, because we love man. Life in our country is devoted to ensuring

As Zdeněk Stříbrný describes, this idealised vision of Soviet society can now be read with ‘a sense of colossal discrepancy between utopian illusion and cruel reality’.[67] However, it is a further example of how crucial it was for a 1930s’ production to project the politically desired image of Soviet society. Othello’s noble and heroic qualities were promoted as being far more important to the Soviet people than his race.

Conclusion

The fact that both Radlov and the management of the Malyi Theatre chose to emphasise that their *Othello* was being staged in Radlova’s new translation demonstrates that it formed an essential part of the director’s interpretation. Radlova’s translation choices therefore must, in some part at least, underlie the production’s success. Working closely with a translator who shared such similar aims enabled Radlov to amplify the elements of the play most relevant to Soviet audiences. As Pavis has argued, a translation for the theatre needs to be ‘clearly and immediately understood’ by spectators, and therefore must be ‘adapted and fitted to [the] present situation’.[68] This statement corresponds neatly with Radlova’s own arguments for the need to re-translate Shakespeare to suit the new Soviet audiences. This adaptation was all the more crucial in the dangerous political climate of Stalin’s Russia. A combination of tradition, modernity, and political acclimatisation therefore ensured that the Radlovs’ ‘rewriting’ of *Othello* became a talking point of Russian Shakespeare production in the 1930s.

through all its policies the realisation of a society which will care for man, for people, and teach the love of man’; see Tizengauzen, ‘Alexander Ostuzhev on *Othello*’, p. 163.

67 Zdeněk Stříbrný, *Shakespeare in Eastern Europe* (Oxford: University Press, 2000), p. 83.

68 Pavis, *Theatre at the Crossroads of Culture*, p. 162.

‘The Truth Only Partially Perceived’: (Mis)Reading/Writing, Rewriting, and Artistic Development in Lawrence Durrell’s *Alexandria Quartet*

Rachel Darling

Goldsmiths, University Of London

Abstract. Through the role of the *Alexandria Quartet*’s writer-narrator, L. G. Darley, Lawrence Durrell interrogates the writing process by demonstrating the co-existence of multiple interpretations of place and time. Both Durrell and Darley build an evocation of Alexandria and its inhabitants using myriad textual sources, including fictional writer-characters as well as well-known authors such as E. M. Forster and Cavafy. This article examines the use of this palimpsest as a device through which Darley learns to become a novelist, by reading, rereading, and rewriting his impressions of the city. The multi-vocal nature of the *Quartet* — in which each of the four books effectively retells the same story — demonstrates not only the inherently intertextual and self-reflexive nature of the novel form, but also the way in which stories take shape. Darley frames and structures the narrative, propelling it forward by demonstrating his evolution as a writer throughout the four books. Durrell illustrates this both structurally and thematically, presenting Darley’s growth as a novelist through the layering of different versions of the truth, whilst suggesting that only together do these disparate readings of ‘truth’ constitute something approaching reality.

* * * * *

> There, lying on the table in the yellow lamplight, lay the great interlinear to *Justine* — as I had called it. It was crosshatched, crabbed, starred with questions and answers in different-coloured inks, in typescript. It seemed to me then to be somehow symbolic of the very reality we had shared — a palimpsest upon which each of us had left his or her individual traces, layer by layer.[1]

This article examines Lawrence Durrell’s use of writing and the writing process as a device through which to question the nature of truth alongside art’s representation of reality. Through the role within the novel of the *Quartet*’s writer-narrator, L. G. Darley, Durrell interrogates artistic creation by demonstrating the co-existence of multiple interpretations of place and time.

[1] Lawrence Durrell, *The Alexandria Quartet* (London: Faber and Faber, 1974), p. 215.

Working Papers in the Humanities vol. 11 (2017), 30–38
© Modern Humanities Research Association 2017

The idea of creative practice is palimpsestic: an undertaking through which Darley learns to become a novelist by writing, reading, rereading, and rewriting his impressions of events that shape and inspire him. The four books of the tetralogy — *Justine* (1957), *Balthazar* (1958), *Mountolive* (1958), and *Clea* (1960) — use the unifying figure of the novelist-character, Darley, as a filter through which to examine the nature of truth. The first three books present the same set of events and characters in Alexandria from three differing perspectives; the fourth volume, *Clea,* is set some six years later, although revisiting the same events. Darley narrates three volumes (the exception is *Mountolive* in which he appears as a more liminal character) thus allowing his understanding of events to unfold and change.[2] Darley's consequent rewriting of his narrative establishes Durrell's intention to focus his work's philosophy on the concept that multiple truths can exist — overlaying each other — and that ultimately truth, which can only ever be subjective, is not the purpose of art. The importance of Durrell's work is in the way this motif is echoed within and throughout the very form of the novel sequence.

In the opening pages of *Balthazar* Darley describes himself as being 'landlocked in spirit as all writers are', yet it is only through the plurality of narrative voices and intertexts that Darley learns to become a more competent writer.[3] Indeed the use of 'quartet' in the title of the sequence may be intended to symbolise a unity that can only come from an incongruent range of voices. Durrell, who gives his own initials to his narrator, L. G. Darley, ends his *Quartet* with the promise of new creation: something which Anne Zahlan has asserted is an 'affirmation of the artistic vocation'.[4] By the end of the sequence Darley has developed and matured into a skilled writer and is, as Lionel Trilling writes, 'at last able to know that he has achieved salvation, that he is at the great moment of "an artist coming of age."' The 'once upon a time' beginning of Darley's own novel at the end of *Clea,* and thus of the *Quartet,* 'announces [...] that he is going to tell a story — really *tell* it as against representing it'.[5]

Steven G. Kellman includes Durrell's *Quartet* in his 1980 work *The Self-Begetting Novel.* The self-begotten novel is first defined by Kellman, in a 1976 essay, as 'an account, usually first person, of the development of a character to the point at which he is able to take up his pen and compose the novel we have just finished reading'.[6] However the *Quartet* itself is not a self-begotten work; Darley instead creates *himself* as an artist, freeing himself from the frame text to become a writer in his own right. We know Darley chooses to begin his own creative work with:

2 See pp. 8–10 for fuller discussion of this feature of *Mountolive*.
3 *The Alexandria Quartet*, p. 213.
4 Anne R. Zahlan, 'Crossing the Border: Lawrence Durrell's Alexandrian Conversion to Postmodernism', *South Atlantic Review*, 64.4 (1999), 84–97 (p. 84).
5 Lionel Trilling, 'The Quartet: Two Reviews', in *The World of Lawrence Durrell*, ed. by Harry T. Moore, (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1962), pp. 58–59 & 64.
6 Steven G. Kellman, 'The Fiction of Self-Begetting', *MLN*, 91.6 (December, 1976), 1245–56 (p. 1245).

