criticism in translation

Bakhtin on Shakespeare: Excerpt from "Additions and Changes to *Rabelais*"

M. M. BAKHTIN

TRANSLATION AND INTRODUCTION BY SERGEIY SANDLER

Introduction

The text translated below is an excerpt from notes the Russian thinker Mikhail Mikhailovich Bakhtin wrote in the mid 1940s as he prepared to revise the manuscript of his now famous book on François Rabelais.[1] The notes were first published, posthumously, in 1992. A corrected edition with commentary, used for this translation, followed in 1996 (Собрание сочинений 5: 80–129). The part where Bakhtin focuses primarily on Shakespeare's tragedies is presented here (80–99). The omitted sections contain summaries of materials Bakhtin was reading (on Dante, Galileo and his contemporaries, Heine, and especially Gogol and Ukrainian folk culture), brief comments on various themes (the name and the nickname, Dostoevsky, Cinderella, riddles), and stand-alone philosophical remarks.

Most of Bakhtin's posthumously published works consist of working notes. Since at least the 1930s, Bakhtin regularly recorded his thoughts in the form of notes, handwritten on loose sheets of paper or in notebooks. The unfinalized nature of his notes is evident in their fragmentary composition and in such stylistic features as the use of questions and noun phrases to mark topics he planned to expand on later.

The fact that Bakhtin never prepared this text for publication is evident also in its content. Because he was working from memory, having only some of the texts he referred to available for his review, the notes contain factual inaccuracies (marked in the translator's notes). On top of that, in analyzing Shakespeare's plays, Bakhtin relied on a Russian translation in verse, which sometimes led him astray. Another obvious consequence of the text's consisting of unedited notes is the need for commentary to supply the necessary context and references omitted by Bakhtin.

Written in the mid 1940s, "Additions and Changes to *Rabelais*" belongs to a little-known period in Bakhtin's work,[2] in which he takes stock of his works on the novel and on carnival from the previous decade and seeks to reconnect them with the main ideas of his earlier philosophical studies. The themes of carnival and laughter, central to Bakhtin's works of the late 1930s and early 1940s, are combined with renewed attention to Dostoevsky's novels and with such central ideas of Bakhtin's early philosophical works as one's inability to form a coherent image of oneself. In addition, Bakhtin

SERGEIY SANDLER is a scholar and translator of Mikhail Bakhtin's works who has published an annotated translation of a collection of late essays and notes by Bakhtin into Hebrew. He is also the author of articles on Bakhtin's philosophy and theory of language.

© 2014 SERGEIY SANDLER
PMLA 129.3 (2014), published by the Modern Language Association of America

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2014.129.3.522 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of the early and mid 1940s opens up new topics, which he goes on to explore later, such as Menippean satire and the philosophical status of the human sciences. This period also shows subjects in his thought not found elsewhere, such as seriousness and tragedy, that put his more familiar, brighter themes in a new perspective. Finally, he writes in this period about authors he rarely discussed elsewhere—Flaubert, Mayakovsky, and Shakespeare.

This is the only extant text in which Bakhtin devotes such close attention to Shakespeare and to the tragedy genre. Moreover, his reading of Shakespeare cannot be easily extrapolated from his other writings. To the contrary, Bakhtin's other, better-known work is revealed in a new light by his reading of Shakespeare, at the center of which we find the "suprajuridical crime of any self-asserting life (implicitly containing, as its constitutive moment, the murder of one's father and the murder of one's son)." At first glance, such a remark may appear a variant of Freudian literary analysis, but Bakhtin is quick to distance himself from that implication: "if one may speak of psychology here, it is only the deep psychology of life itself, the psychology of individuality as such."

This "deep psychology" manifests itself in what Bakhtin terms the "topographic gesture." Topographic gestures locate the speaker in the cosmos, which is not the universe studied by modern science but the concretely experienced, tangible space-time of human deeds and of the human body, complete with heaven above and hell below, both tangibly present as levels on the medieval and Renaissance theater stage.[3] The topographic gesture thus binds together into one focal point Bakhtin's work on carnival (*Rabelais and His World*) and on the chronotope ("Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel"), while retaining his early philosophical commitment to concrete human experience and action (*Toward a Philosophy of the Act*). Moreover, the discussion of Shakespeare's tragedies leads directly to remarks on Dostoevsky. The notes below thus connect together almost all the major themes in Bakhtin's work.

Notes

I would like to thank Caryl Emerson for her detailed and valuable comments on this introduction and on the text of the translation. I would also like to thank Sergey Georgievich Bocharov, Bakhtin's literary executor, for his kind permission to publish this work.

1. The first manuscript of the book (entitled "François Rabelais in the History of Realism") was completed in 1940. Bakhtin was trying to get it published, and he made progress in negotiations with the Moscow-based publishing house Goslitizdat in 1944. This prospect fell through, but it most likely instigated the writing of the present notes as part of preparing the manuscript for publication. However, later revisions of the manuscript and the eventually published version (*Rabelais and His World*) make little use of these notes (Popova 5: 474–78).

2. Texts from this period are published in Russian in Собрание сочинений (4, pt. 1: 733–49 and 5: 7–158).

3. This notion of the cosmic reflects Bakhtin's reading of Ernst Cassirer (Собрание сочинений 4, pt. 1: 785–828), some of whose ideas Bakhtin borrowed in his book on Rabelais (Poole).

Works Cited

Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovich. "Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel: Notes toward a Historical Poetics." 1937–38. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. By Bakhtin. Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Holquist. Austin: U of Texas P, 1981. 84–258. Print.

———. *Rabelais and His World*. Trans. Hélène Iswolsky. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1984. Print.

———. Собрание сочинений [Collected Writings]. 6 vols. Moscow: Russkie slovari, 1996–2012. Print.

———. *Toward a Philosophy of the Act*. Ed. Michael Holquist and Vadim Liapunov. Trans. Liapunov. Austin: U of Texas P, 1993. Print.

Poole, Brian. "Bakhtin and Cassirer: The Philosophical Origins of Bakhtin's Carnival Messianism." *South Atlantic Quarterly* 97.3–4 (1998): 537–78. Print.

Popova, Irina. Commentary. Bakhtin, Собрание сочинений 5: 473–82.

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2014.129.3.522 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Additions and Changes to *Rabelais*

18 Jun. 1944[1]

To the history of laughter (ch. 2).[2] Laughter and the zone of contact with the incomplete[3] present. Laughter first discovers the present time as an object of representation. The familiarization of the world and the premise of fearlessness set the stage for a researcher's stance toward the world and for free experience. The past (in distant view[4]) cannot be the object of laughter. Laughter and the future. The discovery of that which is personal, which belongs to everyday life, and to memoirs.

Excursuses: 1. Rabelais and Gogol; 2. The significance of Menippean satire in the history of the novel.[5]

The present time ("my time") is the object of invective par excellence. The present time, our age, is always derided; this has become a commonplace cliché. It is enough to familiarize oneself with comments by the contemporaries of the greatest ages (left in journals, memoirs, diaries) to reach the conclusion that back then the present time was only derided (in Pushkin's time, his contemporaries complained that there was no literature). The official character of pure praise.

