For Whom the Beyle Toils: Stendhal and Pseudonymous Authorship

RALPH SCHOOLCRAFT

In memory of an exceptional teacher, admired scholar, and irreplaceable friend: Luce Briche, 1967–2002

STENDHAL'S DREAM OF POSTHUMOUS GLORY GOT OFF TO A rough start. Two days after his death on 23 March 1842, the Parisian papers briefly noted the passing of "M. Bayle," a writer who had used the name "Frédéric Stendhall" for the publication of several respected works ("Faits divers" 125). Matters have since turned in Stendhal's favor, but what could be more fitting for a writer with more than three hundred pseudonyms than an obituary of botched names? An individual christened Henri-Marie Beyle who writes an autobiography for Henry Brulard, refers to it as Dominique's memoirs, and signs it Stendhal is bound to create confusion. (For convenience I will use his given name, Beyle.) Moreover, nomination is just as problematic in his private writings. His correspondence and diaries are rife with similar alter egos. Even his death is pseudonymous: found in his coat pocket after the stroke that killed him is an epitaph, prepared for just such an occasion, in honor of one "*Arrigo Beyle, Milanese*" 'Arrigo Beyle, from Milan.'[1]

In short, for Beyle writing is synonymous with being pseudonymous. At every stage of his career, his self-apprehension and artistic development are mediated by an array of assumed names. This unusual practice also turns out to be a complex one. In the course of his career, Beyle fashions several types of pseudonym, varieties that change according to his intended audience. My project is to identify the principles organizing these categories of pseudonym and thereby decipher the script of his experiments with falsified identity. It would be difficult, after all, to imagine a persuasively coherent account of Beyle's writing practices that failed to address his decisions to sign no published works under his

RALPH SCHOOLCRAFT teaches French at Texas A&M University, College Station. He has published *Romain Gary: The Man Who Sold His Shadow* (U of Pennsylvania P, 2002) and a translation, *The Haunting Past: History, Memory, and Justice in Contemporary France*, by Henry Rousso (U of Pennsylvania P, 2002), as well as contributions in journals such as *L'Esprit Créateur*, *MLN*, *South Central Review*, *Substance*, and *World Literature Today*. He is preparing two book projects, one titled "Literary Gaullism" and the other on pseudonymous authorship in modern France.

© 2004 BY THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081204X21298 Published online by Cambridge University Press

own name and to indulge such a vast proliferation of names in public *and* private spheres of writing. Given the extent of Beyle's use of the device, we can reasonably expect to discover logical patterns in it, conscious or unconscious.

As a preliminary step, I will organize Beyle's pseudonyms into three groups distinguished by audience: public (published works), interpersonal (correspondence), and private (journals). Only rarely does a name from one context surface in another. The three registers are, generally speaking, mutually exclusive, which suggests that they involve different aims.

Let us begin chronologically. If we can trust Beyle's "autobiography" in this instance, his initial foray into falsified identity appears to have occurred circa 1794, at age eleven. He was punished for sending a letter to his grandfather bearing the forged signature of Antoine Gardon, a former Episcopalian vicar turned Jacobin who directed a patriotic paramilitary unit for youth (Beyle was trying to convince his grandfather to let him join these Bataillons de l'Espérance, or Battalions of Hope [*Vie* 647–52]). Though hundreds more letters with fake signatures would follow, this early episode is inconsistent with Beyle's later habits, since he subsequently obeys the founding principle of personal correspondence (an exchange between parties whose identities are known to each other). Thus, even though he continually changes signatures on letters to his sister, Pauline (for instance), the letters' contents immediately reveal their author's identity to her. Furthermore, while it is true that Beyle was occasionally suspected of spying in Italy and Austria, the epistolary pseudonyms belong in fact to a charade whose ludic dimension is often underlined by the burlesque nature of the names ("le Chevalier de Cutendre," "Cornichon," "William Crocodile," and so forth). This does not mean that these masquerades serve no purpose. Intended mostly to bolster private relationships, the secret names establish an intimacy that can be renewed with each letter, a symbolic bond constantly but playfully reaffirmed or renegotiated. When Beyle is disappointed with a friend's infrequent responses, for example, he uses a string of fictive identities accompanied by narratives that successively modify the conditions under which the correspondence can be continued.[2] The result is a coded exchange that excludes third parties in order to extend or reaffirm a private we. In sum, these pseudonyms are disposable masks, used to seal a pact for the letter at hand: of the approximately 250 pseudonyms found in his correspondence, more than 200 appear only once.

Letters thus constitute an independent, private sphere of writing for Beyle, removed from the public's potentially scornful gaze. (This distinction is even represented in his fiction by the famous letter shared by the heroes of *Armance*; the narrator never reveals its contents to the reader even though it contains the key to the entire novel.) Consequently, the textual dynamics of Beyle's personal correspondence are diametrically opposed to those of pseudonymous publication. Literary pseudonyms, contrary to the complicity encouraged by Beyle's epistolary pet names, withhold identity, partially withdrawing authors from symbolic contracts with readers. We move from the development of personal bonds to strategies of public appearance (and disappearance). Since Beyle's epistolary pseudonyms serve objectives largely unrelated to those of his literary career, I will leave them aside to focus on the public and private alter egos.

The next sphere to emerge in Beyle's writing is his "literary workshop," the extensive series of private journals appreciated today as some of the most unusual documents in French literature.[3] Here Beyle discusses the use of pseudonyms some thirty years before the publication of his first novel (*Armance*, in 1827). These journals are thus the best means of tracing Beyle's initial attitudes toward writing as they develop, notebook by notebook.[4]

From the earliest stages of his ambition to become a writer, Beyle sees literary identity as malleable, as something to be orchestrated. Inspired by his admiration for the philosophes, he

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081204X21298 Published online by Cambridge University Press

seeks a strategic approach grounded in a belief in introspection, logic, and system. He uses his journals to contrive and test procedures for achieving literary fame and exploring facets of himself. He hones his skills in different literary genres, all the while studying the functioning of French literary institutions. The bulk of this apprenticeship takes place during 1801–22, and its importance is signified by the fact that it is the one occasion on which he applies his own name to a product of his imagination: the celebrated ensemble of principles for success dubbed *le beylisme* 'Beylism.'

Pseudonyms are an integral part of Beylism. Initially, these fake names are given a purely defensive role, imagined as a buffer to shield the young writer from criticism. Explains Beyle in a letter: "Je suis las de l'obscurité. Je [donnerai] mes pièces *incognito*; si sifflées personne n'en sait rien, si applaudies au bout de quinze représentations je me nomme" 'I'm tired of obscurity. I['ll present] my plays incognito. If they're booed, no one's the wiser; if applauded, I'll reveal my name after the fifteenth show' ("To Louis Crozet," 7 June 1804 [*Correspondance* 1: 99]). This is a traditional use of pseudonymous publication. It allows a novice to test the waters without venturing too much, to profit from success yet cut losses in the event of failure.

In the first decade of Beyle's diaries, all his works in progress are assigned prospective pseudonyms of this type. Taken singly, each pseudonym is barely an anecdote, but collectively they demonstrate a desire to orchestrate his arrival on the literary scene. One of the clearest examples is his approach to a literary contest sponsored by the Institut de France in 1804. Intending to submit part of an unfinished play, *Le pervertisseur* 'The Perverter,' Beyle produces nearly as many pseudonyms as pages: "Henri-Clarence Banti," in August, is followed in September by "Leimery" and the punning "Octavien-Henri Fair-Monfort" (i.e., *faire mon fort* 'do my best' [*Journal* (1981) 1: 127]). These initial plans to establish his reputation, marked at times by indifference to questions of literary merit, stem from a preoccupation with becoming an author (a publicly recognized figure), as opposed to a writer (an artist who researches subjects, refines literary technique, develops themes).[5]

These early scenes of Beyle courting public exposure therefore make a good case for Jean Starobinski's unindulgent assessment in "Stendhal pseudonyme." In this reading, Beylism is primarily a series of social maneuvers used by a writer beset by feelings of inadequacy (humbly born, maladroit, unattractive). To compensate for these perceived shortcomings, Beyle has devised his strategy of masking (Starobinski 207).

But are Beyle's pseudonyms really nothing more than expressions of vanity, envy, and paranoia? If we look concretely at his different literary experiments, various facts soon cloud the picture. Beyle's notebooks, for example, feature a group of pseudonyms that appear solely in this private space. This goes counter to the notion of the pseudonym (as designed for publication). If Beyle's pseudonyms are owed only to social or commercial strategies, how does one account for the existence of well-developed names in private papers? These fictional identities have no possible social application given that they are not intended to surface in any public context. Nor can they be dismissed as "alibis"—pseudonyms that camouflage compromising narratives as a protection against indiscreet acquaintances (see Michel)—since the sobriquets often appear in innocuous passages. Why then does Beyle extend his masquerade to private writing exercises?