> Four words (four letters! Four faces!) with which every story-teller since the world began had staked his slender claim to the attention of fellow-men. Words which presage simply the old story of an artist coming of age. I wrote: 'Once upon a time [...].'
>
> And I felt as if the whole universe had given me a nudge![7]

This contrasts with the opening of the *Quartet* itself, 'The sea is high again today',[8] but more than this, it would make little sense in terms of Durrell's own sequence for this to be the *Quartet*'s beginning. His four volumes are designed to show the evolution of Darley as a novelist through the rewriting and revising of the narratives in the first volumes until the conclusion of *Clea* sets him free of the narrative we have just read in order that he write his own story. Alan Friedman writes that Darley's '"Once upon a time" serves the same function as Stephen's "Old father, old artificer, stand me now and forever in good stead," at the end of Joyce's *A Portrait* [...] both figures have emerged not as identical with their authors but as artists in their own right'.[9] If the ending were to return Darley to the beginning then he would have learnt nothing. Durrell's introductory note to the first edition of *Balthazar*, as well as his two references to palimpsests within the story, indicate a thematic design that simply does not support the self-begetting of the *Quartet*:

> Modern literature offers us no Unities, so I have turned to science and am trying to complete a four-decker novel whose form is based on the relativity proposition. Three sides of space and one of time constitute the soup-mix recipe of a continuum. The four novels follow this pattern. The first three parts, however, are to be deployed spatially [...] and are not linked in a serial form. They interlap, interweave, in a purely spatial relation. Time is stayed. The fourth part alone will represent time and be a true sequel [...] the third part, *Mountolive*, is a straight naturalistic novel in which the narrator of *Justine* and *Balthazar* becomes an object, i.e. a character.[10]

Through this note, Durrell sets forth his ideology of the novel: the *Quartet* takes the modern relativity principle as well as that of the ancient palimpsest to convey his thesis on the nature of truth and art's portrayal of it. In his 1959 interview with *The Paris Review* Durrell went even further, stating that 'ideally, all four volumes should be read simultaneously [...] but as we lack four-dimensional spectacles the reader will have to do it imaginatively, adding the part of time to the other three [...] a kind of *demonstration* of a possible continuum'.[11] Arguably, as readers, we are only intended to take what Durrell sets out as his scientifically-based design for the novel semi-seriously; his alternative intent

7 *The Alexandria Quartet*, p. 877.

8 Ibid., p. 17.

9 Alan Warren Friedman, *Lawrence Durrell and The Alexandria Quartet: Art for Love's Sake* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1970), p. 164.

10 Lawrence Durrell, *Balthazar* (London: Faber and Faber, 1958), p. 7.

11 Lawrence Durrell, 'The Art of Fiction No. 23', *The Paris Review*, Autumn-Winter 1959–60 <http://www.theparisreview.org/interviews/4720/the-art-of-fiction-no-23-lawrence-durrell> [accessed 11/05/2016].

with the novel's form is to attempt a break-down of the dichotomy he observes as existing between life and art. In the same *Paris Review* interview he refers to what he sees as an 'artificial distinction between artists and humans'.[12] We may therefore see the multivocal nature of Durrell's novel sequence as intended to define writing as a *process*: artistic creation as evolution rather than any kind of romanticised inspiration that would set the artist apart from the rest of humanity. The profusion of flawed writing-characters, in addition to Darley's (at times painfully slow) development as a writer, reveal the fallible nature of artists and presents them in a more realistic and human light than many modernist texts which posit the author as god.

The effect of re-writing throughout the four novels not only depicts multiple truths and serves to illustrate how, through seeing the different versions of the story, Darley grows and matures as a writer, but it also comments upon the inherently intertextual nature of the novel form. Indeed as well as the four 'stories' within the *Quartet*, there is, too, a myriad of allusions to the writing and composition of Alexandria. Ray Morrison has noted that the narrator 'begins to reconstruct Alexandria and his life from notebooks, diaries, and materials by Justine, Nessim, Arnauti, E. M. Forster and Cavafy',[13] assimilating real-life literary inspirations with the writing of characters within the novels and thus attesting to Roland Barthes's contention that the text is a 'tissue of quotations drawn from the innumerable centres of culture'.[14] The character, Balthazar, in a note to Darley explaining his interlinear, suggests that 'if you wished somehow to incorporate all I am telling you into your own Justine manuscript now, you would find yourself with a curious sort of book — the story would be told, so to speak, in layers. Unwittingly I may have supplied you with a form'.[15] Durrell's inclusion of this incredibly self-knowing passage arguably reveals more of his true intention than his own explanatory note at the beginning of *Balthazar*. That is, through Balthazar's influence on Darley's manuscript, Durrell plainly shows that writing goes through many stages; each completed manuscript is a palimpsest of these innumerable, various stages of production and revision.

In his book *Palimpsests*, Gérard Genette (1982) examines the relationships a text can have to preceding texts, something Genette sees as 'a universal feature of literarity: there is no literary work that does not evoke (to some extent and according to how it is read) some other literary work, and in that sense all works are hypertextual'.[16] The palimpsestic nature of *The Alexandria Quartet* — in which each of the four books effectively retells the same story — denotes not only the inherently intertextual and self-reflexive nature of the novel

[12] Ibid.

[13] Ray Morrison, 'Mirrors and the Heraldic Universe in Lawrence Durrell's *The Alexandria Quartet*', *Twentieth Century Literature*, 33.4: II (1987), 499–514 (p. 501).

[14] Roland Barthes, *Image, Music, Text* (London: Fontana Press, 1977), p. 146.

[15] *The Alexandria Quartet*, p. 338.

[16] Gérard Genette, *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree,* trans. by Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), p. 9.

form, but also the way in which stories take shape.[17] The significance of the various intertexts which permeate Darley's own writing illustrate the value of reading the writing of others. Darley is, as Kellman points out, not just a writer but crucially also a *reader* 'not only of Balthazar's "Interlinear" and of other documents that fall into his hands, but of a wide range of cryptic and conflicting codes'.[18] His misreading of events leads to (what Balthazar and other characters see as) the inaccuracy of representation in the narrative, although Durrell is keen to point out that Darley's interpretation is still valid as it remains true to his recollections. Particularly in *Balthazar* and *Clea*, Darley's reminiscences of the novelist-character, Pursewarden, are used by Durrell to undermine the idea of an ultimate 'truth'. Pursewarden's aphorisms often relate the comparative worth of truth to art (always to the detriment of truth). He states, for example: 'Truth is independent of fact', 'We live [...] lives based upon selected fictions', and 'the so-called act of living is really an act of the imagination'.[19] Ultimately the verification of fact is unimportant to Darley (and Durrell), rather what matters is his writer's imagination: 'his ability not simply to piece together the many fragments of his past but to reconcile and recreate them into a whole, coherent work — a complex but unified vision'.[20]

