

The Scholar as Scientist:
Iurii Tynianov and the OPOIaZ

Robert Daly

D.Phil. Thesis

Faculty of Medieval and Modern Languages
University of Oxford

2016

Abstract

The present work deals with the literary-theoretical work of the Petrograd Formalists — those who participated in the OPOIaZ in the 1910s and early 1920s — with a focus on that of Iurii Tynianov. It attempts to unpack the representation of their literary-theoretical work as ‘science’ [*nauka*] by exploring how that category was constructed in dialogue with their evolving conception of literature. It is argued in the first chapter that, for the duration of their project, they conceptualized the ‘language of *nauka*’ — and their own prose by association — in accordance with the laws of their theory of language. It is argued in the second chapter that, as the Formalists developed a theory of literary history as an endless succession of ‘revolutions’ in the period 1919–24, they tried to make their theorization of that process take a correspondingly revolutionary form, one in which the sciences of nature and those of history would become one. It is argued in the third chapter that, as the Formalists came to theorize the connection between literature and life in the period 1924–30, they practised a new ‘type’ of *nauka* in the form of the authorial collection of articles, one in which their own work was historicized in a ‘literary’ manner. It is concluded that, for the OPOIaZ, *nauka* came into being as a function of its object: as the Formalists transformed their conception of literature, their realization of *nauka* was correspondingly transformed. The conclusion then problematizes the categorization of Formalism as a purely ‘scientific’, extra-‘literary’ movement, since emphasis is placed on their authorship of that categorization, and raises broader questions about the origin of modern ‘literary theory’.

Longer Abstract

The Petrograd Formalists — those who participated in the OPOIaZ in the late 1910s and early 1920s — triumphantly represented their literary-theoretical work as ‘science’ [*nauka*]. They originally conceptualized their work, as *nauka*, in contradistinction to literature. As Eikhenbaum wrote in ‘Teoriia formal'nogo metoda’ (1927), their construction of the concept of ‘literature as such’ [*literatura kak takovaia*] in the late 1910s had allowed them correspondingly to construct a ‘literary science as such’ [*literaturnaia nauka kak takovaia*].

The present work explores the implications for the work of the OPOIaZ of its members’ original strategy of conceptualizing *nauka* and literature in contradistinction to each other. It begins with an introduction in which the central problem is posed: how did the original polarization by the Society of *nauka* and literature find formal realization in its work? The body of the thesis is divided into three chapters. The aim is not to provide an exhaustive analysis, but rather to explore three ways in which the relation between *nauka* and literature was reconfigured, three moments in the history of Formalism at which its resonance was felt with a particular intensity. The progression of the chapters mirrors the historical development of Formalism during the period 1916–30: the first chapter concerns the theory of language, the focus of the OPOIaZ in the 1910s; the second chapter concerns the early work of the Society on literary history, the theoretical problem to which its members first turned in the period 1919–24; the third chapter concerns the increasingly ‘social’ orientation of Formalism in the period after 1924. The first chapter is the largest in scope, spanning the full duration of the

Formalist project; each of the remaining two chapters explores a reconfiguration of the same problem with reference to a single moment in its history.

The first chapter, ‘The Language of Science’, explores the relation between *nauka* and poetry conceptualized as linguistic categories. It is divided into three sections. The first section reconstructs the category of ‘scientific language’ [*nauchnyi iazyk*] in the work of the OPOIaZ on language. The contributors to the *Sborniki po teorii poeticheskogo iazyka* defined the ‘language of *nauka*’ and the ‘language of poetry’ in contradistinction to each other, such that ‘scientificity’ [*nauchnost'*] was implicated in the construction of literariness and vice versa. The second section considers Tynianov’s theoretical work on language of the period 1921–24. It is argued with reference to the monograph *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka* (1924) and the article ‘Slovar’ Lenina-polemista’ (1924) that Tynianov developed the same, linguistic polarization of *nauka* and poetry. Like his colleagues in the OPOIaZ, Tynianov identified terminology as the ultimate expression of proseness and associated it with *nauka*. Furthermore, his own theoretical work of the period 1921–24 can be neatly divided into concise, terminologically dense works of linguistic analysis (such as *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka*) and more repetitive, metaphorical works of historical analysis (such as ‘O literaturnom fakte’, 1924). The third section of the chapter follows Tynianov into the late 1920s, by which time he had collapsed the division between synchrony and diachrony by expanding the application of the tools of linguistics. He thereby overcame the division observed in his theoretical work of 1924 — that between the language of linguistic analysis and that of historical analysis. Tynianov’s new, syncretic language of theory — an extremely abstract language of ‘systems’ and ‘functions’ — seemed

paradoxically to embody how the OPOIaZ had originally imagined poetry. The original, linguistic polarization of *nauka* and poetry, it is argued, progressively collapsed in on itself in Tynianov's theoretical work of the 1920s.

The second chapter, 'The Science of History', considers the work of the OPOIaZ on literary history of the period 1919–24. As Shklovsky, Eikhenbaum, and Tynianov developed a theory of literary history as an endless succession of 'revolutions' in the period 1919–24, they tried to make their theorization of that process take a correspondingly revolutionary form. They did so, it is argued, by attempting to collapse the well-established dichotomy between the sciences of nature and those of history. The chapter reconstructs a natural-scientific paradigm in the early work of the Society on literary history. Their 'mechanical' theory of literary history is shown to support parallels with Darwin's theory of evolution by natural selection and Newton's conception of motion. Furthermore, Tynianov was beginning to experiment with concepts from genetics and relativistic physics. He was beginning to transform the natural-scientific paradigm of the work of the OPOIaZ on literary history by introducing concepts associated with the early twentieth-century 'revolution' in the natural sciences. The chapter concludes with a discussion of how natural-scientific models of change were beginning to come into conflict with materialist theories of development in 1924.

The third chapter, 'The Collection of Articles as Science', offers an interpretation of the four (or, if the second edition of *O teorii prozy* is included, five) authorial collections of articles compiled by the most prominent members of the OPOIaZ in the period 1924–30: Eikhenbaum's *Skvoz' literaturu* (1924), Shklovsky's *O teorii*

prozy (1925, 1929), Eikhenbaum's *Literatura* (1927), and Tynianov's *Arkhaisty i novatory* (1929). The collections consisted in the most part of substantial literary-theoretical articles that had already been published. The first and last examples of the genre, *Skvoz' literaturu* and *Arkhaisty i novatory*, are given greatest attention. They can be considered examples of a distinct genre oriented towards autobiography, one allowing its exponents to represent a process of intellectual development. Shklovsky, Eikhenbaum, and Tynianov, it is concluded, each made an original contribution to *nauka* by recycling old material in a 'literary' manner.

The conclusion ties together the three chapters by showing how each of them addresses a reconfiguration of the same relation between *nauka* and literature. It situates the work as a whole in the context of the historiography on Formalism. Parallels are then suggested between Formalism and Romanticism, and the conclusions drawn are projected into the late twentieth century as of possible relevance to modern 'literary theory' more generally.

The thesis is an attempt ultimately to make sense of the oblique self-referentiality of much of the literary theory of the OPOIaZ. It seeks to explore three moments in the history of Formalism with a focus on how *nauka* and literature were conceptualized as structurally equivalent, on how the realization of the Formalist project was made intelligible principally in terms of its own conceptual apparatus. It is argued not that the work of the Society was in any way 'unscientific', whatever that might be taken to mean, but merely that the creation of an independent intellectual activity, of a science that did not submit to the authority of

any other science, resulted in a curious union of subject and object with far-reaching consequences.

In the context of the historiography on Formalism, the consideration here of the question of *nauka* can be seen to engage with a recent study by Jan Levchenko, *Drugaia nauka: russkie formalisty v poiskakh biografii* (2012). In a number of its chapters, Levchenko examines Eikhenbaum and Shklovsky's generically experimental, (auto)biographical prose works of the 1920s as examples of what he terms the strategy of 'allegorizing theory' [*inoskazanie teorii*], a strategy equivalent in function to Tynianov's decision to begin writing historical fiction in late 1924.¹ This path towards literature, Levchenko concludes, was a response to a heightened historical self-consciousness in the 1920s. The present work takes a different approach. It is argued that, from the very inception of their intellectual project, the Formalists conceptualized *nauka* as the mirror image of literature. The proposed approach makes it possible to explore the orientation towards literature of even the most apparently conventional literary-theoretical work produced by the Formalists. Thus, the present work considers the orientation towards literature even of such works as Tynianov's *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka* (1924), 'O literaturnom fakte' (1924), and *Arkhaisty i novatory* (1929), among others.

From a broader perspective, the thesis can be read in light of recent work on the origin of modern literary theory in Central and Eastern Europe. Galin Tihanov argues that the 1910s 'signalled the ambition' of the study of literature to

¹ Jan Levchenko, *Drugaia nauka: russkie formalisty v poiskakh biografii* (Moscow: Izdatel'skii dom NIU VShE, 2012), p. 10.

‘emancipate itself from the master discourses of philosophy’.² The Formalist emphasis on the ‘specificity’ of literature, on ‘literature as such’, expressed a desire to allow it to speak on its own terms. It is argued here that such an emphasis intensified the relation between the subject and the object of theoretical investigation, that the resulting polarization of *nauka* and literature was repeatedly reconfigured in the literary-theoretical practice of the OPOIaZ.

² Galin Tihanov, ‘Why did Modern Literary Theory Originate in Central and Eastern Europe? (And Why is it Now Dead?)’, *Common Knowledge*, 10 (2004), 61–81 (p. 62).

Acknowledgements

My warmest thanks are due to Andrei Zorin, who supervised the project from its inception in Michaelmas Term 2012. He has been an incisive and challenging reader of my work. I also thank my examiners, Philip Ross Bullock and Galin Tihanov, for giving an appraisal of the thesis and offering valuable suggestions. Many other people have taken the time to share their expertise with me. I would above all like to thank John Cook, Julie Curtis, Alexei G. Evstratov, Adam Fergus, Ann Jefferson, Polly Jones, Andrew Kahn, Catriona Kelly, Franziska Kohlt, Henry Mason, David Shepherd, Margarita Vaysman, and Josephine von Zitzewitz.

It would not have been possible for me to complete the project without the generous financial support of the University of Oxford. The award of a Clarendon Scholarship in 2012 funded three years of doctoral study and offered many opportunities for intellectual development both within and beyond the field of my doctorate. I also thank the Centre for East European Language-Based Area Studies (CEELBAS) for the award of a subsidized place on its library and archive training scheme, the British Society for Literature and Science (BSLS) for the award of a bursary allowing me to present a paper at its annual conference, and Santander Universities for the award of a travel grant.

My doctoral project is the culmination of eight years at New College, Oxford. I am deeply grateful to the fellows of the College for their support of my academic work and in particular for the award of the Reynolds Scholarship, without which I would not have been able to take up a place on a taught master's course in 2011. I am

especially grateful to Ann Jefferson and Catriona Kelly for their continued encouragement. It has been a privilege to study at New College.

Finally, I thank my parents and my friends.

April 2016

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Longer Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	ix
Table of Contents	xi
Preparation of the Manuscript	xii
Abbreviations	xiv
Glossary	xiii
Introduction	1
Chapter One: The Language of Science (1914–30)	42
Chapter Two: The Science of History (1919–24)	106
Chapter Three: The Collection of Articles as Science (1924–30)	171
Conclusion	219
Bibliography	228

Preparation of the manuscript

The Library of Congress transliteration system is used throughout. Exceptions are made for Russian surnames well known in another form and include Bely, Dostoevsky, Gogol, Gorky, Jakobson, Lunacharsky, Mayakovsky, Shklovsky, Tolstoy, and Trotsky. The names of Russian scholars who have published in English are transliterated in accordance with their preferred forms.

Quotations from Russian-language sources are given in Russian. Orthography has been modernized where necessary. Short quotations from Russian sources of only a few words in length are translated into English and usually given with a transliteration of the original Russian supplied immediately afterwards, italicized and in parentheses. All such translations are my own.

References are given in footnotes and in accordance with the conventions of the *MHRA Style Guide*, 2nd edn (London: Modern Humanities Research Association, 2008). Full references are given for the first citation of a work in each chapter and abbreviated forms are used thereafter.

Abbreviations

<i>NLO</i>	<i>Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie</i>
<i>PILK</i>	Iu. N. Tynianov, <i>Poetika. Istoriiia literatury. Kino</i> , ed. by A. P. Chudakov, M. O. Chudakova, and E. A. Toddes (Moscow: Nauka, 1977)
<i>TS</i> , 1 (1984)	<i>Tynianovskii sbornik</i> , vyp. 1: Pervye Tynianovskie chteniia, ed. by M. O. Chudakova et al. (Riga: Zinatne, 1984)
<i>TS</i> , 2 (1986)	<i>Tynianovskii sbornik</i> , vyp. 2: Vtorye Tynianovskie chteniia, ed. by M. O. Chudakova et al. (Riga: Zinatne, 1986)
<i>TS</i> , 3 (1988)	<i>Tynianovskii sbornik</i> , vyp. 3: Tret'i Tynianovskie chteniia, ed. by M. O. Chudakova et al. (Riga: Zinatne, 1988)

Glossary

GIII	Gosudarstvennyi institut istorii iskusstv <i>(State Institute for the History of the Arts)</i>
MLK	Moskovskii lingvisticheskii kruzhok <i>(Moscow Linguistic Circle)</i>
OPOIaZ	Obshchestvo izucheniia [teorii] poeticheskogo iazyka <i>(Society for the Study of [the Theory of] Poetic Language)</i>
RGALI	Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv literatury i iskusstva <i>(Russian State Archive for Literature and Art)</i>
RIII	Rossiiskii institut istorii iskusstv <i>(Russian Institute for the History of the Arts)</i>

Introduction

‘Наша культура построена на чопорном
дифференцировании науки и искусства.’¹

Iu. Tynianov, 1924

In an article of 1926 on the ‘Formalists’,² by which he meant those — including himself — who had participated in the Society for the Study of Poetic Language (ОПОИaZ) during the previous decade,³ Boris Eikhenbaum struggled accurately to categorize the nature of their work. He rejected the appellation preferred by their opponents, the ‘Formal method’, since their work did not amount to an ‘aesthetic theory’, nor was it a ‘finalized scientific system’; ‘characteristic of us’, he wrote, resorting to circumlocution, was ‘merely the aspiration to create a self-sufficient literary science’.⁴ The Formalists aspired to the creation of a science that was autonomous, he reasoned, because they were not required to submit to the ultimate authority of any other science. Their interest was in the ‘specificity’ of their object, in that which made it what it was, and they were therefore able to create an immanent science, to begin from first principles. They had made ‘literature as

¹ Iu. Tynianov, ‘Literaturnoe segodnia’, *Russkii sovremennik*, 1 (1924), 292–306 (p. 305).

² B. Eikhenbaum, ‘Teoriia “formal'nogo metoda”’, in *Literatura: teoriia, kritika, polemika* (Leningrad: Priboi, 1927), pp. 116–48 (p. 116n): ‘Под “формалистами” я разумею в этой статье только ту группу теоретиков, которая объединилась в “Обществе изучения поэтического языка” (ОПОЯЗ) и с 1916 г. начала издавать свои сборники.’

³ On the alternative gloss of the acronym ОПОИaZ, as Obshchestvo izucheniia teorii poeticheskogo iazyka, see A. P. Chudakov, comm. to Tynianov, ‘Predislovie k knige “Problema stikhovoi semantiki”’, in *PILK*, pp. 501–07.

⁴ Eikhenbaum, ‘Teoriia “formal'nogo metoda”’, in *Literatura*, p. 117: ‘Для нас характерен не “формализм” как эстетическая теория и не “методология” как законченная научная система, а только стремление к созданию самостоятельной литературной науки на основе специфических свойств литературного материала.’

such' [*literatura kak takovaia*], or 'literariness' [*literaturnost'*], the object of their work and, it followed, had thereby created a correspondingly immanent scientificity, a 'literary science as such' [*literaturnaia nauka kak takovaia*].⁵ What united those who participated in the Society was thus the project simultaneously to isolate literariness and produce scientificity, the one possible only on condition of the other.⁶ In other words, the extent to which the work of the Society was scientific was made dependent on the extent to which its members were capable of articulating that which was specific to its object. The present work explores how this original connection between 'science' [*nauka*] and literature, the relation of interdependence that resulted from the implementation of the principle of literary specificity, was realized in the course of the theoretical work of the Society.

The wider intellectual movement of which the OPOIaZ was a major part, Russian Formalism, is celebrated internationally for what Eikhenbaum called the 'aspiration' to create a self-sufficient science. It was typical, for example, that, several decades after the politically motivated capitulation of Formalism in 1930, Roman Jakobson, the first chairman of the Moscow Linguistic Circle (MLK) and a participant in some of the early meetings of the OPOIaZ,⁷ reasserted its claim to scientificity by selecting 'Vers une science de l'art poétique' as the title for his preface to *Théorie de la littérature* (1965), a collection of Formalist articles in

⁵ Ibid., pp. 120–21 (all quotations).

⁶ See also the two complementary tasks identified as the *raison d'être* of the OPOIaZ, ibid., p. 120: 'Искусство требовало, чтобы к нему подошли вплотную, а наука — чтобы ее сделали конкретной.'

⁷ On Jakobson's involvement, see A. V. Krusanov, 'OPOIaZ' and 'MLK', *Russkii avangard: 1907–1932 (Istoricheskii obzor)*, 2 vols (Moscow: NLO, 2003), vol. 2: *Futuristicheskaia revoliutsiia (1917–1921)*, kn. 1, pp. 287–304, pp. 452–95.

translation.⁸ The Formalists' cultivation of intellectual self-sufficiency in the study of literature has led to a widespread acknowledgement of their place at the origin of the twentieth-century project of literary theory. Raman Selden traces the 'scientific ambitions' of the French structuralists of the 1950s and 1960s to the Russian Formalists in the 1920s, arguing that the 'anti-humanism' common to both movements was part of a project to cultivate a 'subjectless scientificity' in the study of human activity.⁹ Galin Tihanov notes that Formalism was 'epistemologically related to positivism, psychoanalysis, and Marxism', that its exponents sought to demonstrate that literature was 'entirely amenable to scientific study and rationalization'.¹⁰ Formalism represented a pivotal moment in European intellectual history, the ambition to elevate the study of literature to an epistemologically and methodologically more considered enterprise, one whose sole task was the discovery of the hidden 'laws' by which it operated.¹¹

⁸ Roman Jakobson, 'Vers une science de l'art poétique', in *Théorie de la littérature: textes des formalistes russes*, ed. and trans. by Tzvetan Todorov (Paris: Seuil, 1965), pp. 9–13.

⁹ Raman Selden, 'Introduction', in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, vol. 8: From Formalism to Poststructuralism, ed. by Raman Selden (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 1–10 (both p. 5).

¹⁰ Galin Tihanov, 'Russian Formalism', in *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*, 4th edn, ed. by Roland Greene et al. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2012), pp. 1239–42 (both p. 1240).

¹¹ For an excellent analysis of Formalism from the perspective of the philosophy and sociology of science (i.e. a discussion of the movement in light of the work of such philosophers and sociologists of science as Thomas Kuhn, Pierre Bourdieu, Robert Merton, and Bruno Latour), see Aleksandr Dmitriev and Jan Levchenko, 'Nauka kak priem: eshche raz o metodologicheskome nasledii russkikh formalistov', *NLO*, 50 (2001), 195–245. On the epistemology of Formalism, see also Ewa Thompson, *Russian Formalism and Anglo-American New Criticism: A Comparative Study* (The Hague: Mouton, 1971), pp. 11–16, pp. 54–110 (where the movement is discussed in the context of Heinrich Rickert's philosophy of science and a dichotomy is established between 'idealist' Formalism, as represented by the early Shklovsky, and 'neo-positivist' Formalism, as represented by Tynianov, the latter a theorist who 'wanted literary criticism to become a scientific investigation of facts').

Its immense and rightly celebrated achievement in that respect notwithstanding, the present work leaves to one side the question of how the Formalists constructed a rigorous scientificity in epistemological and methodological terms. It also makes no attempt to formulate an objective evaluation of their claim to scientificity. It attempts only to explore how the original union of ‘science’ [*nauka*] and literature as structural opposites played out in the course of the theoretical work of the OPOIaZ. It is argued that their polarization caused the ‘scientificity’ [*nauchnost*] of the theoretical work of the Society, the quality that its members were supposedly cultivating, to take shape as a reflection of ‘literariness’, the quality that they were supposedly investigating. Literature and ‘science’, in other words, were minted as two sides of the same coin, two components of a single intellectual undertaking. The argument made here about the construction by the Society of literariness and scientificity as interdependent is by no means incompatible with intellectual-historical arguments about the paradigm-shifting epistemological and methodological innovations of Formalism. It is argued not that the members of the Society produced theoretical work that was in any way ‘unscientific’, whatever that might be taken to mean, but only that, at a number of moments in the history of Formalism, their ‘science’ [*nauka*] could not find formal realization in a manner indifferent to its object.

The focus of the present work is on Iurii Tynianov, a relative latecomer to the OPOIaZ. Indeed, he was not published until 1921,¹² whereas the Society had its origins in the period 1914–16, when Viktor Shklovsky, Lev Iakubinskii, and others

¹² Iu. Tynianov, *Dostoevskii i Gogol': k teorii parodii* (Petrograd: OPOIaZ, 1921).

began to meet in Petrograd.¹³ Tynianov joined the Society in 1918 or soon afterwards and quickly became one of its leading figures.¹⁴ According to an official document of December 1921, the OPOIaZ had thirteen members in total at that time; Shklovsky was president, Eikhenbaum vice-president, and Tynianov secretary.¹⁵

Of Shklovsky, Eikhenbaum, and Tynianov, those whom Eikhenbaum dubbed the ‘revolutionary trio’ [*revtroika*] of the OPOIaZ,¹⁶ Tynianov could be called the most ‘theoretical’ member of the Society. Both Shklovsky and Eikhenbaum were prominent defenders of the ‘Formal method’ in the polemical debates of the 1920s, at ease in the journal culture of the early twentieth century.¹⁷ They were both prolific writers. Furthermore, as the 1920s progressed, Shklovsky and, to a lesser degree, Eikhenbaum both experimented with a self-consciously more ‘autobiographical’, ‘journalistic’, or even ‘literary’ prose, one in which ‘theory’ was presented in a profoundly new way. Tynianov, by contrast, wrote less, producing only one monograph during the decade, the densely theoretical *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka*, and did not experiment with provocative fusions of theoretical, literary, and autobiographical writing. Although he produced a small

¹³ Krusanov, vol. 2, kn. 1, p. 287.

¹⁴ Iurii Tynianov, ‘Avtobiografiia’ (1939), in *Iurii Tynianov: pisatel' i uchenyi. Vospominaniia, razmyshleniia, vstrechi*, ed. by V. Kaverin (Moscow: Molodaia gvardiia, 1966), pp. 9–20 (p. 19). The date of his entry to the society is given as ‘1919 or 1920’ in Chudakov, comm. to Tynianov, ‘Predislovie k knige “Problema stikhovoi semantiki”’, in *PILK*, p. 505.

¹⁵ Krusanov, vol. 2, kn. 1, p. 301.

¹⁶ Eikhenbaum, diary entry of February 1922, as quoted in A. P. Chudakov, comm. to Tynianov, ‘Stikhovye formy Nekrasova’, in *PILK*, pp. 404–07 (p. 404).

¹⁷ Note, e.g., that in Trotsky’s 1923 article on the ‘Formal school of poetry’, ‘Formal’naia shkola poezii i marksizm’, *Pravda*, 166 (26 July 1923), 2–4, he mentioned by name only Shklovsky and Jakobson, and that it was Eikhenbaum who responded to the Marxist critique, the following year, in *Pechat' i revoliutsiia*.

number of more ‘literary’ feuilleton pieces at the very beginning of the 1920s, most of them published under a pseudonym,¹⁸ many of his ‘literary-critical’ articles were indistinguishable from his literary-theoretical and literary-historical ones.¹⁹ Even when he began to write historical novels in late 1924,²⁰ he continued to observe a clear division between *nauka* and fiction in his own work, later claiming that, for him, the latter ‘began’ where the former ‘ended’.²¹ Tynianov’s continued cultivation of a ‘purer’ form of theory, his reluctance to style himself as a polemicist, and his resistance to the blending of theoretical, literary, and autobiographical writing makes his literary theory of the 1920s the richest source for the purposes of the present work. Indeed, he preserved in the form of a rigidly observed dichotomy in his own oeuvre the original polarization of *nauka* and literature on which the OPOIaZ had been founded.