The single-toned and single-styled character of all things official. "Merry fearlessness" is to some extent a tautology, for total fearlessness cannot be anything but merry (fear is a constitutive moment of seriousness), while true merriment is incompatible with fear. The fearless image = the merry (laughing) image. The stock of these fearlessly merry images—folk-festive merriment, familiar speech, the stock of gestures (this is where this stock of fearlessly merry images is to be sought rather than in the officialized system of somber myth; tragedy plus the satyr play restore the ambivalence and wholeness of the folk image).

The real physical contagion by (partaking in) the ancestral human and folk-national ("our people") fearlessness in the carnival crowd.

Merry fearlessness as the premise of cognition (the new concept[6] hatches out of the Socratic dialogue).

"Pentheus ragout"[7] and the comic Dionysus (Friar John[8]).

Two lines in the development of Menippean satire; one of them, the single-toned oxymoronic one, culminates in Dostoevsky.

The officialization of the image and its related single-tonedness. From the ambivalent sphere, the image is transferred onto the purely serious plane, becomes unambiguous—the black and the white, the positive and the negative, are set apart and contrasted. This is the process in which new boundaries between the meanings, phenomena, and things of the world solidify, in which an element of stability enters the world (the stabilization of a new hierarchy), the process of perpetuation (canonization); this is the process of *seriousening* the world (its images, thoughts about it, valuations of it), of inserting into it elements of threat, of intimidation, of fear. But this process, in which the images of the world solidify and are made serious, only takes place in the official spheres; however, this officialized culture is but an islet, surrounded by the ocean of the unofficial.

Physical contact, the contact of bodies, as one of the necessary elements of familiarity. Entering the zone of physical contact, the zone mastered by my body, where one can touch with one's hands and lips, can take, hit, embrace, tear apart, eat, annex to one's body, or be touched, embraced, torn apart, eaten, devoured by another body. All the facets of an object (both front and rear[9]) are revealed in this zone, not only its exterior but also its entrails, its depth. This is a spatiotemporal zone.

Apart from official seriousness, the seriousness of power,[10] intimidating and frightening seriousness, there is also the unofficial

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2014.129.3.522 Published online by Cambridge University Press

seriousness of suffering, fear, of being frightened, of weakness, the seriousness of a slave and the seriousness of the sacrificial lamb (separated from the sacrificing priest). The special, deepest (and, to a certain extent, free) variety of this unofficial seriousness. The unofficial seriousness of Dostoevsky. This is the protest of individuality (bodily and spiritual) longing to be perpetuated against replacement and absolute renewal, taken to the limit, the protest of a part against its dissolution in the whole. These are the greatest and best-grounded claims to eternity, to the indestructibility of everything that once was (rejection of becoming). The eternity of the moment. The pure curse, to be replaced in the finale with pure praise (with hosanna).[11]

The wisdom of the depersonalizing whole in Tolstoy (Eroshka, Platon Karataev,[12] and others). The single-tonedness of ambivalence in Goethe (he thought that only poems can express contradictory ambivalence[13] because he had not mastered *alogical* laughing prose).

Not hosanna but the Homeric "eternal (inextinguishable) laughter"[14] of the gods.

The Faust of the folk novel and Goethe's Faust. The image of Faust in the folk novel was born (like the devilkin Pantagruel[15]) from the unofficial, familiar, swearing, all-profaning (ambivalently blasphemous) element of the medieval student bohemia. This is a profligate student true to form, from head to toe, a foulmouthed roisterer (something like Friar John), an extrahierarchical personality of familiar interaction, for which nothing is sacred and cherished, the product of carnival and Shrovetide jokes and mystifications, and he is cosmic in the carnival and Shrovetide sense. The image and plot are based on a realized profanity—"the devil take him!" (a Christianized single-toned form of a blessing curse, a wish of renewing death). Realized invective also lies at the basis of Rabelais's novel and of descents into the underworld. This is Menippean satire transferred into a single-toned register. The laughter of Mephistopheles. A residue of the paired (bicorporal) nature of the image. The peculiar use of pairedness in the rendezvous scene—Faust—Gretchen, Mephistopheles—Martha[16] (the front appears and alternates with the rear, turning cartwheels[17]). Menippean satire turns out here as well to be leading toward the archetypal phenomenon[18] of the novel. The term *Menippean satire* is as conventional and as accidental, bearing as accidental a trace of one of the secondary moments of its history, as the term *novel* for the novel.

All such world images as Faust (and all the plots and the types of constructing the whole literary work—i.e., genre variety—organically linked with them) should be reconsidered in the light of the folk-festive, carnivalesque underlying ground of world literature. Analyzing them will turn out to be incomparably more complex, their meaning incomparably deeper and, so to speak, *more liminal*, in the light of their genuine tradition and its complex history. Here is where the struggle takes place between ambivalent praising-invective images, seized with the process of officialization, transferred into the single-toned (and unequivocal[19]) register, characteristic of recent centuries in European culture.

["May your ashes rest in eternal peace." The conception of peace, eternity, nonexistence, and annihilation. The contingence, insignificance, of annihilation and death; nothing can be said; death is something transient that essentially says nothing, there are no grounds for viewing it as absolute; viewing it as absolute, we turn nonbeing into dull being, absence into dull presence; death is in time and is temporal,[20] for we know its effect only on the tiniest segment of time and space (the death[21] of flesh—the thieving box[22]).][23]

The drive, characteristic of Menippean satire (and all its offspring), toward liminality, toward the cosmic, toward the ultimate whole, its topographic nature, its enmity toward the average, the averagely typical, the naturally realistic (the ordinary and average,

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2014.129.3.522 Published online by Cambridge University Press

that which is not extraordinary, has no right to appear behind the footlights).

To make an image serious means to remove its ambivalence and ambiguousness, its unresolvedness, its readiness to change its meaning, to turn itself inside out, its mystifying carnival essence—it means to stop the turning of cartwheels, its tumbling, to separate front from rear (to stop it at a moment in which the face is up front), to separate praise from invective, to chop away all the shoots and branches protruding from it.

The idea of the unatonable and irreparable in Dostoevsky and its artistic importance.

The separation of death from life, praise from invective, which has to do with seriousening; to declare something stable and unchangeable. The merger of front and rear in fast spinning and of top and bottom[24] (heaven and underworld) in fast rocking. To stop the spinning and the rises and falls, to place upright, facing the audience. The festivity of the image, its being removed from the linearity and practical seriousness of life and from the norms and prohibitions dictated by this seriousness.

One has to find a new worldview approach to praise and invective as two exceptionally important categories of worldview, culture, and art. Their role in creating the image of a human being. The history of the praising (glorifying) word and the history of invective (the shaming[25] word). The folklore roots of both. The praising-invective nickname.