The multiple texts and intertexts that make up the *Quartet* correlate with the characters' divergent points of view and understanding of events, in order that a fully realised portrait of Alexandria and its inhabitants can be construed. Parallels are drawn between the ways in which the city, the text, and the self more generally are constructed as palimpsests, each conceived as myriad levels of atemporal, imbricated experiences with no one level alone able to render the complexity of life. Balthazar describes his own reconstruction of Darley's text as becoming 'some medieval palimpsest where different sorts of truths are thrown down one upon the other, the one obliterating or perhaps supplementing another'.[21] As well as the numerous references to palimpsests throughout his work, Durrell also uses the image of a mirror to evoke the multiple angles from which everything can be seen. Morrison counts 'more than one hundred and twenty mirrors',[22] but the most famous mirror scene displays something of Durrell's design for the novel behind his multi-layered narrative:

> Justine hated to hear the truth spoken [...] I remember her sitting before the multiple mirrors at the dressmaker's, being fitted for a shark-skin costume,

[17] For further analysis of Durrell's use of the palimpsest throughout his works see James M. Clawson, *Durrell Re-Read: Crossing the Liminal in Lawrence Durrell's Major Novels* (Maryland: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2016).

[18] Steven G. Kellman, 'Sailing to Alexandria: The Reader in/of Durrell's Byzantine *Quartet*', in *Into the Labyrinth: Essays in the Art of Lawrence Durrell*, ed. by Frank L. Kernowski (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1989), p. 118.

[19] *The Alexandria Quartet*, pp. 386, 216, 210, 772.

[20] Donald P. Kaczvinsky, *Lawrence Durrell's Major Novels, or The Kingdom of the Imagination* (London: Associated University Presses, 1997), p. 38.

[21] *The Alexandria Quartet*, p. 338.

[22] Morrison, p. 500.

> and saying: 'Look! Five different pictures of the same subject. Now if I wrote I would try for a multi-dimensional effect in character, a sort of prism-sightedness. Why should not people show more than one profile at a time?'.[23]

This mirror's relation to the fragmentation of the self also comments upon different potentials of the writer: he can act like the mirror and reflect multiple realities, but always only on the surface, or he can construct anew out of the various impressions. In the early volume, Darley fails in his design to 'completely [...] rebuild this city in my brain' because to begin with he only reflects upon events.[24] He tells us that he has 'no pretensions to being an artist. I want to put things down simply and crudely, without style'.[25] It is only later, after Balthazar's 'Interlinear' has revealed to him how mistaken he was about what he considered to be the 'truth', that he realises that truth itself is not vital, but rather what he himself makes of it in his role as the writer. Darley reflects on something Pursewarden had said to him earlier in the narrative: 'if things were always what they seemed, how impoverished would be the imagination of man!'.[26] Eventually, writes James M. Clawson, Darley is able to dismiss 'expectations of factual exactitude in favour of artistic merit'.[27] However at this stage of *Balthazar* he is seemingly unable to let go of his original intention of rebuilding, in his mind, the city, inhabitants, and events of Alexandria as he interprets them in order to make sense of what happened to him. Darley, although he accepts his misreading of the truth, cannot yet turn it into the stuff of fiction. Therefore he must continue to 'set it down in cold black and white, until such time as the memory or impulse of it is spent. I know that the key I am trying to turn is in myself'.[28] This key is his ability to use the skewed and varied truths in order to create something new, his own work of fiction.

The revelations in *Balthazar* set Darley on his way to becoming a writer, but it is between the third and fourth volumes that he really begins to develop and see the errors of his previous work. Between *Balthazar* and *Clea* is *Mountolive*, which, unlike the other three volumes of the *Quartet*, is not narrated by Darley but by an unknown and supposedly omniscient narrator: 'an account of the thing by an invisible narrator, as opposed to somebody engaged in the action',[29] states Durrell. There is much scholarly debate over *Mountolive* for this reason.[30] This issue of authorship in *Mountolive* is also crucial in regard

23 *The Alexandria Quartet*, p. 28.
24 Ibid., p. 17.
25 Ibid., p. 73.
26 Ibid., p. 216.
27 Clawson, p. 13.
28 Ibid., p. 217.
29 Durrell, 'The Art of Fiction No. 23'.
30 See particularly Donald P. Kaczvinsky, *Lawrence Durrell's Major Novels, or The Kingdom of the Imagination* (London: Associated University Presses, 1997); Eugene Hollahan, 'Who Wrote Mountolive? The Same One Who Wrote "Swann in Love"', in *On Miracle Ground: Essays on the fiction of Lawrence Durrell*, ed. by Michael H. Begnal (London: Associated University Presses, 1990), pp. 113–32; and Carol

to the sequence's focus on the evolution of the novelist. Durrell tells us, in the note to *Balthazar*, that in *Mountolive* the narrator (Darley) will become 'an object, i.e. a character',[31] but that does not necessarily negate the possibility that Darley himself authors *Mountolive*. His authoring of *Mountolive* also prefigures his eventual unique composition, which he is finally able to begin after the conclusion of the *Quartet*. As Kaczvinsky notes 'it preserves the continuity, consistency, and coherence of the entire series [...] that Darley himself "wrote" *Mountolive*'.[32]

Warren Wedin, who initially proposed this hypothesis, points out that several sections of *Balthazar* are written by Darley but narrated in the third person, thus smoothing the narrative link between the second and the third volumes' narrative style. Wedin suggests that this device is used to discuss 'events about which Darley could have no personal knowledge [...] the point here is that Darley is writing an imaginative reconstruction of the events in the third person, based on someone else's information. In other words he is writing fiction'.[33] That Darley narrates the first two volumes, trials his writing style within the third, and then resumes narration in the fourth (where he can garner the techniques he has learnt in the writing of *Mountolive* to master the problems in the narrative and finally embark upon his own creative work) would logically fit with Durrell's design for the *Quartet*. No doubt Durrell intended the uncertainty; his biographer, Ian MacNiven, writes that he regarded the third volume 'as the *clou*, the nail holding together the entire structure of the *Quartet*'.[34] Eugene Hollahan calls it 'the most puzzling piece of *The Alexandria Quartet* as the only piece that could be construed as "written" in the usual novelistic sense'.[35] In the second edition of his *Rhetoric of Fiction* (1983), Wayne C. Booth places the narrator of *Mountolive* in his 'Gallery of Unreliable Narrators and Reflectors'.[36] Friedman comments that 'Durrell [in *Mountolive*] deliberately misleads us in many ways, perhaps the most significant of which is his narrator's presumably accurate knowledge of the solutions to factual mysteries [...] the naïve, unreliable narrator would have us believe that all motives, all causes, are precise and unambiguous'.[37]

Arguably, as part of Durrell's design for the sequence, *Mountolive* is offered as a supposed contrast with Darley's subjective 'truths' in the preceding volumes; however it in fact further confounds the idea that truth can exist by

Peirce, '"Wrinkled Deep in Time": The Alexandria Quartet as Many-Layered Palimpsest', *Twentieth Century Literature*, 33.4 (Winter, 1987), 485–98.