A few words should be said at the outset about terminology, since, as will by now be apparent, the English *science* and the Russian *nauka* do not fully coincide.

Given that the Russian *nauka* is closer semantically to the German *Wissenschaft*

¹⁸ Tynianov used two pseudonyms in the early 1920s: ‘Iu. Van-Vezen’ and ‘G. Montelius’. For a discussion of their function, see M. O. Chudakova, comm. to Tynianov, ‘Zapiski o zapadnoi literature’, in *PILK*, pp. 441–46.

¹⁹ On the theoreticism of Tynianov’s literary-critical articles, see the justification given in the draft of the foreword to *Arkhaisty i novatory* (Leningrad: Priboi, 1929) for the decision to include some of them in that collection, as quoted in E. A. Todd, comm. to Tynianov, ‘Predislovie k knige “Arkhaisty i novatory”’, in *PILK*, pp. 567–73 (p. 567): ‘Ввиду того, что несколько критических статей, которые случилось мне написать, не многим отличаются от моих историко-литературных статей [...], я включил их в сборник.’

²⁰ On the genesis of Tynianov’s first historical novel, *Kiukhlia: povest' o dekabrists* (Leningrad: Kubuch, 1925), see Kornei Chukovskii, in *Iurii Tynianov*, ed. by Kaverin, pp. 111–19.

²¹ See Tynianov’s well-known explanation of the turn to historical fiction in his contribution to *Kak my pishem* (Leningrad: Izd. pisatelei v Leningrade, 1930), pp. 158–68 (p. 160): ‘Там, где кончается документ, там я начинаю.’

than to the English *science*, it is illuminating to consider Fritz Ringer's discussion of the fundamental semantic distinction between those words: 'In English, it is possible to argue about whether sociology or history is "a science."' In German, [...] to ask whether sociology is *eine Wissenschaft* is to wonder about its status as a distinct and clearly circumscribed discipline, not about its more or less "scientific" methods.'²² The emphasis on methodological rigour identified by Ringer in the semantic range of the English *science* is related to what the *Oxford English Dictionary* identifies as the sense most typical of its 'modern use', 'those branches of study that relate to the phenomena of the material universe and their laws', a sense 'treated as synonymous with "Natural and Physical science"'.²³ According to the same principle, the Russian *nauka* is usually translated into English as *science*, if the field of study in question concerns the physical universe, or *scholarship*, if it does not.²⁴ Given the cultural specificity of the words *science* and *nauka*, the Russian words *nauka* ('science') and *nauchnost'* ('scientificity') will henceforth be transliterated rather than translated.

Nauka became an exceptionally revered activity in modern Russian culture, one associated with a 'Westernizing' force of reason.²⁵ Thus, although the word could serve as the relatively neutral designation of systematic intellectual activity of any

²² Fritz Ringer, *The Decline of the German Mandarins: The German Academic Community, 1890–1933* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969), p. 103.

²³ See sense 5b in the entry for '*science*, n.', in the *Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd edn, 20 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), vol. 14, pp. 648–49 (p. 649).

²⁴ See, e.g., the entry for '*nauka*, n.' in the *Oxford Russian Dictionary*, 2nd edn (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984), p. 385 (where the single sense given as an equivalent in modern English is 'science, learning, scholarship, study').

²⁵ Andy Byford, *Literary Scholarship in Late Imperial Russia: Rituals of Academic Institutionalization* (London: Legenda, 2007), p. 37.

kind, it also acquired the function of a value judgment. Its use by the members of the OPOIaZ was often typical in that respect. *Nauka* quickly became the basic category of their self-analysis: they soon generalized their conception of a ‘literary *nauka* as such’ by making their work — a quest for the ‘specificity’ of its object — synonymous with *nauka* in general in the study of literature. They reasoned, in other words, that it was impossible for a student of literature to produce *nauka* without adhering to the principle of literary specificity. If we read the three early collections of the *Sborniki po teorii poeticheskogo iazyka* (1916–19), the mouthpiece of the Society in the 1910s, we find many attempts by its members to claim *nauka* for themselves alone. In the unofficial manifesto of the Society, ‘Iskusstvo kak priem’, Shklovsky wrote that his colleague Iakubinskii had produced one of the few theories of poetry — that to which he also ascribed — to withstand ‘scientific criticism’ [*nauchnaia kritika*].²⁶ Shklovsky described the work of the Society as a ‘scientific poetics’ [*nauchnaia poetika*].²⁷ In his seminal study of Gogol’s short story ‘Shinel’, Eikhenbaum challenged those whose reading of the story as a social commentary had been dominant in the nineteenth century, arguing that their canonization of ‘Shinel’ as a critique of Russian society had been ‘no cause for science to celebrate’ [*dlia nauki sovsem ne torzhestvo*] and the ‘wrong path for science’ [*lozhnyi dlia nauki put*].²⁸ The failure of other commentators on literature to isolate its specificity, to read literature ‘as such’, it was argued, denied them any role in the furthering of *nauka*. The Formalists thus

²⁶ Viktor Shklovsky, ‘Iskusstvo kak priem’, in *Sborniki po teorii poeticheskogo iazyka*, vyp. 2 (Petrograd: OPOIaZ, 1917), pp. 3–14 (p. 6).

²⁷ Viktor Shklovsky, ‘Ptebnia’, in *Poetika. Sborniki po teorii poeticheskogo iazyka* (Petrograd: Gos. tip., 1919), pp. 3–6 (p. 6).

²⁸ B. M. Eikhenbaum, ‘Kak sdelana “Shinel”’, in *Poetika*, pp. 151–66 (both p. 161).

made a leap from the original claim to having created a ‘literary *nauka* as such’, the result of their implementation of the principle of literary specificity, to the much grander claim that no other realization of *nauka* was possible in the study of literature.

In perhaps the best-known expression of the Formalist aspiration to *nauchnost*, Jakobson made a distinction between the ‘science of literature’ [*nauka o literature*], the value-neutral designation of a particular field of study, and ‘science’ [*nauka*] as such: ‘Если наука о литературе хочет стать наукой, она принуждается признать “прием” своим единственным “героем”.’²⁹ Jakobson argued that the adoption of Shklovsky’s concept of the ‘device’ [*priem*] would allow the *nauka* of literature, previously a confused intellectual enterprise, finally to ‘become *nauka*’, that ideal to which all areas of study should aspire.³⁰ By juxtaposing two senses of the word successively, Jakobson reflected the direction in which the *nauka* of literature was moving in the work of the Formalists, its elevation towards *nauka* in the absolute.

The Petrograd Formalists made a second questionable leap of logic by conflating their creation of a science irreducible to other sciences with the notion of a *nauka* independent of political interference. They reasoned that the *nauchnost* of institutionalized literary scholarship, by contrast, could be reduced to a sanction from the state. The first three collections of the *Sborniki po teorii poeticheskogo*

²⁹ R. Jakobson, *Noveishaia russkaia poeziia. Nabrosok pervyi* (Prague: Politika, 1921), p. 11.

³⁰ Cf. the distinction between senses 3a and 4a in the entry for ‘science, n.’, in the *Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd edn, vol. 14, pp. 648–49 (p. 649).

iazyka (1916–19) once again provide many examples. In ‘Zvukovye povtory’ (1917), Osip Brik repeatedly contrasted his theory of verse against the ‘established theory of versification’ [*kazennaia teoriia stikhoslozheniia*].³¹ In the bibliography of thirty-five works on metrics contributed to the third collection in the series (1919), Eikhenbaum did not include a single study written by a Russian literary scholar.³² Indeed, the Formalists came close to denying their debt to academic literary scholarship entirely, a fact that led many contemporaries to accuse them of overstating the case for the originality of their theoretical work.³³ The Formalists thus actively conflated purely epistemological and methodological questions with ultimately political ones in their identification of their own work as *nauka*.³⁴

With regard to the ease with which the OPOIaZ projected the specificity of its science into the political sphere, it is instructive to compare the Society and the MLK, the other hub of Formalism in Russia. The participants of the MLK associated their *nauchnost'* with the rigour of their methodology. They pioneered the application of ‘exact methods’ to the analysis of verse, for example, and took care to define their terms with great precision. Given that the scientificity of their work was assured first and foremost by methodological rigour, and that it was consequently reducible to one or other philosophical system in which such a quality was the defining characteristic of science, they had less need than did those in the OPOIaZ of aggressive assertions of the *nauchnost'* of their work.

³¹ O. M. Brik, ‘Zvukovye povtory’, in *Sborniki*, vyp. 2, pp. 24–62 (e.g. p. 59).

³² B. M. Eikhenbaum, ‘Prilozhenie’, in *Poetika*, pp. 167–68.

³³ See, e.g., A. I. Beletskii, ‘Neskol'ko slov o razrabotke nauchnoi poetiki v Rossii i na Zapade’, in Richard Müller-Freienfels, *Poetika*, trans. by I. Ia. Kaganov and E. S. Paperna (Kharkov: Trud, 1923), pp. 3–20 (p. 5).

³⁴ See Dmitriev and Levchenko for a discussion of the Formalists’ presentation of their work as a ‘scientific revolution’ (with reference esp. to Thomas Kuhn).

As the 1920s progressed, the OPOIaZ increasingly came into conflict with Marxist literary theory. It is notable that members of both camps adopted the same rhetorical strategy of claiming *nauka* exclusively for themselves. In a piece on Formalism of 1923, Lev Trotsky represented the Formalists as scientifically backwards, equating their refusal to accept materialism to a refusal to accept Darwin's theory of evolution by natural selection.³⁵ In the title of his piece on Formalism, he unexpectedly made reference to the 'Formal school of poetry'; his strategy was perhaps to discredit Formalism intellectually by categorizing it as an 'artistic' movement rather than as a 'scientific' one.³⁶ The eventual capitulation of Formalism in 1930 took the form of an article by Shklovsky in which he confessed to a 'scientific error' [*nauchnaia oshibka*], a deviation from the correct path for *nauka*.³⁷ The Formalists had adopted the same rhetorical strategy. Eikhenbaum, for example, wrote in his diary for 1924 that the Marxist critique of Formalism was comparable to medieval 'scholasticism', a war on 'scientific thought as such': 'Идет борьба религиозного догматизма и схоластики с наукой. [...] Идет борьба против научной мысли как таковой.'³⁸ The word *nauka* was thus stripped of any real meaning in the polemical debates of the 1920s, becoming

³⁵ Trotsky, p. 3.

³⁶ Cf. A. Lunacharsky, 'Formalizm v nauke ob iskusstve', *Pechat' i revoliutsiia*, 5 (1924), 19–32 (p. 29), where it is argued that, rather than amounting to a genuine 'science' [*nauka*], Formalism comprised a series of mere intellectual 'operations' [*operatsii*]. See also P. N. Medvedev, *Formal'nyi metod v literaturovedenii (Kriticheskoe vvedenie v sotsiologicheskuiu poetiku)* (Leningrad: Priboi, 1928), p. 167, where it is argued that one of Shklovsky's formulations did not constitute a legitimate 'scientific position' [*nauchnoe polozhenie*] against which one could mount an argument.

³⁷ See Viktor Shklovsky, 'Pamiatnik nauchnoi oshibke (Redaktsiia vtoraia)', *NLO*, 44 (2000), 154–58 (ed. by Aleksandr Galushkin).

³⁸ Eikhenbaum, diary entry of 29 September 1924, as quoted in Ewa Bérard-Zarzycka, 'La genèse des travaux sur le *literaturnyj byt* d'après le *Journal d'Ëjxenbaum*', *Revue des études slaves*, 57 (1985), 83–89 (p. 86).

instead a value judgment, a partisan assertion of the superiority of one theoretical approach over another.

If we leave aside the polemical debates in which the members of the OPOIaZ became involved in the 1920s, the bond of ‘specificity’ linking their ‘literary *nauka* as such’ and its object, ‘literature as such’, comes more clearly into focus. Their realization of *nauka*, their ‘scientific poetics’, took the form of a new way of writing theoretically about literature, one that made it possible for them to discuss both the contemporary and the historical in the same meta-language. In ‘Iskusstvo kak priem’, Shklovsky coined the term ‘estrangement’ [*ostranenie*] to describe the various ‘devices’ [*priemy*] by which literature could rescue our powers of perception from ‘automatization’ [*avtomatizatsiia*].³⁹ With a meta-language of this kind, the OPOIaZ was able to overcome the entrenched polarization in nineteenth-century Russian culture of (journalistic) ‘literary criticism’ and (academic) ‘literary *nauka*’.⁴⁰ The Formalists theorized written texts of various eras and nations, from the poetry of the Russian futurists to *One Thousand and One Nights*, with an emphasis on what unified them, their literariness. They thus replaced the polarization of *nauka* and *kritika* with that of *nauka* and literature itself, the subject and the object of the theoretical act.

³⁹ Shklovsky, ‘Iskusstvo kak priem’, all p. 7.

⁴⁰ On the construction of the dichotomy between literary criticism and literary *nauka* in nineteenth-century Russian culture, see Byford, pp. 1–13. For a Formalist account of the collapse of that dichotomy in the early twentieth century, see B. Eikhenbaum, ‘Metody i podkhody’, *Knizhnyi ugol*, 8 (1922), 13–23 (pp. 13–14): ‘Была критика — “субъективная”, импрессионистическая, философская и т. д. Выступала со своими “размышлениями” о том о сем. Была и наука — “объективная”, академическая, внутренне враждебная критике. Поучала с кафедры, уверенная в своих истинах. И вдруг — все это стало смешным анахронизмом.’

The emphasis of the OPOIaZ on a universal, ‘specific’ literariness entrenched a polarization of *nauka* and literature. As Eikhenbaum recognized in ‘Teoriia “formal’nogo metoda”’, the *nauchnost’* of the work of the Society had been made conditional on the success with which its members could isolate the ‘specificity’ of literature. Their early focus on trans-sense language [*zaum’*] made it possible for that polarization to be reproduced in their theory of language: by presenting *zaum’* as a ‘pure’ form of poetry, as the clearest expression of the poetic, they implicitly presented their own work as an equally ‘pure’ form of *nauka*. Indeed, as a body of written texts, the work of the Society was necessarily implicated in the theory of language that it had been founded in order to develop. The basic methodology of the Society was to define poetry in opposition to ‘prose’, to ‘practical’ language. Poetry was language that drew attention to itself, that had been made ‘difficult’ to cognize, whereas practical language had become less so, or ‘automatized’. Their own articles, as examples of non-poetic language, thus came into being in opposition to poetry, as part of the methodological strategy by which literariness was made into a legitimate object of study. They repeatedly exploited that polarization in their early years, often including extensive quotations from poetry in their articles, for example, so as to exaggerate the effect of juxtaposition. In a number of their articles on poetic language, they made reference to algebra as the most perfect expression of ‘scientific language’ [*nauchnyi iazyk*] and, therefore, as the polar opposite to *zaum’*.⁴¹ *Zaum’* was language that was ‘felt’, made maximally difficult so as to extend the cognitive process by which it was perceived, whereas algebra was language that erased itself, one ‘felt’ minimally so as to facilitate a

⁴¹ On algebra as the linguistic opposite of poetry, see, e.g., Shklovsky, ‘Iskusstvo kak priem’, pp. 6–7.

maximally economical mode of cognition. The early work of the Society entailed an active effort to construct *nauka* as the mirror image of poetry, to formulate their polarization in linguistic terms.

As Formalism developed into the 1920s, Shklovsky, Eikhenbaum, and Tynianov took a greater interest in the problem of literary history, in a more functional conception of the system of literature, and, in the process, distanced themselves from the exclusively linguistic focus of the OPOIaZ in its earliest years.⁴²

Tynianov was the leading Formalist theorist of literary history, developing a model of the process in which the constituent genres of literature were periodically renewed by ‘peripherally’ literary genres such as the familiar letter, genres that ‘floated’ into the ‘centre’.⁴³

Given the Formalists’ interest in the historical relativity of literature, it is significant that Shklovsky began to experiment with an ambiguously ‘literary’ prose style in the course of his theoretical work. He produced three such ‘experimental’ books during his exile in Germany in 1922–23: *Khod konia* (1923), *Sentimental'noe puteshestvie* (1923), and *Zoo, ili pis'ma ne o liubvi* (1923). Shklovsky’s works were ‘felt’ as literature while nevertheless retaining what Tynianov termed a ‘potent kernel of scientific thought’ [*krupnaia sol' nauchnoi*

⁴² For evidence of the shift, see, e.g., the comment about Iakubinskii in B. Eikhenbaum, ‘Metody i podkhody’, p. 19: ‘Якубинский [...] соблазнился наивно, как лингвист, с высоты своей научной позиции’. See also the distinction made between linguistics and poetics in B. Eikhenbaum, *Melodika russkogo liricheskogo stikha* (Petrograd: OPOIaZ, 1922), p. 14.

⁴³ See Iurii Tynianov, ‘O literaturnom fakte’, *Lef*, 2 (6) (1924), 100–16 (p. 103).

mysli].⁴⁴ Shklovsky had not collapsed the polarization of *nauka* and literature, but allowed the two to come more closely into contact within a single work. A number of the letters comprising *Zoo*, for example, include comments about the status of the letter as a literary genre.⁴⁵ *Zoo* was a work of *nauka* and literature simultaneously, as Tynianov recognized in a comparison of the book to Heine's collections of poetry.⁴⁶ Since the Formalists were convinced of the historical significance of the periphery of literature as the source of new literary phenomena, the motor of its 'evolution', they began to conceptualize their own peripherally literary work as essential to the same process, to the transformation of Russian prose at the beginning of the 1920s.⁴⁷ They allowed their practice of genres associated with *nauka* to come into contact with literature, that is, so as to participate in the development of the contemporary literary process. It could be argued that the very formulation used by Eikhenbaum, 'literary science' [*literaturnaia nauka*],⁴⁸ was ambiguous, since, though the adjective referred principally to a particular field of study (the science of literature), it also suggested an oxymoronic characterization of that science (a science that was literary in character).

In the early 1920s, Shklovsky, Eikhenbaum, and Tynianov wrote explicitly about the possibility of a different type of *nauka*, one presented in a more 'literary'

⁴⁴ Tynianov, 'Literaturnoe segodnia', p. 305.

⁴⁵ See, e.g., letter nineteen in Viktor Shklovsky, *Zoo, ili pis'ma ne o liubvi* (Berlin: Gelikon, 1923), pp. 74–75.

⁴⁶ Tynianov, 'Literaturnoe segodnia', p. 305.

⁴⁷ Cf. Viktor Shklovsky, 'Sovremenniki i sinkhronisty', *Russkii sovremennik*, 3 (1924), 232–37 (p. 237): 'Русская [...] проза сейчас распадается на составные части так, как недавно распадалась поэзия в руках первых футуристов'.

⁴⁸ Eikhenbaum, 'Teoriia "formal'nogo metoda"', in *Literatura*, p. 120.

manner. In the early 1920s, they all used the adjective ‘gay’ [*veselyi*] to describe the ideal practice of conceptual prose writing, an allusion to the Nietzschean concept of the ‘gay science’ [*die fröhliche Wissenschaft*].⁴⁹ The term *gaya scienza*, which originated in Provençal culture of the High Middle Ages, was originally a synonym for the art of poetry.⁵⁰ Nietzsche himself glossed the term as ‘that unity of *singer, knight, and free spirit* which distinguishes the wonderful early culture of the Provençals from all equivocal cultures’.⁵¹ For the OPOIaZ, the concept of a *gay nauka* seems to have meant a more ‘literary’ form of conceptual prose, one akin to Nietzsche’s more ‘literary’ mode of *Wissenschaft*. In 1922, Eikhenbaum argued that the unusually ‘gay’ mode of presentation cultivated by the OPOIaZ distinguished its members from their many ‘morose’ contemporaries: ‘Нас язвительно называют “веселыми историками литературы”. Что ж? Это не так плохо. [...] Мрачных работников у нас было довольно — не пора ли попробовать иначе?’⁵²

The turn to the question of literary history had further ramifications for the relation of interdependence between *nauka* and literature in the work of the Society.

⁴⁹ On the allusions to Nietzsche in the work of the OPOIaZ of the early 1920s, see M. O. Chudakova, comm. to Tynianov, ‘Zhurnal, kritik, chitatel' i pisatel'’, in *PILK*, pp. 147–50; and Dragan Kujundžić, *The Returns of History: Russian Nietzscheans After Modernity* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997), pp. 9–13.

⁵⁰ See Walter Kaufmann, ‘Translator’s Introduction’, in Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Gay Science*, ed. and trans. by Walter Kaufmann (New York: Vintage Books, 1974), pp. 3–26 (pp. 5–6).

⁵¹ Ibid., pp. 3–26 (p. 6, emphasis in original).

⁵² B. Eikhenbaum, ‘5 = 100’, *Knizhnyi ugol*, 8 (1922), 38–41 (p. 40). His argument anticipated Arkadii Gornfel'd’s critique of the Formalists as theorists who had debased questions ‘of purely scientific method’ [*chisto nauchnogo metoda*] by bringing them ‘onto the street’ [*na ulitsu*], by making them the topics of a *krikliivaia publitsistika*. See A. Gornfel'd, ‘Formalisty i ikh protivniki’, *Literaturnye zapiski*, 3 (1922), 5–6 (all quotations p. 5).

Shklovsky, Eikhenbaum, and Tynianov's increased interest in the historical development of literature led them to reflect on their own role in history, on the historical significance of the OPOIaZ. They made their theory of history into its own object: during the early 1920s, as they were formulating their theory of literary history, they were simultaneously generalizing it, describing their own work in the same terms. Thus, they described the formation of the OPOIaZ as historically analogous to the formation of a new literary genre: a 'revolution' in literary studies, the culmination of an antagonistic 'struggle' among competing trends, a historical 'rupture', and an intellectual phenomenon itself at risk of becoming 'automatized' through an inevitable 'canonization'.⁵³ Their application of their theory of history to themselves had the effect of further complicating the relationship between *nauka* and literature, by making the two subject to the laws of a single conception of historical development. Shklovsky's sudden departure for Germany in March 1922 served only to accelerate the process of self-historicization, since it was symbolic of an effective end to the work of the Society proper.⁵⁴ The same generalization of theory, the promotion of its self-referentiality, continued into the late 1920s. The opening pages of Eikhenbaum's 'Teoriia "formal'nogo metoda"', for example, include descriptions of '*nauka*' that mirrored his conception of literature as an inherently dynamic process.⁵⁵

⁵³ For many such self-referential comments, see Eikhenbaum 'Metody i podkhody'; and idem, '5 = 100'. See also the published excerpts of Eikhenbaum's diary of the early 1920s in Bérard-Zarzycka; and M. O. Chudakova, 'Sotsial'naia praktika, filologicheskaiia refleksii i literatura v nauchnoi biografii Eikhenbauma i Tynianova', in *TS*, 2 (1986), pp. 103–31. For a discussion of Formalist 'metahistory', see Ilya Kalinin, 'Istoriia literatury mezhdu parodie i dramoi. K voprosu o metaistorii russkogo formalizma', *NLO*, 50 (2001), 287–95.

⁵⁴ For information about the sudden end to the OPOIaZ proper in 1922, see Krusanov, vol. 2, kn. 1, p. 304.

⁵⁵ Eikhenbaum, 'Teoriia "formal'nogo metoda"', in *Literatura*, esp. pp. 116–17.

After 1924, Shklovsky, Eikhenbaum, and Tynianov shifted the focus of their theoretical work away from the problem of literary history as a process of immanent development towards the problem of how everyday life [*byt*] was involved in that process. The ‘social’ turn in their theoretical work of the late 1920s has often been presented in part as a response to the increasingly powerful Marxist critiques of Formalism, as an attempt on their part to give consideration to social questions without renouncing the fundamental principles of their doctrine.⁵⁶ Although Eikhenbaum and Tynianov approached the problem of *byt* differently,⁵⁷ and Tynianov, Shklovsky, and Jakobson all explicitly distanced themselves from Eikhenbaum’s ‘eclectic’ theory of ‘literary *byt*’,⁵⁸ their shared eagerness to theorize the extra-literary factors in the development of literature served further to reconfigure the original relationship between literature and *nauka* on which the OPOIaZ had been founded. Jan Levchenko argues that Shklovsky and Eikhenbaum’s interest in the late 1920s in social questions, and especially in biography, had a profound effect on the manner in which they practised *nauka*: such texts as Shklovsky’s *Tret’ia fabrika* (1926) and Eikhenbaum’s *Moi vremennik* (1929) were works of *nauka* in which the role of the ‘autobiographical “I”’ was strongly accentuated.⁵⁹ Tomáš Glanc notes the clear applicability to the OPOIaZ of

⁵⁶ See, e.g., Victor Erlich, *Russian Formalism: History — Doctrine*, 4th edn (The Hague and New York: Mouton, 1981), pp. 99–140, pp. 192–211.