Over a seven-year period (1809–16), a new type of pseudonym emerges. In the journal's first phase, with its loose collection of aborted drafts, each hypothetical name is used only in passing, a mere mask for preserving Beyle's anonymity. With time, however, a few invented names take on greater breadth and evolve into personae. Here is the apparent paradox of pseudonyms that are at once authorial and purely private.

This form is also a byproduct of the apprentice's concern with the institutional facets of

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081204X21298 Published online by Cambridge University Press

literature, but now the emphasis shifts from public appearance to craft. As early as 1803, for example, Beyle spoke of composing profiles of famous writers after which to pattern himself ("To Pauline Beyle," 8 Feb. 1803 [*Correspondance* 1: 55]). He also filled countless pages attempting to imitate the writing of Ovid, Tasso, Ariosto, Milton, Shakespeare, and Molière (Schneider 98). A few years later, he seeks to form an ideal image of himself as a writer, searching for the style, subjects, and genre that correspond to his "nature." In the course of these reflections, he sketches and evaluates several models. In other words, while refining technique and voice, poetics and themes, Beyle also tries to construct viable models of writers to imitate that will, through their coherence and scope, empower him to write. Each of these is in turn designated by a pseudonym, which helps organize the exploration by providing a sort of anchor for this slow-forming identity.

The resulting repertory of alter egos demonstrates the complexity of the possibilities allowed by the pseudonym and shows that the elements Starobinksi highlights are but a departure point for Beyle. As a matter of fact, a clean break separates the pseudonyms of 1804 from the stage that begins circa 1810. During this five-year gap, literary pseudonyms essentially disappear from the journals. Moreover, because Beyle arrives at the latter stage through private reflections gropingly elaborated in his journals, these pseudonyms are much more difficult to interpret. Freed from the task of communicating with others, he simply jots down a name in passing to record his fragmentary inspiration. He never defines them explicitly, and some are so ambiguous as to resist decoding.

I will begin with the journal pseudonym "Mocenigo," one of the most elusive but complete examples of how Beyle places a name at the center of an effort of literary self-transformation. Situated somewhere between pseudonym and concept, Mocenigo is defined broadly by Henri Martineau as "tantôt le poète dramatique que [Beyle] avait décidé d'être, tantôt les beaux caractères, les esprits libres, les connaisseurs du cœur humain, tantôt Stendhal lui-même" 'at times, the dramatic poet that [Beyle] had decided to be; at other times, the striking personalities, free spirits, and connoisseurs of the human heart; and, at still others, Stendhal himself' (271). Michel Crouzet goes even further, arguing that Mocenigo "renvoie presque à une poétique" 'nearly corresponds to a poetics' (*Stendhal ou Monsieur Moi-même* 170). Mocenigo therefore is at the limit of what can be considered a pseudonym, insofar as it names as much a talent or an approach as it does an identity.

Not all Mocenigo's history is known, but it originates with Giacomo Lechi, an aristocrat who shares a carriage with Beyle during a trip through Italy in 1811. Lechi makes a profound impression on Beyle: "Voilà certainement l'homme qui en parlant m'a causé le plus de plaisir depuis dix ans peut-être; je ne me souviens pas d'une autre manière aussi aimable" 'He is certainly the man whose conversation has caused me the greatest pleasure in perhaps the last ten years; I can't remember a manner [of speaking] as agreeable as his' (*Journal* [1981] 1: 728). Already nursing a Romantic penchant for Italy, Beyle is only too disposed to see in Lechi a sort of ego ideal: "[Lechi] parlait avec tant de grâce et de comique . . . que j'ai souvent désiré pouvoir sténographier ce qu'il me disait"; "[i]l faut que je me souvienne de ce modèle parfait" '[Lechi] spoke with so much grace and comic sensibility. . . that I often wished I could record word for word what he was saying; I must remember this perfect model' (*Journal* [1981] 1: 728, 720).

Beyle is especially struck by two of Lechi's anecdotes, though there is a curious twist in their transcription. Beyle dubs them "Mocenigo's anecdotes," named for a person ridiculed in one of them, Pietro Mocenigo, governor of Brescia.[6] The second one establishes a parallel with Pietro Mocenigo in that it appears to concern another victim of Lechi's wit, Count Francesco Melzi d'Éril (*Journal* [1981] 1: 728). A plausible reading thus consists in granting an extended, more

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081204X21298 Published online by Cambridge University Press

general reference to the term. Derived from the anecdotes, "Mocenigo" seems initially to designate any self-important noble whose vanity brings ridicule on him: "Ne pas oublier d'écrire avec soin les deux anecdotes des Mocenigo. Elles peignent fortement et se servent de correctifs l'une à l'autre" 'Don't forget to write down carefully the two anecdotes about the Mocenigi. They are quite illustrative and serve as correctives to each other' (*Journal* [1981] 1: 741).[7] In abstracting the figures from these tales, Beyle transposes social anecdotes into a character type at the same time as he detaches the concept from Lechi, who could impede the processes of the imaginary by his own reality.

Working intermittently on the draft of his comedy *Letellier*, Beyle listens to Lechi with the ear of a would-be playwright. Mocenigo's use continues to evolve in this direction. Generalized once more, the name becomes synonymous with the craft of theater: "Si vous lisez une comédie pour votre plaisir, laissez-vous aller. Mais si vous voulez vous instruire dans l'art de Mocenigo, il faut, avant de commencer une pièce, vous demander quel a été le but de l'auteur" 'If you read a comedy for pleasure, let yourself go. But if you want to learn about the art of Mocenigo, you must, before beginning a play, ask yourself what the author's objective was' (*Journal littéraire* 2: 388). Beyle then incorporates into this portrait additional elements from his own artistic vision, crediting Mocenigo with a philosophical intuition that complements Lechi's style and humor:

> Le philosophe voit le ridicule. Par exemple, l'affectation du comte magistrat. . . . L'art de le rendre sensible, d'en faire *rire* tout le monde, forme le talent du poète comique. Dire, en faisant telle remarque: «C'est ridicule» peut instruire l'auditeur, mais ne le fait pas rire. Il faut donc deux choses au Mocenigo: 1º philosophie pour apercevoir les affectations; 2º art de nous en faire rire. (*Journal littéraire* 2: 386)
>
> Philosophers see the ridiculousness [in one's character]. For example, the affectation of the count magistrate. . . . The art of making it perceptible, of making everyone *laugh* at it, constitutes the comic poet's talent. Saying, through a remark like, "That's ridiculous," can inform the listener, but it doesn't make him laugh. The Mocenigo must therefore have two things: 1. philosophy in order to perceive affectation; 2. art to make us laugh at it.

In the end, the transformation is relatively simple: Mocenigo no longer designates the figure(s) of ridicule but, rather, identifies the comedic artist who recognizes, analyzes, and communicates this ridicule. It is now synonymous with a specific and personal vision of a dramatic author.

While a theatrical vision combining the comic with the philosophical is common enough in the period, Beyle's means of arriving at it is not. In anchoring his dramatic doctrine to a pseudonymous persona, he provides himself with an image of what he feels he has to become to be successful as a writer for the stage. Thus, though Mocenigo is not to be confused with Beyle himself, a passage from generic designation to specific literary identity has occurred. As Beyle notes in his peculiar mixture of French and English: "Depuis [décembre 1811] j'ai travaillé le plus que j'ai pu. *That is usefull* [sic] *for Mocenigo* en agrandissant ma manière, qui eût été d'un sec et d'un soigné détestables" 'Since [December 1811] I've worked as much as I could. *That is useful for Mocenigo* to help develop my style, which would have been unbearably dry and overwrought' (*Journal* [1981] 1: 821). We see now more clearly what Beyle was searching for throughout the refashioning of the term: a definition of his literary project, the means of proceeding toward it, and a sense of the makeup of the writer capable of doing so—an aesthetics, a method, and an image all in one. The result is that from 1811 to 1815 Mocenigo is the sole name for Beyle's struggle to form himself as a playwright.