[31] *Balthazar*, p. 7.

[32] Kaczvinsky, p. 59.

[33] Warren Wedin, 'The Artist as Narrator in *The Alexandria Quartet*', *Twentieth Century Literature*, 18.3 (July, 1972), 175–80 (p. 177).

[34] Ian MacNiven, *Lawrence Durrell: A Biography* (London: Faber and Faber, 1998), p. 466.

[35] Hollahan, p. 128.

[36] Wayne C. Booth, *The Rhetoric of Fiction*, 2nd edn (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983), pp. 492–94.

[37] Friedman, pp. 119–20.

offering the reader deliberately false deductions and solutions to the puzzles via the supposedly omniscient narrator. Friedman concludes that in fact the 'truth abstracted from "felt reality" is neither beautiful, nor important, not even very reliable'.[38] Thus the reader is forced to realise that Darley's previous misunderstandings are not that severe and actually they are important for the development of both the narrative and Darley as a writer; if he has written *Mountolive*, then there is an evident continuation of theme in the disregard for the importance of truth.

Darley's infrequent appearances within *Mountolive* are limited to the filter of the titular character, David Mountolive, although he is always described with what Henry Miller saw as 'characteristic self-deprecation'.[39] He participates in *Mountolive* much less than in the other three volumes, arguably because his writing (and rewriting) of the story has forced him above the action. He returns himself to the action as the narrator in *Clea*, but the change in him is evident from the first page, in which he redresses his authorial intentions:

> I had set out once to store, to codify, to annotate the past before it was utterly lost — that at least was a task I had set myself. I had failed in it (perhaps it was hopeless?) for no sooner had I embalmed one aspect of it in words than the intrusion of new knowledge disrupted the frame of reference, everything flew asunder only to reassemble again in unforeseen, unpredictable patterns [...]
>
> 'To re-work reality' I had written somewhere; temeritous, presumptuous words indeed.[40]

Darley not only recognises but freely admits his failure to follow through with his self-appointed task, seeing that his plan for writing the truth was ultimately unworkable and unrealistic. He seemed far further away from reaching this conclusion at the end of *Balthazar*, and we see so little of the character Darley in *Mountolive* that we are unable to perceive how exactly he has come to this realisation unless we accept that he learnt through doing: that he *did* write *Mountolive*. He has been able to step out of the shadow of the *Quartet*'s other novelists, moving 'from a reliance on the literature of others to the creation of his own'.[41] Even the overbearing Pursewarden's input in *Clea*, in the form of 'My Conversations with Brother Ass',[42] augments Darley's position as a writer to one of equality by calling him 'brother'. Darley begins the *Quartet* feeling threatened and jealous of Pursewarden's success, he tells us: 'I disliked this literary figure for the contrast he offered to his own work — poetry and prose of real grace. I did not know him well but he was financially successful

38 Ibid., p. 132.

39 Letter from Henry Miller to Lawrence Durrell: '*from Le Chambon 9/7 [i.e., 9 July] 59', in *Durrell-Miller Letters, 1935–1980*, ed. by Ian MacNiven (London: Faber and Faber, 1988), p. 345.

40 *The Alexandria Quartet*, p. 657.

41 James Van Dyke Card, '"Tell Me, Tell Me": The Writer as Spellbinder in Lawrence Durrell's *Alexandria Quartet*', *Modern British Literature*, 1.1 (1975), 74–83 (p. 80).

42 *The Alexandria Quartet*, p. 749.

as a novelist which made me envious'.[43] Yet, by the concluding volume, he has come to appreciate him as he furthers his understanding of himself as a writer. He is finally able to exorcise the fixation that the works of Pursewarden, as well as those of the other major novelist figure, Arnauti, have held over his understanding of the narrative:

> I began to see too that the real 'fiction' lay neither in Arnauti's pages nor Pursewarden's — nor even in my own. It was life itself that was a fiction — we were all saying it in different ways, each understanding it according to his nature and gift.
>
> It was only now that I began to see how mysteriously the configuration of my own life had taken its shape from the properties of those elements which lie outside the relative life — in the kingdom which Pursewarden calls the 'heraldic universe'. We were three writers, I now saw, confided to a mythical city from which we were to draw our nourishment, in which we were to confirm our gifts. Arnauti, Pursewarden, Darley — like Past, Present and Future tense![44]

The education Darley has received at the hands (or pens) of these other novelists — as well as from subsidiary writing and artistic characters like Balthazar and Clea — is vital to the thematic structure of the *Quartet* as it demonstrates how these various intertexts go towards the creation of his own eventual narrative. Chiara Briganti asserts that, 'Darley renounces any claim to invention and originality. Writing becomes for him a question of assemblage in which the writing subject undoes itself and becomes dispersed and fragmented'.[45] He learns to accept he cannot control the hypertextual nature of his narrative, that it is by nature something protean, even unstable. Darley is the central figure of the *Quartet* in that his presence frames and structures the narrative, propelling it forward as he evolves as a novelist throughout the four books. Durrell illustrates this both structurally and thematically; he uses the idea of the palimpsest to represent Darley's growth as a novelist through superimposed versions of the truth, with the prevailing suggestion that only together do these disparate readings of 'truth' constitute something approaching reality.

[43] Ibid., p. 50.
[44] Ibid., p. 792.
[45] Chiara Brigati, 'Lawrence Durrell and the Vanishing Author', in *On Miracle Ground*, p. 50.

Spectres of Balzac: Stefan Zweig's Collection of Manuscripts and his Rewriting of the Unfinished *Balzac*

Pardaad Chamsaz

British Library and University of Bristol

Abstract. This article ties together two of Stefan Zweig's (1881–1942) principal creative enterprises — the collection of autograph manuscripts and the writing of biographies — and positions him as a significant figure in the developing appreciation of 'rewriting'. Zweig's collection included working drafts and corrected proofs from many great writers, but central among these was Honoré de Balzac, who is pivotal to both the nineteenth century's turn towards authors' compositional traces and the more modern practice of genetic criticism. Focusing partly on Balzac's bound proofs of the novel *Une ténébreuse affaire*, an early part of Zweig's collection, a conflicting, or perhaps hybrid, conception of creativity can be drawn out. On the cusp of material and textual criticism, yet fixed to a Romantic admiration of the author figure, Zweig's thought represents an interesting negotiation of authorship. His process of writing biography sheds further light on his conception of a creator. Zweig revises his early drafts of *Balzac* to maximise the personal struggle of the protagonist at the expense of contingent factors to creativity. Simultaneously reductive and personal, Zweig's empathetic mode of biography, so often condemned, might also be seen to have a moral foundation in its focus on human exceptionality.