⁵⁷ On Tynianov and Eikhenbaum’s disagreement in the late 1920s, see A. P. Chudakov, M. O. Chudakova, and E. A. Toddes, comm. to Tynianov, ‘O literaturnoi evoliutsii’, in *PILK*, pp. 518–30.

⁵⁸ Note, e.g., Shklovsky, letter to Jakobson of 16 February 1929, as quoted in Chudakova, ‘Sotsial’naia praktika’, p. 120: ‘Борис Михайлович [Эйхенбаум] в последних работах разложился до эклектики. Его лит[ературный] быт — вульгарнейший марксизм.’

⁵⁹ Jan Levchenko, *Drugaia nauka: russkie formalisty v poiskakh biografii* (Moscow: Izdatel'skii dom NIU VShE, 2012), pp. 83–218. See esp. the comment on p. 38: ‘интерес представляют [...] альтернативные формы рефлексии над

Eikhenbaum's heightened theoretical interest in the late 1920s in the significance of social groups (literary societies and circles) for the historical development of literature.⁶⁰ Furthermore, the Formalists began individually to publish collections of their most significant theoretical articles during the mid-1920s, the first example being Eikhenbaum's *Skvoz' literaturu* (1924). The authorial collection of articles became an important tool of self-historicization for the Formalists — if not a form of autobiography — because it allowed them to manipulate the manner of their inclusion into the history of literary theory. It was also representative of the same reconfiguration of the relation between *nauka* and literature: by establishing connections between their old theoretical articles, and packaging them into a new whole, the Formalists were implementing what they had originally identified as 'literary' devices of composition. Their strategy of expanding the application of such devices allowed them to develop a new mode of *nauka*, to make theoretical arguments with literary means.

The brief outline given above of the development of an interdependent relation between literature and *nauka* demonstrates that their original polarization was repeatedly reconfigured as the Formalist project developed in the late 1910s and 1920s. The Formalist project was a unified intellectual enterprise in which the theorization of literature was formed as a mirroring of its object, as a shadow of the

материалом, каковыми оказываются тексты, посвященные литературному быту, опыты “беллетризации” и “окультуривания” маргиналов (от “Кюхли” Тынянова до “Матвея Комарова” Шкловского), наконец, собственно беллетристика, имеющая для формалистов не меньшее теоретическое значение, чем пре- и дескриптивные опыты рубежа 1910–1920-х годов.’

⁶⁰ Tomáš Glanc, ‘The Russian Formalists as a Community’, in *Theoretical Schools and Circles in the Twentieth-Century Humanities. Literary Theory, History, Philosophy*, ed. by Marina Grishakova and Silvi Salupere (London and New York: Routledge, 2015), pp. 1–22 (p. 14).

literary. The creation of immanent literariness, an autonomous object of investigation, required a correspondingly immanent *nauka*, an activity oriented exclusively towards that object. Even in the late 1920s, by which time Shklovsky, Eikhenbaum, and Tynianov had distanced themselves from their original focus on immanent literariness, the original polarization of *nauka* and literature on which the OPOIaZ had been founded continued to resonate. Indeed, it continued to resonate for the duration of the project of ‘literary theory’ into the late twentieth century.

Before coming to a delineation of the precise topics to be examined in the present work, let us first consider in detail the existing critical literature on Formalism. Although there is not space here for a review of the critical literature in its entirety, what follows is an attempt, first, to characterize a few important trends in scholarship on the movement and, second, to address in greater detail those most immediately relevant here.

Victor Erlich’s *Russian Formalism* (1955) introduced the Formalists’ theoretical work to a Western audience,⁶¹ and its publication was followed by several decades of increasing interest in the movement.⁶² Further monographs were published in

⁶¹ Victor Erlich, *Russian Formalism: History — Doctrine* (The Hague: Mouton, 1955).

⁶² See, e.g., the following major publications of Formalist theoretical work: *Russian Formalist Criticism*, ed. by Lee T. Lemon and Marion J. Reis (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1965); *Théorie de la littérature; Texte der russischen Formalisten*, Band I: Zur allgemeinen Literaturtheorie und zur Theorie der Prosa, ed. by Juri Striedter (Munich: Fink, 1969); *Texte der russischen Formalisten*, Band II: Texte zur Theorie des Verses und der poetischen Sprache, ed. by Wolf-Dieter Stempel (Munich: Fink, 1972); *Readings in Russian Poetics: Formalist and Structuralist Views*, ed. by Krystyna Pomorska (Cambridge, MA:

the 1960s–1980s, the major examples being those by Krystyna Pomorska (1968), Ewa Thompson (1971), Fredric Jameson (1972), R. H. Stacy (1977), Aage A. Hansen-Löve (1978), Tony Bennett (1979), Peter Steiner (1984), and Jurij Striedter (1989).⁶³ In general, as literary theory was progressively institutionalized in Western universities, Formalism was with ever greater certainty identified as an early stage in the development of that project — if not as its ultimate origin. The authors of the later monographs cited above tend to take for granted the nature of Formalism as a moment in the history of literary theory and devote their attention to the parallels between it and other literary-theoretical developments (such as Marxist literary theory, the work of the Prague Linguistic Circle, Anglo-American New Criticism, and French structuralism). Steiner identifies Formalism ultimately as an “interparadigmatic” stage in the history of literary theory’.⁶⁴

For the purposes of the present work, Pomorska’s, Hansen-Löve’s, and Steiner’s studies are the most illuminating. In the introduction to her monograph on the

MIT Press, 1971); *Russian Formalism: A Collection of Articles and Texts in Translation*, ed. by Stephen Bann and John E. Bowlt (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1973). Note also Lawrence Michael O’Toole and Ann Shukman’s *Russian Poetics in Translation* (1975–83), vol. 4: Formalist Theory (1977), vol. 5: Formalism: History, Comparison, Genre (1978), and vol. 9: The Poetics of Cinema (1982).

⁶³ Krystyna Pomorska, *Russian Formalist Theory and its Poetic Ambiance* (The Hague: Mouton, 1968); Thompson; Fredric Jameson, *The Prison-House of Language: A Critical Account of Russian Formalism and French Structuralism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1972); R. H. Stacy, *Defamiliarization in Language and Literature* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1977); Aage A. Hansen-Löve, *Der russische Formalismus: Methodologische Rekonstruktion seiner Entwicklung aus dem Prinzip der Verfremdung* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1978); Tony Bennett, *Formalism and Marxism* (New York: Methuen, 1979); Peter Steiner, *Russian Formalism: A Metapoetics* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1984); Jurij Striedter, *Literary Structure, Evolution, and Value: Russian Formalism and Czech Structuralism Reconsidered* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989).

⁶⁴ Steiner, p. 10.

‘poetic ambiance’ of Formalism, Pomorska reconstructs Formalist theory as a ‘generalization’ of futurist poetics. Her approach makes it possible to problematize the representation of Formalism as a purely intellectual movement. She argues that ‘the theory of literature is a generalization of literature, that is, of literary practice’ and that the theory of literature developed by the OPOIaZ was therefore a ‘particular product of the Futurist movement in literature’.⁶⁵ Hansen-Löve’s monumental study of Formalism is relevant here, in addition to its comprehensive treatment of Formalist literary theory, in that it explores two aspects of the relationship between theory and literature. First, like Pomorska, he looks for the origins of the fundamental concept of *ostranenie* in various poetic movements with reference above all to the early twentieth-century avant-garde.⁶⁶ Second, he explores what he calls the ‘projection of theory into practice’ in the 1920s,⁶⁷ examining in particular how the Formalists made their literary criticism into a ‘realization of [their] method’, how they applied their theories of plot construction in the development of their own, ‘Formalist prose’, and how they practised other ‘literary-scientific hybrid genres’.⁶⁸ Steiner’s study of the work of the Formalists, a ‘typology for the theoretical models that they applied to the study of literature’,

⁶⁵ Pomorska, pp. 11, 17.

⁶⁶ Hansen-Löve, pp. 19–172.

⁶⁷ Ibid., p. 14 (quot. from foreword).

⁶⁸ Ibid., pp. 510–70 (quotations: pp. 510, 515, 563). On the ‘projection of theory into practice’ with reference to Shklovsky’s prose in particular, see also Gary Saul Morson, *The Boundaries of Genre: Dostoevsky’s Diary of a Writer and the Traditions of Literary Utopia* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981), pp. 39–68; Verena Dohrn, *Die Literaturfabrik: die frühe autobiographische Prosa V. B. Šklovskijs* (München: O. Sagner, 1987); and Beate Jonscher, *Viktor Šklovskij. Leben und Werk bis zum Beginn der dreißiger Jahre unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Verfremdungsbegriffes und seiner Entwicklung* (Jena: Jenzig, 1994).

pioneered a new approach to Formalism.⁶⁹ He identifies three principal groups of interrelated metaphors in their work: the machine, the organism, and the system. Steiner underscores the significance of language in the development of theoretical models.

Let us briefly consider one important trend in late Soviet scholarship on the Formalists. Whereas their articles were generally republished as part of collective publications in the West, the Formalists received more individualized attention in Russia, their articles being republished principally in authorial collections accompanied by scholarly commentaries. Two early examples were the republication of Tynianov's *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka* (1965) and the publication of a collection of his articles on early nineteenth-century literature, *Pushkin i ego sovremenniki* (1969).⁷⁰ The turning point, however, came with the publication of Tynianov's *Poetika. Istoriiia literatury. Kino* (1977), a collection of his articles accompanied by a meticulously researched commentary by A. P. Chudakov, M. O. Chudakova, and E. A. Toddes. The authors of the commentary made extensive use of unpublished archival materials, notably the correspondence between Shklovsky, Eikhenbaum, and Tynianov, together with Eikhenbaum's diary, and also incorporated first-hand evidence obtained from those participants in the development of Formalism who were still alive in the 1970s, including Shklovsky and Lidiia Ginzburg.

⁶⁹ Steiner, p. 43.

⁷⁰ Iu. N. Tynianov, *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka: stat'i* (Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1965); idem, *Pushkin i ego sovremenniki* (Moscow: Nauka, 1969).

The publication of *Poetika. Istoriia literatury. Kino* initiated a tradition of scholarship on the OPOIaZ, one that found subsequent expression in the conferences held every two years in Tynianov's native town of Rēzekne since 1982, the Tynianovskie chteniia, whose proceedings have been published in the form of the corresponding *Tynianovskie sborniki* since 1984. The early *Tynianovskie sborniki* included a number of major publications in which previously unpublished material was made available.⁷¹ Excerpts from Eikhenbaum's diary and from the correspondence between Shklovsky, Eikhenbaum, and Tynianov were also published elsewhere.⁷² The same group of scholars were involved in the preparation of similarly well-researched editions of the works of others associated with the OPOIaZ, including Eikhenbaum and Shklovsky.⁷³ Although it lies far beyond the scope of the present work, the significance of the tradition of the Tynianovskie chteniia in itself, with its self-

⁷¹ See esp. M. O. Chudakova and E. A. Toddes, 'Tynianov v vospominaniakh sovremennika', in *TS*, 1 (1984), pp. 78–104; Chudakova, 'Sotsial'naia praktika'; L. Ia. Ginzburg, 'Eshche raz o starom i novom (Pokolenie na povorote)', in *TS*, 2 (1986), pp. 132–40; Shklovsky, 'Iz perepiski Shklovskogo', in *TS*, 3 (1988), pp. 494–512 (ed. by R. M. Iangirov); 'Perepiska B. M. Eikhenbauma i V. M. Zhirmunskogo', in *TS*, 3 (1988), pp. 256–329 (ed. by N. A. Zhirmunskaiia and E. A. Toddes); and L. Ia. Ginzburg, 'Vspominaia Institut istorii iskusstv', in *Tynianovskii sbornik*, vyp. 5: chetvertye Tynianovskie chteniia (Riga: 1990), pp. 278–89.

⁷² See esp. Eikhenbaum, 'Muchitel'no rabotaiu nad stat'ei o Tolstom', *Voprosy literatury*, 3 (1978), 308–14 (ed. by Tat'iana Bek); idem, 'Rabota nad Tolstym. Iz dnevnikov 1926–1959 gg.', in *Kontekst. 1981* (Moscow: Nauka, 1982), pp. 263–302 (ed. by S. A. Mitrokhina); 'Iz perepiski Iu. Tynianova i B. Eikhenbauma s V. Shklovskim', *Voprosy literatury*, 12 (1984), 185–218 (ed. by O. Panchenko); Bérard-Zarzycka; Eikhenbaum, 'Iz pisem k V. V. Shklovskomu', *Neva*, 5 (1987), 156–64 (ed. by M. O. Chudakova); and Eikhenbaum, "'Budushchee — neizvestno..." Iz dnevnikov B. M. Eikhenbauma 1917–1918 godov', *Kommunist*, 5 (1991), 52–59.

⁷³ B. Eikhenbaum, *O literature: raboty raznykh let*, ed. by M. O. Chudakova, E. A. Toddes, and A. P. Chudakov (Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1987); Viktor Shklovsky, *Gamburgskii schet: stat'i — vospominaniia — esse, 1914–1933*, ed. by A. Iu. Galushkin and A. P. Chudakov (Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1990).

consciously historical orientation and stylized publishing practices, remains to be examined as a phenomenon of the late Soviet period.⁷⁴

After a period of relative neglect in the 1990s, not coincidentally a decade often associated with the ‘death’ of literary theory, the twenty-first century has seen a resurgence of interest in the work of the OPOIaZ, both within Russia and beyond, though the focus has shifted from an attempt to explicate the Formalists’ ideas, and perhaps even to provide the definitive theory of literature, towards an attempt to resituate them in the intellectual, cultural, and institutional context in which they worked.

Two of the leading intellectual historians of early twentieth-century Russia to have worked on Formalism are Ilona Svetlikova and Galin Tihanov. Svetlikova has produced a major monograph on the pervasive ‘psychologism’ of Petrograd Formalism and Tihanov has written on many topics of direct relevance to the movement, among them the politics of Shklovsky’s wartime work and the project of literary theory more generally as a response to a historically and geographically specific experience of modernity.⁷⁵ Numerous other scholars have made major contributions to the intellectual history of Formalism.⁷⁶

⁷⁴ Note also that another group of scholars, led by M. I. Shapir and others associated with the journal *Philologica*, undertook to remedy the comparative neglect of the MLK by reconstructing its doctrine as distinct from that of the OPOIaZ, an endeavour involving the publication of archival documents related to the circle. They include important works by such previously overlooked members of the MLK as Maksim Kenigsberg, Aleksandr Romm, and Boris Iarkho.

⁷⁵ Ilona Svetlikova, *Istoki russkogo formalizma: traditsiia psikhologizma i formal'naia shkola* (Moscow: NLO, 2005); Galin Tihanov, ‘Zametki o dispute marksistov i formalistov 1927-ogo goda’, *NLO*, 50 (2001), 279–86 (trans. by M. Poliakova); idem, ‘Why did Modern Literary Theory Originate in Central and

Aleksandr Dmitriev and Jan Levchenko, the authors of the article ‘Nauka kak priem’ (2001), make an important contribution to the intellectual history of Formalism with a focus on the question of *nauchnost*.⁷⁷ Their application to the movement of sophisticated late twentieth-century sociologies and philosophies of science makes it possible for them to raise many new questions about, for example, the emergence of ‘poetics’ at the beginning of the twentieth century as a ‘scientific revolution’ or ‘paradigm shift’, the function of the social circle [*kruzhok*] in early twentieth-century Russian intellectual culture, and the political implications of a disinterested or ‘pure’ science. However, it prevents them from exploring a major specificity of the Formalist case, the way in which they defined *nauka* and literature in contradistinction to each other.

Two other scholars, Carol Any and Catherine Depretto, have taken what might be called a more biographical approach, focussing on the intertwined lives of

Eastern Europe?; idem, ‘The Politics of Estrangement: The Case of the Early Shklovsky’, *Poetics Today*, 26 (2005), 665–96.

⁷⁶ See esp. *Russkaia teoriia, 1920–1930-e gody. Materialy 10-kh Lotmanovskikh chtenii* (Moskva, dekabr' 2002 g.), ed. by Sergei Zenkin (Moscow: RGGU, 2004); Sergueï Tchougounnikov, ‘Éduard Sievers et la phonétique allemande du début du 20-e s. Les sources allemandes des théorisations russes de la charpente sonore du langage’, *Histoire Épistémologie Langage*, 29 (2007), 145–62; Douglas Robinson, *Estrangement and the Somatics of Literature: Tolstoy, Shklovsky, Brecht* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008), pp. 79–132; *Evropeiskii kontekst russkogo formalizma: K probleme estetieskikh peresechenii. Frantsiia, Germaniia, Italiia, Rossiia*, ed. by Ekaterina Dmitrieva, Michel Espagne, and Valerii Zemskov (Moscow: IMLI RAN, 2009); David Romand and Sergueï Tchougounnikov, ‘Le formalisme russe: une séduction cognitiviste’, *Cahiers du monde russe*, 51 (2010), 521–46; Rad Borislavov, ‘Revolution is Evolution: Evolution as a Trope in Šklovskij’s Literary History’, *Russian Literature*, 69 (2011), 209–38; Jessica Merrill, ‘Fol’kloristicheskie osnovaniia knigi Viktora Shklovskogo “O teorii prozy”’, *NLO*, 133 (2015), 197–213 (trans. by Natal’ia Movnina); and Patrick Flack, ‘Le formalisme russe entre ferment néo-kantien et linguistique structurale’, in *L’arrière-plan linguistique du formalisme russe*, ed. by Sylvie Archambault and Sergeï Tchougounnikov (Paris: forthcoming).

⁷⁷ Dmitriev and Levchenko.

Shklovsky, Eikhenbaum, and Tynianov in terms of their educational background, personal relationships, and institutional affiliations.⁷⁸ Important comparative work continues to be done on Formalism in relation to, for example, Arzamas,⁷⁹ the early nineteenth-century literary society of which Pushkin was a member, and Mikhail Bakhtin.⁸⁰ Note also the work done on the so-called *mladoformalisty*, the younger generation of the Formalists (including Boris Bukhshtab, Lidiia Ginzburg, and Nikolai Stepanov), those who studied under Tynianov and Eikhenbaum at the State Institute for the History of the Arts (GII).⁸¹

The journal *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* (NLO) has dedicated several special issues to Formalism.⁸² The same journal and others have published articles in

⁷⁸ Carol Any, *Boris Eikhenbaum: Voices of a Russian Formalist* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1994); Catherine Depretto, *Le Formalisme en Russie* (Paris: Institut d'Études Slaves, 2009).

⁷⁹ Efim Kurganov, *Arzamas i OPOIaZ* (St Petersburg: Zvezda, 1998).

⁸⁰ Note, e.g., the following studies of Bakhtin in which Formalism is discussed in some detail: Gary Saul Morson and Caryl Emerson, *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a Prosaics* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1990); Igor Shaitanov, 'Zhanrovoe slovo u Bakhtina i formalistov', *Voprosy literatury*, 3 (1996), 89–114; Galin Tihanov, *The Master and The Slave: Lukács, Bakhtin, and the Ideas of Their Time* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000); Alastair Renfrew, *Towards a New Materialist Aesthetics: Bakhtin, Genre and the Fates of Literary Theory* (London: Legenda, 2006); idem, 'The Dialectics of Parody', *Poetics Today*, 33 (2012) 301–28.

⁸¹ Denis Ustinov, 'Formalizm i mladoformalisty. Stat'ia pervaiia: postanovka problemy', *NLO*, 50 (2001), 296–321; Stanislav Savitskii, 'Spor s uchitelem: nachalo literaturnogo/issledovatel'skogo proekta L. Ginzburg', *NLO*, 82 (2006), 129–54; and 'Mladoformalisty': *Russkaia Proza*, ed. by Jan Levchenko (St Petersburg: Petropolis, 2007). See also Lidiia Ginzburg, 'Pis'ma B. Ia. Bukhshtabu', *NLO*, 82 (2006), 325–86 (ed. by D. V. Ustinov).

⁸² '1920-e gody kak intellektual'nyi resurs: v pole formalizma', *NLO*, 50 (2001); 'Filosofskie traektorii russkogo formalizma', *NLO*, 80 (2006); "'Postakademicheskaia" filologiya 1910–1920-x godov: idei i institutsii', *NLO*, 86 (2007); 'Viktor Shklovskii: figury i zhanry (I)', *NLO*, 128 (2014); 'Viktor Shklovskii: figury i zhanry (II)', *NLO*, 133 (2015). For special issues of other journals, see esp. the following: 'La destinée de l'œuvre de Ju. N. Tynjanov', *Revue des études slaves*, 55 (1983), 405–521; 'Èjxenbaum: la mémoire du siècle',

which archival materials of relevance to the history of Formalism have been made available or quoted at length.⁸³

There have been several doctoral theses and candidate dissertations on Tynianov's literary theory, literary history, and literary criticism,⁸⁴ and an even larger number on his historical fiction and film work.⁸⁵ There are also a number of important unpublished theses of relevance to Formalism more generally.⁸⁶

Revue des études slaves, 57 (1985), 27–173; 'Tynianov', *Littérature*, 95 (1994), 52–94; 'Estrangement Revisited (I)', *Poetics Today*, 26 (2005), 579–753.

⁸³ See esp. 'Materialy disputa "Marksizm i formal'nyi metod" 6 marta 1927 g.', *NLO*, 50 (2001), 247–78 (ed. by D. Ustinov) (p. 259); and 'Beseda o formal'nom metode v petrogradskoi assotsiatsii 10 dekabria 1922 goda', *Zvezda*, 8 (2004), 145–60 (ed. by V. G. Belous).

⁸⁴ Barbara Korpan Bundy, 'Jurij Tynjanov and Cleanth Brooks: A Comparative Study in Russian Formalism and Anglo-American New Criticism' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Indiana University, 1970); S. G. Freels Rosengrant, 'The Theoretical Criticism of Ju. N. Tynyanov' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Stanford University, 1976); Michael R. Sosa, 'Jurij Tynjanov: Method and Theory' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1987); E. P. Berezhnaia, 'Evgenii Onegin v literaturovedcheskoi kontseptsii Iu. N. Tynianova' (unpublished candidate thesis, Novosibirsk State University, 2007).

⁸⁵ See esp. Larry Philip Joseph, 'From Literary Theory to Fiction: An Interpretive Biography of Yury Tynyanov in the 1920s' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Stanford University, 1994); and Anna Rush, 'The Generic Originality of Iurii Tynianov's Representation of Pushkin in the Novels "Pushkin" and "The Gannibals"' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of St Andrews, 2011).

⁸⁶ See esp. Richard Sheldon, 'Viktor Borisovich Shklovsky: Literary Theory and Practice, 1914–1930' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Michigan, 1966); Stephen Rudy, 'Jakobsonian Poetics of the Moscow and Prague Periods' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Yale University, 1978); Samuel Eisen, 'Politics, Poetics, and Profession: Viktor Shklovskii, Boris Eikhenbaum and the Understanding of Literature (1919–1936)' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Stanford University, 1994); Mariia Umnova, 'Literaturnaia kritika formal'noi shkoly: teoreticheskie osnovaniia i praktika, na mater'iale kriticheskikh rabot Iu. N. Tynianova' (unpublished candidate thesis, Moscow State University, 1996); Paula Powell Sapienza, 'A Study of Selected Terms in the Rhetorical Dictionary of Viktor Sklovskij, 1914–1933' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Michigan, 1997); Lynne Ellen Ikach, 'Reinventing the Self: Five Narrative Personae in the Autobiographical Works of Viktor Shklovskii' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, 1997); Jan Levchenko, *Istoriia i fiktsiia v tekstakh V. Shklovskogo i B. Eikhenbauma v 20-e gody* (Tartu:

Although no one has yet published a monograph on Tynianov in English, there is one in German by Klaas-Hinrich Ehlers and one in French by Marc Weinstein.⁸⁷ While Weinstein's monograph provides an introduction to Tynianov's literary theory alongside French translations of some of his most important articles, Ehlers's monograph represents a major work of scholarship on Formalism and, indeed, on structuralism: he expands Peter Steiner's 'metaphorical' approach by tracing the development of the 'metaphorical repertoire' of the 'system' from that of the 'construction'. Ehlers, like Striedter and other prominent scholars writing in German, places emphasis on Tynianov's role in the development of structuralist thought.