The self-glorification of oriental despots and gods in the history of praise. The apology of posthumous prayers. Forms of crowning (of heroes, emperors).[26]

Forms of monumentalism and heroization. The feeling of might and force (of power) as a constitutive moment of them. Relation to enemies. The philosophy of praise (and glorification). The element of perpetuation and of immutability, identity (hostile toward being replaced); the role of memory. The relation of glorification to the past (fathers) (patricide—a motif of invective); epic glorification. The relation between praise and death. Praise (glorification, crowning) and idealization, sublimation. The topographic aspect of praise (height, top, distance, face, front). Relation to size (big, enlargement, as opposed to reducing abuse). Hyperbole and its double signification. The role and significance of the superlative, its types and varieties. It is precisely here, in the realm of pure praise, where the forms of complete and opaque individuality were being created, where bicorporality was being overcome.

The craving for fame and for having one's *name* (rather than nickname) perpetuated in the memory of future generations, in people's mouths; caring about one's memorial monument.[27] Speaking stones.

Why are we attributing such significance to the categories of praise and invective? They make up the most ancient and undying substrate of the main human stock of lingual images (serious and laughing myths), the stock of intonations and gestures (the overtones of individualized and expressive intonation and gesticulation)—they determined the main means of representation and expression (starting from the material). They determine the topography of the world and the topographic accentuation, permeating this stock of images and gestures through and through (i.e., the fundamental architectural forms, and not the surface ornament on them)—top, bottom, rear, front, face, underside, entrails, exterior, etc. The overtonal character of all that appears neutral to praise and invective, that determines the changing trends and styles (classicism, Romanticism, etc.), which only superficially covers and veils, like an ornament in architecture, the fundamental movement of the major (bearing) architectural forms (after all, the ornament does not take part in their movement—it bears no loads, does not endure resistance).

Victories, titles, awards—everything that defined and defines a life, that builds the (hierarchical) image of a human being.

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2014.129.3.522 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The myth of *judgment* after death and its immense form-generating role in the history of the creation of the image of a human being. Intimidation as a necessary aspect of the monumental style. An emphasis on the hierarchical abyss between one human being and another (ruler and trembling slaves). Self-assertion is inseparable from the annihilation of enemies—exaltation is inseparable from diminishing all other people.

The problem of praise-glorification in Shakespeare: crushing and annihilating self-assertion in *King Lear*, *Richard III*, and *Macbeth*. The prolongation of life (beyond the limit set for it) and its perpetuation are possible only at the cost of murder (taken to the limit—the murder of one's son, the murder of children, the motif of slaying infants[28]); an ambivalent supplement to patricide. The problem of crowning-decrowning in Shakespeare (the problem of the crown in general).

Cruelty and bloodshed as a constitutive moment of force and of life. The single-toned (noncarnivalesque) tearing to pieces, not the ritual (or the semiritual, without rebirth and renewal) sacrifice.

What strike and captivate us are precisely Shakespeare's basic tones, but so far we have acknowledged, made sense of, and discussed merely the overtones. (Macbeth at the level of present-day criminology, Lear and feudalist conceptions of the divisibility of a state's territory.) Macbeth is no criminal: the logic of all his deeds is the necessary iron logic of self-crowning (and, more broadly, the logic of any crowning, of any crown or power, and, more broadly still, the logic of any self-asserting life, which is therefore hostile to replacement and renewal). Macbeth begins with the murder of his father (Duncan stands for a father: he is a relative, he is gray-headed, etc.)—here he is the heir, here he accepts replacement; he ends up slaying babes (standing for his sons)—here he is a father, rejecting replacement and renewal (decrowning). This is the suprajuridical crime of any self-asserting life (implicitly containing, as its constitutive moment, the murder of one's father and the murder of one's son), the suprajuridical crime of a link in the chain of generations, hostilely separating itself, tearing itself apart from what precedes and what follows, trampling like a petulant boy on the past (the father, old age) and putting it to death and, like an old man, hostile to the future (to the son, to youth). This is the deep tragedy of *individual* life itself, condemned to be born and to die, born out of another's death and by its own death fecundating another's life (if one may speak of psychology here, it is only the deep psychology of life itself, the psychology of individuality as such, the psychology of the struggle of soma and plasma[29] in a person's soul). But this tragedy (and crime) of individual life itself is inserted into the potentiating form of the tragedy of crown and power (the ruler, the king, the one crowned is the limit and triumph of individuality, its crown, which realizes all its possibilities); here too all Macbeth's deeds are determined by the iron logic of any crowning and any power (hostile to replacement). Its constitutive moment is violence, oppression, lie, trembling, and fear of the underling and the obverse, the reciprocal fear of the ruler before the underling. This is the suprajuridical crime of all power. This is the first deep level of the images (their core), but the tragedy of individuality and of power, which potentiates it, is inserted into the tragedy of the usurper, i.e., of the criminal ruler (this is already a juridical crime); here we already have the iron logic of crime (a crime that is *not contingent*) and the psychology (in the ordinary sense) of a criminal. The juridical crime (before people and the social order) is necessary to reveal (explicate), actualize (recall from the depth of the unconscious), and make concrete the deep crime (potential criminality) of any self-asserting individuality, any born and dying life (another life, eternal life, we know not; we merely postulate it and must postulate it). A person tamed by law, i.e., one who is not a criminal, willy-nilly

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2014.129.3.522 Published online by Cambridge University Press

accepts replacement, is resigned to the law of replacement, his deeds are determined by fear, his thought and words are subject to the censorship of consciousness; he patiently waits for the death of his father, is sincerely afraid of it and mourns it, sincerely loves his son and heir (and successor) and sincerely lives for his son; such a man is not fit to be the hero of a tragedy, he does not actualize the depths hidden behind the normal (i.e., bridled and tamed) course of life, he cannot reveal the subatomic contradictions of life. The significant form-generating role of crime in literature (most clearly visible in Dostoevsky). Thus, the tragedy (and crime) of all power (that is, even the most legitimate power) is revealed in the image of the usurper (the criminal ruler). This is the second level of Shakespeare's images. Then follows the third level, on which the images are made concrete and actualized already on the plane of his historical time (this level is full of hints and allusions); this level directly merges with and fades into the ornament (all sorts of false, painted, and embossed columns, bearing no load, false windows, the false movement of ornamental lines that does not match the movement of architectural masses, etc.), which softens and veils the correlation of forces and the movement of main architectural forms. [In the new drama, such as Ibsen's plays, the whole matter is in the ornament (which, in addition, deals almost with current affairs), glued to the carcass of a prop made of cardboard, devoid of any architectural complexity.] Shakespeare is a playwright of the first (but not the fore-most) deep level. This is why he could take any plot, from any time and people, could remake any kind of literary work, if only it was at least faintly connected to the main topographic stock of folk images; he actualized that stock; Shakespeare is cosmic, liminal, and topographic; that is why his images—topographic by their nature—can develop such extraordinary force and lifelikeness in the topographic and thoroughly accentuated space of the stage. [Our stage is but an empty crate without topography and accents, a neutral crate; only images of the second and third level can live in it, and they live a petty, diluted life, remote from any kind of limits; on this stage one may only bustle about, but not make essential movements; forward, backward, up, and down—these are given a merely practical meaning by things that have been arranged thus and not otherwise. Its emptiness and lack of accents then has to be cluttered with naturalistic decorations, props, and accessories.]