* * * * *

Stefan Zweig: Professional Adorer, Schmoozer, Inheritor, Collector[1]

Criticism of Stefan Zweig in his own time and since has been primarily related to his reticence to condemn fascism: he preferred a pacifistic position that rejected the dogma of partisanship, leading him to focus on literary rather than political activity. This was by no means a bid to hide behind the literary framework, but rather evidence of Zweig's genuine belief in the aesthetic response as the best reaction to the contemporary political situation. Zweig's articulation of intellectual, cultural Vienna takes us back to that which critics regularly condemn in this outlook: 'Vienna, as everyone knew, was an epicurean city — however, what does culture mean but taking the raw material

[1] This is a phrase adapted from Michael Hoffmann; see Michael Hoffmann, 'Vermicular Dither', *London Review of Books*, 32.2 (2010), 9–12 (p. 9).

Working Papers in the Humanities vol. 11 (2017), 39–49
© Modern Humanities Research Association 2017

of life and enticing from it its finest, most delicate and subtle aspects by means of art and love?'.[2] To retreat into the aesthetic mode, an act which Zweig viewed as elevating oneself above conflict, was deemed more 'wavering',[3] 'tolerant',[4] and 'dithering'.[5]

Some critical reflective essays on Zweig after his death in 1942 view his manuscript collection as emblematic of his flawed existence. The collection of drafts, fair copies, corrected proofs, and musical scores amongst other items was partly a vehicle for idolising greatness (or great men) at a time when the idea of greatness was being distorted by the destructive rise of Hitler. Meshing the motivations of the collection with Zweig's historical blindness, Hannah Arendt reads Zweig's growing despair as a result of the shame he intrinsically felt at being dismissed from the nostalgic 'paradise' of Zweig's European 'world of yesterday'. Zweig, she writes, was more concerned with the private lives of dead geniuses than with like-minded peers, and that collecting the relics of these geniuses was the single most satisfying engagement in his 'unengaged' life.[6]

Critics more sympathetic to Zweig depict a similarly obsessive relationship with creative figures, noting the ebullient author's frequent evocation of gods, heroes, and genius in relation to his collection. Hilde Spiel shows how this enthusiasm for cultural achievement endowed Zweig with a 'particular empathetic capacity', which was the foundation for his mass appeal.[7] In Spiel's essay, Zweig's weakness for greatness is threaded throughout his attempts to animate those forgotten or undervalued creative and historical figures and moments. The critic cannot deny the sense of renewal, warmth, and 'presence' given to forgotten scenes of the past. What Zweig sought to achieve was to make these achievements 'present' again. Zweig formulates this idea of 'making present' in his many essays that concern his manuscript collection, rendering the power of compositional documents timeless, or ever-*present*. In 'Sinn und Schönheit der Autographen', he writes,

> In such a secretive way, autograph manuscripts have the power to conjure the presence of long disappeared figures, and, like in an art gallery, one can pass by these pages, seized and moved differently by each of them.[8]

[2] Stefan Zweig, *The World of Yesterday*, trans. by Anthea Bell, (London: Pushkin, 2009), p. 35.
[3] Joseph Roth, 'An Stefan Zweig, 7.11.1933', in Ulrich Weinzierl, *Stefan Zweig — Triumph Tragik Aufsätze, Tagebuchnotizen, Briefe* (Frankfurt: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 1991), pp. 97–100 (p. 99).
[4] Erwin Egon Kirsch, 'Über den Tod Stefan Zweigs', in Weinzierl, *Stefan Zweig*, pp. 147–48 (p. 148).
[5] Hofmann, 'Vermicular Dither', p. 9.
[6] Hannah Arendt, 'Juden in der Welt von gestern' (1948), in Weinzierl, *Stefan Zweig*, pp. 158–61 (p. 159).
[7] Hilde Spiel, 'Ein Ruhn von gestern. Zum 100. Geburtstag von Stefan Zweig', in Weinzierl, *Stefan Zweig*, pp. 175–80 (p. 179).
[8] Stefan Zweig, 'Sinn und Schönheit der Autographen' (1934), in *Ich kenne den Zauber der Schrift: Katalog und Geschichte der Autographensammlung Stefan Zweig*, ed. by Oliver Matuschek (Wien: Inlibris, 2005), pp. 136–40, (p. 138). All translations from the German are my own unless otherwise stated.

What detractors considered nostalgic aestheticism was, naively or not, viewed by the collector as a relevant, timeless, and potentially productive encounter with creativity. The underlying motive for his work may then be articulated in the pithy phrase Zweig uses in his first essay on manuscript collecting: ‘to create something living from dead material’.[9] By enlivening the aesthetic past for present purposes, Zweig offers a more organic and dynamic view of manuscripts.

The Secret of Creation

The oft repeated single motivation behind Stefan Zweig’s manuscript collection is the search for ‘the secret of artistic creation’.[10] He draws a line between this ‘secret’ and manuscripts in the following example:

> Nothing in the world, if not the mystery of earth’s own existence, is as unreachable and impenetrable as the coming-into-being of an artwork [...]. We have no other sign, no other medium, through which to get closer to the creative moment of an artwork, as the autograph manuscript.[11]

The manuscript is the space through which we approach the creative moment precisely because it is a retreat into a work’s formation in a document that materializes that process. To read a manuscript is to experience a ‘retreat of a Being back to its Becoming, a creation back to its emergence’.[12] Zweig’s primary emphasis on the creative document, laying the ground for a potentially analytical approach to the process of a text’s formation, distances his collecting practice from the conventional notion of collecting for rarity or prestige. We begin to see in Zweig’s frequent use of terms such as ‘mode of production’, ‘emergence’, and ‘creative conditions’ that to consider his collection solely as a plain fascination with genius writers would neglect the processual element of his thought on creativity. What is particularly interesting about Zweig’s range of writings on the collection is their potential to be read both as consistent with some of his reductive adulatory artist portraits *and* as a radically different textual approach to creativity.