The studies of greatest relevance here are those in which the Formalists' literary-fictional, literary-autobiographical, and literary-critical work is examined in light of their literary-theoretical work.

Several studies have examined Shklovsky's prose of the 1920s as an example of the 'projection of theory into practice'. A. Razumova, for example, argues that Shklovsky's 'artistic prose', and *Zoo* in particular, developed organically from his theoretical work of the early 1920s, as a means of exploring in practice the central

Tartu University Press, 2003); Rad Borislavov, 'Viktor Shklovskii: Between Art and Life' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Chicago, 2011); and Jessica Merrill, 'The Role of Folklore Study in the Rise of Russian Formalist and Czech Structuralist Literary Theory' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of California, Berkeley, 2012).

⁸⁷ Klaas-Hinrich Ehlers, *Das dynamische System. Zur Entwicklung von Begriff und Metaphorik des Systems bei Jurij N. Tynjanov* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1992); Marc Weinstein, *Tynianov, ou la poétique de la relativité* (Saint-Denis: Presses universitaires de Vincennes, 1996).

concepts of his doctrine.⁸⁸ Scholarship on Shklovsky's experimental prose is dominated by the metaphor of the 'border'. In one of the most perceptive contemporary appraisals of *Zoo*, Tynianov described it as simultaneously a 'novel, a feuilleton article, and a scientific investigation'.⁸⁹ Punning on the fact that it had been written during Shklovsky's exile in Germany, Tynianov wrote that *Zoo* was a thing 'on the border' [*na granitse*].⁹⁰ Commentators on Shklovsky's prose work of the 1920s continue to argue that he erased in practice the 'border' or 'borders' separating *nauka*, literature, and autobiography.⁹¹

Special mention should be made of Il'ia Kalinin and Jan Levchenko's recent work on the OPOIaZ. Both take a particular interest in the 'projection of theory into practice'. In a series of highly theoretical articles with a focus on Shklovsky, Kalinin argues that the continued relevance of Formalism is due not to the 'scientific heritage' [*nauchnoe nasledie*] of the movement, but to its unique historical trajectory.⁹² In a recent monograph, *Drugaiia nauka* (2012), Levchenko explores Shklovsky and Eikhenbaum's 'historical self-definition', their interest in biography, concluding that, as the 1920s progressed, they 'turned *nauka* into

⁸⁸ A. Razumova, 'Put' formalistov k khudozhestvennoi proze', *Voprosy literatury*, 3 (2004), 131–50. See also, e.g., Sergei Zenkin, 'Priklucheniia teoretika: Avtobiograficheskaia proza Viktora Shklovskogo', *Druzhba narodov*, 12 (2003), 170–83; and Emily Finer, *Turning into Sterne: Viktor Shklovskii and Literary Reception* (Leeds: Legenda, 2010), pp. 100–29.

⁸⁹ Tynianov, 'Literaturnoe segodnia', pp. 305–05.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 305.

⁹¹ See, e.g., Asiya Bulatova, 'Neumestnyi modernizm Viktora Shklovskogo: "Pis'ma ne o liubvi" i granitsy literatury', *NLO*, 133 (2015), 182–96.

⁹² See esp. Ilya Kalinin, 'Istoriia literatury'; *idem*, 'Istoriia kak iskusstvo chlenorazdel'nosti (istoricheskii opyt i metaliteraturnaia praktika russkikh formalistov)', *NLO*, 71 (2005), 103–31; *idem*, 'Istoriia literatury kak *Familienroman* (russkii formalizm mezhdu Edipom i Gamletom)', *NLO*, 80 (2006), 64–84; and *idem*, 'Priem ostraneniia kak opyt vozvyshennogo (ot poetiki pamiati k poetike literatury)', *NLO*, 95 (2009), 39–57.

literature' as a strategy to inscribe the authorial self into history.⁹³ He considers such works as Shklovsky's *Khod konia* (1923), *Tret'ia fabrika* (1926), and *Gamburgskii schet* (1928) and Eikhenbaum's *Moi vremennik* (1929) as a form of what he terms *inoskazanie teorii*.⁹⁴ He argues that, by cultivating in practice an amalgamation of *nauka*, literature, autobiography, journalism, and other modes of writing, by 'transgressing their object and metalanguage', they practised 'another science' [*drugaiia nauka*], a more performative mode of theorizing.⁹⁵ Kalinin and Levchenko make a major contribution to scholarship on the Formalists by showing not only that the experimental prose of the 1920s was of theoretical significance in its own right, but also that the manner of its presentation, its performativity, was the product of a unique experience of the historical process.

In one section of a recently published monograph on the OPOIaZ, Mariia Umnova (2013) discusses Shklovsky, Eikhenbaum, and Tynianov's literary criticism, concluding that it was a way of mediating between *nauka* and literature.⁹⁶

With regard to Tynianov, it is often argued that his historical novels were a continuation of his *nauka* and that the latter therefore holds the key to

⁹³ Levchenko, *Drugaiia nauka*, pp. 9, 279. See p. 9 for the clearest statement of the central argument: 'предмет книги можно определить как самосознание петербургской ветви формальной школы в лице Виктора Шкловского и Бориса Эйхенбаума'.

⁹⁴ Ibid., p. 10.

⁹⁵ Ibid., p. 279.

⁹⁶ Mariia Umnova, '*Delat' veshchi nuzhnye i veselye*': *Avangardnye ustanovki v teorii literatury i kritike OPOIaZa* (Moscow: Progress-Traditsiia, 2013), pp. 95–141, pp. 142–45.

understanding the former.⁹⁷ In a 2003 monograph on Tynianov's 'Voskovaia persona' (1931), Arkadii Bliumbaum calls for a reversal of the approach, arguing that Tynianov's fiction could be considered of vital significance to his theoretical work: 'настало время именно литературных сочинений Тынянова и здесь становится очевидным значение его теоретических работ, остающихся исключительно важными при изучении его литературы.'⁹⁸ Andrew Wachtel takes a novel approach to the problem: he compares Tynianov's literary-historical and historical-fictional treatments of the life of the archaist poet V. B. Kiukhel'beker.⁹⁹ Arguments about the mutual relevance of theory and fiction are strengthened by E. A. Toddes's research on Tynianov's unpublished papers: Toddes shows that Tynianov formulated new ideas for his theoretical work and his historical fiction simultaneously, that both were developed through a study of the same 'material'.¹⁰⁰

Another trend in scholarship on Tynianov has been to presuppose an underlying struggle in his oeuvre between *nauka* and literature. Kornei Chukovskii was among the first to make that argument, describing Tynianov as a man whose personality

⁹⁷ See, e.g., M. B. Iampol'skii, 'Maska i metamorfozy zreniia (zametki na poliakh "Voskovoi persony" Iu. Tynianova)', in *Tynianovskii sbornik*, vyp. 8: Piatye Tynianovskie chteniia (Riga: 1994), pp. 40–99.

⁹⁸ Arkadii Bliumbaum, *Konstruktsiia mnimosti. K poetike 'Voskovoi persony' Iu. Tynianova* (St Petersburg: Giperion, 2002), p. 20. Cf. the comment about Tynianov in Depretto, p. 173: 'Jusqu'à présent, on s'est surtout intéressé à l'influence de ses conceptions historico-littéraires sur ses romans, mais on n'a pratiquement pas posé la question du poids de sa nature artistique dans son travail de chercheur'.

⁹⁹ Andrew Wachtel, 'Zamechaniia o vzaimootnoshenii khudozhestvennykh i nauchnykh proizvedenii Tynianova', *Tynianovskii sbornik*, vyp. 9: Sed'mye Tynianovskie chteniia. Materialy dlia obsuzhdeniia (Riga and Moscow: 1995–96), pp. 222–30.

¹⁰⁰ E. A. Toddes, 'Neosushchestvlennye zamysly Tynianova', in *TS*, 1 (1984), pp. 25–45.

was split at some fundamental level between the ‘scholar’ [*uchenyi*] and the ‘artist’ [*khudozhnik*].¹⁰¹ Perhaps the most engaging discussion of this ‘struggle’ is M. L. Gasparov’s piece on *nauchnost*’ and *khudozhestvennost*’. Gasparov argues that Tynianov’s studies of early nineteenth-century Russian literary history were increasingly characterized by a form of ‘argumentation by quotation’ [*argumentatsiia tsitatami*], that *khudozhestvennost*’ was beginning to encroach on *nauchnost*’.¹⁰² He concludes that the struggle between the two was ultimately resolved in favour of the latter.¹⁰³ Gasparov suggests that the struggle in Tynianov’s work reflects a more enduring struggle in Russian culture as a whole.¹⁰⁴ It is notable that the various discussions of the interaction between *nauka* and literature in Tynianov’s work tend to reproduce Tynianov’s own model of literary history (as a process of ‘struggle’ between two forces in which one ultimately ‘pushes out’ the other).

Scholars of the work of the OPOIaZ have thus often had occasion to consider the expansion of *nauka* in Shklovsky, Eikhenbaum, and Tynianov’s work. Emphasis has been placed on the interaction of *nauka* with journalism, autobiography, and literature in their own output, and in particular on the apparent disintegration of those categories in their own careers as the 1920s progressed. It has been shown that Shklovsky and Eikhenbaum’s experimental prose of that decade was another

¹⁰¹ Chukovskii, in *Iurii Tynianov*, ed. by Kaverin, p. 114. The struggle between ‘*Tynianov-uchenyi*’ and ‘*Tynianov-khudozhnik*’ is a running theme in the other contributions to the same volume.

¹⁰² M. L. Gasparov, ‘*Nauchnost*’ i *khudozhestvennost*’ v tvorchestve Tynianova’, in *Tynianovskii sbornik*, vyp. 5: chetvertye Tynianovskie chteniia (Riga: 1990), pp. 12–20 (p. 15).

¹⁰³ Ibid., p. 18.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., pp. 14–15.

manifestation of *nauka*, a historically necessary, performative way of producing theory. The category of *nauka* itself, however, remains unproblematized. Studies of the Society continue to take as self-evident the *nauchnost'* of its theoretical work, focussing instead on how that category was brought into contact with literary practice in the 1920s.

For scholars writing in English, the very concept of *nauka* has presented an obstacle, since, though it was fundamental to how the members of the OPOIaZ conceptualized the work of the Society, it loses something in translation. As discussed above, the Russian *nauka* and English *science* are only superficially synonymous. To ask in English how the work of the Society was constructed as 'science' seems to raise only questions of epistemology and methodology. Russian scholars could be said to have faced a different obstacle. Formalism is celebrated internationally as one of the greatest Russian contributions to twentieth-century intellectual history. To problematize its *nauchnost'* therefore runs the risk of threatening to undo a national mythology by seeming to question its intellectual legitimacy. Even Levchenko, who argues convincingly that Shklovsky and Eikhenbaum practised a 'different *nauka*' towards the end of the 1920s, takes for granted the *nauchnost'* of other texts produced by the Formalists. In the introduction to his monograph, for example, he justifies his decision to focus on Shklovsky, Eikhenbaum, and, to a lesser extent, Tynianov by claiming that, conversely, such Formalists as Boris Tomashevskii and Brik were characterized by a 'more scientific' [*bolee nauchnyi*] 'type of consciousness' [*tip soznaniia*].¹⁰⁵ He largely excludes Tynianov from his study on the grounds that, unlike Shklovsky

¹⁰⁵ Levchenko, *Drugaia nauka*, p. 11.

and Eikhenbaum, Tynianov always ‘remained’ a ‘scholar’ [*uchenyi*].¹⁰⁶ Aside from the problem of a certain vagueness, such formulations reflect an acceptance of the category of *nauka* in the work of the Society as ultimately unproblematic.

The present work makes an attempt to deconstruct the category of *nauka* in the work of the OPOIaZ, to explore how it was conceptualized as the mirror image of literature, how their inseparability was basic to the Formalist project. For the core members of the Society, *nauka* ultimately did not have ‘borders’: *nauka* was not capable simply of being brought ‘closer’ to other modes of writing through the development of a ‘more literary’ prose, for example. For Tynianov to have made *nauka* ‘more literary’ by increasing the number of first-person interjections in his literary-theoretical articles, for example, would ultimately have amounted only to a superficial change, since the OPOIaZ had, from the beginning of its work, inscribed *nauka* within literature, defining the two in contradistinction to each other. Formalism was fundamentally a creative activity, a self-sufficient intellectual adventure in which, in defiance of the ‘metadiscourses of philosophy’,¹⁰⁷ literature was asserted as an autonomous, ‘specific’ object of investigation. The ‘science of literature’ was asserted as correspondingly autonomous, its scientificity irreducible to ultimately philosophical systems in

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., p. 12: ‘Юрий Тынянов оказывается несколько в тени. [...] Тынянов нигде не превращает себя в собственного же персонажа, он остается ученым [...]. Напротив, Эйхенбаум и, тем более, Шкловский устраивают непосредственную встречу своего писательского “Я” с историей, дабы тут же превратить этот факт в художественный прием.’

¹⁰⁷ The phrase belongs to Tynianov, ‘Why did Modern Literary Theory Originate in Central and Eastern Europe?’, p. 72.

which science was defined by, for example, Kantian necessity or Comtean empiricism: *nauka* was made dependent on literature alone.¹⁰⁸

The present work will therefore present the literary-theoretical work of the OPOIaZ, and in particular that of Tynianov, as the key to understanding the relation between *nauka* and literature for the movement. While Shklovsky and Eikhenbaum's 'projection of theory into practice' was clearly of major historical significance, representing as it did a new mode of theorizing, it has obscured the original polarization of *nauka* and literature in the theoretical work of the Society, their union as one. In fact, Shklovsky and Eikhenbaum's experimental prose could be conceptualized merely as a further reconfiguration of that original polarization. As for Tynianov, his historical fiction has proved something of a red herring, encouraging scholars to argue for the theoretical significance of his novels, to problematize the apparently rigid dichotomy between *nauchnost'* and *khudozhestvennost'* in his oeuvre as a whole without giving due consideration to how the Society constructed that dichotomy in the course of its literary-theoretical work.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Andrei Bely's attempts to develop a scientific aesthetics. In some articles, such as 'Printsipy formy i estetiki', he invoked Kant's definition of a 'proper science' as one whose laws had to be necessary in all cases. In others, such as 'Lirika i eksperiment', he attempted to produce an 'empirical aesthetics'. See Andrei Bely, *Simvolizm: kniga statei* (Moscow: Musaget, 1910), pp. 175-94 and pp. 231-85 respectively. For a discussion of Bely's apparently contradictory attitude towards the 'exact sciences', see Steven Cassedy, 'Introduction', in Andrei Bely, *Selected Essays of Andrey Bely*, ed. and trans. by Steven Cassedy (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1985), pp. 3-69 (esp. pp. 64-69). See also the chapter on Bely in Steven Cassedy, *Flight from Eden. The Origins of Modern Literary Criticism and Theory* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1990), pp. 162-80.

The present work builds on recent work on Shklovsky and Eikhenbaum's performative experimental prose of the 1920s, but reframes the problem slightly: instead of asking how *nauka* was made more literary in the 1920s, how theoretical insights were presented in a literary manner, it asks how *nauka* and literature were conjoined from the very inception of the Formalist project. For that reason, the proposed approach makes it possible to consider even the most conventionally 'theoretical' (that is, generically unexperimental) work of the Formalists in terms of an inescapable orientation towards literature.

The remainder of the thesis is divided into three chapters of roughly equal length. Each chapter addresses a particular configuration of the same fundamental relation of interdependence between *nauka* and literature. The progression of the chapters mirrors the chronological development of Formalism: the first chapter concerns the theory of language, the focus of the OPOIaZ in the 1910s; the second chapter concerns the early work of the Society on literary history, the theoretical problem to which its members first turned in earnest in the period 1919–24; the third chapter concerns the increasingly 'social' orientation of Formalism in the period after 1924. The first chapter, however, extends up until the late 1920s, since its subject is the most fundamental to the thesis as a whole: the original formulation of a linguistic polarization of *nauka* and literature continued to resonate for the full duration of the Formalist project, even as its exponents were developing more 'functional' models of language. The second and third chapters are more limited in historical scope, each focussing on a reconfiguration of the problem unique to a distinct phase in the history of Formalism. The historical breadth of the first chapter makes it necessary for the two subsequent chapters occasionally to return

to particular texts for a second time, but they are seen each time from a different perspective.

Since the aim here is to show how the members of the OPOIaZ conceptualized *nauka* and literature analogously, to show how the two were originally defined in opposition to each other and were therefore inseparable, the methodology adopted must to some extent necessarily be that of the Society itself. It is not possible to understand the interconnectedness of *nauka* and literature in the work of the Formalists without an extrapolation from their theoretical work on literature. The proposed strategy is thus to enter into the polarizing, binary logic of the OPOIaZ in order to articulate more fully the implicit or often explicit self-referentiality of much of what they had to say about literature, its applicability in a refracted form to *nauka*, the category in which they situated their own theoretical work.

The first chapter, 'The Language of Science', traces the development by the OPOIaZ of a linguistic polarization of *nauka* and poetry. It reconstructs the category of 'scientific language' [*nauchnyi iazyk*] in the theoretical work of the Society, a counterpart to the category of 'poetic language', and examines Tynianov's development of an analogous linguistic polarization in his theoretical work of 1924 (that between the 'word in prose' and the 'word in verse'). The aim of the chapter is to explore how the original polarization of *nauka* and poetry played out in the course of Tynianov's theoretical work of the 1920s. It is argued that Tynianov's increasingly abstract theoretical prose entailed the progressive erasure of the original polarization, as he himself recognized, and resulted in an apparently paradoxical convergence of *nauka* and poetry.

The second chapter, 'The Science of History', considers Shklovsky, Eikhenbaum, and Tynianov's theoretical work on literary history of the period 1919–24. It is argued that, during that first, exploratory period of their work on the question, they were gesturing towards a problematization of well-established late nineteenth-century dichotomies between the sciences of nature and those of history. It is argued that their early work on literary history supports parallels with various (albeit modified) natural-scientific models of change, and that Tynianov went as far as to make clear appeals to the sciences of genetics and relativistic physics, two components of a broader early twentieth-century paradigm shift in the natural sciences. The aim of the chapter is to present the early work of the OPOIaZ on literary history ultimately as a reproduction of the theory of history that it advanced. Their model of literary history was itself conceived as a historical rupture: as they came to theorize literary history as an immanent process, an endless chain of revolutions, that is, they wanted their own theorization of that process to take a correspondingly revolutionary form.

The third chapter, 'The Collection of Articles as Science', explores the authorial collections compiled by Shklovsky, Eikhenbaum, and Tynianov, largely from already-published articles, in the period 1924–30. It is argued that the authorial collection of articles became a self-consciously and nostalgically 'Formalist' genre, increasingly inseparable from a repertoire of literary 'devices' associated with the early work of the OPOIaZ on composition, and that Tynianov's *Arkhaisty i novatory* (1929) represented its culmination. The collection of articles allowed the products of *nauka* to be made 'literary' in their manner of presentation. As the Formalists turned to the theoretical problem of biography in the late 1920s, the

collection of articles offered them a means of historicizing themselves in a manner compositionally consistent with the doctrine of the OPOIaZ.

The first chapter, on the so-called ‘language of *nauka*’, and the third, on the authorial collection of articles, address questions that have, to my knowledge, been posed only in passing, if at all, in the scholarship on the OPOIaZ and have never before been given extended treatment; the second chapter addresses a well-worn topic, the work of the Society on literary history, but it does so from a fresh angle.

Taken together, the chapters explore reconfigurations of the same relation of interdependence, the original polarization of *nauka* and literature on which the OPOIaZ had been founded. The three chapters thereby aim to expand the usual consideration of such self-referential aspects of Formalism as Shklovsky’s ‘literary’ style and his and Eikhenbaum’s experimental prose of the late 1920s. Furthermore, since the progression of the chapters mirrors the development of Formalism, the work as a whole makes it possible to see the development of that relation. The original, linguistic focus of the OPOIaZ caused its members to theorize their own prose as being subject to the same cognitive laws as the language of poetry, to see *nauka* as a kind of anti-poetry. In the 1920s, Tynianov continued to make sense of his ‘language of *nauka*’, a prose marked by a high density of terminology, from a linguistic perspective rooted in the work of the OPOIaZ on ‘poetic language’. As they turned to literary history in the period 1919–24, and elevated the concept of the historical ‘break’ to its central principle, their own theorization of that process acquired a correspondingly and self-consciously revolutionary form in intellectual-historical terms. It was a practical

demonstration of its basic argument, a reproduction — in '*nauka*' — of the spirit of revolution that they believed to be the principle of that process. Towards the end of the decade, by which time the revolutionary days of the OPOIaZ had long since passed, they began to historicize the work of the Society through authorial collections of articles, odes in composition to the Society. For the duration of the Formalist project, then, Shklovsky, Eikhenbaum, and Tynianov made sense of what they were doing through a dialogue with their evolving conception of literature. Their creation of literariness, their great contribution to the intellectual history of the twentieth century, caused it to cast a shadow over their work. Formalism unfolded as an obliquely self-referential activity, offering itself as a legitimate text for the expansion of its doctrine.

Chapter One

The Language of Science (1914–30)

The members of the Society for the Study of Poetic Language (OPOIaZ) announced in the very name of their Society a focus on the study of ‘poetic language’ [*poeticheskii iazyk*], on poetry conceptualized as a category of human discourse. In order to isolate what they called the ‘specificity’ of poetry, that which made it what it was, they adopted the basic method of differentiating it formally from various other categories including ‘prosaic language’ [*prozaicheskii iazyk*], ‘practical language’ [*prakticheskii iazyk*], and ‘colloquial language’ [*razgovornyi iazyk*]. The seminal nature of what the members of the Society had to say about poetry therefore cannot be separated from the wider theory of language of which it was only one part. As the Formalist project unfolded, its leading exponents — Viktor Shklovsky, Boris Eikhenbaum, and especially Iurii Tynianov — grew increasingly conscious of the fact that the products of their work, as linguistic artefacts, were necessarily subject to the theories of language that they had been produced to advance. Even though they had focussed on poetry in particular, and literary prose as a slightly later development, their own language could not operate outside the general linguistic laws observed in the course of their work.

The present chapter addresses the question of the language of literary theory with reference to the work of the OPOIaZ in the late 1910s and to that of Tynianov in the 1920s. Any consideration of the language of Formalism owes a debt to Peter Steiner’s *Russian Formalism* (1984) and Klaas-Hinrich Ehlers’s *Das dynamische System* (1992), two pioneering studies of the most significant groups of

interconnected metaphors used by the leading exponents of the movement.¹ Much less attention, however, has been given to the question of how they conceptualized the language of their literary-theoretical work in relation to its object, how they made sense of the relationship between *nauka*, the category in which they situated their literary-theoretical work, and literature. E. P. Berezhnaia has recently taken a step in that direction. She argues that Tynianov's work on Pushkin's *Evgenii Onegin* can productively be applied to his literary-theoretical articles,² making reference in the title of one article to the 'poetics' of the *nauchnyi tekst*.³ In that article, she discusses the development of the concept of the 'hero' in Tynianov's work on the Onegin stanza, argues that his article 'O kompozitsii "Evgeniia Onegina"' is structured analogously to *Evgenii Onegin*, and ends provocatively by arranging well-known quotations from Tynianov's article 'O literaturnom fakte' (1924) into stanzaic units.⁴ Berezhnaia's reading of Tynianov's work on the early nineteenth century as self-referential is striking, but the insufficiently motivated focus on *Evgenii Onegin* results in an oblique approach to the problem of the language of his literary-theoretical work.