All that is essential in Shakespeare can only be made fully meaningful on the first (topographic) level. Here the fact that Macbeth has neither a father nor children (moving from the second level to the first), that he is sufficient unto himself, becomes meaningful; also made meaningful here is the motif of being "of no woman born" (of the *Caesarean* section) and other such motifs.

Other aspects of the same problem in *King Lear*. The plot itself is remarkable: the transfer of inheritance while alive, to die before death, to peep in on one's own posthumous destiny, an arbitrary (rather than a voluntary) premature replacement (a suicide of sorts), the naive refusal to believe that children and heirs are by their nature father murderers (which is why we have *daughters* here, complemented by sons in the parallel story of Gloucester), the attempt to verify this; putting their "virtue" to the test (naively believing in the verity of the superficial, censorship-bound logic of feeling, thoughts, words, in censorship-bound—even if sincere—love and respect, in children's devotion to their father, in the censorship-bound loyalty and devotion of his subjects), he himself puts the murder weapon in their hands. Blinded by the power of a king and a father, he takes seriously the censorship-bound lies of children and subjects, created by his very own power; he tests the firmness of the superficial (external) censorship-bound hierarchy, tests the official lie of the world (children and subjects

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2014.129.3.522 Published online by Cambridge University Press

love and respect their king and father, the beneficiary is grateful to the benefactor, and other such official truths); he is crushed, the world turns inside out, for the first time he has touched the genuine reality of the world, of life, and of the human being. The problem of the crown and the ruler is revealed here in a deeper, wiser, and more complex fashion, it is less single-toned here than in *Macbeth*, here everything is penetrated with the ambivalent folk wisdom of the saturnalia and the carnival. The theme of madness.[30]

Other aspects of the same problem in *Julius Caesar* and in the histories. But the exceptional complexity of the way in which it is posed in *Hamlet*. Here the false play of forces in the ornament has deeply veiled the actual movement of the main architectural masses. This is a dislocated, shifted *Oedipus Rex*: Creon (had he been a brother to Laius) killed Oedipus's father and married his mother; what should Oedipus, who knows that the potential genuine murderer by nature is he, do; another has murdered instead of him; the avenger here turns out to be a rival murderer (comparison with Dostoevsky: who among the brothers really wanted to murder, and who really murdered). The revenge for his father would in fact have turned out to be a simple removal of a rival: it's not you but I who should have murdered and inherited. The mother's betrayal. Ophelia turns out to be a potential stand-in for the mother in the incestuous bed (mother and lover are fused in the image of the woman—the same womb both is fecundated and gives birth in the coitus). Hamlet does not accept the patricidal role of the heir. Having killed Claudius (who, after all, also plays a loving father), Hamlet should die himself too, as a (potential) comurderer. Crime lies in the very essence of self-asserting life, and, having lived, one cannot but get entangled in it. Like Lear, Hamlet touched the genuine reality of the world, of life, and of the human being; the whole system of official good, truth, devotion, love, friendship, etc., has collapsed. It is deeply naive to reduce all this to the psychology of a man who is indecisive, eaten by reflection, or overly scrupulous. Top and bottom, front and rear, outside and inside have shifted and blended, but this is revealed on the single-toned tragic plane. Such is life. It is criminal by its very nature; if one is to affirm it, if one is to persist in it, if one is to put its bloody task to action and insist on one's rights, one should have committed suicide, but death too is dubious. But here too, once in a while, the liberating tones of the saturnalia and the carnival are heard. [Characteristic of an ideologue of the last four centuries of European culture is a mixture of childlike naïveté with sly charlatanry, to which is sometimes added a peculiar kind of spiritual possessedness. To love and to pity the lonely and forsaken, naively pitiful being and with merciless and fearless sobriety to peer into the cold emptiness surrounding it.]

The influence of folk praise and folk public-square advertisement on the genre of "on one's own works" (advertising products) and on the forms of official single-toned praise in general.

The main peripeties, in *Oedipus Rex* as well as in *Hamlet*, are determined by answering the question of who is the murderer; the murderer must be found to save Denmark from disaster (plague); the father's ghost corresponds to the oracle.

On *Macbeth*[31]

"***fair is foul and foul is fair.***"[32] (act 1, scene 1, concluding couplet—its first line belongs to the witches).

Bodenstedt[33] notes that the word ***bloody*** appears on almost every page of *Macbeth*.

Scene 3 (dialogue of the witches): *1st Witch:* Where hast thou been, sister? *2nd Witch:* Killing swine. *3rd Witch:* Sister, where thou? *1st Witch:* A sailor's wife had chestnuts in her lap, and mounch'd, and mounch'd, and mounch'd: "Give me," quoth I:—"Aroynt thee, witch!" the *rump-fed ronyon* cries. Her husband's to Aleppo gone, master o'th' Tiger:

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2014.129.3.522 Published online by Cambridge University Press

but in a sieve I'll thither sail, and like a rat without a tail I'll do, I'll do, and I'll do . . . I'll drain him dry as hay: sleep shall neither night nor day hang upon his penthouse lid; he shall live a man forbid. Weary sev'n-nights nine times nine, shall he dwindle, peak, and pine . . . Look what I have . . . a pilot's thumb, wrack'd as homeward he did come. *All three:* The Weïrd Sisters, hand in hand, posters of the sea and land, *thus do go about, about*: thrice to thine, and thrice to mine, and thrice again, to make up nine . . .[34]

Macbeth, entering, says (the same 3rd scene), "***So foul and fair a day I have not seen***."

Scene 4: The Thane of Cawdor, according to Malcolm, died peacefully, "**as one that has[35] been studied in his death**." Study annihilates fear.

Scene 4: Duncan's words: "I have begun to plant thee, and will labour to make thee full of growing" (addressing Macbeth).

Banquo's words in response to Duncan's embrace: "There (i.e., on Duncan's chest) if I grow, the harvest is your own."

Duncan's words: "My plenteous joys, wanton in fulness, seek to hide themselves in drops of sorrow" (ambivalence).

Also his words, about Macbeth: "in his commendations I am fed; it is a banquet to me."

The obscene jokes of the porter (fool) in the 1st scene[36] of act 2 immediately follow the tragic scene of Duncan's murder; these are graveside jokes. In *Romeo and Juliet*, after Juliet's *fake* death, musicians appear in her room and start joking in the presence of the body of the deceased.[37]

To *lie*—to tell lies, and to *lie*—to lie down; Shakespeare often uses these two homonyms in wordplay.[38]

Act 3, scene 4: Macbeth's words addressed to Banquo's ghost: to avoid the rise of the dead from their graves, he wishes them to be pecked by vultures and eagles, which, consuming their bodies, would, as it were, become their grave monuments.[39]

Act 4, scene 3: *Malcolm:* "**I should pour the sweet milk of concord into hell**."