For all his emphasis on the materiality of the manuscript and the process of re-writing, there remains, for Zweig, something ‘incommensurable’ in this encounter — that is, something immaterial, something without substance. The simultaneity of something physical and something spiritual leads Zweig to describe ‘a feeling of an almost spectral presence’.[13] Zweig flits between emphasising the power of the material traces, their movement and texture, and

[9] Stefan Zweig, ‘Die Autographensammlung als Kunstwerk’ (1914), in *Ich kenne den Zauber der Schrift*, facsimile insert.
[10] Stefan Zweig, ‘Das Geheimnis des künstlerischen Schaffens’ (1938), in *Zeit und Welt: gesammelte Aufsätze und Vorträge, 1904–1940* (Stockholm: Bemann-Fischer, 1946), pp. 251–74 (p. 251).
[11] Stefan Zweig, ‘Vom Handschriften-Sammeln’, in *Ich kenne den Zauber der Schrift*, pp. 120–21 (p. 120).
[12] Zweig, ‘Die Autographensammlung als Kunstwerk’.
[13] Stefan Zweig, ‘Die Welt der Autographen’, in *Ich kenne den Zauber der Schrift*, p. 103.

the atmospheric presence of something less tangible that resides behind these traces, be that some kind of authorial or divine inspiration. This 'paradoxical phenomenality' of presence and absence is encapsulated in Derrida's definition of the spectre.[14] Derrida notes that the spectre 'is doubtless a supernatural and paradoxical phenomenality, the furtive and the ungraspable visibility of the invisible, or an invisibility of a visible X'.[15] The paradox of the spectral encounter reappears in Zweig's recurring notion of proximity and distance to a presence. He mentions 'a feeling of proximity to immensity', or 'the bringing closer of the figures once pushed away to eternity', or even 'the tangible closeness of great figures',[16] appearing to anticipate Walter Benjamin's understanding of the aura:

> The trace is appearance of a nearness, however far removed the thing that left it behind may be. The aura is appearance of a distance, however close the thing that calls it forth. In the trace, we gain possession of the thing; in the aura, it takes possession of us.[17]

Zweig's depiction of the auratic atmosphere of the manuscript encounter dominates much of his attempted translations of this specific reading experience. This does not preclude a focus on the tangible material traces; indeed Zweig's singularity as a collector is just that processual bent to his motivations. Yet this material focus is always accompanied by a magical element to creation, conjured in the world of autograph manuscripts.

Zweig was the key figure, according to Bodo Plachta, in the late nineteenth- to early twentieth-century shift in collecting motivations from a focus on the prominence of a manuscript's creator towards considering it as a creative document. Plachta asserts that the collector begins to move away from the authorial and transcendental creative concept to focus on the textual and material aspects of production. He establishes a significant contrast between *Schriftdenkmal* — manuscripts as memorial objects for their creators — and *Textträger* — manuscripts as primarily textual phenomena — providing a useful spectrum from early collecting practice to contemporary analytical trends in source studies, including philology, textual criticism, and genetic criticism.[18] Zweig lays frequent emphasis on the 'genetic' process of his manuscripts, and it is this terminology that brings him closer to the writings of 'genetic criticism', a critical field that goes back to the compositional sources of works in order to expand the interpretative frame:

[14] On the idea of 'spectral presence' see also Ulrike Vedder, 'Zur Magie der Handschrift. Stefan Zweig als Autographensammler', in *Zweig's England*, ed. by Rüdiger Görner and Klemens Renoldner (Würzburg: Königshausen u. Neumann, 2014), pp. 141–52.

[15] Jacques Derrida, *Specters of Marx: The State of the Debt, the Work of Mourning, and the New International*, trans. by Peggy Kamuf (New York; London: Routledge, 1994), p. 6.

[16] Zweig,'Die Welt der Autographen', pp. 104–07.

[17] Walter Benjamin, *The Arcades Project* (Cambridge, MA; London: Belknap Press, 1999), p. 447.

[18] Bodo Plachta, 'Schriftdenkmal oder Textträger', in *Materialität in der Editionswissenschaft*, ed. by Martin Schubert (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), pp. 79–94 (p. 85).

> Like old-fashioned philology or textual criticism, it examines tangible documents such as writers' notes, drafts, and proof corrections, but its real object is something much more abstract — not the existing documents but the movement of writing that must be inferred from them. Then, too, it remains concrete, for it never posits an ideal text beyond those documents but rather strives to reconstruct, from all available evidence, the chain of events in a writing process.[19]

Zweig explains, in similar terms, that his collection is comprised of 'documents, which directly materialise the creative moment of a work and both in terms of visuals *and* character, offer an insight into the *genesis* of creation'.[20] Elsewhere, he notes that he seeks documents that show 'the genetic process characteristically'.[21] Where Deppman *et al.* stress their research into 'the movement of writing', Zweig also accents the importance, for him, of the becoming of a text, most emphatically denying the very designation of his collection as one of 'autograph' manuscripts, preferring the term *Werkschriftensammlung*,[22] a collection of working drafts. Deppman *et al.* echo Zweig's focus on process since '[o]ne could even say that genetic criticism is not concerned with texts at all but only with the writing processes that engender them'.[23] And yet, Zweig's is a personal, experiential approach to texts that shares the same foundations as genetic analysis but stays at one remove from it. Plachta's tentative positioning of Zweig's conception of manuscripts in between the categories of *Schriftdenkmal* and *Textträger* is derived from Zweig's progressive search for processual creativity within a more nonanalytical, aesthetic, and 'auratic' experience.

Balzac in Perpetual Motion

Honoré de Balzac, whose writing ruled the sphere to which Zweig refers as 'the world of society',[24] was a figure who dominated Zweig's understanding of literature and creativity and who has a prime position in Zweig's manuscript collection, his essayistic output, and in his biographical work. There is undoubtedly a thread that ties the Balzac manuscripts in the Zweig collection to Zweig's work on the French author, culminating in his unfinished and posthumously published biography, *Balzac*.[25]

In March 1914, Zweig acquired Balzac's bound corrected proof for his novel *Une ténébreuse affaire*,[26] a document made up of over 1200 pages of corrected

[19] Jed Deppman, Daniel Ferrer and Michael Groden, 'Introduction: A Genesis of French Genetic Criticism', in *Genetic Criticism: Texts and Avant-Textes*, ed. by Jed Deppman, Daniel Ferrer and Michael Groden (Philadelphia; Great Britain: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), pp. 1–16 (p. 2).

[20] Stefan Zweig, 'Handschriften als schöpferische Dokumente', in *Ich kenne den Zauber der Schrift*, p. 117.

[21] Stefan Zweig, 'Meine Autographensammlung', in *Ich kenne den Zauber der Schrift*, pp. 128–29 (p. 128).

[22] Ibid., p. 128.

[23] Deppman, Ferrer and Groden, 'Introduction', p. 11.

[24] Stefan Zweig, *Drei Meister: Balzac, Dickens, Dostojewski* (Leipzig: Insel Verlag, 1919/1929), p. 8.

[25] Stefan Zweig, *Balzac*, ed. by Richard Friedenthal (Stockholm: Bermann-Fischer, 1946).

[26] London, British Library, Stefan Zweig Collection, Zweig MS 133.

printed pages and manuscript insertions. This proof is by far the largest item in the remaining Zweig Collection donated to the British Library in 1986. Not only is it the most materially substantial manuscript that the collection contains, but its influence on Zweig is distinct. For a collector such as Zweig, whose motivation was much more the process than the work, Balzac's work was the pinnacle and his manuscripts therefore the most insightful materialisation of the writing and correcting process. Zweig writes, in his essay dedicated to Balzac's corrected proofs *Die unterirdischen Bücher Balzacs*, that 'each of these books is not only a personal document of Balzac's creative process, but of the struggle for the epic form from genesis to creation'.[27] Zweig's note on the content of his new manuscript also appears to distinguish it from his collection: 'This precious manuscript of incomparable value demands a particular description and perhaps a whole book, so much does it contain Balzac's creative process, like no other manuscript'.[28] In other words, it is not a distinctive item for its rarity in commercial terms; rather, Zweig considers this corrected proof of *Une ténébreuse affaire* from an analytical perspective borne out of the challenge that its sheer immensity and material change demands.