¹ Peter Steiner, *Russian Formalism: A Metapoetics* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1984); Klaas-Hinrich Ehlers, *Das dynamische System. Zur Entwicklung von Begriff und Metaphorik des Systems bei Jurij N. Tynjanov* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1992).

² See esp. E. P. Berezhnaia, 'Oneginskii sloi v knige Iu. N. Tynianova "Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka"', *Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta*, 4 (2009), 152–55; and idem, 'K poetike nauchnogo teksta Iu. Tynianova', *Kritika i semiotika*, 1 (2014), 149–68. See also idem, "'Evgenii Onegin" v literaturovedcheskoi kontseptsii Iu. N. Tynianova' (unpublished candidate thesis, Novosibirsk State University, 2007).

³ Cf. G. A. Levinton, 'K poetike Iakobsona (poetika filologicheskogo teksta)', in *Roman Iakobson. Teksty, dokumenty, issledovaniia*, ed. by Henryk Baran et al. (Moscow: RGGU, 1999), pp. 744–60.

⁴ Berezhnaia, 'K poetike nauchnogo teksta', esp. pp. 161–64.

The question of how the Formalists conceptualized the language of their literary-theoretical work remains an important one. The inescapable self-referentiality of any formulation — in language — of a theory of language was compounded in their case because their methodology involved the juxtaposition of the original object of their enquiries, ‘poetic language’, against other categories of discourse. Their own theoretical writing, which they identified as a practice of *nauka*, was implicated in the construction of its object by virtue of its belonging to one such rival category. In other words, the epistemological polarization of object and subject was made formal in the work of the Society through a polarization of the category of language under analysis, poetry conceptualized as ‘poetic language’, and that in which the analysis was communicated, the language of the theory of ‘poetic language’, the language of *nauka*. Since the Formalists were embarking on a new project, one institutionalized as literary theory only later, they were initially uncertain of how to represent such an activity.

The chapter begins with the work of the OPOIaZ in the 1910s in order to reconstruct the category of ‘scientific language’ [*nauchnyi iazyk*] in their original theory of language, one constructed originally as a counterpart to that of ‘poetic language’. It then moves to the early 1920s to consider how Tynianov developed the category both in theory and in practice. Emphasis is placed on what Tynianov perceived as an unbridgeable division between the language of linguistic analysis, a true language of *nauka*, and that of historical analysis, a more metaphorical language. It ends with an exploration of the language of Tynianov’s literary-theoretical work of the late 1920s, by which time he had expanded the application of the methods of linguistics to encompass history.

In the early years of the OPOIaZ in the 1910s, the members of the Society conceptualized the category of ‘poetic language’ in contradistinction to such categories as ‘prosaic language’. In their occasional comments on prosaic language, Shklovsky and Lev Iakubinskii identified *nauka* as its extreme manifestation, and, in a handful of passages in articles of the period, explored the possibility of a ‘scientific language’ [*nauchnyi iazyk*] in greater detail.

The OPOIaZ inherited its conception of *nauka* as a category of language from Russian literary scholarship of the late nineteenth century. It had been common for literary scholars of the late imperial period to conceptualize the object of their study, *literatura* or *poeziia*, as one of several fundamental categories of language, another of which was *nauka*. Andy Byford notes that many scholars established typologies among these various categories of human discourse. The typologies often took the form of a progressive continuum of categories arranged by their increasing levels of ‘objectivity’: *literatura* or *poeziia* was positioned at one extreme and *nauka* at the other; various other categories, such as *pismennost'* and *slovesnost'*, were positioned between the two poles.⁵ While *literatura* was represented in the typologies as a highly ‘accessible’ field, characterized by its ‘*obshchedostupnost'* and *obshcheinteresnost'*’, *nauka* was by contrast represented as highly ‘specialized’, accessible only to those equipped with formal training.⁶ Byford cites the literary historian Nikolai I. Kareev’s article ‘Chto takoe istoriia literaturny’ (1883) as a representative example. He explains that, ‘for Kareev, literary scholarship itself was defined as a kind of “portal” between the discourses

⁵ Andy Byford, *Literary Scholarship in Late Imperial Russia: Rituals of Academic Institutionalization* (London: Legenda, 2007), pp. 140–45.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 142.

of *nauka* and *literatura*'.⁷ Late nineteenth-century Russian literary scholars thus frequently defined *nauka* and *literatura* in terms of their functional differences, constructing the two categories, one of which they sometimes explicitly claimed as that in which they were working, in opposition to each other.

Aleksandr Potebnia was another late nineteenth-century scholar to write about the linguistic realization of *nauka*. His theory of language was subsequently developed by later generations of literary scholars and by the theoreticians of symbolism. Shklovsky, Eikhenbaum, and Tynianov all cited Potebnia and, although Shklovsky, in particular, presented a misleadingly simplistic account of his theory,⁸ they knew his work well.⁹ Above all, they acknowledged Potebnia as the originator of the concept of *poeticheskii iazyk*, though they thought that his theory of language needed to be reconsidered. In recent years, it has been shown that other traces of Potebnia's theory of language remain in the work of the OPOIaZ. Sergei Zenkin, for example, shows that Potebnia's basic concepts of 'inner form' [*vnutrenniaia forma*] and 'outer form' [*vneshniaia forma*] can be seen to live on in the early work of the Society.¹⁰

⁷ Ibid., p. 143.

⁸ See, e.g., Viktor Shklovsky, 'Iskusstvo kak priem', in *Sborniki po teorii poeticheskogo iazyka*, vyp. 2 (Petrograd: OPOIaZ, 1917), pp. 3–14 (p. 3).

⁹ See, e.g., Viktor Shklovsky, 'Potebnia', in *Poetika. Sborniki po teorii poeticheskogo iazyka* (Petrograd: Gos. tip., 1919), pp. 3–6; and Iu. N. Tynianov, [review of Rainov, *Aleksandr Afanas'evich Potebnia* (1924)], *Russkii sovremennik*, 1 (1924), 324 (signed 'Iu. T.').

¹⁰ Sergei Zenkin, 'Forma vnutrenniaia i vneshniaia (Sud'ba odnoi kategorii v russkoi teorii XX v.)', in *Russkaia teoriia. 1920–1930-e gody. Materialy 10-kh Lotmanovskikh chtenii (Moskva, dekabr' 2002 g.)*, ed. by Sergei Zenkin (Moscow: RGGU, 2004), pp. 147–67. See also I. A. Pil'shchikov, "'Vnutrenniaia forma slova" v teoriiakh poeticheskogo iazyka', *Kritika i semiotika*, 1 (2014), 54–76.

In his work of the 1860s, Potebnia had established the same juxtaposition between *nauka* and *poeziia*. He developed a ‘psycholinguistic’ theory according to which language was a representation of thought, such that to analyse the language of a speaker was to understand how that speaker thought.¹¹ The basic categories of human discourse (such as poetry and prose) therefore corresponded to fundamental modes of cognition.

Potebnia proposed that the word had three basic components: outer form [*vneshniaia forma*], content [*soderzhanie*], and inner form [*vnutrenniaia forma*]. He explained their interaction as follows: ‘В слове мы различаем: *внешняя форма*, то есть членораздельный звук; *содержание*, объективируемое посредством звука; и *внутренняя форма*, то есть ближайшее этимологическое значение слова, или тот способ, каким выражается содержание.’¹² Potebnia believed that modes of cognition (such as poetry and prose) could be differentiated from one another in accordance with precisely how they allowed the three components of the word to interact. The role of the *vnutrenniaia forma*, the closest etymological meaning of a word, was decisive. In prose, for example, the *vnutrenniaia forma* was simply the means by which the *soderzhanie* was communicated; in poetry, however, the *vnutrenniaia forma* was able to give play to a wide range of meanings.

¹¹ On Potebnia’s theory of language, see John Fizer, *Aleksandr A. Potebnja’s Psycholinguistic Theory of Literature* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986); and Thomas Seifrid, *The Word Made Self: Russian Writings on Language, 1860–1930* (Ithaca, NY, and London: Cornell University Press, 2005), pp. 7–52. Note that neither focuses on the category of *nauka* in Potebnia’s work.

¹² A. A. Potebnia, *Mysl’ i iazyk*, 2nd edn (Kharkov: tip. Adol’fa Darre, 1892), p. 178.

In his magnum opus, *Mysl' i iazyk* (1862), Potebnia included a chapter on the distinction between poetry and prose conceptualized as distinct modes of cognition.¹³ He explained that, although language as such had once been synonymous with poetry, that is, although all uses of language had once allowed the *vnutrenniaia forma* of a word to generate multiple meanings, prose had since emerged as another mode of cognition, one in which the *vnutrenniaia forma* had been reduced to a means of mere semantic equivalence. The extreme manifestation of the tendency towards the prosaic, he continued, could be defined as *nauka*.

Из языка, первоначально тождественного с поэзией, следовательно, из поэзии, возникает позднейшее разделение и противоположность поэзии и прозы [...]. Прозу принимаем здесь за науку, потому что [...] особенности прозаического настроения мысли, требующие прозаической формы, в науке достигают полной определенности и противоположности с поэзией.¹⁴

Potebnia understood prose as an intermediary step on the path from poetry to *nauka*, such that *nauka* was simply an extreme case of what, elsewhere, he termed *prozaichnost'*. He went on, later in the chapter, to explain that the most perfect realization of *nauka*, and therefore the most perfect contrast to poetry, must be mathematics, given its high degree of 'abstractness' [*otvlechnost'*].¹⁵

Mathematics was the most 'objective' possible discourse.¹⁶ Potebnia's association of *nauka* with objectivity can be considered typical in light of Byford's argument about the self-representational strategies of late nineteenth-century Russian literary scholars.

¹³ Ibid., pp. 177–228. On *nauka* as a discursive category, see esp. pp. 198–205.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 201.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 204.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 204.

Potebnia developed his ideas about the discourse of *nauka* in the posthumously published *Iz zapisok po teorii slovesnosti* (1905). He attempted to express his theory of language mathematically. The following formulae, in which the term *obraz* was analogous to *vnutrenniaia forma* and *znachenie* to *soderzhanie*, constituted his attempt to represent the difference between poetry and prose:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{poetry:} & A (\text{образ}) < X (\text{значение}) \\ \text{prose:} & A (\text{образ}) = X (\text{значение})^{17} \end{array}$$

Potebnia meant that poetry made it possible for the *obraz*, the inner form of a word, to be magnified, producing a higher volume of content, or a larger number of meanings, such that they amounted to more than the *obraz* itself; in prose, by contrast, the meaning of a word was more predictable, a simple transposition of its *obraz*, such that *obraz* and *znachenie* could be considered equivalent components. The poetic word could thus be said to be ‘allegorical’, allowing for the semantic transformation of the *obraz*, whereas the prosaic word — and the *nauchnoe slovo* especially — was ‘tautological’, a mere reproduction of the *obraz*.

Установление равенства между А [*sc.* образом] и Х [*sc.* значением] уничтожило бы поэтичность, то есть или превратило бы образ в прозаическое обозначение частного случая, лишённого отношения к чему-либо другому, или превратило бы образ в научный факт, а значение в закон. [...] если поэзия есть иносказание, ἀλληγορία в обширном смысле слова, то проза, как выражение элементарного наблюдения, и наука стремятся стать в некотором смысле тождесловием (ταυτολογία).¹⁸

Potebnia established an analogy between, on the one hand, scientific *fakt* and *zakon* and, on the other, poetic *obraz* and *znachenie*: just as poetry subordinated

¹⁷ A. A. Potebnia, *Iz zapisok po teorii slovesnosti* (Kharkov: tip. Zil'berg, 1905), p. 100.

¹⁸ Ibid., pp. 100–01. On *nauka* as a discursive category, see pp. 97–110 *passim*.

obraz to *znachenie*, science subordinated *fakt* to *zakon*. Whatever the merit of that particular parallel, the important point to make is that Potebnia considered the discourses of *nauka* and *poeziia* to be analogously, if oppositely, structured in accordance with generalized cognitive laws. Furthermore, his argument in the above-quoted passage was ingeniously performative: by condensing his theory of poetry into an algebraic formula, Potebnia produced a discourse that was, according to his own typology, the perfect expression of *nauka*.

The OPOIaZ inherited Potebnia's distinction between *poetichnost'* and *prozaichnost'*. Indeed, without Iakubinskii's detailed knowledge of Potebnia's psycholinguistic theory, the Society might never have formed. In early 1914, Shklovsky showed Professor I. A. Baudouin de Courtenay the manuscript of what would later become the pamphlet *Voskreshenie slova* (1914). The professor sent him to see Iakubinskii, one of his pupils, who, he thought, would be in a better position to offer advice on the subject.¹⁹

In *Voskreshenie slova* (1914), Shklovsky reproduced Potebnia's conception of poetry as a sort of original language, a language of primal intensity, and much of his terminology (including the term *poeticheskii iazyk* itself, the concepts of

¹⁹ See A. Iu. Galushkin, comm. to V. B. Shklovsky, 'Voskreshenie slova', in *Gamburgskii schet: stat'i — vospominaniia — esse (1914–1933)*, ed. by A. Iu. Galushkin and A. P. Chudakov (Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1990), pp. 486–87. Shklovsky later described his meeting with Iakubinskii on 8 February 1914 as an event of decisive significance: 'Лев Петрович объяснил мне разницу между поэтическими и прозаическими функциями языка. [...] Стало нас двое.' (p. 487)

vneshniaia forma and *vnutrenniaia forma*, and the same sense of the term *obraz*).²⁰ He also reproduced the metaphor of poetry as ‘alive’ and that of prose as ‘dead’.²¹ However, he defined poetry rather differently, claiming that it was language made more difficult to cognize. Shklovsky described the language of futurist poetry as ‘incomprehensible’ [*neponiaten*] and ‘difficult’ [*truden*] rather than as accessible to all.²² He explained that, as forms became more or less familiar, they would lose or gain their defining quality, their ‘difficulty’. Some genres of poetry, for example, ‘become fossilized’ [*okamenevaiut*] as they become familiar.²³ Old Church Slavonic, by contrast, had by the twentieth century become a manifestation of poetic language for speakers of Russian precisely because it had become a ‘half-comprehensible language’ [*polu-poniatnyi iazyk*] to them.²⁴

Shklovsky’s conception of poetry as ‘difficult’ was able to develop in the meetings of the OPOIaZ in the late 1910s, though the category of *poeticheskii iazyk* appeared in the work of the Society in various guises. Shklovsky continued to write about *poeziia*, *poeticheskii iazyk*, and *poetichnost’* in his contributions to the first three issues of the *Sborniki po teorii poeticheskogo iazyka* (1916–19). Iakubinskii used the term ‘verse language’ [*stikhotvornyi iazyk*] in the article ‘O zvukakh stikhotvornogo iazyka’ (1916), writing that verse language was that in which the acoustic element drew attention to itself: ‘При языковом мышлении

²⁰ Viktor Shklovsky, *Voskreshenie slova* (St Petersburg: tip. Sokolinskogo, 1914), pp. 3, 14. On the concept of *obraz* in the work of the Formalists, see esp. Ilona Svetlikova, *Istoki russkogo formalizma: traditsiia psikhologizma i formal'naia shkola* (Moscow: NLO, 2005), pp. 41–71.

²¹ Shklovsky, *Voskreshenie slova*, p. 6.

²² Ibid., pp. 13, 14.

²³ Ibid., p. 7.

²⁴ Ibid., pp. 14–15.

стихотворном звуки являются предметом внимания, обнаруживают свою самоценность, всплывают в светлое поле сознания.’²⁵ Roman Jakobson, who had taken part in some of the early meetings of the Society, went on to use the term ‘literariness’ [*literaturnost’*] to characterize ‘literary language’ [*literaturnyi iazyk*], arguing that that category was the proper object of the science of literature.²⁶ The word *literariness* was the form in which the concept of a specifically literary quality was subsequently canonized in literary theory, especially outside Russia.²⁷

The members of the Society tended to contrast what they termed ‘poetic’, ‘verse’, or ‘literary’ language against such abstractions as ‘prosaic language’ [*prozaicheskii iazyk*] and ‘practical language’ [*prakticheskii iazyk*]. In ‘O zvukakh stikhotvornogo iazyka’ (1916), Iakubinskii contrasted *stikhotvornyi iazyk* against *prakticheskii iazyk* in terms of how the two were supposedly cognized. In the former, he explained, the ‘semantic’ [*smyslovoi*] element of a word was subordinated to its ‘acoustic’ [*zvukovoi*] element, whereas the opposite was true of the latter.²⁸ Iakubinskii claimed intellectual ownership of the category of *prakticheskii iazyk* and, in 1922, would effectively accuse Viktor Zhirmunskii of having stolen it from him.²⁹

²⁵ L. P. Iakubinskii, ‘O zvukakh stikhotvornogo iazyka’, in *Sborniki po teorii poeticheskogo iazyka*, vyp. 1 (Petrograd: OPOIaZ, 1916), pp. 16–30 (pp. 18–19).

²⁶ R. Jakobson, *Noveishaia russkaia poeziia. Nabrosok pervyi* (Prague: Politika, 1921), p. 11

²⁷ See, e.g., the entry for *literariness*, in *A Dictionary of Critical Theory*, ed. by Ian Buchanan (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 295–96.

²⁸ Iakubinskii, ‘O zvukakh stikhotvornogo iazyka’, p. 16.

²⁹ L. P. Iakubinskii, ‘Po povodu knigi V. M. Zhirmunskogo “Kompozitsiia liricheskikh stikhotvorenii”’, *Knizhnyi ugol*, 8 (1922) 54–58 (p. 55).

The members of the OPOIaZ thus reversed Potebnia's distinction between poetry and prose in the late 1910s. Instead of reasoning, as had Potebnia and many other Russian literary scholars of the late nineteenth century, that the leap from poetry to prose could be modelled as one of increasing specialization, they reasoned that it must be modelled as one of increasing ease.³⁰

In the article 'Iskusstvo kak priem' (1917), Shklovsky explained exactly how he had transformed Potebnia's theory of language. He had, he explained, brought a firm theoretical foundation to the division between poetry and prose by introducing the principle of the 'economy of cognitive effort' [*ekonomiia umstvennykh sil*], a theory of cognition described as a 'universally recognized law'.³¹ According to this principle, categories of discourse could be graded on a sliding scale in accordance with how much 'effort' a recipient had to expend in the process of decoding them. Poetic language, Shklovsky argued, required a greater expenditure of effort on the part of the recipient; indeed, he argued that it has been constructed in order to increase the effort necessary. Over time, artistic forms apparently lost their ability to provoke such a response, a process that he termed 'automatization' [(ob)avtomatizatsiia]³².

In the same article, Shklovsky attributed authorship of the principle of the economy of cognitive effort to Herbert Spencer and Richard Avenarius, though he

³⁰ For a discussion of the development of the theory of poetic language, see Wolf-Dieter Stempel, 'Zur formalistischen Theorie der poetischen Sprache', in *Texte der russischen Formalisten*, Band II, ed. by Wolf-Dieter Stempel (Munich: Fink, 1972), ix–liii.

³¹ Shklovsky, 'Iskusstvo kak priem', pp. 3, 5.

³² Ibid., p. 7.

argued that Spencer had been incorrect to see artistic language — and not ‘practical language’ [*prakticheskii iazyk*] — as that of the greater economized cognitive effort. Thus, whereas Spencer had allegedly thought that poetry was a language of artificially reduced cognitive effort, Shklovsky argued instead that it was a language of artificially heightened cognitive effort.

Two quotations in ‘Iskusstvo kak priem’ are attributed to Spencer’s *Philosophy of Style*.³³ Galin Tihanov shows that, despite the misleading attributions, the two quotations in question can be traced to a passage in Veselovskii’s ‘Tri glavy iz istoricheskoi poetiki’ in which Spencer had been quoted and discussed.³⁴ In fact, the first of the quotations, as Tihanov shows, was taken from Veselovskii’s discussion of the *Philosophy of Style*.³⁵ As for the other quotation attributed to Spencer, if Shklovsky had seen fit — and been able — to consult the passage from which he was claiming to quote, he would have found that Spencer was fully in agreement with him. The passage in question was a discussion of the ‘economy’ of the exclamation *beware* in English, a surely unambiguous example of ‘practical language’.³⁶ Shklovsky could, therefore, have quoted the passage in support of his argument, that is, in support of the greater economy of practical language.

The notion of a generalized tendency in the development of language towards forms that are less difficult to cognize can also be found in the work of Baudouin

³³ Ibid., pp. 5–6, 13.

³⁴ Galin Tihanov, ‘The Politics of Estrangement: The Case of the Early Shklovsky’, *Poetics Today*, 26 (2005), 665–96 (p. 682).

³⁵ Ibid., p. 682.

³⁶ Herbert Spencer, *The Philosophy of Style* (Boston, MA, and Chicago, IL: Allyn and Bacon, 1895), p. 4.

de Courtenay himself, though Shklovsky did not mention him in 'Iskusstvo kak priem'. Baudouin de Courtenay had written about the determination of linguistic structures by 'psychic' conditions, making the argument that the general law of the process was the 'drive towards ease': 'двигателем всех изменений языка является стремление к удобству, стремление к облегчению.'³⁷ Language, according to this interpretation, developed in order to economize the cognitive means of its users.

Whatever the origin of the principle of the economy of cognitive effort, its application to Potebnia's division between poetry and prose made it possible for Shklovsky to unite poetic language and prosaic language as the two ends of a continuum. Rather than being the essence of one kind of language, he thought, *poetichnost'* was characteristic to a greater or lesser degree of all uses of language. In 'O poezii i zaumnom iazyke' (1916), Shklovsky took *poetichnost'* to its ultimate limit by considering the 'trans-sense' language pioneered by Velimir Khlebnikov and the Russian futurists (*zaum'* or *zaumnyi iazyk*). As a sort of thought experiment, he imagined the extreme manifestation of *poetichnost'*: a hypothetical poem written in pure *zaum'*, a 'truly artistic work' [*istinno khudozhestvennoe proizvedenie*].³⁸ Such a poem would be entirely independent of all convention, the

³⁷ I. A. Baudouin de Courtenay, 'Nekotorye iz obshchikh polozhenii (iz "Slovaria" S. A. Vengerova)' (1897), in *Izbrannye trudy po obshchemu iazykoznaniyu*, 2 vols (Moscow: Izd. Akademii nauk SSSR, 1963), vol. 1, pp. 348–50 (p. 348). See also idem, 'Ob obshchikh prichinakh iazykovykh izmenenii' (1890), *ibid.*, vol. 1, pp. 222–54, in which the same principle is described as the 'drive towards the economy of effort and its non-expenditure without need' [*stremlenie k ekonomii sil i k nerastrachivaniyu ikh bez nuzhdy*] (p. 226).

³⁸ Viktor Shklovsky, 'O poezii i zaumnom iazyke', in *Sborniki*, vyp. 1, pp. 1–15 (p. 14).

‘pure kind’ [*chistyĭ vid*] of the poetic.³⁹ It followed that all other texts, including the majority of other ‘poetic’ texts, were less poetic than pure *zaum*’, the ultimate limit of the linguistic continuum, but that they varied in terms of how much less. Shklovsky thus used the principle of the economy of cognitive effort to transform Potebnia’s theory of language into a scale of ‘languages’ graded according to how easily they could be cognized.

Iakubinskii placed less emphasis than did Shklovsky on the interdependence of *poetichnost*’ and *prozaichnost*’. In a 1916 review of a book by Vasilii Chernyshev, Iakubinskii characterized that author’s model of language as a continuum — rather than a simple binary opposition — between poetry and prose in which *literatura* and *poeziia* represented two different stages in the same progression: Chernyshev had, according to Iakubinskii’s paraphrase, made reference to ‘literary speech and, ultimately, the speech of poets’ [*literaturnaia rech’ i, nakonets, rech’ poetov*].⁴⁰ Iakubinskii, however, argued instead that the ‘speech of poets’ was a category apart, an ‘entirely distinct linguistic system in need of a distinct theory of language’ [*sovershenno osobaia iazykovaia sistema, podrazumevaiushchaia osoboe iazykoznanie*].⁴¹ His conception of the relationship between prose and poetry seems thus to have been distinct from Shklovsky’s, somewhat removed from the notion of a continuum of languages.

³⁹ Ibid., pp. 9, 11 (used twice).