Ibid., Macduff on the piety of Malcolm's mother: "**She[40] died every day she lived**."

Macbeth occupies the place of the Thane of Cawdor, who (as he thinks) is still alive. "The Thane of Cawdor lives: why do you dress me in borrow'd robes?"[41]

He would have wanted the crown to become his without involving his (inevitably criminal) activity. About putting Malcolm (as the legal heir) out of the way, he says:

> The eye wink at the hand; yet let that be,
> Which the eye fears, when it is done, to see.[42]
> (Ivan Karamazov)

The ghost of Banquo takes Macbeth's place at the banquet. Running through the whole tragedy is the struggle between the living and the dead, whose place in life the living one occupies.

In Shakespeare's images (similes, metaphors, etc.) both poles are always given—hell and heaven, angels and demons, earth and sky, life and death, top and bottom (they are ambivalent thematically but not in their tone); they are topographic; they are cosmic; all the elements of the world, the entire universe, are implicated in their play. Shakespeare's image always feels hell under its feet and heaven above its head (i.e., it feels the actual topography of the stage); it is deeply topographic and liminal. His similes either materialize and embody (bodily topography) or cosmicize (world topography) the phenomenon, spread it to the limits of the world, from pole to pole, reduce their play to the play of the elements (as in Aeschylus)—all things small they spread to make them large, to bring them to the limit (as opposed to similes in which both members are of the same size). Examples:

> *Macduff:* [A]wake!
> Shake off this downy sleep, *death's counterfeit*,
> And look on death itself!—up, up, and see
> The *great doom*'s image!—Malcolm! Banquo!
> *As from your graves* rise up, and walk *like sprites*
> To countenance this horror! (*Mac.* 2.1)[43]

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2014.129.3.522 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Macbeth: Had I but *died* an hour before this chance,
I had liv'd a blessed time; for, from this instant,
There's *nothing serious in mortality*;
All is but toys: renown, and grace, is dead;
The wine of life is drawn, and the mere lees
Is left *this vault* to brag of. (ibid.)[44]

Lady Macbeth: Come, thick night,
And pall thee in the dunnest *smoke of hell*,
That my keen knife see not the wound it makes,
Nor *Heaven* peep through the blanket of the dark,
To cry, "Hold, hold!" (1.5)

Macbeth: [H]is virtues
Will plead like *angels*, trumpet-tongu'd, against
The deep damnation of his taking-off;
And pity, like a naked new-born babe,
Striding the blast, or heaven's *Cherubins*, hors'd
Upon the sightless couriers of the air,
Shall blow the horrid deed *in every eye*,
That *tears shall drown the wind*. (1.7)[45]

Macbeth: Now *o'er the one half-world*
Nature seems *dead*, and wicked dreams abuse
The curtain'd sleep. . . .
. . . . . .
Thou sure and firm-set *earth*,
Hear not my steps, which way they walk, for fear
Thy very *stones* prate of my where-about. . . .
. . . . . .
Hear it not, Duncan; for it is a knell
That summons thee to *Heaven*, or to *Hell*. (2.1)

Lady Macbeth says that she would have killed Duncan herself had he, in his sleep, not resembled her *father* so much.[46]

There are times when children oppress and murder their fathers (the Renaissance, our own time), and times when it goes the other way: fathers oppress and put to death their children (all authoritarian times).

Also going through the entire tragedy is the play of: life—*sleep*—death.

Macbeth, in act 5, scene 3, proposes that the doctor cure the state and shove his nose into the urine of the state.

Macbeth: She should have died hereafter:
There would have been a time for such a word.—
To-morrow, and to-morrow, and to-morrow,
Creeps in this petty pace from day to day,
To the last syllable of recorded time;
And all our yesterdays have lighted fools
The way to dusty death. Out, out, brief candle!
Life's but a walking shadow; a poor player,
That struts and frets his hour upon the stage,
And then is heard no more: it is a tale
Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury,
Signifying nothing.[47]

These and similar generalizations concern not only the life of the criminal but any human life.

To a certain extent, *Macbeth* may also be called a tragedy of fear (the fear inherent in everything that lives). There is no assuredness in life, nothing is tranquilly (and eternally) possessed. Any activity is criminal (taken to its limit, it is always murder). The ideal is the prenatal state.

On *Othello*

Hell and night
Must bring this monstrous *birth* (of Iago's plan) *to the world's light*. (1.3)

In Desdemona's conversation with Iago about women, Iago presents an image of woman in the spirit of Gothic realism[48] (but without the positive pole). Lowering similes in Iago's speech. "Yet again your fingers to your lips?" "Would they (Cassio's fingers when meeting Desdemona, suspecting a kiss—lips and hands) were clyster-pipes for your sake!" (2.1).

Othello: It gives me wonder great as my content
To see you here before me! O my soul's joy,

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2014.129.3.522 Published online by Cambridge University Press

If after every tempest come such calms
May the *winds* blow till they have waken'd
death,
And let the labouring bark climb *hills of seas*[49]
Olympus-high, and duck again as *low*
As *hell*'s from *heaven*. If it were now to *die*,
'*Twere now to be most happy*, for I fear
My soul hath her content so absolute
That not another comfort like to this
Succeeds in unknown fate.[50]

Iago speaks about Englishmen being able to outdrink anyone else (ambivalent praise) (2.3).

The lowering jokes of the musicians at the beginning of act 3: wind instruments belong under the tail.

In the speeches of tragic (high) heroes (such as Othello), the prevailing images are those of cosmic topography (the earth, the sky, hell, paradise, life, death, angel, demon, the elements), while in the speeches of fools (the porter in *Macbeth*) and such heroes as Iago, the prevailing images are those of bodily topography (face-rear, copulation, a beast with two backs, food, drink, bed, excrement, etc.), i.e., lowering images.

The problem of *gesture* in the Shakespearean theater. On a stage, the topographic nature of which is felt, the gesture inevitably retains some degree of topographicity (symbolicity): it points, as it were, to top and bottom, to sky and earth (as in taking oaths and in ritual gestures in general); the expressive (in our sense) psychological gesture is fitted into the frame of the topographic gesture (after all, words too clothe the hero's experiences in topographic images, not in explanatory similes in the spirit of recent times). After all, the room (palace, street, etc.) in which the hero acts and gesticulates is not the room (palace, street) of ordinary life either, for it is fitted into the frame of the topographic stage, it is on earth, hell is underneath it and heaven above it, the action and the gesture taking place in the room are at the same time taking place in a topographically understood universe, the hero keeps moving all the time between heaven and hell, between life and death, next to the grave. Realistic ordinary-life stage scenery erases all traces of topographicity; in the conditions it creates, the Shakespearean gesture degenerates and topographic verbal images begin to sound almost comical. The topographic gesture is particularly clear in comic (laughing) theater and is still alive in puppet shows and in the circus arena (on a different plane—in church); the descent of comic heroes into the underworld.

In Shakespeare's topographic similes and images we can feel the logic of oaths, curses, profanities, incantations, blessings.