The seeming complexity of Mocenigo's construction is reduced somewhat when we situate it in Beyle's activities during this period. Mocenigo takes shape at a time of intense productivity, when Beyle was assembling several

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081204X21298 Published online by Cambridge University Press

manuscripts simultaneously. In addition to his effort on the comedy *Letellier*, he is compiling a history of Italian art, a book on music, and a travel guide for Italy. (These will become *Histoire de la peinture en Italie* 'The History of Italian Painting,' *Vies de Haydn, Mozart et Métastase* 'The Lives of Haydn, Mozart, and Metastasio,' and *Rome, Naples et Florence en 1817* 'Rome, Naples, and Florence in 1817.') These latter three projects are intended to make him more visible in the world of letters and to generate a bit of income. Beyle's comments on his survey of Italian art are candid in this respect: "Cette idée [de faire *Histoire de la peinture en Italie*] me ferait perdre mon temps *as Mocenigo*. Mais, l'amour-propre étant fixé, j'acquerrais des connaissances véritables en peinture, *and probably money sufficient for a second tour throught* [sic] *Italy*" 'This idea [of doing *The History of Italian Painting*] would cause me to waste time [that would be better spent] as Mocenigo. But, my self-esteem being set, I would acquire real knowledge about painting, and probably enough money for a second tour of Italy' (*Journal* [1981] 1: 813). A draft of *Histoire de la peinture en Italie* completed, he reiterates the claim, as if to reassert his true values: "Si je meurs, regret d'avoir fait l'*H*[*istoire de la peinture en Italie*] au lieu de travailler au genre Mocenigo" 'If I die, regret at having done *H*[*istory of Italian Painting*] instead of working at Mocenigo's genre' (*Journal* [1981] 1: 959). Mocenigo, symbol of higher aspirations, is a convenient reference for opposing the theater projects to Beyle's more mercenary aims.

Two ideas of himself as a writer are at work: a dramatic author and, as Gérald Rannaud notes (117), an elegant connoisseur displaying cultural expertise. A flurry of pseudonymous activity in the journals corresponds to the sorting out of these plans. The play in progress is of course Mocenigo's responsibility, while Dominique is charged with the history of music. *Histoire de la peinture en Italie* ends up assigned the pseudonym "Bombet." The draft of the Italian guidebook is attributed to "M. de Léry" until a late change places it with "Stendhal." At a moment when Beyle is searching for himself as a writer, the array of names allows him to entertain several distinct visions of himself and eliminates the need to reconcile their contradictions. It allows him to imagine who could write each work at the same time as he imagines the work itself. The strategy appears effective: Beyle publishes three books in sixteen months, after having failed to produce any in the preceding *fifteen years* of efforts.

As the projects take shape, new names grow in prominence. When the first drafts of *Histoire de la peinture en Italie* are lost and Beyle is forced to shift his focus to the musical biographies, Dominique crops up more frequently. Used for the first time in June 1812 (some seven months after Mocenigo's invention), this alter ego is derived from Domenico Cimarosa. Beyle already recorded his attachment to this eighteenth-century figure in a note claiming a physical resemblance to the corpulent Italian composer (*Journal* [1981] 1: 623). The terrain thus organized, a narcissistic idea of himself as a writer whose talent lies in a certain musicality becomes possible. Fittingly, Beyle switches to his flawed Italian for this observation: "*Credo ch'el amor mio per Cimarosa vienne di ciò ch'elli fa nascere delle sensationi* pareilles *a quello che desidero di far nascere un giorno. Quel misto d'allegria et di tenerezza del Matrimonio* [*segreto*] *è affatto congeniale con me*" 'I believe that my love of Cimarosa comes from this: that he arouses sensations similar to those that I hope one day to arouse. The mix of lightness and tenderness in his "[Secret] Wedding" is completely compatible with me' (*Journal* [1981] 1: 828). This identification results in an ambition to become the Cimarosa of prose, and Dominique is henceforth ready to take charge of the aforementioned musical biographies.

In looking at the genesis of these names, we see that Mocenigo is not an isolated case, for the evolution of Dominique mimics it strikingly. Beyond the homology of Mocenigo and Domenico,

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081204X21298 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Beyle again translates an idealized Italian model from another sphere (here, music) into a viable literary approach rooted in his own capacities and aims. The ego ideal is transformed into a pseudonymous identity that keeps the advantages of the valorized model yet that springs from a source sufficiently removed from Beyle's endeavors to allow a free scripting of his particular aims. Thus, in the same way that Mocenigo was a tool for Beyle's apprenticeship in the dramatic arts, Dominique becomes an organizing point in the journals for Beyle's search to develop tone.

What is unique here is the full participation of these two pseudonyms in the creative process. Not only do they consolidate a number of ideas Beyle explored in the preceding ten years of journal writing, but, more important, they serve as conceptual chaperons mirroring and directing the writer's vision of particular book projects. This practice constitutes, to the best of my knowledge, a pseudonymous device previously unknown in literature.[8]

Toward 1814, Beyle begins to phase out Mocenigo. In the following passage, for instance, Beyle contrasts the practicality of his friend Édouard Mounier with his own plodding pace: "Je sens comment un tel homme a beaucoup de supériorité sur M. M[oceni]go, qui rêve quinze jours de suite aux moyens *of writing in five years a good* page" 'I see how such a man is far superior to Mr. M[oceni]go, who dreams fifteen days in a row of finding the means five years from now to write one good page' (*Journal* [1981] 1: 870). Ultimately, Beyle's inability to finish his theatrical projects—"*'tis for that* que *Mocenigo is perhaps done for me*" (*Journal* [1981] 1: 907)—leads him to abandon the name in 1816. This spells the end not just of a project but also of a belief in the efficacy of a certain temperament and method. An entire image of himself as a writer, elaborated over five years, finds itself discarded. With the displacement of his interest in theater and the concomitant publication of the composers' biographies, musicality rises to the forefront of Beyle's stylistic preoccupations:

> Mes sentiments brodent sur un chant ce qui, d'après la passion dominante, peut faire le plus de plaisir à mon âme; je ne puis broder aussi fortement les vers du meilleur spectacle français. De là vient peut-être mon amour pour la musique, l'ennui que me donne le théâtre français.
>
> (*Journal* [1981] 1: 724)

> My feelings can improvise new turns to a song, which, depending on the predominant passion, can cause my soul the greatest pleasure. I can't work as effectively with the verse of the best piece of French theater. This is perhaps the source of my love for music and of the ennui that French theater causes me.

This clears the way for Dominique to inherit the mantle of Beyle's literary aspirations: "*On me*.—Dominique travaille trois fois plus qu'un autre auteur; que de choses qu'il fait et qu'il efface ensuite!" 'On me.—Dominique works three times as much as other authors; he does so many things, only to erase them!' (*Journal* [1981] 2: 252). This name serves henceforth as the primary reference point during the completion of *Histoire de la peinture en Italie* (published in 1817), *Rome, Naples et Florence en 1817*, and *De l'amour* 'On Love' (nearly finished in 1820, published in 1822). By 1818 it is the signature in Beyle's journal for social commentary, political aphorisms, and statements of literary dogma; even later, returns to theatrical projects will be tied to it (see *Journal* [1981] 2: 4, 11, 53). In fact, Dominique becomes interchangeable with Beyle's literary and inner selves to such an extent that for several years Beyle stops using "Mr. Myself," an English term he previously affectioned for self-reference. Given Dominique's eventual pervasiveness, one easily forgets its original, fairly restricted application.

Dominique's rise, simultaneous with Beyle's emergence as an author, thus marks a third stage in his pseudonymous practices. We have jumped from names that maintain anonymity (Banti, Leimery) to one aimed at training an artistic temperament (Mocenigo), before arriving at a sort of paper double of Beyle's artistic self, a

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081204X21298 Published online by Cambridge University Press

full-fledged alter ego (Dominique). In the light of this significant expansion in its range of responsibilities, one would expect Beyle to adopt Dominique as the pseudonym for the publication of his early nonfiction works. Strangely enough, however, the manuscripts that Dominique oversees all reach the public under other names. The first edition of the composers' biographies remains with "Louis-César-Alexandre Bombet." *Histoire de la peinture en Italie* is cryptically signed "M.B.A.A." (an abbreviation for "Monsieur Beyle, Ancien Auditeur," or Former Auditor). Following shortly thereafter is *Rome, Naples et Florence en 1817*, which marks the first use of Stendhal: "Monsieur de Stendhal, officier de cavalerie" 'cavalry officer.' Never mind that the journal refers to these books as "D[omini]que'*s writings*" (*Journal* [1981] 2: 117); for all the dozens of times that this name appears in the diaries, it is never even projected as a name for an author.[9]

In contrast, Bombet, M. de Léry, and Stendhal are names chosen for the publication of works without ever being associated with authorial character traits or literary practice. The additional example of "Is. Ich. Charlier" is telling: it shows up in a draft for a prospectus of *Histoire de la peinture en Italie*, outlined before the work was begun (*Journal* [1981] 1: 812). During the actual compilation of the history, Charlier never reappears. Other fleeting names are restricted to similar capacities: the printing of the composers' biographies "*will cost . . . Barett* 1,500 francs"; "[e]xemplaire [d'*Histoire de la peinture en Italie*] donné par l'auteur, M. Aubertin" 'copy [of *The History of Italian Painting*] offered by the author, M. Aubertin' (*Journal* [1981] 1: 914, 972). These pseudonyms are mere drawers in a figurative desk used to compartmentalize ventures. They sign, but they do not write. They continue in the tradition of Banti, Junius, and Fair-Monfort, one-dimensional masks Beyle uses to conceal his identity. One cannot really speak here of authorial identity, because these names never graduate to the status of alter egos with individuated features.