⁴⁰ L. P. Iakubinskii, [review of V. Chernyshev, *Pravil’nost’ i chistota russkoi rechi* (1915)], *Sovremennyi mir*, 5–6 (1916), 121–22 (p. 122).

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 122.

Like Potebnia, Shklovsky represented *nauka* as a linguistic category lying towards the extreme end of prose and he represented algebra as its ultimate limit. In *Voskreshenie slova*, Shklovsky had written that, although ‘fossilization’, the process of becoming familiar, caused the gradual ossification of what was poetic about a work of poetry, it could be productive in other contexts. Since the process served to shortcut the cognitive processes by which a word was perceived, it allowed for it to be perceived more easily. The ‘loss of form’ was, he continued, the process by which *nauka* was made cognitively possible: ‘Эта потеря формы слова является большим облегчением для мышления и может быть необходимым условием существования науки’.⁴² Shklovsky meant that *nauka* exploited the same process of ‘fossilization’ that gradually stole from poetry its *poetichnost’*. Unlike poetic language, a language that made difficult the processes by which it was perceived, a language that drew attention to itself, the language of *nauka* did the opposite, effacing itself in the service of concepts. That which took from poetry therefore gave to *nauka*.

In ‘Iskusstvo kak priem’, Shklovsky described algebra as the ‘ideal expression’ [*ideal'noe vyrazhenie*] of *prozaichnost’*.⁴³ As he had in *Voskreshenie slova*, he argued that the automatization of aesthetic objects and the replacement of concepts by symbols were two processes governed by the same principle of cognition.⁴⁴ He went on to describe the ‘process of algebraization’ [*protsess algebraizatsii*] and the ‘algebraic method of thinking’ [*algebraicheskii metod myshleniia*].⁴⁵ Shklovsky

⁴² Shklovsky, *Voskreshenie slova*, p. 5.

⁴³ Shklovsky, ‘Iskusstvo kak priem’, both p. 7.

⁴⁴ Ibid., pp. 6–7.

⁴⁵ Ibid., both p. 7.

thought that algebra was the very purest form of prose, a maximally automatized language of economized cognitive effort, in much the same way as that in which *zaum'* was the very purest form of poetry, a minimally automatized language. He constructed algebra and *zaum'* as the mirror images of each other in his theory of language, the two extremities of a single continuum.

Although Iakubinskii did not make explicit the connection between *nauchnyi iazyk* and *poeticheskii iazyk* in the early OPOIaZ theory of language, that of their being the mirror images of each other, there is evidence to suggest that he, too, saw scientific language as a valuable avenue for future research. According to the minutes of a meeting held at the Institute of the Living Word on 18 October 1918, Iakubinskii called for the creation of a 'laboratory' whose experiments would determine how to differentiate 'scientific language' [*nauchnyi iazyk*] from both 'artistic language' [*khudozhestvennyi iazyk*] and 'colloquial language' [*razgovornyi iazyk*].⁴⁶

Towards the end of 1919, Zhirmunskii, who would later briefly participate in the OPOIaZ before quarrelling with Eikhenbaum, wrote about the category of *nauchnyi iazyk* in much the same way. In a review of the third issue (1919), entitled *Poetika*, of the *Sborniki po teorii poeticheskogo iazyka*, he wrote, in paraphrase of the theory of language to which the members of the Society ascribed,

⁴⁶ See Raffaella Vassena, 'K rekonstruktsii istorii deiatel'nosti Instituta zhivogo slova (1918–1924)', *NLO*, 86 (2007), 79–95. Cf. also the three categories of language distinguished by L. P. Iakubinskii, 'Programma kursa lektsii: evoliutsiia rechi', *Zapiski Instituta zhivogo slova*, 1 (1919), 85–86 (p. 85): 'Речь, как средство ежедневного общения; речь, как средство выражения умозаключений; речь, как самоценная деятельность (поэтическая речь).'

that ‘poetic language’ and the ‘language of science’ [*iazyk nauki*] occupied the two ends of a single spectrum.⁴⁷ Whereas poetic language took the word as its ‘material’, the language of science was ‘abstract, amorphous, mathematical’ [*otvlechennyi, amorfnyi, matematicheskii*],⁴⁸ three adjectives strongly reminiscent of the description of the discourse of *nauka* given by Potebnia in *Mysl' i iazyk*.

In an article originally published at around the same time, ‘Zadachi poetiki’, Zhirmunskii gave two examples of practical language, ‘business telegrams’ and ‘Soviet acronyms’, explaining that both had their own ‘devices’. But the ultimate manifestation of practical language, Zhirmunskii concluded once again, was ‘scientific language’ [*nauchnyi iazyk*].⁴⁹ Indeed, taken to its limit, it led to a form of ‘algebraic language’ [*algebraicheskii iazyk*], a category that he equated with the *characteristica universalis* imagined by Leibniz, a universal language of symbols developed to make possible the representation of abstract reasoning.⁵⁰ Scientific language, according to Zhirmunskii, sought to reduce words to symbols as far as was possible: ‘Научная речь стремится в пределе заменить слова абстрактными математическими значками понятий.’⁵¹ Like Potebnia and Shklovsky before him, Zhirmunskii identified the discourse of *nauka* as the extremity of a more general tendency in language and mathematics as its ultimate

⁴⁷ V. M. Zhirmunskii, [review of *Poetika. Sborniki po teorii poeticheskogo iazyka* (1919)] (1919), in *Voprosy teorii literatury* (Leningrad: Academia, 1928), pp. 337–56 (p. 338).

⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 338.

⁴⁹ V. M. Zhirmunskii, ‘Zadachi poetiki’, *Nachala*, 1 (1921), 51–81 (esp. pp. 57–59). An earlier version of the article had been published in *Zhizn' iskusstva* in 1919.

⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 58.

⁵¹ Ibid., p. 58.

limit, writing that the idea of an algebraic language would be a ‘truly scientific’ [*istinno nauchnaia*] one.⁵²

Zhirmunskii recognized that the categories of *nauchnyi iazyk* and *poeticheskii iazyk* were nothing more than useful methodological abstractions, the difference between them being a matter of degree: ‘Мы условно выделим научную речь и речь поэтическую в предельном и последовательном осуществлении’.⁵³ He went on to consider one peculiarity of the prose of early twentieth-century Russian *nauka*: its predilection for foreign words. He explained that foreign words were useful to *nauka* because they were, by definition, free of any ready-made connotations in the language into which they were imported.⁵⁴ They offered more of a blank slate, something that could be bent towards an intended new meaning. Zhirmunskii then suddenly dropped the subject, turning his attention back to poetry, the language to which, he wrote, *nauka* stood ‘in contrast’ [*protivopolozhnost'*].⁵⁵ Even Zhirmunskii’s last phrase, ‘in contrast’, recalls once again Potebnia’s description of the distinction between poetry and *nauka*.

Thus, in the late 1910s, Shklovsky and Iakubinskii posited *nauchnyi iazyk* as the counterpart to *poeticheskii iazyk*, a juxtaposition that can be traced ultimately to Potebnia’s theory of language. Shklovsky developed Potebnia’s juxtaposition by reconceptualizing language in accordance with the principle of the economy of cognitive effort, such that different categories of language could be mapped onto a

⁵² Ibid., p. 58.

⁵³ Ibid., p. 58.

⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 58.

⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 59.

linear continuum: scientific language was thought to operate by means of an artificially reduced cognitive effort; poetic language by means of an artificially heightened one. Algebra and *zaum'*, thought Shklovsky, lay at the extremities of the continuum. It followed that *nauka* and *poeziia* were not qualitatively different from each other in linguistic terms; they were structurally equivalent, if opposite, languages.

In the late 1920s, the authors of the two most comprehensive appraisals of the 'Formal method' would disagree about the validity of the various linguistic abstractions used by the participants of the OPOIaZ in the 1910s. Boris Engel'gardt recognized *zaumnyi iazyk* as a productive abstraction, one that made it possible to isolate different degrees of *zaumness* across a range of texts: 'если в фактическом языковом опыте понятию "заумного языка" не соответствует никакая особая языковая система, то это обстоятельство [...] не умаляет его значения в качестве предельного методологического принципа.'⁵⁶ Pavel Medvedev, by contrast, a member of Mikhail Bakhtin's circle, refused to endorse these abstractions as properly 'scientific'. In *Formal'nyi metod v literaturovedenii* (1928), Medvedev argued that the Formalists relied on an 'apophatic' method of argumentation in which poetry and prose were defined as 'dogmatic negations' of each other, in which prose was the 'parasite' of poetry.⁵⁷ He wrote that a genuinely 'scientific' abstraction could not be constructed only as a negation: 'Во всякой научной абстракции отрицание диалектически соединено с утверждением, и

⁵⁶ B. M. Engel'gardt, *Formal'nyi metod v istorii literatury* (Leningrad: Academia, 1927), p. 67.

⁵⁷ P. N. Medvedev, *Formal'nyi metod v literaturovedenii (Kriticheskoe vvedenie v sotsiologicheskuiu poetiku)* (Leningrad: Priboi, 1928), pp. 120–33.

только потому она не может застыть и окаменеть.’⁵⁸ In fact, as has been shown, Shklovsky understood the two linguistic categories in question — poetry and prose — as differing degrees on a scale of ‘languages’. Since they represented only different concentrations of the same quality, the connection between them was necessarily ‘dialectical’. Although Iakubinskii, in particular, often resorted to a rather crude, ‘apophatic’ methodology, Shklovsky’s comments about poetry and prose suggested a more nuanced understanding of the productive abstractness of those terms.

The construction of a linguistic continuum ranging from *nauchnost'*, on the one hand, to *poetichnost'*, on the other, must also be interpreted in the context of the frequent claims made by the participants of the OPOIaZ to the superiority of their theory of literature over those of their predecessors in the field, to their claim to a monopoly on *nauchnost'*. Indeed, it is possible to interpret some of Shklovsky’s more overtly mathematical formulations as attempts to reproduce in his own writing an ideally scientific mode of expression. His well-known comment about the content of a work of literature being ‘equal to the sum of its stylistic devices’,⁵⁹ for example, strikes the ear as an attempt to produce a formulation corresponding to his own conception of *nauchnyi iazyk*, recalling as it does Potebnia’s

⁵⁸ Ibid., pp. 126–27.

⁵⁹ Viktor Shklovsky, *Rozanov: iz knigi ‘Siuzhet, kak iavlenie stilii’* (Petrograd: OPOIaZ, 1921), p. 8: ‘Содержание [...] литературного произведения равно сумме его стилистических приемов.’ Cf. Ibid., p. 4: ‘Литературное произведение есть [...] отношение материалов. И как всякое отношение и это — отношение нулевого измерения. Поэтому безразличен масштаб произведения, арифметическое значение его числителя и знаменателя, важно их отношение.’

performatively scientific condensation of the theory of poetic language into an algebraic formula.

Ultimately, however, the members of the OPOIaZ did not need to perform their conception of *nauchnyi iazyk*, since they had, from the very beginning of their project, ensured the representation of their own work as *nauka* at a more fundamental level. They had done so by implicating the category of *nauka* in the construction of its object: to analyse a text in terms of how its *poetichnost'* had been realized was, according to the logic of Shklovsky's linguistic continuum, necessarily also to analyse it in terms of how its *nauchnost'* remained unrealized. The scientific was inscribed within the poetic, such that the act of isolating the *poetichnost'* of the analysed text was simultaneously an act of affirming the *nauchnost'* of the analysing text. The Formalists' desire to represent their work as *nauka* thus found expression not only in off-hand moments of self-congratulation, as exemplified by Jakobson's boast about literary scholarship finally being able to 'become science' [*stat' naukoi*] through their work,⁶⁰ but also in the very structure of their basic theory of language.

In the early 1920s, the Formalists developed their early theory of language, one concerned largely with the distribution of particular sounds across such 'languages' as poetry and prose, into a more 'functional' theory, one in which poetry was defined explicitly as a particular function of language.⁶¹ Eikhenbaum's

⁶⁰ Jakobson, *Noveishaia russkaia poeziia*, p. 11.

⁶¹ It has been argued that, even in the earliest work of the OPOIaZ, poetry had been conceptualized as a particular function of language. See Stempel, 'Zur

Melodika russkogo liricheskogo stikha (1922) and Jakobson's *O cheshskom stikhe* (1923) were the central texts in the turn away from a more 'mechanical' brand of linguistics towards a more functional one. Eikhenbaum and Jakobson reconceptualized language as a tool of communication in which, in any given situation, one function took precedence over others. Poetry, wrote Jakobson in a well-known definition, was language in its 'aesthetic function'. The explicitly 'functional' approach brought to an end the Formalists' work on *nauchnyi iazyk* proper because language was no longer conceptualized as a continuum of linguistic categories. For that reason, it was no longer methodologically necessary for such emphasis to be placed on the extremities of the continuum, algebra and *zaum*'.

Nevertheless, Tynianov continued to think about the language of *nauka* in his work of the early 1920s. Tynianov had joined the OPOIaZ in 1919 or 1920 and, with Shklovsky and Eikhenbaum, quickly became one of the most prominent members of the Society. He followed two principal lines of enquiry in his theoretical work of the early 1920s. The first was the theory of language. Tynianov's two principal works on the theory of language were *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka* (1924), a study of the semantics of 'verse language', and 'Slovar' Lenina-polemista' (1924), a study of the semantics of the language of Lenin's journalism. The second line of enquiry was the theory of literary history, one that resulted in the article 'O literaturnom fakte' (1924). It can be shown that the two lines of enquiry each allowed Tynianov to make sense of his own prose, the 'language' of the theory of literature, in a different way.

formalistischen Theorie der poetischen Sprache', in *Texte der russischen Formalisten*, Band II, xxix.

The first line of enquiry was the theory of language. Despite the fact that his first published work, *Dostoevskii i Gogol'* (1921), had been a study of the function of parody in the history of Russian prose, the first major theoretical concern of Tynianov's career had been the problem of the language of poetry. His university dissertation had focussed on Tiutchev and Heine.⁶² The following year, he gave a more theoretical course on poetry at the House of Arts in Petrograd.⁶³ In December 1921, a book by him entitled *Semantika poeticheskogo iazyka* was included in a list of titles soon to be published by the OPOIaZ.⁶⁴ It was eventually published by Academia as *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka* in February 1924,⁶⁵ though the preface is dated to June 1923.⁶⁶ The book was Tynianov's first monograph and the most extensive of several important works by him to be published in 1924. Indeed, in October 1923, a few months after he had completed the manuscript, Tynianov told Shklovsky that he considered the book his most 'most important and central' [*naibolee vazhnaia i tsentral'naia*] work.⁶⁷ Soon after the publication of his monograph, Tynianov had completed the article 'Slovar' Lenina-polemista'. The article can be considered a counterpart to *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka*, the two forming a single theory of language: whereas Tynianov had focused on 'verse language' in *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka*, seeking to understand the semantic

⁶² The dissertation was destroyed in a fire in Yaroslavl in 1918. See M. O. Chudakova and E. A. Toddes, 'Tynianov v vospominaniakh sovremennika', in *TS*, 1 (1984), pp. 78–104 (p. 93).

⁶³ A. P. Chudakov, comm. to Tynianov, 'Predislovie k knige "Problema stikhovoi semantiki"', in *PILK*, pp. 501–07 (p. 501).

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 501–2.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 501.

⁶⁶ Iu. N. Tynianov, *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka*, *Voprosy poetiki*: vyp. 5 (Leningrad: Academia, 1924), pp. 5–6 (p. 6).

⁶⁷ Tynianov, letter to Shklovsky of late September or early October 1923, as quoted in Chudakov, comm. to Tynianov, 'Predislovie k knige "Problema stikhovoi semantiki"', in *PILK*, p. 502.

openness of the ‘word in verse’, he focused on prose language in the article on Lenin, seeking to understand the semantic closedness of the ‘word in prose’. Tynianov’s theory of language in 1924 thus retained, in the form of a juxtaposition of poetry (or verse) and prose, the basic structure of Shklovsky and Iakubinskii’s theory of language of the late 1910s.

In *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka*, Tynianov set out to describe how rhythm, the ‘constructive principle’ [*konstruktivnyi printsip*] of verse, distorted the usual semantic mechanisms of the Russian language. He began by explaining that the meaning of any concrete occurrence of a word was determined by the interaction of various factors. The primary factor was the ‘basic sign of meaning’ [*osnovnoi priznak znachenii*] associated with that word, its etymological ‘essence’ or the most fundamental semantic kernel to which it could be reduced. Another factor was the overall meaning of the sentence of which the word was one part, the context in which the basic sign of meaning was conditioned: this factor could determine how the ‘lexical plane’ [*leksicheskii plan*] of a word, the complex constellation of its potential senses, was organized in any concrete occurrence. Verse complicated the situation. Tynianov concluded that verse imposed on the primary meaning-determining conditions of language a secondary set of conditions. The verse line, he argued, was characterized to a high degree by ‘unity’ [*edinstvo*] and ‘compactness’ [*tesnota*], two qualities causing the individual word to be very strongly determined semantically by other words in it, such that ‘speech material’ was made more ‘dynamic’ and ‘successive’ than it was in other linguistic situations. Tynianov summarized the theoretical section of the monograph as follows: ‘Таким образом, ритмическими факторами являются: 1) фактор

единства стихового ряда; 2) фактор тесноты его; 3) фактор динамизации речевого материала; и 4) фактор сукцессивности речевого материала в стихе.⁶⁸ The word in verse was thus caught between, on the one hand, the usual syntactic patterns of the language in question and, on the other, the unity and compactness of the verse line, a tension giving rise to its semantic openness.⁶⁹

Ilona Svetlikova shows the extent to which Tynianov based his ideas about verse language on Wilhelm Wundt's theory of the naming of objects. He borrowed most extensively from a chapter on the meaning of names in the first volume of Wundt's *magnum opus*, the ten-volume *Völkerpsychologie*.⁷⁰ In his debt to Wundt, Tynianov was true to the early strategy of the OPOIaZ, that of seeking the specificity of poetic language in universal cognitive laws, though Wundt's experimental psychology represented a more overtly natural-scientific brand of the discipline than Potebnia's more philosophical psychology. Tynianov mentioned Wundt and other experimental psychologists by name at several points in *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka*.

⁶⁸ Tynianov, *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka*, p. 47.

⁶⁹ For an interpretation of the theory of semantics advanced in *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka*, see Stempel, 'Zur formalistischen Theorie der poetischen Sprache', in *Texte der russischen Formalisten*, Band II, esp. xxxiii–xxxviii.

⁷⁰ Svetlikova, pp. 99–124. She shows that the central categories in Tynianov's theory of language originate in Wundt, *Völkerpsychologie*, Band I: Die Sprache (Leipzig: Engelmann, 1900), vol. 2, pp. 420–583. They include the 'basic sign of meaning' [*osnovnoi priznak znachenii*; cf. *das Hauptmerkmal*] and the 'unity and compactness of the verse series' [*edinstvo stikhovogo riada i tesnota ego*; cf. *die Einheit und Enge der Apperzeption*]. Note that Tynianov ascribed uniquely to the cognitive processing of verse the characteristics originally ascribed by Wundt to the cognitive faculties of man in general.

It is less well known that Joseph Vendryes's *Le Langage* (1921), a major text in the history of structural linguistics, played a similarly important role in the development of Tynianov's theory of language. Chudakov, Chudakova, and Toddes note that one of Tynianov's notebooks of the period contains passages copied out from Vendryes's book, but they mention its significance only for Tynianov's work of the late 1920s.⁷¹ Tynianov's debt to Vendryes was nevertheless also clear in his work on language of 1924. Tynianov's concept of the basic sign of meaning seems analogous to Vendryes's *sémantème*, a concept used to model the most basic semantic content of a word.⁷² Vendryes had made a methodological distinction between *sémantèmes* and *morphèmes*: the former, he wrote, expressed semantically the 'ideas of representations' and the latter expressed grammatically the 'relations between the ideas'.⁷³

'Slovar' Lenina-polemista' was Tynianov's contribution to a special issue of *Lef* partly dedicated to Lenin's language. It was published in the spring of 1924, soon after Lenin's death in late January. Shklovsky, Eikhenbaum, Iakubinskii, Boris Kazanskii, and Boris Tomashevskii were the other contributors.⁷⁴ Tynianov played an important role in the preparation of the section on Lenin, liaising with the

⁷¹ A. P. Chudakov, M. O. Chudakova, and E. A. Toddes, comm. to Tynianov, 'O literaturnoi evoliutsii', in *PILK*, pp. 518–30 (p. 524).

⁷² It is noted, *ibid.*, p. 524, that the term *sémantème* appears in the notebook.

⁷³ J. Vendryes, *Le Langage: introduction linguistique à l'histoire* (Paris: Renaissance du livre, 1921), pp. 85–105.

⁷⁴ Viktor Shklovsky, 'Lenin kak dekanonizator', *Lef*, 1 (5) (1924), 53–56; B. Eikhenbaum, 'Osnovnye stilevyie tendentsii v rechi Lenina', *ibid.*, 57–70; Lev Iakubinskii, 'O snizhenii vysokogo stilia u Lenina', *ibid.*, 71–80; Iurii Tynianov, 'Slovar' Lenina-polemista', *ibid.*, 81–100; B. Kazanskii, 'Rech' Lenina', *ibid.*, 111–39; Boris Tomashevskii, 'Konstruktsiia tezisov', *ibid.*, 140–48.

editor, Osip Brik, on behalf of the other contributors.⁷⁵ The publication of a series of ‘Formalist’ articles on Lenin was a provocative act, an attempt to cast Lenin as a revolutionary of language. Nevertheless, Tynianov’s ‘Slovar’ Lenina-polemista’ had little to do with Lenin, the purported object of its analysis: Tynianov took many examples from Lenin’s journalism, and concluded the article with a few generalizations about his style, but he could have supplied examples from any other writer of conceptual prose. Lenin served as the pretext for a more wide-ranging exploration of how it was possible to manipulate the general semantic mechanisms of the ‘word in prose’. For a piece written at such a critical moment in Tynianov’s career, ‘Slovar’ Lenina-polemista’ remains an oddly overlooked part of his theoretical work: although it was highly regarded by such prominent literary figures as Vladimir Mayakovsky and Maksim Gorky,⁷⁶ and it was reprinted alongside a new edition of *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka* in 1965,⁷⁷ it awaits a full scholarly commentary of the kind from which most of Tynianov’s other major articles have benefitted.

In the article on Lenin, Tynianov focussed on ‘concreteness’, one of the problems that Vendryes had explored in detail in *Le Langage*. Vendryes had noted that, as they developed, languages became decreasingly adapted to the expression of ‘the concrete’ [*le concret*] and increasingly adapted to the expression of ‘the abstract’

⁷⁵ See Tynianov’s letter to Osip Brik of 23 February 1924 (RGALI, f. 2582, op. 1, ed. kh. 272, l. 1.), in which he seems to be coordinating the project and negotiating on behalf of Eikhenbaum, Tomashevskii, and Iakubinskii.

⁷⁶ According to Iulian Oksman, as quoted in Chudakova and Toddes, ‘Tynianov v vospominaniiakh sovremennika’, pp. 87–88.

⁷⁷ Iu. N. Tynianov, ‘Slovar’ Lenina-polemista’, in *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka: stat’i* (Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel’, 1965), pp. 197–247.

[l'abstrait].⁷⁸ He had made a distinction between the concreteness of a noun and that of the 'idea' that it expressed, observing that the two were inversely proportional.⁷⁹ In other words, nouns that expressed abstract ideas were themselves more concrete than those that expressed concrete ideas. Tynianov explored the same phenomenon in his article on Lenin. He explained that the words that designated common physical 'things' were less concrete than those that designated more abstract ones, since the basic sign of meaning in the latter was more limited in scope. It followed that words such as *golova* and *zemlia* were less concrete than, to use the example that Tynianov found in Lenin's journalism, the word *ekspropriatsiia*, even though very concrete things were included within the lexical plane of the first two words.⁸⁰ Tynianov summarized the process as follows: 'чем шире объем лексического единства слова, чем крепче в слове основной признак, — тем больше ассоциаций с разными значениями одного слова, тем больше возможность "многосмыслия", [...] тем насыщеннее слово и беднее обозначение.'⁸¹ It is notable that Tynianov preserved from the early work of the OPOIaZ the notion of continuum, a sliding scale of proseness. He argued that, as a linguistic revolutionary, Lenin had sought to challenge the lexical abuse of such minimally concrete words as *svoboda*, *ravenstvo*, and *narod*.⁸² Lenin had thus brought rational precision to the Russian language by manipulating the general semantic mechanisms of the 'word in prose'.