The universal importance of Balzac's corrected proof is also derived from Balzac's position in the history of manuscript preservation and collection, as well as in a nineteenth-century culture gradually moving towards a materialist perspective from which to understand and represent the world. Anticipating genetic criticism — a field which has always been related to Balzac studies — Balzac would compile versions of his corrected proofs, have them bound and sent to those close to him. In Balzac's short story 'The Unknown Masterpiece', one can begin to understand the value that the author placed on bearing witness to the composition of an artwork. A young painter encounters the protagonist Porbus' art studio:

> the neophyte was spellbound by the fascination experienced by the born painters with the appearance of the first studio they have seen in which some of the material methods of art are revealed to them. [...] Plaster écorchés, fragments and torsos of antique goddesses, lovingly polished by kisses over the centuries, were strewn among the tablets and consoles. Numerous sketches, studies in red, white and black crayon, in red chalk or ink, covered the walls from floor to ceiling.[29]

Like Zweig regarding his manuscripts, the young painter Poussin wades through the material mess of the creative artist's 'workshop', bearing witness to the fragments of paintings, sketches, unused casts, and feeling overloaded by the significance of this creative waste. Not only does Balzac then introduce the 'real' into literature, at a time when the 'real' material documents of composition

[27] Stefan Zweig, 'Die unterirdischen Bücher Balzacs' (1917), in *Ich kenne den Zauber der Schrift*, pp. 96–99 (p. 99).
[28] London, British Library, Add MS 73168 (Catalogue cards to the Zweig Collection).
[29] Honoré de Balzac, *The Unknown Masterpiece*, trans. by Leon Livingstone (London: Enitharmon Press, 1996), pp. 13–14.

began to gain greater prominence, but this shift in attitude anticipates Zweig's and genetic criticism's introduction of the same 'real' aspects of writing into literary commentary. In Laurent Jenny's words, as

> textual theory found itself constrained by the analysis of the immanent structures of the text, caught in the trap of the dogma of closure [...] Critics then questioned if it would not be possible for the 'real' to be reinserted into a literary analysis that seemed to be distancing itself from just such a move.[30]

It is precisely this impulse to stave off interpretative closure by re-imagining the processual variance and contingency through the material traces of a manuscript, which is shared by Balzac, genetic criticism, and Stefan Zweig.

One glance at Balzac's corrected proof in the Zweig collection exposes a similar artist's workshop with the mess of failure strewn across the page in deletions and emendations as well as the continuity of a suspended process of writing and re-writing. For Zweig, there is an 'eruption of eternal excess into the proofs, whose rigid structure he repeatedly tore apart like the feverish tear at their wounds, in order to chase the once again red flowing blood of writing through the once fixed and frozen body'.[31] Zweig's experience is always tactile. He does not read the manuscripts but enters into an experience, in which he only *feels* (*spüren*) process, change, writing. What Zweig recognises in his most-prized manuscript and what the material experience leads him to figure is that with materiality comes process — a movement of writing behind a final work that constantly destabilizes the authority of any printed work through the mass of potential deviations. Balzac's proofs become hybrids of 'half manuscript and half print', which 'are protean and transform themselves, working more and more against any definitive picture'.[32]

The constant undermining of the fixed text through the continuous process of revision — what Stéphane Vachon calls the 'infinite reprisal of the work'[33] — installs a mobility inherent in the work as a whole. As the notes to the Pléiade critical edition of *Une ténébreuse affaire* suggest, a Balzac text first undergoes numerous revisions and might indeed fix itself in various print editions, but even between each print Balzac would continue to revise, rendering each version provisional.[34] Considering the correction phase is effectively a 'second composition',[35] a re-writing rather than just a correction, Balzac sets his works in perpetual motion. This collapses the teleology of creation in the form of

30 Laurent Jenny and Richard Watts, 'Genetic Criticism and Its Myths', *Yale French Studies*, 89, (1996), 9–25 (p. 11).
31 Zweig, *Drei Meister*, p. 55.
32 Zweig, 'Die unterirdischen Bücher Balzacs', p. 96.
33 Stéphane Vachon, 'Les enseignements des manuscrits. De la Variation contre La Variante', *Genesis*, 11 (1997), 61–80 (p. 76).
34 Honoré de Balzac, *La Comédie Humaine VIII* (Bibliothèque de la Pléiade, 1978), p. 1465.
35 Wells Fenton Chamberlin, *Génèse et Structure d'Une Ténébreuse Affaire de Balzac* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1956), p. 34.

iterated composition, which sees the palimpsestic takeover of printed text by manuscript and the establishment of an open-ended process. Zweig points to this infinite mobility, regarding the *Comédie humaine* project more broadly: 'The *Comédie Humaine* wants to show the eternally transformative world in transformation'.[36] The infinite mutability of life is enacted in the shifting structure of the cycle of novels, and further embodied in the 'protean' system of revision.

Reductive Revision Or The Moral Lesson

Zweig ultimately suggests that 'only he who has seen such a corrected proof example of one of Balzac's works, can truly appreciate his craft and his process'.[37] From this position of privileged insight, Zweig undertook the biography of Balzac that he thought would be his *magnum opus*. Left unfinished and published posthumously, it underwent a tortuous composition, affected ultimately by exile, the author's depression and reluctance to complete such an ambitious project. The prolonged efforts and revisions, as his editor Richard Friedenthal suggests, almost too perfectly mirror the creative process of his subject. Friedenthal writes, 'something of the Balzacian unrest seems to have been swept up into the work and documents [...] the already written was constantly re-worked'.[38] He continues to suggest that the incessant corrections of the Balzac manuscript, which Zweig experienced first-hand, ultimately 'infected' Zweig's biography. There are plain similarities between the manners in which the authors worked, each leaving a significant margin, each covering the page back and front with revisions.[39] In material terms, their manuscripts are of a piece and yet, if it is possible for critics to see the indeterminacy of the Balzacian process inherent in the complexity and ambiguity of the content,[40] the same cannot be said of Zweig.