These reflections bring us, chronologically and conceptually, to the case of Stendhal. This pseudonym, as I have mentioned, first surfaces on the side of those names destined solely for publication. One would think, however, that since Beyle retains it for the majority of his later works, it would become in time more than just a signature. Surprisingly, though, a look at its use reveals the contrary, on a number of fronts. First of all, Beyle treats it as but one pseudonym among many: "Au lieu de faire un article sur Stend[hal], articulez sur Bombet. Songez à huit cents [exemplaires de celui-ci] en magasin. Les cent cinquante-huit Stend[hal] se débiteront d'eux-mêmes" 'Instead of doing an article on Stend[hal] [i.e., *Rome, Naples et Florence en 1817*], articulate something on Bombet [*Vies de Haydn, Mozart et Métastase*]. Think of 800 [copies of the latter] still in stock. The 158 Stend[hal] will sell themselves' ("To De Mareste," 12 Mar. 1818 [*Correspondance* 1: 894]). Second, Stendhal is not used frequently. Beyle signs his correspondence with it when writing to the press but rarely when addressing friends. It appears in the journals only a handful of times.

What then is the basis for Stendhal's place at the head of Beyle's collected works? Critics have deployed a great deal of ingenuity (for want of a better word) on why Beyle chose the name in the first place. Dieter Diefenbach argues that Stendhal is derived from an "arithmosophic equation" used to encode the date of Beyle's initiation into Freemasonry, while another critic notes that it is an anagram of *Shetland* (and thus constitutes a nod to the famous *Edinburgh Review* [Pierre Angrand, cited in Beyle, *Voyages* 1313n1]). Nicholas Rand remarks that *Beyle* is "ax" in German (*Beil*) and that the French word for "ax" (*hache*) is pronounced like *h*, the letter Beyle added to the name of the German village Stendal (400–02).

Onomastics aside, the most reasonable explanation for Beyle's last-minute decision to drop M. de Léry in favor of "Stendhal, officier de cavalerie" is linked to the circumstances sur-

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081204X21298 Published online by Cambridge University Press

rounding the publication of *Rome, Naples et Florence en 1817*. According to Victor Del Litto, Beyle's presence in Lombardy, then an Austrian possession, made Beyle anxious about passages in his book concerning Napoléon's legacy. In an attempt to ease the work past government censors, Beyle dropped the French-sounding Léry in favor of the Prussian Stend(h)al, while the qualifier "cavalry officer" was meant to suggest a person of orthodox inclinations (Del Litto, "Notice" 1312–13). In this reading, Stendhal falls into the category of the self-protective alibis discussed by François Michel. If we extrapolate from this hypothesis, Stendhal was a name chosen to suggest a figure contrary to Beyle and thus to protect him from political or social pressures. For many critics—especially those favoring sociopolitical interpretations, like René Andrieu, former editor in chief of the French Communist Party newspaper *L'humanité* (238–39)—this explanation has sufficed. There is doubtless some truth to it, and it is consistent with the rare remarks on the subject left by Beyle.[10]

The argument runs into a few problems, however. Stendhal's value as a disguise was virtually nil. From the outset, the author's true identity was common knowledge to the reading public and foreign authorities (reports from the Austrian and pontifical police, for instance, show that they confronted Beyle on this matter [Jourda 76–78]). Another difficulty is that this stance does not explain why Beyle maintained the pseudonym for subsequent publications. After all, he had not maintained any of the previous ones. Last, everything about this name is antipathetic to Beyle's tastes. Strongly preferring southern European cultures like those of Italy and Spain, he voices anti-Germanic views throughout his 1807 stay in Brunswick, the trip during which he most likely visited the village of Stendal (*Voyages* 1312). Furthermore, this village's initial significance is owed to Beyle's readings of Johann Joachim Winckelmann, a native of Stendal. While acknowledging this prominent scholar in German archaeology and classical art as "[le] premier b[aro]n de Steindhal" '[the] first b[aro]n of Steindhal' ("To Sophie Duvaucel," 28 Oct. 1834 [*Correspondance* 2: 713]), Beyle mocks him frequently: "Winckelmann (ridicule de). . . . Je pourrais tirer de là du comique. Ce pauvre W[inckelmann], qui pouvait être très savant ne raisonne pas du tout. On est sans cesse étonné de sa manière de tirer des conséquences" 'Winckelmann (ridiculousness of). . . .There are comic effects to be had here. Though he could be quite scholarly, this poor W[inckelmann] does not reason at all. One is constantly astonished at how he draws his conclusions' (*Journal* [1981] 1: 818). Unlike the prior models of Lechi and Cimarosa, Winckelman inspires no bond of identification.[11]

Beyle's aggressive attitude here is typical of his handling of other such "mercenary" masks. An important subtext, however, casts light on his behavior. It is well documented that Beyle plagiarized freely in the compilation of his nonfiction works (Chaudenay 277–80). We can thus better understand why Beyle shows testiness about writers close to his interests. He disparages those whom he has pillaged—Luigi Lanzi, for instance. Initially intending to publish his own translation of Lanzi's volumes on the history of Italian painting, Beyle soon rethinks this project, realizing that he would benefit more if he signed the work as its author. The end product is a patchwork largely assembled from the texts of Lanzi and a host of others (Arbelet 140–87). Years later, Beyle makes this evaluation of his primary source:

> Je vois seulement (après treize ans) comment il se fera que *this author* ne sera pas *a rival for* Dominique's *History of* [*Italian*] *painting*. . . . Lanzi faiblit dès qu'il est question d'un des trente ou quarante bons peintres. La chaleur de son âme, si âme il y a, ne paraît que lorsqu'il s'agit de restituer le nom ou l'époque de quelque peintre de sixième ordre. . . . Le grand travail littéraire de ce pauvre Lanzi est [de] préparer ses transitions. (*Journal* [1981] 2: 138)

> Only after thirteen years do I see why Lanzi will not be a rival for Dominique's *History of* [*Italian*] *Painting*. . . . Lanzi weakens as soon

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081204X21298 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> as it becomes a question of one of the thirty or forty painters of note. The warmth of his soul—if indeed he has a soul—only manifests itself when it is a matter of reestablishing the name or period of some sixth-rate painter. . . . The main literary project of this poor Lanzi is to set up his transitions.

"Poor Lanzi," "poor Winckelmann." Beyle's compulsion to denigrate his sources is perhaps an attempt to muddy the trace of his debts. Moreover, he is prepared to go to some lengths to do so. When an outraged author, Giuseppe Carpani, exposes L. A. C. Bombet as having pillaged Carpani's *Haydine* (1812), Beyle invents a younger brother, H. C. G. Bombet, to dismiss the accusations: his sibling, H. C. G. Bombet affirms, suffering from old age and gout, has long since retired to London and has little interest in music or Carpani ("Au Rédacteur en Chef du *Constitutionnel*," 26 Sept. 1816 [*Correspondance* 1: 816–18]). H. C. G. Bombet's conclusion? "Ce pauvre M. Carpani" (817).

These details would be little more than forgotten skirmishes were it not that the same process occurs in Beyle's invention of pseudonyms. In a letter concerning a new edition of *Histoire de la peinture en Italie*, Beyle suggests replacing the original byline, "M.B.A.A.," with "M. Jules-Onuphre Lani" ("To Pierre Didot," 5 Mar. 1817 [*Correspondance* 1: 857–61]). The new authorial signature is one letter short of Lanzi, a reversal of how Stendhal alters Winckelmann's birthplace. The pattern recurs with one of the sources exploited in the musical biographies: Beyle amputates the author Giuseppe Baretti's name to obtain the aforementioned pseudonym Barett (*Journal* [1981] 1: 914n2). These onomastic links are not intended as tributes. At the same time as Beyle steals from writers, he systematically dispossesses them of their names. This in effect enables him to appropriate and occupy their place as authors.[12] Beyle summarizes his strategy nicely in an aphorism (fittingly borrowed from someone else): "'Oui, il est permis de copier, mais quand on tue son homme'" 'Yes, you are allowed to copy, as long as you kill your source' (*Journal* [1981] 1: 230–31).