⁷⁸ Vendryes, *Le Langage*, pp. 136–61 (pp. 160–61).

⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 161.

⁸⁰ Tynianov, 'Slovar' Lenina-polemista', pp. 88–89.

⁸¹ Ibid., p. 88.

⁸² Ibid., pp. 95–100.

The most concrete category of word, Tynianov went on to explain, was the ‘word-term’ [*slovo-termin*]. Zhirmunskii and Iakubinskii had already touched on the problem of terminology, identifying it as a manifestation of scientific language. Two years previously, for example, Iakubinskii had written that the ‘term’ [*termin*] was the ‘ideal’ manifestation of ‘scientific-logical speech’.⁸³ In the article on Lenin, Tynianov followed Iakubinskii in positioning the term as an extreme example of proseness, as something akin to an algebraic symbol. Minimally concrete words (such as *golova* and *zemlia*), argued Tynianov, were strongly afflicted by the ‘contagion’ [*zarazhenie*] of the overall meaning of the sentence of which they were part.⁸⁴ He attributed the concept of semantic ‘contagion’ to the French philologist Michel Bréal.⁸⁵ To ward off the process of semantic contagion, the proliferation of meanings, Tynianov argued, words could have their semantic potential limited by being made into ‘word-terms’: ‘Слово-термин, [...] — при узком объеме лексического единства — лишено этих ассоциативных нитей; поэтому оно хрупко держится в сознании, оно отъединено, — и к быту не апеллирует, не ведет.’⁸⁶

Tynianov thought that the ‘word-term’ was a word whose semantic potential had been limited. In his exposition of the concept, Tynianov was true to the etymology of the Russian word *termin*: the Latin word *terminus*, from which it, like the

⁸³ Iakubinskii, ‘Po povodu knigi V. M. Zhirmunskogo “Kompozitsiia liricheskikh stikhotvorenii”’, pp. 55–56.

⁸⁴ Tynianov, ‘Slovar’ Lenina-polemista’, pp. 84–86.

⁸⁵ Michel Bréal, *Essai de sémantique (Science des significations)* (Paris: Hachette, 1897).

⁸⁶ Tynianov, ‘Slovar’ Lenina-polemista’, p. 89.

English *term*, ultimately derives, referred to a limit or boundary in space or time.⁸⁷

A high density of ‘word-terms’, according to Tynianov, endowed a text with a distinct ‘orientation towards “*nauka*”’ [*ustanovka na ‘nauku’*].⁸⁸ Lenin, he showed, was drawn towards ‘word-terms’ in an attempt to avoid the obfuscatory language of the lesser polemicists of his day. In much the same way, Kazanskii argued that the density of ‘technical terms’ in Lenin’s language at times brought it close to the ‘purest prose’ [*chisteishaia proza*], the ‘language of science’ [*iazyk nauki*].⁸⁹

Although Tynianov did not explain the origin of the term *word-term* itself, and it was not a category used by Vendryes, it can be traced to the work of Andrei Bely, the symbolist poet-theoretician. Bely’s essays of the first decade of the twentieth century relied on Potebnia’s theory of language. He had developed the concept of the ‘word-term’ in ‘*Magiia slov*’, an essay included in *Simvolizm* (1910). Bely’s word-terms were semantically limited words, words deprived of an original, utopian semantic openness. They stood in opposition to the ‘living word’ [*zhivoe slovo*] of poetry.⁹⁰ He recommended euthanasia for those words that stood no chance of ‘resurrection’, ‘living corpses’ [*zhivye trupy*] of words, but reasoned that

⁸⁷ Cf. the entry for ‘*terminus*, n.’, in the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, ed. by P. G. W. Glare (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), p. 1926. The four senses given are: (1.) ‘A post, stone, or similar marking the boundary of a property’; (2.) ‘The remotest limit, furthest point [...] or a natural feature marking it’; (3.) ‘a point marking the furthest extent of an action, condition, etc.’; and (4.) ‘the point at which an activity or process stops, the end’.

⁸⁸ Tynianov, ‘*Slovar’ Lenina-polemista*’, p. 89. Cf. Eikhenbaum, ‘*Osnovnye stilevyie tendentsii v rechi Lenina*’, p. 63: ‘Основной слой его речи [*sc.* речи Ленина] — деловой, иногда намеренно сухой научный язык.’

⁸⁹ Kazanskii, p. 112.

⁹⁰ Andrei Bely, ‘*Magiia slov*’, *Simvolizm: kniga statei* (Moscow: Musaget, 1910), pp. 429–48 (p. 436).

true word-terms were so dead, so unresurrectable, that they posed no threat to the living.

единственное, на что обязывает нас наша жизненность, — это творчество слов; мы должны упражнять свою силу в сочетаниях слов; так выковываем мы оружие для борьбы с живыми трупами, втирающимися в круг нашей деятельности; мы должны быть варварами, палачами ходячего слова, если уже не можем мы вдохнуть в него жизнь; другое дело — слово-термин; оно не представляется живым; оно — то, что есть; его не воскресишь к жизни; но оно безвредно: самый трупный яд разложился в идеальном термине, так что он уже никого не заражает.⁹¹

Bely's description of the word-term both in the above-quoted passage and elsewhere in the essay strongly recalls Potebnia's description of the *nauchnoe slovo* as the extreme end of a continuum, in this case one between 'life' and 'death'. The 'ideal' term, Bely thought, would be maximally dead: it would contain the most putrid deathliness, the 'most corpse poison' [*samyi trupnyi iad*]. He nevertheless acknowledged the worldly usefulness of the maximally dead word: after its 'definitive decomposition', the word-term remained an 'eternal crystal' [*vechnyi kristall*],⁹² a clearly delineated kernel of conventionalized reference. The decomposition of living words into dead terms, thought Bely, served a practical purpose in allowing for more precise communication. It is clear, then, that Tynianov's article on Lenin was inspired by Bely's concept of the word-term, but, instead of presenting the development of terminologies as a process of 'decomposition', he emphasized the artistry involved in crafting the perfect term, the skill with which Lenin made language referentially precise.

⁹¹ Ibid., p. 436.

⁹² Ibid., p. 436.

Tynianov thus followed in Shklovsky and Iakubinskii's footsteps by polarizing verse language and prose language in his work on the theory of language. His understanding of language, as advanced in *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka* and 'Slovar' Lenina-polemista', depended on a juxtaposition of verse and prose, since the semantically closed 'word-term' was conceptualized in terms of its difference from the semantically open words of poetry. Indeed, Tynianov considered terminology to be the very essence of the word in prose, the ultimate manifestation of proseness. He strongly associated the development of terminologies with *nauka*, as had Zhirmunskii and Iakubinskii, but ultimately appropriated his concept of the 'word-term' from Bely. Tynianov transformed the concept in light of Vendryes's work on semantics, coming to conceptualize terminology as a maximally 'concrete' use of language. Tynianov's theory of language in 1924 can ultimately be traced, via Bely and the early work of the OPOIaZ, to Potebnia's late nineteenth-century psycholinguistic theory.

Tynianov's decision to consider the 'word in prose' led him, naturally, to scrutinize his own language, the very language in which the concept of the 'word in prose' was being explicated. The Formalists had been forced to consider the question of their own prose two years previously, when the literary critic Arkadii Gornfel'd had mocked them for self-importantly elevating their convoluted 'circle jargon' [*kruzhkovoi zhargon*] to the status of a 'scientific terminology'.⁹³ It is unsurprising that Tynianov should have begun to examine the nature of his own prose, since, in his work on language of 1924, he had effectively developed a

⁹³ A. Gornfel'd, 'Formalisty i ikh protivniki', *Literaturnye zapiski*, 3 (1922), 5–6 (p. 5).

terminology with which to describe the development of terminologies. *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka* and ‘Slovar’ Lenina-polemista’ were themselves terminologically dense texts. *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka* has long been regarded as impenetrable, containing, as has been shown, such enigmatic formulations as the ‘unity of the verse series’.⁹⁴ The publisher of *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka*, Academia, had taken steps to make the book appear less formidable, having requested that *Stikhovaia semantika*, the esoteric title originally proposed by Tynianov, be replaced by the marginally more palatable *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka*.⁹⁵ Soon before its publication, Tynianov himself admitted, perhaps in recognition of the problem of its linguistic obscurity, that, compared to Eikhenbaum’s most recent work, his monograph was ‘not a very elegant book’: ‘Эйхенбаум у нас стал Августом Шлегелем, пишет много, интересно и изящно. Я печатаю не очень изящную книгу: “Проблема стихотворного языка”’.⁹⁶

Those associated with the MLK were critical of *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka* precisely on account of its lack of clarity. In a review of the book, Georgii Vinokur

⁹⁴ For a discussion of the general reactions of leading late twentieth-century philologists to Tynianov’s *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka*, see Svetlikova, pp. 100–01. See, e.g., Omri Ronen, in ‘Anketa k 100-letiiu so dnia rozhdeniia Iu. N. Tynianova’, in *Tynianovskii sbornik*, vyp. 9: Sed’mie Tynianovskie chteniia. Materialy dlia obsuzhdeniia (Riga and Moscow: 1995–96), pp. 47–49 (p. 48): ‘Тынянов создал темную метафорику, пользуясь своеобразными, более художественными, чем точными, переводами немецких терминологических выражений, и она поддается разным интерпретациям.’

⁹⁵ Iu. N. Tynianov, letter to L. N. Lunts of 14 January 1924, as given in ‘L. Lunts i “Serapionovy brat’ia”’, *Novyi zhurnal*, 83 (1966), 132–84 (publ. by Gary Kern) (pp. 141–42): ‘название [книги] принадлежит издателю, который испугался “Стиховой семантики”’. Note that yet another title is given on the original contract signed by Tynianov (RGALI, f. 2224, op. 1, ed. kh. 190, l. 1.): *Problemy stikhotvornogo iazyka*.

⁹⁶ Ibid., pp. 141–42.

complained of its ‘rigorous theoretical character’ [*strogii teoreticheskii kharakter*], implying that it was overly abstract in approach.⁹⁷ Boris Tomashevskii, a scholar very sensitive to the linguistic clarity of theoretical work,⁹⁸ made more detailed comments about the style of *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka*, explaining that Tynianov’s extremely terse, terminologically dense manner of exposition seriously hindered comprehension.

книга Тынянова является исключительно сгущенной по своему изложению [...]. Это в значительной степени затрудняет изложение, — а со стороны автора не принято достаточных мер к тому, чтобы изложение это сделать ясным и простым. Напротив, его как будто бы пленяет сложная немецкая терминология [...]. Эта темнота и трудность изложения делают неубедительными или недостаточно убедительными и некоторые утверждения автора.⁹⁹

Tomashevskii thought that Tynianov had not taken sufficient steps to avoid the ‘difficulty’ and ‘murkiness’ presented by such a density of terminology. Boris I. Iarkho, another member of the MLK, made the same point much more forcefully. In an unpublished assessment of Tynianov’s book, Iarkho described its author’s ‘sloppiness of expression’ [*razgil'diaistvo v vyrazheniiakh*], his ‘vagueness’ [*neiasnost'*], and the impression consequently created of a ‘distinct idiocy’

⁹⁷ G. Vinokur, [review of Tynianov, *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka* (1924)], *Pechat' i revoliutsiia*, 4 (1924), 267–71 (p. 269).

⁹⁸ See, e.g., Boris V. Tomashevskii, [review of Istrin, *Ochet istorii drevnerusskoi literatury domoskovskogo perioda* (1922)], *Kniga i revoliutsiia*, 3 (1923), 48–50 (signed ‘Borskii’), where he describes Istrin’s ‘murky exposition’ [*tumannoe izlozhenie*], a consequence of the book’s ‘stylistic deficiencies’ [*stilisticheskie nedostatki*], and makes the following assessment: ‘Этот способ выражаться придает утверждениям автора такую туманную форму, что трудно догадаться о действительном смысле.’

⁹⁹ B. V. Tomashevskii, [review of Tynianov, *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka* (1924)], *Russkii sovremennik*, 3 (1924), 265–68 (p. 266) (signed ‘T. B.’).

[*osobennoe idiotstvo*].¹⁰⁰ For Iarkho, Tynianov's obscurantism denied him any claim to being a legitimate producer of *nauka*.¹⁰¹

On the point of the opaque terminology of Tynianov's theory of language in 1924, it is illuminating to consider the reactions of the members of the MLK to the symbolist poet Valerii Briusov's much-derided foray into the territory of *nauka*. Briusov had anachronistically attempted to apply to Russian verse a terminology of neo-classical origin, one poorly suited to the structures of the Russian language. The MLK had set their sights on him in 1919, as is shown by the published minutes of the circle's meetings of that year.¹⁰² Jakobson and Vinokur's reactions to Briusov's theory of verse were published a few years later. Jakobson made a comparison between Briusov's theoretical articles on poetry and his fellow symbolist Konstantin Bal'mont's mystical writings on the same topic, concluding that the former were the more 'dangerous' to *nauka* because they had the superficial appearance — gained through a proliferation of terminology — of *nauchnost'*: 'Опасней подобные экскурсы в тех случаях, когда они

¹⁰⁰ As quoted in M. I. Shapir, "'...Domashnii, staryi spor...'" (B. I. Iarkho protiv Iu. N. Tynianova vo vzgliadakh na prirodu i semantiku stikha), *Philologica*, 7 (2001/2002), 239–46 (all p. 240). See also M. V. Akimova, 'B. I. Iarkho v polemike s tynianovskoi kontseptsiei stikhotvornogo iazyka', *ibid.*, 207–25.

¹⁰¹ Cf. B. I. Iarkho, 'Granitsy nauchnogo literaturovedeniia', *Iskusstvo*, 2 (1925), 45–60 (p. 46, emphasis in original): 'научное познание в чистом виде вряд ли существует в природе. [...] *научность является свойством не познания, а изложения.*'

¹⁰² 'Kak Moskovskii lingvisticheskii kruzhek voeval s Briusovym i Potebnei', *NLO*, 86 (2007), 70–78 (ed. by S. I. Gindin and A. V. Man'kovskii). See esp. the minutes of the meeting of 23 September 1919 at which Jakobson gave a paper on Briusov entitled 'Obrazchik nauchnogo sharlatanstva'. See also S. I. Gindin, 'Pervyi konflikt dvukh pokolenii osnovatelei russkogo stikhovedeniia', *ibid.*, 64–69.

претендуют на научность, когда они, так сказать, наукообразны.¹⁰³ The deployment of terminology had become such a conventionalized device of the discourse of *nauka*, as Tynianov acknowledged in the article on Lenin's language, that it could be implemented in bad faith. *Nauchnost'* could be simulated, according to Jakobson, by a *naukoobraznost'*. In much the same way, Vinokur thought that Briusov's bizarre contribution to the theory of verse was a form of 'playing' at *nauka*. Briusov had, Vinokur concluded, been seduced by a mysterious, ancient 'nomenclature', convinced that terminology alone was a sufficient condition for *nauchnost'*: 'он [*sc.* Брюсов] с упорством [...] продолжает прищипливать греко-латинские ярлычки к явлениям, [...] очевидно полагая, что в этой изысканной и блестящей номенклатуре весь секрет и заключается.'¹⁰⁴ In December 1924, Tomashevskii offered a more considered interpretation of Briusov's work on the theory of verse. He gave a speech at the Institute of Literatures and Languages of the West and the East in that month in which he offered a reading of the poet's theoretical work as an extension of his creative practice. Although Briusov's work on the subject had failed in terms of 'pure science' [*chistaia nauka*], it could productively be considered an object of study in its own right.¹⁰⁵ In light of the above-mentioned

¹⁰³ R. Jakobson, 'Briusovskaia stikhologiya i nauka o stikhe', *Nauchnye izvestiia Akademicheskogo tsentra Narkomprosa*, 2: *Filosofiia, literatura, iskusstvo* (1922), 222–40 (p. 223).

¹⁰⁴ G. Vinokur, 'Igra v nauku', *Lef*, 2 (1923), 158–59 (p. 158).

¹⁰⁵ B. Tomashevskii, 'Briusov kak stikhoved', in *O stikhe: stat'i* (Leningrad: Priboi, 1929), pp. 319–25 (pp. 321–22): 'С точки зрения [...] чистой науки [...], труды Брюсова вызвали резкую и может быть справедливую критику. Но совершенно несомненно значение трудов Брюсова, рассматриваемых как объект изучения [...]. На очереди у науки — вовсе не усвоение положений Брюсова в том виде, как они у него даны, вовсе не введение мелких коррективов в сложную систему его терминологии: задача науки — найти то творческое единство, [...] которое выразилось, с одной стороны, в его

comments by members of the MLK about the relationship between terminology and *nauka*, Tynianov's work on the theory of language must have seemed similarly 'dangerous', threatening as it did to undermine its claim to *nauka* by linguistically performing its own *nauchnost'* to an excessive degree.

Whatever the ultimate evaluation made of Tynianov's work on the theory of language by his contemporaries, it was universally seen as linguistically exceptional, an extreme example of concision, abstraction, and obscurity. It could be argued that Tynianov's theoretical work on language was to some extent an attempt to make sense of his increasingly opaque prose. He produced a conspicuously exemplary terminology in the process of defining the 'word-term' as the ultimate manifestation of proseness. It is particularly notable that Tynianov preserved, in a somewhat altered form, the juxtaposition of *nauka*, the category in which he situated his own work, and poetry or verse. Like Shklovsky in the 1910s, he therefore continued to implicate his own discourse in the construction of his object: the semantic openness of the 'word in verse' was guaranteed by its non-identification with the semantic closedness of the 'word in prose', the 'word-term' being the 'ideal' realization of the latter.

What contemporary commentators saw as the danger of Tynianov's language, however, its extreme obscurity, threatened to complicate the relation between his realization of *nauka* and its purported object. Tynianov's peculiar theoretical prose seemed to cause *nauka* to resemble poetry as originally defined by the OPOIaZ, as

практике, в его творчестве, а с другой стороны — в его теоретических работах.'

language made ‘difficult’ and ‘strange’. Tomashevskii’s comments about the linguistic ‘obscurity’ [*temnota*] and ‘difficulty’ [*trudnost’*] of Tynianov’s *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka*, for example, strongly recalled Shklovsky’s original description of the language of futurist poetry as being ‘incomprehensible’ [*neponiaten*] and ‘difficult’ [*truden*].¹⁰⁶ In an article published soon after *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka* and ‘Slovar’ Lenina-polemista’, Tynianov commented astutely on the entrenched polarization of *nauka* and art in Russian culture.¹⁰⁷ He was perhaps beginning to consider their paradoxical convergence in the realization of his theoretical project. In late 1923 and early 1924, then, Tynianov began to write about language in a manner so abstract as to complicate the juxtaposition between *nauka* and poetry on which the Society had been founded.

In addition to his work on the theory of language, the second principal line of enquiry in Tynianov’s work of the early 1920s was the theory of literary history. He developed an influential theory of the historical relativity of the category of ‘literature’. According to Tynianov, what was considered literary in one era was not necessarily considered so in the next. In his comments on the language of historical analysis, he developed a very different conception of the language of *nauka*.

Tynianov developed his ideas about the language of historical analysis through a polemical exchange with the ‘eclectic’ literary scholar A. A. Smirnov. Smirnov

¹⁰⁶ Tomashevskii, [review of Tynianov, *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka*], p. 266. Cf. Shklovsky, *Voskreshenie slova*, p. 13: ‘Этот новый язык [sc. язык футуристов] непонятен, труден, его нельзя читать’.

¹⁰⁷ Iu. Tynianov, ‘Literaturnoe segodnia’, *Russkii sovremennik*, 1 (1924), 291–306 (pp. 305–06).

came to RIII (later GIII) to give a paper in July 1922,¹⁰⁸ and, the following year, published an expanded version of the text of his paper as the article ‘Puti i zadachi nauki o literature’.¹⁰⁹ Smirnov made distinctions between the terms *poeziia*, *literatura*, and *slovesnost’*. He proposed a methodological division between the *nauka o literature* and the *nauka o poezii*, for example, on the basis of their respective objects: he argued that poetry, as a discourse endowed with a more ‘closed and perfect character’ [*zamknutyi i zavershennyi kharakter*], demanded of the scholar a methodology qualitatively different from literature.¹¹⁰

In a published response to the article, Tynianov wrote that Smirnov’s terminological distinctions were arbitrary and could therefore not be used to settle questions of methodology. In a facetious paraphrase of Smirnov, Tynianov joked that one must be very careful not to confuse writers of poetry and writers of literature, since the two were so deceptively similar: ‘Во всяком случае рекомендуется относиться с терпимостью к литераторам, которые иногда чрезвычайно похожи на поэтов’.¹¹¹ Tynianov thought that Smirnov had fallen victim to the temptation of attempting to establish absolute distinctions between three semantically overlapping words in the Russian language. He concluded that the words with which the object of *nauka* was described must not be imposed on it

¹⁰⁸ See M. O. Chudakova, comm. to Tynianov, “‘Literaturnaia mysl’”. Al'manakh II', in *PILK*, pp. 454–56.

¹⁰⁹ A. A. Smirnov, ‘Puti i zadachi nauki o literature’, *Literaturnaia mysl'*, 2 (1923), 91–109.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., p. 103. Cf. Iakubinskii’s implied distinction between *poeziia* and *literatura* (discussed above with reference to his work of the late 1910s).

¹¹¹ Iu. N. Tynianov, [review of *Literaturnaia mysl'*, 2 (1923)], *Kniga i revoliutsiia*, 3 (1923), 71–72 (signed ‘Iu. T.’).

as fixed categories, but constructed ‘on the basis of concrete theoretical studies’.¹¹² For Tynianov, such terms as *poeziia*, *literatura*, and *slovesnost'* could not be considered the neutral tools of historical analysis because they were themselves historical: *poeziia*, for example, was a historically relative term, acquiring different meanings in different epochs. He thought that literary historians could, therefore, only ever use such terms descriptively, as a means of referring to historically specific classifications rather than as absolute classifications in themselves. In the foreword to *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka*, Tynianov justified his decision not to use the term *poeziia* by making a broadly similar argument.¹¹³

Tynianov’s first major theoretical discussion of the history of literature was ‘O literaturnom fakte’. It was published in the issue of *Lef* that followed the special issue on Lenin. The article represented an important moment in the development of Formalism, the formulation of a historically relative conception of literature. In his ‘Pis'mo Tynianovu’, Shklovsky described ‘O literaturnom fakte’ as a ‘very important article, perhaps even decisive in its significance’.¹¹⁴ It was later included, under the title ‘Literaturnyi fakt’, as the first chapter in the collection *Arkhaisty i novatory*.¹¹⁵ Given his preoccupation in 1924 with his own prose, it was typical that Tynianov both began and ended the article with discussions of the

¹¹² Ibid., p. 72.

¹¹³ Tynianov, ‘Predislovie’, in *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka*, pp. 5–6 (p. 5): ‘Термин “поэзия” [...] потерял в настоящее время конкретный объем и содержание и имеет оценочную окраску.’ Cf. Ibid., p. 9: ‘Беру на себя смелость утверждать, что слово “композиция” в 9/10 случаев покрывает отношение к форме как статической.’

¹¹⁴ Viktor Shklovsky, ‘Pis'mo Tynianovu’, in *Tret'ia fabrika* (Moscow: Krug, 1926), pp. 98–100 (p. 98).

¹¹⁵ Iu. N. Tynianov, ‘Literaturnyi fakt’, in *Arkhaisty i novatory* (Leningrad: Priboi, 1929), pp. 5–29.

language of historical analysis, the impossibility of static terms in the face of history.

In the opening paragraph of the article, Tynianov sought to show that, since the very concept of literature was historically relative, shifting through the centuries, the term *literatura* could not be used in any absolute sense. In a nod to Shklovsky and Zhirmunskii's original fantasy of the language of *nauka* as a form of algebra, Tynianov singled out mathematics as a discipline whose language was qualitatively different from that of the study of literature.