Othello: If thou dost slander her and torture me
Never pray more, abandon all remorse;
On horror's head horrors accumulate,
Do deeds to make *heaven* weep, all *earth*
amazed,[51]
For nothing canst thou to damnation add
Greater than that! (3.3)

Othello: O that the slave had forty
thousand lives!
One is too poor, too weak for my revenge.
Now do I see 'tis true. *Look here, Iago,*
All my fond love thus do I blow to heaven:
(Adjuring gesture)
'Tis gone!
Arise, black vengeance, from the *hollow*
hell,[52]
Yield up, O love, thy *crown* and hearted
throne
To tyrannous hate! *Swell*,[53] *bosom*, with
thy fraught,
For 'tis of aspics' tongues! (ibid.)

Emilia: 'Tis not a year or two shows us a man.
They are all but stomachs, and we all but food:
To eat us hungerly, and when they are full
They belch us. (3.4)

Othello: O devil, devil!
If that the *earth* could *teem* with woman's tears
Each drop she falls would prove a crocodile.
(4.1)

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2014.129.3.522 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Othello: What committed!
Heaven stops the nose[54] at it, and the moon
winks. (4.2)

Othello: You! mistress!
That have the office opposite to *Saint Peter*
And keep the *gate of hell*! (to Emilia[55]). (ibid.)

Othello: O insupportable, O heavy hour!
Methinks it should be now a huge eclipse
Of *sun* and *moon*, and that th'affrighted *globe*
Should *yawn* at alteration. (5.2)

Othello: Whip me, ye *devils*,
From the possession of this *heavenly* sight!
Blow me about in winds, roast me in *sulphur*,
Wash me in steep-down *gulfs of liquid fire*!
O Desdemon! dead, Desdemon. Dead! O, O!
(5.2)

The tragedy of the lack of assuredness, of doubt, fear of possibility (the possibility that poisons reality; trust-distrust in human nature).

The birth and formation of our expressive, psychological, individual gesture. It developed as the topographic coordinates of action and gesture became blurred and effaced, as verbal topographic images turned into conventional clichés (with the corresponding process of their moderation, softening). Once it becomes a cliché, the topographic verbal image loses any connection to the concrete topographic gesture and even to the very notion of such a gesture; the ambivalence of the image and the gesture is lost even earlier (clichés belonging to topographic heights live in the official and higher strata of speech, while the related expressions of the topographic nethers are preserved only in the familiar strata). For example, "*Heaven turns away* its *face* from it"[56]—this is a double topographic image (which is quite ordinary): *heaven*—cosmic heights and the *face*—bodily topographic heights; "to turn away one's face," "to turn away from a person," is one of the most enduring topographic gestures (still alive today); a corresponding gesture is showing one's butt (or offering one's butt for kissing) or the softened gesture of turning one's back. The bodily nether gesture is still alive today in familiar social interaction, especially in the form of giving the finger (i.e., the phallus, the bodily nether); on the other hand, in formal usage only the requirements of "politeness" remained—not to seat oneself with one's back turned to another person (i.e., not to turn away one's face from him, not to show him one's rear side); but in the upper official spheres of speech, the cliché "to turn away one's face," "to turn away from someone," still remains, divorced from the gesture (and even from any notion of the gesture). It should be noted more generally that in the lowest strata of familiar social interaction, the topographic gestures that belong to the nether regions of the body are still alive and clear, and for this reason these strata are of great scholarly interest. Their high ambivalent complements, however, remain only in the impoverished and reduced form of clichés in formal speech. The verbal topographic images and gestures in Shakespeare are distributed among the heroes and characters of the high and low (clownish) planes and sometimes among different conditions in which the same hero appears, moving from one plane to the other. Thus, the topography of the cosmic (and in part the bodily) heights is dominant in the words and gestures of Othello, Desdemona, Cassio, while the topography of the bodily nether regions is dominant in Iago, Emilia, and, of course, the clowns. But when Othello is seized by the "madness" of jealousy (the traditional passing of the sun-hero through the eclipse phase, the phase of temporary death-madness), when the image of Desdemona in his imagination moves from the high cosmic plane of *heavenly* purity, *paradise*, and angel to the plane of the bodily nether regions, of the *whore* ("lying" and "lying"[57]), his speech (and his gestures) is flooded with images of the bodily nether regions and at times approximates Iago's speech. We also observe this in the case of Lear in his "madness" stage, where he makes his transition to the role of the fool-king. This is especially interesting to follow in

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2014.129.3.522 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the case of Hamlet: in the state of fictive madness, the world is revealed to him in the aspect of the bodily nether regions, the images of which are combined in his lines with the retained images of high topography (restoring ambivalence).

The topographic coordinates of action, word, and gesture have faded and rubbed off, they wound up on the dense (impenetrable) ordinary-life and abstractly historical plane that the limits and poles of the world could no longer glow through. The remaining topographic elements (the nethers and heights, fronts and rears) become a relative and conventional unfelt form. Action, word, and gesture acquire a practical and ordinary, pragmatic and story-line-related meaning, one that is abstractly historical (rationalistic), but the main and decisive meaning becomes the expressive one: they become the expression of the *individual* soul, its inner depths. If earlier the gesture was perceived, "read," *extensively*, in relation to the concrete (and visible) topographic limits and poles of the world, between which it *extended*, stretched (it pointed to the heavens or to the earth, or beneath the earth—to the underworld—showed the front or the rear, blessed or annihilated, made its object partake in life or in death; see Goethe's characterization of the plot of *Faust*[58]), if, when reading it, our eye had to move from pole to pole, from limit to limit, drawing, delineating, a topographic line, the axial coordinates of the gesture and of the human being, localizing the one acting and gesturing *with his soul* in the *whole* of the world, now the gesture is read intensively, i.e., only in relation to one point—the speaker himself, as a more or less deep expression of his individual soul; but this point itself—the soul speaking by means of the gesture—cannot be localized in the *whole* of the world for there are no (axial) coordinates to localize it. The only direction of the gesture is to the speaker himself, but the place of the speaker himself in the *ultimate* whole of the world is not *immediately*, *visibly* determined by the gesture (its line leads inward, to the innermost depth of his *individual* soul). If this ultimate whole is assumed at all, it is *mediated* through a complex process of *thought*: it cannot be shown with one's hand (which is exactly what the topographic gesture used to do). The gesture and the position, the place, of a human being are immediately and visibly localized and made sense of only in the proximate whole—the whole of one's family and everyday life, the whole of life's story line, a historical whole; in most cases the gesture is distant from the poles of life and death (removed from them by the ordinary, comfortable, and safe course of life of the civil 19th-century bourgeois). The typicality of the expressive chamber-scale gesture, something like the quivering of the hand opening a cigarette box and taking a cigarette out: what is typical is precisely the combination of practical ordinary-life meaningfulness with the individual, inner expressiveness of the gesture, and the latter, like any subjectivity, is revealed precisely in the violations, the deviations of the gesture from the normal (practically efficient, practical, technical) path, in its retardations and errors.