Stendhal is thus a pseudonym in the strictest sense: it is a fictive name that intercedes for Beyle on the occasion of each publication. Without ever becoming confused with Beyle himself, it extends to the whole of his life as a *public* literary figure (to responses to his work in the press, his dealings with his editors, the social perception of his presumed traits and intentions, etc.). These are not matters of indifference for Beyle. As his correspondence shows, he follows closely the sales and reviews of each work and looks for critical comments concerning Stendhal. But the name Stendhal is fundamentally separate from Beyle's *creative* processes, which remain in later years the province of Dominique.

From this perspective, it is easier to see why Stendhal does not develop into an alter ego. The two principal pseudonymous practices I have outlined move in opposite directions: Dominique and Mocenigo are part of the effort to develop literary talent, while the pirated names Stendhal, Lani, and Barett fit into a professional strategy of spoliation and suffocation. The journals confirm which figure is considered to produce the works, for even when Beyle measures himself against other writers, Stendhal is not the usual reference: "La grande différence entre Fielding et Dominique, c'est que Fielding décrit *à la fois* les sentiments et actions de *plusieurs* personnages, et Dominique d'*un seul*. Où mène la manière de Dominique?" 'The main difference between [Henry] Fielding and Dominique is that Fielding describes the feelings and actions of *several* characters *simultaneously*, while Dominique only treats *one*. Where does Dominique's approach lead?' (*Journal* [1981] 2: 215). The distinction is not one of moral judgment either, since Beyle unflinchingly credits "Dominique" with directing his techniques of plagiarism: "Peut-être le style naturel de Dom[ini]que est-il comme la note ou l'art de filouter" 'Perhaps Dom[ini]que's natural style is like the note or art of cagey pilfering' (*Journal* [1981] 1:

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081204X21298 Published online by Cambridge University Press

924). To summarize, we can say that Dominique writes all Stendhal's books. In the following example, the first project mentioned is a work in progress while the second is a published volume: "Ne pas faire de plan *for Dom*[*inique*]*'s tragedy as for the admirable tale of the life of Ghita in S*[*tendh*]*al*" 'Don't do an outline for Dom[inique]'s tragedy as you did for the admirable tale of Ghita's life in S[tendh]al' (a reference to an episode recounted in *Rome, Naples et Florence en 1817* [*Journal* (1981) 2: 53, 53n1]).

Beyle has established a division of labor in which Stendhal is like a photographic negative of Dominique. While Dominique and Mocenigo are tied to ego ideals, the mercenary pseudonyms appear as almost clownlike figures intended to distract the public. The first names Louis-Alexandre-César play on pompousness (allusions to King Louis, Alexander the Great, and Julius Caesar), and Bombet and Baron de Cotonnet self-deprecatingly recall Beyle's perceived pudginess (*bombé* 'rotund'; *cotonné* 'stuffed with cotton'). M. de Léry, the pseudonym that preceded Stendhal, is doubtless a loose anagram of the name of Count d'Éril, one of the figures ridiculed by Lechi. The names associated with the publications thus show a peculiar ambivalence characterized by, on the one hand, Beyle's provocation of his rivals and, on the other, his tendency to play the buffoon. They manifest Beylist defensive tactics, as paraphrased by Léon Blum: "Let us hide our originality and our difference from society; yield to it the concessions it demands; then, our peace once assured by this dissimulation, let us live secretly, according to our own inclinations and our own law" (104). Stendhal is the social mask worn by the writer, Dominique. Becoming an author (a published and thus public figure) and becoming a writer (an accomplished artist with something to say) are, in Beyle's handling, separate exercises requiring separate strategies and identities.

This demonstration reminds us that Stendhal is one pseudonym among hundreds, and the more one delves into its role in Beyle's writings, the more one is puzzled by the twentieth century's predilection for it. Beyle's famous contemporaries—Goethe, Turgenev, Lamartine, Delacroix, Berlioz—all knew this writer as Henri Beyle. Balzac's remarks are typical: "[Beyle] porte, dans la conversation . . . cette bizarrerie qui le pousse à ne jamais signer *ce nom déjà illustre de Beyle*, à s'appeler un jour Cotonnet, un autre, Frédéric [de Stendhal]" 'In conversation, [Beyle] draws on . . . his bizarre habit of never signing a work with *this already illustrious name of Beyle* and of calling himself Cotonnet one day, Frédéric [de Stendhal] the next' (qtd. in Jourda 125–26; emphasis added). George Sand's autobiography even suggests that the name Stendhal was being forgotten: in 1833 "je rencontrai un des écrivains les plus remarquables de ce temps-ci, Beyle, dont le pseudonyme était Stendhal" 'I met one of the most remarkable writers of the time, Beyle, whose pseudonym was Stendhal' (2: 204). In fact, Beyle may well have had another authorial name in mind as the definitive proprietor of his corpus. Daniel Desormeaux has noted an unusual autobiographical notice written by Beyle in 1831 and bearing the title "M. Darlincourt" (134). Though the life story invented for Darlincourt bears little resemblance to Beyle's own, the piece lists all Beyle's volumes published to date, from the first edition of the musical biographies in 1815 to *Le rouge et le noir* in 1830 (*Journal* [1981] 2: 971–72). It is one of the few occasions on which all Beyle's works are brought together under a single name, implying that he had not necessarily cast his posthumous lot with Stendhal.

The contrast between the exclusive use of Stendhal today and its relatively insignificant role in Beyle's lifetime stems perhaps as much from the substantial evolution of his corpus as it does from that of our critical practices. The posthumous publication of his private journals, correspondence, and autobiography focused attention on Beyle and Beylism from the 1880s up through World War II. This led to landmark works in Beylist scholarship by Blum and others

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081204X21298 Published online by Cambridge University Press

but also to an excessive interest in the author's life. To correct this bias, postwar studies shifted away from the biographical person of Beyle and toward the texts. *Le rouge et le noir* and *La Chartreuse de Parme* now occupied undisputed places in the highest echelons of the French literary canon, while the nonfiction works (*Histoire de la peinture en Italie*, etc.) had largely faded from memory. As a result, the object of study for important critics as diverse as Erich Auerbach, Georges Blin, Gérard Genette, and Starobinski was «Stendhal» (to borrow Genette's quotation marks), the "paper author," rather than Beyle, the biographical person. Stendhalism had replaced Beylism (Corredor 155–56).

At the risk of passing for Beylist myself, I have highlighted Beyle's organization of his pseudonymous personae because it reveals the unique manner in which he retooled old techniques on the way to creating a modern sensibility. Auerbach is certainly correct in his appraisal of Beyle's debts to eighteenth-century thinkers (408–12), but the complex patterns and writing practices I have identified here show Beyle's remarkable prescience with respect to our contemporary vision of the paper author.

In this respect, it is worth remembering that Beyle's literary apprenticeship occurs during a time not only of great sociopolitical transformations but of major aesthetic and intellectual shifts as well (the emergence of Romanticism and the ensuing development of first-person forms like autobiography, prose lyricism, and journals; the transition from Enlightenment science and philosophy toward the positivism of the industrial age; etc.). These changes have repercussions on specific institutional features of the literary world like pseudonymous authorship. As Maurice Laugaa demonstrates, Beyle's generation falls on the cusp of two definitions of the pseudonym: a prior description that characterizes the device negatively as a lie, a falsification of identity, and its modern legal definition, which posits it as a name freely chosen for professional activity and producing a new identity (36–38). Beyle draws on both traditions in his peculiar strategic division between dissimulation and self-invention. Situating these techniques in their general historical context will clarify the significance of this two-pronged approach.

We can deal briefly with the first. Beyle's antagonistic tactics mark a break with eighteenth-century authorial practices. Pseudonyms were frowned on by the ancien régime and thus tended to be mostly the recourse of authors fearing even greater trouble with the authorities. François Arouet, for instance, eager to avoid a return to the Bastille, not only reinvents himself under the name Voltaire but coins some 175 additional pseudonyms along the way. However, when he signs a text "Papa Nicolas Charisteski de l'église de Sainte Toleranski" 'Papa Nicolas Charisteski from the Church of Saint Toleranski,' "Père Mauduit qui prie qu'on ne le nomme pas" 'Father Mauduit Who Begs of You Not to Reveal His Name,' or "Dr. Ralph," the name is not mistaken for a personal identity. Mocking as they mask, the pamphleteer's pseudonyms draw attention to their own artifice. They are primarily a byproduct of semiclandestine publication and do not participate significantly in the creative process.[13] Moreover, Voltaire never uses this multiplicity of straw stand-ins to act out or instigate a philosophical critique of identity. On the contrary, as Gérard Leclerc remarks, European readers of the day were invited to try to detect whether the single, unifying persona of Voltaire lurked behind particular polemical masks (242). Voltaire's use of polemical pseudonyms bears witness to a crisis of authorship, where the writer's author-ity is in constant conflict with institutional authority.