The general flow of revision in Zweig's *Balzac* adapts events, which often highlight outside influence on Balzac's actions, in a way that allows the protagonist to take them over, creating a linguistic strategy to match the overt emphasis on the creator's self-determination. Changes which appear minor redress the whole tone of paragraphs in the later versions. A modest revision to a passage in the second chapter — addressing the author's attempt at writing his first work, a dramatization of the life of Oliver Cromwell — shifts Balzac from passive to active agent. The first version is followed by its revision below:

36 Zweig, *Drei Meister*, p. 45.
37 Zweig, 'Die unterirdischen Bücher Balzacs', p. 98.
38 Richard Friendenthal, 'Afterword', in Stefan Zweig, *Balzac*, pp. 535–41 (p. 537).
39 The manuscript of Zweig's *Balzac* is kept in The Stefan Zweig Collection, Daniel A. Reed Library Archives and Special Collections, State University of New York at Fredonia. Content cited with permission.
40 See Michael Tilby, 'Plotting and the Novel', *The Modern Language Review*, 110.2 (2015), 422–37 (p. 428).

(*a*) The work had seized him, for the first time Balzac felt he was placed before a task [...]. Finally the dice were thrown and Balzac began to work. For the first time in his life, he truly worked and for the first time with that devotion, which is comparable to nothing in all of literature.[41]

(*b*) For the first time, Balzac placed himself before a task and threw his unconquerable Will into the game. Where there is this Will, there is no resistance. Balzac knows he will finish *Cromwell* because he wants to finish it and because he must finish it [...] Balzac throws himself into work with such monomaniacal energy [...].[42]

In the first attempt, it is the work, the task, which has imposed itself on the fateful writer. Balzac feels as if he has been given the task. In the second version, Balzac sets himself the task, he is the active person in the sentence. Again, Zweig switches the subjects in his use of 'werfen' [the verb 'to throw']. Originally the dice *are thrown*, the passive structure signifying the lack of control over the external circumstances thrown onto the protagonist. In the revised passage, Balzac, as the continuing active subject at the start of the sentence, is the one throwing his 'Will' into the game, thereby taking charge of his own destiny.

Linguistic modification is complemented by structural change, which sees the beginning and end of chapters re-shaped to show a protagonist, who, rather than falling and rising against adversity, comes to possess a consistent power which elevates him through the book in a more harmonious image. The two endings to the second chapter read as follows:

(*a*) No one would see them and even in the times of his most desperate poverty, when he exploited every old manuscript page from his desk, he never showed anyone this first work, which had been the desperation, the hope, the pride and the deepest disappointment of his youth.[43]

(*b*) Unbent and unrelenting like after every one of the hundreds of disappointments, and even more determined than before to make himself independent from drudgery and family, he returns to his chosen prison cell on Rue Lesdignières.[44]

In the draft, Balzac's disappointment at the underwhelming response to his first play, *Cromwell*, is allowed to end the chapter. In the correction phase, this ending is cleaned up to deny any chance of the reader mistaking this as a sign of weakness or self-doubt in the heroic artist. Zweig retouches the final lines to make Balzac show defiant independence *in spite of* his disappointment. The chapter therefore leaves the reader with a sense of Balzac's unshakeable will, rather than leave lingering any notion of fragility in the young writer. The revision process suggests that Zweig has a type of Balzac, a rounded figure,

[41] Fredonia, State University of New York at Fredonia, Daniel A. Reed Library Archives and Special Collections, The Stefan Zweig Collection, G23 *Balzac*, Folder 7, Chapter 2, page marked 'e'.

[42] Ibid., Folder 6, Chapter 2, p. 9.

[43] Ibid., Folder 7, Chapter 2, page marked 'k'.

[44] Ibid., Folder 6, Chapter 2, p. 18.

which needs to be reflected coherently in the biography. To an extent, the historical knowledge only complements a pre-conceived ideal portrait, rather than informing it at every turn.

For an explanation of Zweig's harmonizing corrective process we need to return to his essays on manuscripts and his suspended position between the processual and the authorial. Unlike genetic criticism's ostensible objective to seek a process — movement itself — Zweig only ever seeks either a 'secret' or a 'moment' of creation. In other words, the manuscript is ultimately more conceivable as the distillation of a single moment of inspiration, and therefore, although *accessible* through the processual analysis of material traces, creativity is often portrayed as an occurrence beyond it. Where genetic criticism claims to *follow* the movement of writing, Zweig frequently refers to his seizure before the manuscript. He is transfixed, spellbound like Balzac's young artist, unable to move analytically with the genesis of the artwork, while yet still capable of re-animating the process he observes. This is a pre-hermeneutic (if not a non-hermeneutic) experience, a kind of nonanalytical response to textual phenomena, akin to what Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht describes as the 'oscillation between presence effects and meaning effects'.[45] Zweig resists deep interpretation of the creative processes he experiences in favour of re-animating the inexplicable spectral presence he senses.

In these short passages of the corrected *Balzac*, it is evident how creativity — so materially understood in his other essays as process — is, for Zweig, equally, if not more, connected to the realm of psychology and the person of the author. The inability and unwillingness to 'follow', analyse, and interpret the processes he experiences result in the static search for the secret, the moment, the incommensurable, which leave Balzac in a struggle with fate and demonic inspiration more than in a network of familial, literary, material contingencies that may also determine his creativity.

Yet, to shift between a conception of textual materiality and the physical humanity of its creator is crucial to Zweig's understanding of the *moral lesson* of drafts. He writes:

> The moral lesson — that the works, which we marvel at as perfection, are not simply gifts of genius bestowed upon artists, rather the fruits of painstaking, hard, sacrificial work. They show us the battlefields of the spiritual struggle of man with material, Jacob's eternal battle with the angel, they lead us down into the inner realm of creation and for the sake of their sacred efforts, they make us revere and love the human within the artist doubly.[46]

The collector reconciles the processual mobility of the manuscript, the precarious encounter with an auratic presence, and the notion of an originating

[45] Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht, *The Production of Presence* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004), p. 107.

[46] Zweig, 'Sinn und Schönheit der Autographen', p. 139.

author. He does not practise immanent textual criticism precisely because it is the human aspect of creativity that is ultimately transformative. Not only does he experience the creator as an extraordinary artist, beyond terrestrial possibility, but also as a human like us, whose efforts, struggles, hard work astound us. This awestruck disposition before manuscripts, the submission to presence ahead of meaning, and the general openness to textual experience may be interpreted as an example of what Derek Attridge calls a kind of 'ethics of literary reading [...] a disposition, a habit, a way of being in the world of words'[47], or perhaps in the world of autograph manuscripts.

By deriving the energy of a compositional text in part from the craft of the author, there is a move to return the author to a position of influence in literary criticism. It is then in fact the emphasis on the author-figure — what Zweig experiences as a spectral presence in the encounter with the manuscript — which moves him to consider the act and event of writing in its most modern, 'genetic' sense. With creativity in some form restricted by the body and physical work of a creating figure, Zweig is able to be led to the material process of creation. That the collector views such a process as ultimately the tangible manifestation of some momentary and mystical inspiration moderates the role of process in creativity for Zweig, without, however, undermining the novelty and significance of his early genetic perspective on manuscripts.

[47] Derek Attridge, *The Singularity of Literature* (London: Routledge, 2004), p. 130.