This inner intensiveness of the individual soul seeks new, equally intensive coordinates in this new, infinitely complex, temporally and spatially relative world. The utmost depth of the inner internum *aeternum* of the human being, to use Augustine's words,[59] reappears on the topographic mystery-play stage in Dostoevsky (a peculiar phase of this development in Gogol). Behind the rooms, streets, public squares, despite their thickened realistic typicality, the poles, limits, coordinates of the world again become visible (shine through). Each act, word, gesture is filled with intense *ultimateness*. When analyzing topographic images—mythical and folk-festive—one should always take into account ancestral fear and laughter overcoming it.

The nasal sound of the instruments from *Naples* in *Othello* (3.1)—the clown's allusion to *syphilis*.

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2014.129.3.522 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Wretch—"slut"—a pejorative reference to a woman—the word is simultaneously used in a diminutively affectionate sense.[60]

"**Have you scored me**"[61]—literally—"so you calculated me"—which means—done me in, buried me.

Raskolnikov's room, that typical Petersburg room in such a typical Petersburg house—it is a grave, in which Raskolnikov goes through the phase of death so as to be resurrected and renewed. Sennaya Square,[62] the streets—all these are the arena on which God and the devil struggle in a person's soul; every word, every thought, is correlated with the limits, with hell and paradise, with life and death. But it is typical that life and death are given here exclusively on the inner plane, having to do only with the soul; nobody (among the main heroes) faces the threat of physical death; the struggle between life and death on the earthly plane is here altogether absent—the heroes live in a rather safe world. But how problematic these poles and coordinates are: defining the human being, they themselves need definition; they themselves are drawn into the struggle (there is a need for some kind of coordinates for the coordinates).

Translator's Notes

1. This is most likely the date when Bakhtin started writing the notes. The end date is uncertain (Popova 473).

2. Titled "Rabelais in the History of Laughter" (Собрание сочинений 4, pt. 1: 51–127), ch. 2 of the 1940 manuscript of Bakhtin's book on Rabelais corresponds to ch. 1 of the published book, *Rabelais and His World* (59–144).

3. незавершенный. In other Bakhtin translations this central term and its opposite are rendered as "finalized"/"unfinalized" and "consummated"/"unconsummated." "Complete"/"incomplete" is a more straightforward rendition of the Russian words.

4. далевой образ. In notes from the 1930s Bakhtin identifies these words as the Russian rendition of the term *Fernbild*, coined by Adolf von Hildebrand (Собрание сочинений 3: 245). A distant view of an object presents the whole object to the eye in one coherent image (Bočarov and Liapunov 781–83).

5. An excursus on Rabelais and Gogol occupies the last several pages of the 1940 manuscript (Собрание сочинений 4, pt. 1: 501–05). It was removed from the published book at the publisher's insistence (Popova 483n3) and expanded by Bakhtin into a stand-alone article in 1970 ("Rabelais and Gogol"). An excursus on Menippean satire was never added to the book on Rabelais, but it eventually became the kernel of the ch. 4 that was added to the second edition (1963) of Bakhtin's book on Dostoevsky (*Problems* 101–80).

6. The wording is ambiguous, but Bakhtin almost certainly speaks not about some new concept but about the notion of concept as such, as a recent historical phenomenon.

7. Pentheus, protagonist of Euripides's *The Bacchae*, was a mythical king of Thebes whose body was torn apart by the Bacchantes. Bakhtin notes that the expression *Pentheus ragout* was current in sixteenth-century French literature (*Rabelais* 267).

8. Friar John is a character in Rabelais's novel.

9. лицо и зад. These words mean both "front and rear" and "face and buttocks."

10. I use "power" exclusively to render the Russian власть—i.e., political power, rule.

11. On "hosanna" see Dostoevsky 861–69; bk. 11, ch. 9.

12. Characters in Tolstoy's *The Cossacks* and *War and Peace*, respectively.

13. See Goethe's letter to Riemer from 28 Oct. 1821 (Goethe, *Propyläen Ausgabe* 488–89). See also Popova 472n11.

14. "ἄσβεστος . . . γέλως" (*Il.* 1.599; *Od.* 8.327). Cf. Bakhtin, *Rabelais* 70 (Popova 484n6).

15. On the devilkin Pantagruel, a character in late medieval mystery plays, see Bakhtin, *Rabelais* 325.

16. *Faust*, pt. 1, sc. 12.

17. Bakhtin mentions the cartwheel or somersault as a symbol of carnival imagery in *Rabelais* 396–97 but gives it more attention in the 1940 manuscript (Собрание сочинений 4, pt. 1: 356, 380–81, 433) and in notes from the early 1940s titled "On Questions of the Theory of the Novel" (Собрание сочинений 3: 566).

18. первофеномен. A Russian rendition of the German term *Urphänomen*, usually translated to English as "archetypal phenomenon," which originates in Goethe's scientific works (Pratt and Brook). An archetypal phenomenon is a principle of development, expressed in different ways and to different degrees in members of a given category of phenomena.

19. односмысленный. Lit., "of single meaning."

20. The word can also be read as "temporary."

21. The editors of the Russian text indicate that the reading of the manuscript here is uncertain.

22. "[T]hieving box" refers to a coffin.

23. All square brackets in the text (except when enclosing a single capital letter) are Bakthin's.

24. верх и низ. These words are translated as "top and bottom" or "heights and nethers." Низ is a central term in *Rabelais*, where it is rendered as "lower stratum."

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2014.129.3.522 Published online by Cambridge University Press

25. посрамляющий. The word is derived from срам ("phallus").

26. A reference to themes discussed by Georg Misch in *A History of Autobiography in Antiquity* (Popova 485n10).

27. памятник. The word may also refer to a simple gravestone.

28. "[M]otif of slaying infants" refers in particular to the biblical Massacre of the Innocents (Matt. 2.16).

29. "[S]truggle of soma and plasma" refers to August Weismann's germ plasm theory, according to which only some cells in an organism (plasma) are responsible for its reproduction and carry all genetic information from one generation to the next, while the other cells (soma) are responsible for all other functions in the organism but do not contribute to reproduction and do not affect heredity.

30. Bakhtin briefly returns to *King Lear* in the notes that are omitted from this translation. He writes, "What the madness motif signifies. Lear's straw crown and straw scepter" (referring to Lear's crown of weeds in 4.4) and continues, "The motif of the illegitimate son (not settled by the official order, having no legal fatherhood)" (109). Later he notes an analogy between Cinderella of the folktale and Cordelia in "how the feminine element is construed" (119). Finally, he writes, "Cordelia, deflating the elderly stiffness of the old man who is king—of the old king—Lear, resurrects him (gives birth to him) anew in love, turns him into a child, becomes his mother" (123).

31. Bakhtin relies on a late-nineteenth-century Russian translation of Shakespeare's works by A. L. Sokolovsky. All his quotations are from this edition, and many observations are based on Sokolovsky's commentary (Popova 487n14). The following passage summarizes Sokolovsky's commentary on *Macbeth* (465–71). Bakhtin adds emphasis and a few side comments.