In Beyle's case, as Leclerc notes (244), the issue is much more one of subjective identity, for the threat of official censorship had abated after the French Revolution and even under Napoléon. In addition to the establishment of freedom of the press, concrete expressions of a change in attitudes included the gradual liberalization of the legal status of pseudonyms as professional devices.[14] At the same time, however, these devel-

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081204X21298 Published online by Cambridge University Press

opments entailed clarifying juridical questions related to authorship. The revolutionary decrees of January 1791 and July 1793 concerning *droits d'auteur* created new legal grounding for notions of proprietorship and originality ("works of invention"), thereby strengthening the tie binding an author's name to the work (Faultrier-Travers 11). Henceforth, as Charles Nodier argues, what was common practice among the ancients was now a violation of ethics and law (3–4).[15] Consequently, the disapprobation weighing on plagiarists grew during this period.

Beyle's crime is double, for he borrows text and name from his sources. Even though the pseudonyms Lani, Barett, and (more indirectly) Stendhal were based on practices dating back dozens of centuries—the nineteenth-century bibliographer Jean-Marie Quérard links borrowing all or part of an established figure's name to the ancient tradition of apocryphal authors (6)—this strategy was strongly censured in his day. It was considered especially grave if the victim was a contemporary author (as Carpani was). The only attenuating factor in Beyle's favor, one he himself cites (*Correspondance* 1: 818), is that the world of letters granted greater leeway to "superior" authors, for it was widely thought that they inevitably improved their source even as they exploited it (Nodier 5–9). As Beyle's correspondence demonstrates, he was well aware of these developments. Anticipating legal difficulties before the publication of *Histoire de la peinture en Italie* (because of its plagiarism and because "M.B.A.A." arguably did not conform to the legal standard of a required authorial signature), Beyle discusses his options with his publisher, Pierre Didot: "S'il le faut absolument, je déclare que je suis responsable, devant la Loi, . . . d'*Histoire de la peinture en Italie*. . . . Je vous prie de faire votre possible pour que la présente déclaration n'ait qu'un effet juridique" 'If it is absolutely necessary, I will declare, before the law, that I am responsible . . . for *The History of Italian Painting*. . . . I ask that you do your best to see to it that the present declaration has only juridical consequences' ("To Pierre Didot," 10 Jan. 1817 [*Correspondance* 1: 851]). Two months later, he pursues the same questions with Didot: "D'après la lecture des lois existantes, j'espère . . . que par les renseignements précédents [son nom d'état-civil et adresse] vous êtes parfaitement à couvert. Vous pouvez faire connaître l'auteur du livre imprimé par vous, cet auteur est propriétaire" 'According to my reading of the existing laws, I hope . . . that you are entirely protected by the preceding information [his given name and address]. You may reveal the author of the book you have published; it belongs to him' ("To Pierre Didot," 5 Mar. 1817 [*Correspondance* 1: 858]). The threat of the monarch's dungeons has yielded its place to the scales of justice. The author's status thus institutionalized, pseudonymous publication is transformed in the eyes of the law from negative act to positive.

In the instance of pseudonyms like Mocenigo and Dominique, the issue is more complex and the stakes more significant. Here too the historical moment is important. At the outset of the nineteenth century, the diary is still a new genre, not yet set in its habits and forms. Soon thereafter, with the arrival of Romanticism in France, first-person genres in general undergo rapid evolutions (Pachet 12–13). This flexibility in form no doubt facilitates Beyle's proliferation of quirky experiments. After all, the initial aim of the journals was traditional enough: "*Nosce te ipsum*. . . . Mon moyen, c'est ce journal" '*Know thyself*. . . . This journal is my means' (*Journal* [1981] 1: 710). But Beyle's attempt to examine a self external and prior to his attempt to write counters his other impulse, that of fabricating a productive image of himself as a writer. Moreover, since the privacy of his journals enables the repertory of pseudonymous alter egos to develop unfettered, the conflicting projects of self-knowledge and self-transformation can play themselves out through curious formulations such as this: "Règle de style générale et sans exception: *être soi-même*. Dans le style de De Brosses, profondeur et naïveté; cela convient au

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081204X21298 Published online by Cambridge University Press

caractère de Dominique" 'General rule of style [to be followed] without exception: *be oneself*. With depth and naiveté, in de Brosses's style; this suits Dominique's character' (*Journal* [1981] 1: 905n). The paradoxes of being oneself under another name (Dominique) and while imitating someone (Charles de Brosses, whose published correspondence was put to use in *Histoire de la peinture en Italie*) points to the seemingly compromised nature of Beyle's enterprise. In fact, it quickly is a question no longer of the discovery of a Rousseauesque inner "nature"—even if Beyle uses this vocabulary at times—but of the invention, assimilation, and rewriting of different authorial models. Writing, pseudonymous writing in particular, is a means to (re)invent himself, a form of artistic and social rebirth. The pseudonymous alter egos are not masks donned by an overarching self-image; they are the assembled pieces of a temporary and partial image of himself as a writer and an author.

During this complex mapping of self, Beyle produces several unusual forms of text. In addition to keeping idiosyncratic daily journals, he fills the margins of works he reads with what Genette terms "private graffiti" (157). These notations often have more to do with personal mnemonics than critical readings. This habit also creeps into novel manuscripts, where Beyle incorporates cryptic footnotes and authorial intrusions whose meanings are known only to him. More unusual still, he then requests personal copies of his published novels with blank pages interspersed among the printed ones, ostensibly to abet rewriting with a view toward eventual definitive editions of the works.[16] But here too he inevitably digresses into extraneous remarks on his life and writing.

Arguably, the extension of his private writing to this diverse ensemble of textual forms complements his quasi-modernist apprehension of self. Whereas a single notebook provides a material support tending artificially to push toward the representation of a unified self, the dispersal of his writing venues facilitates a diversification of self-figuration and of role-playing. Furthermore, the escape from the spatial confines of a single calendar-like journal is doubled by the temporal interplay created between different selves when Beyle returns to add new remarks (meticulously dated) to old texts. In this respect, the journals reveal a remarkable exploration and organization of constellations of fluid identity, in contrast with the centered notion of Beylism promoted persuasively by Blum and his successors. One of the most striking features of Beyle's various notations is the apparent naturalness of his movement between the self-nominations. He shows no compulsion to call attention to this diversity, no need to justify or reduce it. The coherence and formative role of this private repertory cast a different light on the creation we know as Stendhal, suggesting a fractured, an undetermined, and a continually evolving authorial self. Beyle's literary ego remains unnameable; or, better, it escapes any single name. As Michel Crouzet comments, "Aucun nom, aucun langage ne peut l'exprimer. . . . Par contre il peut exprimer un *nom*, développer ce qu'il implique, devenir son nom" 'No name, no terms can express him. . . . On the other hand, he can express a *name*, develop what it implies, become his name' (*Stendhal et le langage* 235). This is particularly striking in a work like *De l'amour*, where the use of additional pseudonyms in the text and author's notes disrupts any attempt to construct a figure external to it.[17] Instead of stemming from (or leading to) the affirmation of a distinct and realized self, the literary process brings Beyle to an endless multiplication of selves, one that reveals the absence of any preexisting self to be discovered or defined. Even "Mr. Myself," which serves initially as a reminder of the distance between the literary personae and the ontological self, becomes embroiled in this flight of nomination. Capitalized as a proper name, objectified as a reflexive, and rendered foreign by its anglicization, the first-person "Myself" is converted into a "pseudo nym," a fake name for oneself. Thus, even personal pronouns fail to es-

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081204X21298 Published online by Cambridge University Press

tablish a clear hierarchy of identity. In a sense, Beyle's journals display a self receding ever further through pronouns and nomination even as the writer struggles to make it present or form it in words.[18] The movement is distinct, from the notes of 1812 ("the life of Mys[elf]" [*Journal* (1981) 1: 821n]) to the third-person fragments preparing the book of "*his* life" (*Journal* [1981] 2: 155; emphasis added).

Most readings of Beyle's pseudonyms miss the importance of these innovations because critics assume that the pseudonyms are devised for the public reception of Beyle's texts, to the exclusion of any role in the texts' elaboration. Yet the names play a significant role in his development as a writer. The writer's invention of the author accompanies—guides, even—the creation of the work. In his journals and publications, Beyle repeatedly demonstrates the modernist notion, best rendered in French, that *l'auteur est l'œuvre de ses œuvres* 'the author is the product of her or his production.' The pseudonym exacerbates this rupture between the writer and the author, thus highlighting the artificiality of the textually produced figure. In addition, this self-transformation contains the seeds of a principal feature of literary modernism, in which the figure of the author is increasingly foregrounded. One manifestation of this process in the nineteenth century consists of disguised or overt authorial intrusions that mark the origins of the twentieth-century predilection for autofiction. In Beyle's novels, such gestures are largely confined to the margins of the text (footnotes and prefaces), but later in the century the pseudonymous authors Gérard de Nerval and Lautréamont will place them at the heart of the fiction. Because Nerval and Lautréamont tend to draw attention to the author's self-invention (and therefore fictionality), they hollow out the text and undermine the stability of the authorial signature.[19] Ultimately, however, what Beyle has devised is closer in spirit to the heteronyms that Fernando Pessoa would make famous a century later as leader of the Portuguese modernist movement. Pessoa distinguishes pseudonymous authorship (writing as oneself but under a different name) from heteronymous writing, which he describes as writing outside oneself, through another identity. In texts like "Les privilèges" or *Souvenirs d'égotisme*, Beyle fantasizes about a magic ring that he could wear to change shapes or identities, become another person or an animal for a limited time, speak any language he desired, or acquire exceptional talents: "Je changerais de nom avec délices. . . . Souvent je pense à l'anneau d'Angélique; mon souverain plaisir serait de me changer en un long Allemand blond et de me promener ainsi dans Paris" 'I would love to change my name. . . . I often think of Angélique's magic ring [in Ariosto's *Orlando furioso*]; my ultimate pleasure would be to be transformed into a tall, blond German and walk thus through Paris' (*Souvenirs* 453). Through his innovative pseudonymous techniques, Beyle succeeded in developing his craft as the witty and philosophical Italian Mocenigo, writing as the plump stylist Dominique, and publishing as the blond aristocrat Stendhal.

Notes

I wish to thank the great "Beyle-lettriste" Victor Del Litto. He kindly shared his erudition with me in Grenoble in 1992 and was the first to encourage me to write these pages. I also wish to express my gratitude to Josué V. Harari, Ora Avni, Luis Cortest, and Alain Viala for their comments on drafts of this project.

[1] Unattributed translations are mine.

[2] While traveling back and forth between Italy and Switzerland in the winter of 1820, Beyle entreats his friend Adolphe de Mareste to write him regularly. Beyle concocts complex pseudonymous arrangements for these exchanges, instructing Mareste to contact one "M. Robert" of Milan, in care of a Swiss businessman, "Antonio Augustoni," or, elsewhere, to reach him through "Domenico V[ismara]" or "M. Agostoni." Other letters to Mareste are signed "Aubry," "Tessier," and "Smith and Co." There is even a letter addressed to "Mon cher père" 'My dear father' in which Beyle pretends to be Mareste's son. Throughout it all, he urges Mareste (in English) never to mention his real name and refers to himself only in the third person under the

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081204X21298 Published online by Cambridge University Press

names "Dominique," "S" (Stendhal), and "B" (Beyle [*Correspondance* 1: 1040–55]). These elaborate games were more likely to attract attention than to escape it.

[3] For an elegant overview of their dizzying mixture of languages (generally French, English, and Italian), code names, and pictograms, see Pachet 73–89; for a recent and compelling interpretation of Beyle's approach to his journals and manuscripts, see Desormeaux.

[4] Is it appropriate to insist on distinct roles for Beyle's correspondence and journals? Vincent Kaufmann argues in *Post Scripts: The Writer's Workshop* that for writers like Baudelaire, Flaubert, and Mallarmé, letters become a private space much like journals where the work of authorial self-definition can take place. The writer, "untiringly calling on others only to dismiss them again," profits from the interlocutor's absence to pursue objectives independent of the correspondent (8). But Beyle's use of epistolary pseudonyms unique to an interpersonal relationship actively implicates the addressee. One can hardly speak here of an erasure of the reader. Moreover, in Beyle's case, the correspondence need not play the role described by Kaufmann, because the diaries exist as just such a personal workshop.

[5] Another noted pseudonymous author, Romain Gary, who sought unsuccessfully to publish his first novel as Lucien Brûlard (from *Lucien* Leuwen and Henry *Brulard*), parodies this element of Beyle's writing in *La promesse de l'aube* (Schoolcraft 53–57).

[6] Count Giacomo Lechi, modern-day descendant of Beyle's fellow passenger, has confirmed that Mocenigo was in charge of a blasphemy council investigating the elder Lechi (272–73).

[7] I break with the standard interpretation of "Mocenigo," which argues that Beyle admired Mocenigo as a result of Lechi's stories. This seems incompatible with the mockery in these passages (compare Del Litto's notes in *Journal* [1981] 1: 1422n4 and 728). Moreover, Mocenigo was a bitter enemy of the Lechi family, opposed to them in style and in ideology (Lechi 269–71).

[8] Subsequently (in the 1840s), Søren Kierkegaard publishes a number of works bearing the names of pseudonymous authors and editors. The Danish thinker's pseudonyms are reminiscent of Beyle's innovation insofar as they are intended to embody specific philosophical attitudes. One finds "Johannes de Silentio" (marked by resignation), the drinker and aesthete "Constantin Constantius," the lover of logic "Johannes Climacus," the ethical voice of "Judge William," and so on (see Crites). The case of the Portuguese modernist Fernando Pessoa is discussed below.

[9] This pattern also holds true for Beyle's correspondence. After two early appearances as a signature, Dominique never again "signs" a letter despite the name's mention in the text of at least seventy others. Mocenigo obeys the same rule. Though intimately associated with the development of a literary method, it is never assigned authorship of a text either.

[10] In a will drawn up in 1835, Beyle states that he chose Stendhal "par prudence: j'habitais Milan et voulais y retourner jusqu'en 1825" 'to be prudent: I was living in Milan and planned to return there up until 1825' ("Codicille," *Journal* [1981] 2: 1002).

[11] Francis Claudon argues for an intellectual compatibility between the two, but Claudon's erudition far exceeds Beyle's own articulation of the debates. Del Litto is probably closer to the mark in pointing out that Beyle elaborated many of Beylism's principles during the aforementioned stay in Brunswick (*Vie* 331–32).

[12] Beyle pushes this provocation to perverse lengths, for some of the writers whom he plagiarized are transformed into fictional characters in his novel *La Chartreuse de Parme* (1839). Giuseppe Bossi, author of a book on Leonardo da Vinci, is transparent under the name Joseph Bossi (227–44), while Giorgio Vasari, whose famous works on Italian art were pillaged for *Histoire de la peinture en Italie*, is altered slightly to become "Vasi, marchand de baromètres" 'Vasi the barometer salesman' (78; an idea in turn lifted from a work by Silvio Pellico that Beyle reviewed for an English journal [Beyle, *Chroniques* 102]). Ironically, Bossi and Vasi are in fact false identities taken on by Fabrice del Dongo. In other words, Beyle extends the pattern: instead of veiling his own identity in order to borrow from these authors, he turns them into fictional characters as disguises for his protagonist.

[13] Purely a creature of the title page, the pseudonym in this instance tends to function like pen names used in popular genres, such as detective fiction and romance novels, where the author's name is often formed according to the conventions of the genre.

[14] The decree of *24 Brumaire an II* (14 Nov. 1793) established the right to change one's name, but the Convention rescinded it with the law of *6 Fructidor an II* (23 Aug. 1794), declaring the immutability of patronyms. The Consulat found middle ground by enumerating limited instances in which individuals might legally change their patronyms (*11 Germinal an XI* [1 Apr. 1803]). Artistic pseudonyms were clearly identified as one of the chief categories among these (Faultrier-Travers 89).

[15] Nodier's analysis is useful because it establishes a hierarchy among forms of literary borrowing. This scale of degrees of indebtedness moves from acceptable practices (citation and allusion) and through a gray area (imitation and similarity) before arriving at criminal acts such as plagiarism and what Nodier describes as a sort of aggravated plagiarism, "vol littéraire" 'literary theft' (1–51). In *Histoire de la peinture en Italie* and the composers' biographies, Beyle is guilty of the latter.

[16] The three versions of *La Chartreuse de Parme* are the most important examples (Desormeaux 135–36).