32. Here and below, text appearing in English in Bakhtin's notes is boldfaced. A Russian gloss that follows is omitted from the translation. The Shakespeare quotations that Bakhtin gives in Russian are replaced by passages from *Arden Shakespeare* (Proudfoot, Thompson, and Kastan).

33. Friedrich von Bodenstedt, a nineteenth-century German scholar and translator of Shakespeare, is mentioned by Sokolovsky (464).

34. All ellipses and italics in quotations are Bakhtin's. Bakhtin italicizes themes that are linked to his conception of carnival. At one point, Sokolovsky's translation aids him more than the original English text would: the word *ronyon* is rendered in Russian as туша, which also means "a carcass." Below I supply a back translation (while preserving Bakhtin's italics) from the translated lines cited by Bakhtin whenever similar mismatches arise.

35. In the text of *Macbeth* "had" appears here, not "has."

36. In fact, it is sc. 3.

37. *Rom.* 4.5.

38. This remark, based on Sokolovsky 232, possibly alludes to a scene in *Hamlet*, similar to those just discussed, in which clowns dig Ophelia's grave: "Hamlet [to clown]: Thou dost lie in't [in the grave], to be in't and say it is thine: 'tis for the dead, not for the quick; therefore thou liest" (5.1).

39. Macbeth actually says, "If charnel-houses and our graves must send those that we bury, back, our monuments shall be the maws of kites."

40. "She" does not appear in Shakespeare's text.

41. *Mac.* 1.3.

42. *Mac.* 1.4. Back translation: "The eye fears evil deeds, but would that deed be done on its own."

43. It is sc. 3.

44. *Mac.* 2.3. Back translation: "O, had I *died* an hour before this, I would have then met *death with elation*! . . . What is true, what is sacred after this? *The whole world* is but a fraud!"

45. Back translation: "His death should sound the loud trumpets of *archangels*, to *ever* curse the loathsome murderer! Pity, *on the wings of a hurricane*, like an infant, who mounted a proud steed, or a *cherub*, riding the storm, will throw my horrible deed in the eyes *of the whole world*, and cause *tears*, *a gushing watery abyss*, to drown that *storm and hurricane*!"

46. *Mac.* 2.2.

47. *Mac.* 5.5.

48. The term "Gothic realism," central to the 1940 manuscript of Bakhtin's book on Rabelais, was replaced in all later revisions by "grotesque realism." On the image of the woman in Rabelais and in grotesque realism according to Bakhtin, see *Rabelais* 239–44.

49. The Russian translation describes the ship as rising "to the clouds" (which Bakhtin also italicizes).

50. Back translation of the last sentence: "O, had *death* come now to take me—I would tell it in its *face* that I am *dying at the happiest moment*!"

51. Back translation of the last two lines: "Do deeds *more horrible* and *worse* than which *there are none in the world*! Accumulate horrors as *mountains*! Make *heaven* weep and *the earth* shudder!"

52. Back translation: "from the *depths of hell*."

53. Back translation: "*tear apart*."

54. Back translation: "turns away its face."

55. Othello addresses Desdemona, not Emilia. The likely cause of confusion is that Emilia enters the stage after "You! Mistress!" and Bakhtin must have misread the stage directions as indicating she is the addressee.

56. Shakespeare's original reads, "Heaven stops the nose at it." The gesture of turning one's face away, analyzed by Bakhtin below, is mentioned as such only in the Russian translation. That said, Shakespeare's actual text is amenable to similarly carnivalesque interpretations.

57. Cf. Bakhtin's earlier remark about the common wordplay in Shakespeare's plays around the meanings of the English verb *lie*.

58. The reference is probably to Goethe's conversation with Eckermann on 6 May 1827: "Then they come

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2014.129.3.522 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and ask, 'what idea I meant to embody in my Faust?' as if I knew myself, and could inform them. *From heaven, through the world, to hell*, would indeed be something; but this is no idea, only a course of action" (*Conversations* 415). See also Popova 487n15.

59. The words "internum *aeternum*" appear in Latin in the original. As Popova explains in the commentary (487–88n16), Bakhtin's source on Augustine here is Misch, who credits Heraclitus with making "a forecast of Augustine's *internum aeternum*" (95). Misch does not cite a specific text by Augustine. Popova proposes that the reference is to Augustine's "postposito deo, aeterno interno sempiterno bono" (*De civitate Dei* 15.22), which Marcus Dods translates as "in preference to God, the eternal, spiritual, and unchangeable good" (91).

60. This comment (like the one before it) originates in Sokolovsky's commentary (230–33 [Popova 488n17]). The gloss on *wretch* is misleading, because the word is regularly used in reference to men too. Othello uses the word as an ambivalent term of affection in *Oth*. 3.3.

61. *Oth*. 5.1. Recent editions of Shakespeare's text have "stored" instead of "scored." In any case, Sokolovsky's interpretation of the word, which Bakhtin reproduces here, is probably incorrect.

62. A central square in the part of Saint Petersburg where the plot of Dostoevsky's *Crime and Punishment* takes place.

Works Cited by Translator

Augustine. *The City of God*. Trans. Marcus Dods. Vol. 2. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1871. Print.

Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovich. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Ed. and trans Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1984. Print.

———. "Rabelais and Gogol: The Art of Discourse and the Popular Culture of Laughter." *Missisippi Review* 11.3 (1983): 34–50. Print.

———. *Rabelais and His World*. Trans. Hélène Iswolsky. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1984. Print.

———. Собрание сочинений [Collected Writings]. 6 vols. Moscow: Russkie slovari, 1996–2012. Print.

Bočarov, Sergej, and Vadim Liapunov. Commentary. Bakhtin, Собрание сочинений 3: 765–96.

Dostoevsky, Fyodor. *The Brothers Karamazov*. New York: Bantam, 2003. Print.

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von. *Conversations of Goethe with Eckermann and Soret*. Trans. John Oxenford. Vol. 1. London: Smith, Elder, 1850. Print.

———. *Propyläen Ausgabe von Goethes Sämtlichen Werken*. Ed. Curt Noch. Vol. 34. Berlin: Propyläen, 1909. Print.

Misch, Georg. *A History of Autobiography in Antiquity*. Pt. 1. Trans. E. W. Dickes. Routledge, 1950. Print.

Popova, Irina. Commentary. Bakhtin, Собрание сочинений 5: 466–92.

Pratt, Vernon, and Isis Brook. "Goethe's *Archetype* and the Romantic Concept of Self." *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part A* 27.3 (1996): 351–65. Print.

Proudfoot, Richard, Ann Thompson, and David Scott Kastan, eds. *The Arden Shakespeare Complete Works*. Revised ed. London: Arden Shakespeare, 2001. Print.

Sokolovskij, Aleksandr Lukich. Шекспир в переводе и объяснении А. Л. Соколовского [Shakespeare Translated and Explained by A. L. Sokolovskii]. Vol. 1. Saint Petersburg: Izdatel'stvo A. F. Marksa, 1894. Print.

https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2014.129.3.522 Published online by Cambridge University Press