[17] The reader has little chance of distinguishing between actual and invented sources. The preface is listed as an excerpt from Louis Simond's *Voyage en Suisse*, while the

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081204X21298 Published online by Cambridge University Press

body of the book is identified in a footnote as the posthumous publication of an essay by an Italian noble, Lisio Visconti (7n). Both figures existed, but only the passages attributed to Simond faithfully reproduce a preexisting work. The real Visconti had no role in writing any part of *De l'amour*, and the name must be taken here as a pseudonym. Beyle follows the same procedure in including the names of the Illinois explorer "[Morris] Birkbeck" and "[Viscount Charles-Victor] d'Arlincourt" (278n667, 148n358). A number of other passages are attributed to fictional substitutes, such as citations from the journal of "Capitaine Salviati" (88n201). To further complicate matters, the work ends with a contribution from a friend of Beyle's, Victor Jacquemont, veiled by the latter's own pseudonym, "Goncelin" (385n790). Finally, *De l'amour* scrambles Beyle's prior published pseudonyms, since its first edition is signed only "De l'auteur de l'*Histoire de la peinture en Italie* et *Vies de Haydn, de Mozart et de Métastase*" 'By the author of *The History of Italian Painting* and *The Lives of Haydn, Mozart, and Metastasio*.' Since these works were attributed to different authors, the two prior signatures are annulled, and no stable one replaces them.

[18] In this respect, it is not an undue exaggeration to consider Beyle's experiments precursors to Samuel Beckett's postmodern novelistic trilogy, *Molloy*, *Malone Dies*, and *The Unnameable*, in which Molloy's attempt to put his life story to paper begins a sort of infinite regress leading to the primordial and unnameable "Worm."

[19] Gérard Labrunie (*dit* Nerval) presents "Angélique" as a bibliomane's account of his obsession with a lost volume, but the narrator's quest leads to the location, unbeknownst to the reader, of the Clos de Nerval, the family domain and source of the author's pseudonym. We realize at that juncture that we are seeing a rescripting of Labrunie's family novel. Isidore Ducasse's *Les chants de Maldoror* is another rich example, in which the author reinvents himself under the pseudonym Lautréamont as the phantasmatic substance of his work.

Works Cited

Andrieu, René. *Stendhal ou le bal masqué*. Paris: Lattès, 1983.

Arbelet, Paul. "L'abbé Lanzi et Stendhal." «*L'Histoire de la peinture en Italie*» *et les plagiats de Stendhal*. Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1914.

Auerbach, Erich. "In the Hôtel de la Mole." *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*. Trans. Willard R. Trask. Garden City: Anchor-Doubleday, 1957. 400–13.

Beckett, Samuel. *Three Novels:* Molly, Malone Dies, The Unnameable. New York: Grove, 1958.

Beyle, Henri. *Armance*. *Romans et nouvelles de Stendhal*. Bibliothèque de la Pléiade. Vol. 1. Paris: Gallimard, 1952. 9–189.

———. *La Chartreuse de Parme*. *Romans et nouvelles de Stendhal*. Bibliothèque de la Pléiade. Vol. 2. Paris: Gallimard, 1952. 9–493.

———. *Chroniques de l'Angleterre*. Ed. K. G. McWatters. Trans. Renée Dénier. Vol. 1. Grenoble: U des Langues et Lettres de Grenoble, 1980. 5 vols.

———. *Correspondance*. 2 vols. Bibliothèque de la Pléiade. Paris: Gallimard, 1962.

———. *De l'amour*. Paris: Garnier, 1965.

———. *Journal*. Vols. 1–2 of Beyle, *Œuvres intimes*.

———. *Journal littéraire*. Ed. Victor Del Litto and Ernest Abravanel. 3 vols. *Œuvres complètes*. Vols. 33–35. Geneva: Édito-Service, 1970.

———. *Œuvres intimes*. Ed. Victor Del Litto. Bibliothèque de la Pléiade. 2 vols. Paris: Gallimard, 1981.

———. "Les privilèges." Beyle, *Œuvres intimes* 2: 982–88.

———. *Souvenirs d'égotisme*. Beyle, *Œuvres intimes* 2: 425–521.

———. *Vie de Henry Brulard*. Beyle, *Œuvres intimes* 2: 523–963.

———. *Voyages en Italie*. Ed. Victor Del Litto. Bibliothèque de la Pléiade. Paris: Gallimard, 1972.

Blum, Léon. "A Theoretical Outline of Beylism." *Stendhal*. Ed. Victor Brombert. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice, 1962. 101–13.

Chaudenay, Roland de. *Dictionnaire des plagiaires*. Paris: Perrin, 1990.

Claudon, Francis. "Stendhal et Winckelmann." *Stendhal Club* 98 (1983): 300–03.

Corredor, Marie Rose Guinard. "Du «Beylisme» au «Stendhalisme»: Réflexions sur un parcours idéologique." *Le Temps du Stendhal-Club (1880–1920)*. Ed. Philippe Berthier and Gérald Rannaud. Toulouse: PU du Mirail, 1994. 149–58.

Crites, Stephen. "Pseudonymous Authorship as Art and Act." *Kierkegaard: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. Josiah Thompson. Garden City: Anchor, 1972. 183–229.

Crouzet, Michel. *Stendhal et le langage*. Paris: Gallimard, 1981.

———. *Stendhal ou Monsieur Moi-même*. Paris: Flammarion, 1990.

Del Litto, Victor. "Notice." Beyle, *Voyages* 1295–320.

———. *La vie intellectuelle de Stendhal: Genèse et évolution de ses idées (1802–1821)*. Paris: PUF, 1959.

Desormeaux, Daniel. "Tombeau de bibliomane: Les livres secrets de Stendhal." *La figure du bibliomane. Histoire du livre et stratégie littéraire au XIX^e siècle*. Saint-Genouph: Nizet, 2001. 127–50.

Diefenbach, Dieter. "Stendhal: Un pseudonyme et ses variantes." *Stendhal Club* 113 (1986): 43–48.

"Faits divers." *Le national* 25 Mar. 1842. *Stendhal Club* 134 (1992): 125.

Faultrier-Travers, Sandra de. *Le droit d'auteur dans l'édition*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale Éditions, 1993.

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081204X21298 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Gary, Romain. *La promesse de l'aube*. Paris: Gallimard, 1960.

Genette, Gérard. "'Stendhal.'" *Figures of Literary Discourse*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Columbia UP, 1982. 147–82. Trans. of "«Stendhal»." *Figures II*. Paris: Seuil, 1969. 155–93.

Jourda, Pierre, ed. *Stendhal raconté par ceux qui l'ont vu: Souvenirs, lettres, documents*. Paris: Stock, 1931.

Kaufmann, Vincent. *Post Scripts: The Writer's Workshop*. Trans. Deborah Triesman. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1994. Trans. of *L'équivoque épistolaire*. Paris: Minuit, 1990.

Laugaa, Maurice. *La pensée du pseudonyme*. Paris: PUF, 1986.

Lautréamont. *Les chants de Maldoror*. *Œuvres complètes*. Paris: Gallimard, 1973. 17–266.

Lechi, Giacomo. "Stendhal à Brescia. Mocenigo, le «socinien», les Borroni." *Stendhal Club* 39 (1968): 265–76.

Leclerc, Gérard. *Le sceau de l'œuvre*. Paris: Seuil, 1998.

Martineau, Henri. "Le «Mocenigo» de Stendhal." *Le divan* 250 (1944): 271–74.

Michel, François. "Les alibis de Stendhal." *Le divan* 246–47 (1943): 67–77, 123–36.

Nerval, Gérard de. "Angélique." *Œuvres*. Paris: France Loisirs, 1987. 440–516.

Nodier, Charles. *Questions de littérature légale: Du plagiat, de la supposition d'auteurs, des supercheries qui ont rapport aux livres*. Ed. Jean-François Jeandillou. Geneva: Droz, 2003.

Pachet, Pierre. *Les baromètres de l'âme: Naissance du journal intime*. Paris: Hatier, 1990.

Pessoa, Fernando. "Apresentação dos Heterônimos." *Alguma prosa*. Ed. Cleonice Berardinelli. Rio de Janeiro: Nova Fronteira, 1990. 41–44.

Quérard, Jean-Marie. *Les supercheries littéraires dévoilées*. Vol. 1. Paris: n.p., 1847.

Rand, Nicholas. "*The Red and the Black*, Author of Stendhal: Pseudonyms and Cryptonyms of Beyle." *Romanic Review* 80 (1989): 391–403.

Rannaud, Gérald. "La marge et la pensée. Notes sur la «marginale» chez Stendhal." *Recherches et travaux* 53 (1997): 113–25.

Sand, George. *Histoire de ma vie*. Vols. 1–2 of *Œuvres autobiographiques*. Bibliothèque de la Pléiade. Paris: Gallimard, 1971.

Schneider, Michel. *Les voleurs de mots. Essai sur le plagiat, la psychanalyse et la pensée*. Paris: Gallimard, 1985.

Schoolcraft, Ralph. *Romain Gary: The Man Who Sold His Shadow*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2002.

Starobinski, Jean. "Stendhal pseudonyme." *L'œil vivant*. Paris: Gallimard, 1961. 193–244.

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081204X21298 Published online by Cambridge University Press