Теория словесности упорно состязается с математикой в чрезвычайно плотных и уверенных статических определениях, забывая, что математика строится на определениях, а в теории литературы определения не только не основа, но все время видоизменяемое эволюционирующим литературным фактом следствие. [...] В речи бытуют термины 'словесность', 'литература', 'поэзия', и возникает потребность прикрепить их и тоже обратить на потребу так уважающей определения науке. [...] Собственно говоря, можно бы и не утруждать себя точным определением всех бытующих терминов, возведением их в ранг научных определений.¹¹⁶

The terminology of the *nauka* of literature could only ever be used descriptively, with reference to a particular set of historical conditions in which such a category could have any meaning. Those who studied literature, argued Tynianov, were foolish to seek to fix their terms as absolute because, unlike the object of mathematics, for example, the object of literary scholarship was historically unstable. The inherent dynamism of literature defeated the imposition of static terms. Note that, within a single sentence of the above-quoted passage, Tynianov glided seamlessly from *teoriia slovesnosti* to *teoriia literatury*, treating the two as

¹¹⁶ Iurii Tynianov, 'O literaturnom fakte', *Lef*, 2 (6) (1924), 101–16 (p. 101).

interchangeable. The final sentence of the article summarized his argument about the futility of imposing ‘concrete’ terms on the perpetually evolving ‘literary fact’: ‘Термин конкретен, определение эволюционирует, как эволюционирует сам литературный факт.’¹¹⁷

Tynianov’s solution to what he perceived in 1924 as the impossibility of a single terminology suitable for the problem of history was simply to surrender, to resort instead to a succession of provocative metaphors and thereby to allow his framing of the historical process endlessly to shift. Although it is possible to identify groups of related metaphors in ‘O literaturnom fakte’, it is equally important to note the sheer metaphorical density of that article. Tynianov described the process of change in literature variously as one in which ‘low’ genres pushed out ‘high’ ones through a revolutionary struggle, as one in which the ‘centre’ of literature expanded into its ‘periphery’, as one in which an exceptional literary work was occasionally produced beyond the confines of the ‘canon’, and so forth.¹¹⁸ The metaphors of the early work of the OPOIaZ on literary history will be explored in greater detail in the second chapter of the present work.

Tynianov could be said to have provided a demonstration of the historical instability of literature by constantly changing the terms in which he described instances of historical change, by never allowing his own terminology to become static. The repetitive, cyclical structure of the article adds to the effect of dynamism. Within only fifteen pages, Tynianov returns to the same problems over

¹¹⁷ Ibid., p. 116.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., pp. 110, 103, 109.

and over again. The struggle between the ‘large form’ and the ‘small form’, for example, is introduced on the second page of the article, reprised on the fourth, and once again on the eighth. The concept of genre is discussed at length at the beginning of the article and then again at the very end.

Tynianov’s work on language of 1924 thus divides linguistically into two clear categories: *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka* and ‘Slovar’ Lenina-polemista’, works in the theory of language, were dramatically elliptical texts in which an entire conception of language had been boiled down to a series of abstract terms; ‘O literaturnom fakte’, a work in the theory of literary history, was a more descriptive, repetitive, and metaphorical text in which the same fundamental problem was explored from a shifting succession of angles. Tynianov not only recognized the difference between the two categories in his own theoretical work, but also interpreted it as evidence of a more fundamental division between the language of linguistic analysis and that of historical analysis. Tynianov developed the concept of *nauchnyi iazyk* that he had inherited ultimately from Potebnia, via Bely and the early work of the OPOIaZ, by showing that, while such an abstraction could in many respects be said accurately to characterize Lenin’s prose, and indeed the prose in which he himself had formulated his own theory of language, the ‘dynamism’ of history denied the historian any access to a language of this kind.

It could be argued that Tynianov conceptualized theoretical problems largely in terms of his capacity to write about them: his own prose was necessarily implicated in his theory of language, his unusual terminology functioning according to his own account of its formation; in the same way, his own prose was

necessarily a historical artefact, its terminology destined to shift under pressure from the historical process. It was typical that both *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka* and ‘O literaturnom fakte’ began with comments about the perceived inadequacy of the existing terminologies of the *nauka* of literature. Tynianov recognised that the language of his own theoretical articles was destined to serve as a performance of the general laws that he was trying to describe. His theoretical work took the form of an extended commentary on the limits of his own language: by reflecting on the inadequacy of his own terminology, and, in his work on history, of terminology in general, he was forced to articulate the necessity of developing new conceptual tools.

Towards the end of 1924, Tynianov began to write historical fiction in addition to his literary scholarship. The publishing house that commissioned his first novel, *Kubuch*, had originally wanted a short brochure for children in commemoration of the centennial of the Decembrist uprising, but Tynianov submitted a much longer manuscript.¹¹⁹ Other works of historical fiction soon followed, including *Podporuchik Kizhe* (1927) and *Smert' Vazir-Mukhtara* (1928). In a later essay on Tynianov's novels, Eikhenbaum described them variously as ‘scientific novels’ [*nauchnye romany*] and ‘artistic monographs’ [*khudozhestvennye monografii*], two paradoxical descriptions of a genre that had, Eikhenbaum thought, allowed Tynianov to go beyond historical evidence, to explore the psychology of historical figures about whom relatively little was known.¹²⁰ Tynianov's decision to begin

¹¹⁹ Kornei Chukovskii, in *Iurii Tynianov: pisatel' i uchenyi. Vospominaniia, razmyshleniia, vstrechi*, ed. by V. Kaverin (Moscow: Molodaia gvardiia, 1966), pp. 111–19.

¹²⁰ B. M. Eikhenbaum, in *Iurii Tynianov*, ed. by Kaverin, pp. 73–85 (both p. 84).

writing historical novels produced a new and more glaring division in his oeuvre, one between, on the one hand, theoretical and historical work on literature and, on the other, historical fiction. Scholars of Tynianov now presuppose the division between *nauka* and literature as the basic fact of his oeuvre.

The emergence of a new division in Tynianov's oeuvre as a whole — that between *nauka* and historical fiction — coincided with a unification in his *nauka*: he overcame the old division discussed above in relation to his work of 1924, that between theoretical work on literary language and theoretical work on literary history. Tynianov's article 'O literaturnoi evoliutsii' (1927) was an example of his new, unified theoretical approach. Tynianov conceptualized the individual literary work, the literary genre, and literature itself as interrelated 'systems' of 'functions'. In the system of the eighteenth-century ode, for example, linguistic archaisms served the function of advertising an elevated style; by the mid-nineteenth century, however, the function of archaisms, the very same 'fact', had shifted, as is evident from Tiutchev's poetry.¹²¹ As the title of the article made clear, Tynianov's new model made it possible for him to describe the 'evolution' of literature. He conceptualized literature as one of various 'series' [*riady*] evolving in parallel. Changes of function in the literary series were 'conditioned' [*obuslovlennye*] — but not determined — by changes in the other series.¹²² In 'Problemy izucheniia literatury i iazyka' (1928), an article co-authored with Jakobson, he and Jakobson argued that the dichotomy of synchrony and diachrony had to be overcome to

¹²¹ Iu. N. Tynianov, 'O literaturnoi evoliutsii', in *PILK*, pp. 270–81 (p. 273). The original title, under which it was published in *Na literaturnom postu* in 1927, was 'Vopros o literaturnoi evoliutsii'. The new title was adopted on its inclusion in *Arkhaisty i novatory*, pp. 30–47.

¹²² *Ibid.*, p. 281.

produce a theory of a ‘systemic evolution’, of the ‘evolving system’: ‘мы признаем, что каждая система дана обязательно как эволюция, а с другой стороны, эволюция носит неизбежно системный характер.’¹²³

It is for ‘O literaturnoi evoliutsii’ and ‘Problemy izucheniia literatury i iazyka’ that Tynianov is now best known as a literary theorist, especially outside Russia.¹²⁴ It is often argued that ‘O literaturnoi evoliutsii’ and ‘Problemy izucheniia literatury i iazyka’ represented an early incarnation of the ‘structural’ approach to the study of cultural phenomena, one now strongly associated with the work of the Prague Linguistic Circle in the late 1920s and 1930s and with Jakobson’s work of the following decades.¹²⁵ As Chudakov, Chudakova, and Toddes note, the model of evolution advanced in the two articles represented an application to literary history of the conceptual apparatus of structural linguistics.¹²⁶ It is therefore possible to draw parallels between their model of evolution and the work of such linguists as Ferdinand de Saussure. Chudakov, Chudakova, and Toddes, for example, suggest that the Saussurean dichotomy of *parole* and *langue* inspired similar dichotomies

¹²³ R. Jakobson and Iu. Tynianov, ‘Problemy izucheniia literatury i iazyka’, *Novyi Lef*, 12 (1928), 35–37 (pp. 36–37).

¹²⁴ Note that ‘O literaturnoi evoliutsii’ was first published in an English translation in 1977, whereas ‘O literaturnom fakte’ was not published in English until the year 2000: Tynianov, ‘On Literary Evolution’, trans. by Carol A. Luplow, in *Readings in Russian Poetics: Formalist and Structuralist Views*, ed. by Matejka and Pomorska (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1971), pp. 66–78; idem, ‘The Literary Fact’, trans. by Ann Shukman, in *Modern Genre Theory*, ed. by David Duff (Harlow: Pearson Education, 2000), pp. 29–49.

¹²⁵ On the significance of Tynianov and Jakobson’s work of the late 1920s in the history of structuralism, see esp. Jurij Striedter, *Literary Structure, Evolution, and Value: Russian Formalism and Czech Structuralism Reconsidered* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989), pp. 83–119.

¹²⁶ Chudakov, Chudakova, and Toddes, comm. to Tynianov, ‘O literaturnoi evoliutsii’, in *PILK*, pp. 518–30.

in ‘O literaturnoi evoliutsii’.¹²⁷ Klaas-Hinrich Ehlers demonstrates the continuity between Tynianov’s ‘system model’ of the late 1920s and the ‘construction model’ of his earlier work (and especially of his work on verse), identifying the year 1925 as the turning point in the development of his thought. He argues for the historical significance of Tynianov’s mature theoretical work by comparing its ‘metaphorical repertoire’ — its *riady*, *sistemy*, *funktsii*, and so forth — with that of Saussure and the Prague Linguistic Circle.¹²⁸

More fundamental than the development of Tynianov’s new, embryonically structuralist metaphors, however, was the restriction of his metaphorical apparatus as a whole, its reduction to a handful of highly abstract terms. The publication of ‘O literaturnoi evoliutsii’ and ‘Problemy izucheniia literatury i iazyka’ as lists of numbered theses served only to exaggerate the effect of an increased concision. Tynianov’s theoretical model of the late 1920s provided him with a way of framing multiple instances of change in the one and the same set of terms. He had unified his terminology by developing a meta-language in which any example in the history of literature could be reduced to a discussion of the interaction of ‘functions’ within a ‘system’. It was as if his early work on literary history of the period 1919–24 had been a transitory stage in his thought, one in which it had been necessary to resort to a wide range of evocative metaphors in the absence of an appropriate terminology. *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka*, Tynianov’s first application to literature of the science of language, had been a forerunner of his mature work of the late 1920s. For that reason, the book had been linguistically

¹²⁷ Ibid., esp. pp. 523–24.

¹²⁸ Ehlers, pp. 156–203, 261–67.

analogous: terminologically dense, concise, and abstract. For Tynianov, the science of language led, in its application to literature, to a linguistically specific realization of *nauka*.

To illustrate the argument, let us compare ‘O literaturnom fakte’ and ‘O literaturnoi evoliutsii’ in linguistic terms. Whereas, in ‘O literaturnom fakte’, he had approached the problem of historical change from a variety of angles, generating provocative metaphors as he went, the same strategy was no longer possible in ‘O literaturnoi evoliutsii’. Consider the following two sentences:

В эпоху разложения какого-нибудь жанра — он из центра перемещается в периферию, а на его место из мелочей литературы, из ее задворков и низин wpłyвает в центр новое явление.
(‘O literaturnom fakte’, 1924)¹²⁹

Система литературного ряда есть прежде всего *система функций литературного ряда, в непрерывной соотнесенности с другими рядами*.
(‘O literaturnoi evoliutsii’, 1927)¹³⁰

The first quotation, from ‘O literaturnom fakte’, is typical of that article in that it contains a string of mutually reinforcing metaphors. Tynianov describes the emergence of a new genre from the ‘trivialities’ of literature, but immediately follows his first metaphor with two more, equally evocative metaphors. The sentence thus progressively generates semantic associations. The second quotation, from ‘O literaturnoi evoliutsii’, betrays a more refined, abstract terminology. Like *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka*, it uses language in a different manner: rather than relying on the semantically generative power of individual words, it exploits the

¹²⁹ Tynianov, ‘O literaturnom fakte’, p. 103. The entire sentence is emphasized in the original.

¹³⁰ Tynianov, ‘O literaturnoi evoliutsii’, in *PILK*, pp. 270–81 (p. 277, emphasis in original).

relations between terms stripped of their metaphorical potential. The very structure of the sentence, with two units linked as equivalents by the archaic verb form *est*, could even be said to mimic the way in which an algebraic equation links two expressions by an equals sign. While the two sentences quoted above are perhaps extreme examples, they are nevertheless representative of the general tendency of each article.

Tynianov made several explicit comments about terminology in ‘O literaturnoi evoliutsii’. Towards the end of the article, he explained his decision to cleanse his language of the terms ‘influence’ [*vliianie*] and ‘tradition’ [*traditsiia*], both of which struck him as being excessively diffuse.¹³¹ He and Jakobson continued the task of terminological purification in ‘Problemy izucheniia literatury i iazyka’. In the first of the nine theses that comprise the article, they wrote about the false hope offered by the ‘new terminology’ of other literary scholars, arguing that such terminologies frequently masked nothing more than further historicizable ‘catalogizations’.¹³² Tynianov and Jakobson were attempting to overcome the urge simply to catalogue phenomena under analysis, aiming instead to produce an unhistoricizable terminology, a maximally abstract tool with which to capture their object.

Tynianov saw the development of a new terminology, a language of historical analysis, as synonymous with the development of a new model for the ‘evolution’ of literature. In order successfully to model the historical process, in other words,

¹³¹ Ibid., p. 280.

¹³² Jakobson and Tynianov, ‘Problemy izucheniia literatury i iazyka’, p. 37.

he had to develop a terminology resistant to history, a means of modelling historical development without falling victim to it. Such a language, wrote Tynianov in an echo of Jakobson's well-known comment of 1921, would allow the study of literary history finally to become a 'science' [*nauka*], to achieve *nauchnost'* through a mastery of the historical process: 'Для того чтобы стать наконец наукой, история литературы должна претендовать на достоверность. Пересмотру должны быть подвергнуты все ее термины, и прежде всего самый термин "история литературы".'¹³³ Tynianov associated *nauka* with objectivity, with 'authenticity', an ideal attainable only through the development of a linguistic tool abstract enough to be unhistoricizable. Even the concept of a 'history of literature' had to be re-examined, itself at risk of being historicized. The development of a language of historical analysis and the development of a theoretical model of the historical process thus became identical tasks, both strategies for the cultivation of *nauchnost'*.

Tynianov's development in the late 1920s of a laconic, abstract language of historical analysis can productively be contrasted against the direction taken by Eikhenbaum during the same period. Although Eikhenbaum had been tempted to turn to writing fiction as an escape from the 'crisis' in which he had found himself since early 1924,¹³⁴ he resolved to continue working on the theory and history of literature, that is, to continue producing *nauka*. He had, however, lost patience with

¹³³ Tynianov, 'O literaturnoi evoliutsii', in *PILK*, pp. 270–81 (p. 271). Cf. the comment about terminology in Viktor Shklovsky, in *Iurii Tynianov*, ed. by Kaverin, pp. 48–72 (p. 61): 'Борьба за точность термина должна была стать началом борьбы за историческую конкретность.'

¹³⁴ On Eikhenbaum's 'crisis' of the period 1924–27, see Carol Any, *Boris Eikhenbaum: Voices of a Russian Formalist* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1994), pp. 80–103.

the mode of *nauka* initially practised by the participants of the OPOIaZ. He was trying to find a new path through an intellectual landscape that had changed profoundly since the late 1910s. In a letter to Shklovsky of spring 1927, he expressed frustration with the dated studies of ‘composition’ that had brought him fame.¹³⁵ He overcame his personal crisis by moving in a new direction. By late 1927, he had perfected a more ‘biographical’ approach to the study of literature, one concerned with what it meant to be a writer in history. His new approach found theoretical justification in the article ‘Literaturnyi byt’ (1927) and its most extensive application in the first book (1928) of his *Lev Tolstoi*. The new direction in Eikhenbaum’s work failed to convince Tynianov and Shklovsky, as the published excerpts of their correspondence of the late 1920s show.¹³⁶ Indeed, ‘O literaturnoi evoliutsii’ has often been read as a response to Eikhenbaum’s ‘Literaturnyi byt’,¹³⁷ an attempt by Tynianov to challenge what he saw as the methodologically confused introduction of biography into the study of literature.

Eikhenbaum’s new, ‘biographical’ *nauka* entailed a transformation of his own prose. He had adopted a more accessible mode of writing, one oriented less towards argumentation and more towards discursivity. He wanted to write about the life of the *literator* in richly textured detail. In a diary entry of March 1928, he

¹³⁵ Eikhenbaum, letter to Shklovsky of 16 February 1927, as quoted in M. O. Chudakova, ‘Sotsial'naia praktika, filologicheskaiia refleksii i literatura v nauchnoi biografii Eikhenbauma i Tynianova’, in *TS*, 2 (1986), pp. 103–31 (p. 113).

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 110–23 *passim*.

¹³⁷ For a contemporary interpretation of the two articles as evidence of disagreement among the Formalists, see M. Grigor'ev, ‘Krizis formalizma’, *Pechat' i revoliutsiia*, 8 (1927), 84–91. On Tynianov’s ‘O literaturnoi evoliutsii’ as an example of the ‘genre’ of the *nauchnoe poslanie*, an encoded message to Eikhenbaum, see Jan Levchenko, *Drugaia nauka: russkie formalisty v poiskakh biografii* (Moscow: Izdatel'skii dom NIU VShE, 2012), pp. 67–79.

noted with pleasant surprise that, as well as writing about literature much more voluminously than previously, he had recently begun to write ‘strangely, differently’, in a ‘semi-literary or memoir style’ [*v stile polubelletristiki ili memuara*].¹³⁸ In the same diary entry, Eikhenbaum likened his new style to Veniamin Kaverin and Tynianov’s fiction, seeing his own recent work on Tolstoy as an example of the same ‘lighter path’ [*bolee legkii put'*].¹³⁹ The time for the *nauka* of the OPOIaZ, thought Eikhenbaum, had passed; history now demanded a greater lightness of touch.

Shklovsky, however, worried about the incursion of a lighter style into the territory of *nauka*. In a letter to Tynianov of late 1928, he gave his assessment of ‘Literaturnaia kar'era L. Tolstogo’ (1928), one of Eikhenbaum’s recent articles on Tolstoy. The article, Shklovsky thought, was characterized by a lightness excessive for a work of *nauka*; it did not constitute a recreation of the train of thought underpinning its argument, as was expected of such a work. The linguistic scaffolding of its making, argued Shklovsky, had been removed.

Статья Борина [*sc.* Эйхенбаума] о карьере Толстого написана с тургеневской легкостью. Так хорошо писать не умеет у нас никто, но в этой статье не видны следы инструмента, она не проверяема, в ней нет сопротивления материала, и она значит то, что значит, не давая вращения мысли. [...] Боре нужно написать роман про Толстого. Для этого из его статей нужно будет выскоблить кавычки.¹⁴⁰

¹³⁸ Eikhenbaum, diary entry of 7 March 1928, as quoted in Chudakova, ‘Sotsial'naia praktika’, p. 115.

¹³⁹ Eikhenbaum, diary entry of 7 March 1928, as quoted *ibid.*, p. 115.

¹⁴⁰ Shklovsky, letter to Tynianov of unspecified date (though probably of late 1928 or early 1929), as quoted *ibid.*, p. 118.

Shklovsky thought that Eikhenbaum's recent prose was too polished, his article on Tolstoy suspiciously well written; its superficial perfection had been achieved through an elimination of all 'traces of the instrument' [*sledy instrumenta*], that is, of all evidence of how it had been made syntactically to mean what it meant. In linguistic terms, it was not clearly a realization of *nauka*. Shklovsky likened Eikhenbaum to Turgenev, a writer known for his elegantly 'light' literary prose. In a reply to Shklovsky's letter, Tynianov extended the comparison between Eikhenbaum and Turgenev by noting that Eikhenbaum's books had recently begun to resemble Turgenev's novels and his articles Turgenev's stories.¹⁴¹ Even Eikhenbaum's pupils at GIII — who thought that the Formalism practised by their teachers was in need of some form of rejuvenation — seemed perplexed by the new 'style' of his most recent work on Tolstoy.¹⁴²

Shklovsky made Eikhenbaum aware of his reservations about the 'biographical' style: 'Тот метод полубеллетристического повествования, который ты берешь, [...] дает ошибки красноречивые и непоправимые. Нужно или писать роман, или оставлять следы инструмента в работе'.¹⁴³ The planned resurrection of the OPOIaZ, according to Shklovsky, demanded something different. In a letter to Tynianov of 27 November 1928, Shklovsky recommended the preparation of a collective work 'of maximal theoreticism' [*maksimal'noi teoretichnosti*] and

¹⁴¹ Tynianov, letter to Shklovsky of 31 March 1929, as quoted *ibid.*, p. 118.

¹⁴² On Ginzburg's reaction to Eikhenbaum's work of the late 1920s, see Stanislav Savitskii, 'Spor s uchitelem: nachalo literaturnogo/issledovatel'skogo proekta L. Ginzburg', *NLO*, 82 (2006), 129–54.

¹⁴³ Shklovsky, letter to Eikhenbaum of 27 November 1928, as quoted in Chudakova, 'Sotsial'naia praktika', pp. 119–20. He specified his objection to the style of the work even more clearly elsewhere in the same letter: 'Возражения у меня — метод написания книги, т. е. не преодоленная биография.'

omitted Eikhenbaum from a list of potential contributors.¹⁴⁴ For Shklovsky and Tynianov, then, Eikhenbaum's most recent work on Tolstoy made use of language differently from the *nauka* to which they had become accustomed: it could no longer be conceptualized as an attempt to reproduce tautologically the exposition of an argument through a manipulation of the mechanisms of syntax.

At around the same time, Tynianov was completing the compilation of *Arkhaisty i novatory*, a collection of his articles of the 1920s. As will be explored in greater detail in the third chapter of the present work, the preparation of the collection was a revelatory experience for Tynianov, allowing him retrospectively to reconstruct his career as a theorist of literature. The preparation of the collection was also an opportunity for him to make sense of how he wrote, of his increasingly dense and abstract conceptual prose. In the foreword to the collection, probably written as he was correcting the proofs in October 1928,¹⁴⁵ Tynianov defended the apparent difficulty of the language in which 'many articles', presumably including his own, were written. He explained that, although the language of some works of *nauka* could be interpreted as being obscure for the sake of obscurity, it was impossible to make an original contribution to *nauka* in any other way. Every article was written to say something, but, once that something had been said, the article seemed

¹⁴⁴ Shklovsky, letter to Tynianov of 27 November 1928, as given in 'Iz perepiski Iu. Tynianova i B. Eikhenbauma s V. Shklovskim', *Voprosy literatury*, 12 (1984), 185–218 (ed. by O. Panchenko) (pp. 193–94). Note also the implied exclusion of Eikhenbaum from the OPOIaZ in Shklovsky, letter to Jakobson of 16 February 1929, as quoted in Chudakova, 'Sotsial'naia praktika', p. 120: 'Опояз можно восстановить только при твоём приезде, так как Опояз — это всегда трое.'

¹⁴⁵ See A. P. Chudakov, M. O. Chudakova, and E. A. Toddes, comm. to Jakobson and Tynianov, 'Problemy izucheniia literatury i iazyka', in *PILK*, pp. 530–36 (p. 530).

unsatisfactory; the linguistic mechanisms by which the message was communicated were undone in the process, leaving an impression of redundancy.

Собственно говоря, всякая статья пишется для того, чтобы нечто выяснить; когда же нечто выяснено, статья отменяется этим самым и кажется неудовлетворительной.

Это относится, в частности, к тяжеловатому и иногда даже неясному языку, которым написаны многие статьи и который, при желании, критика может объяснить как авгурский язык, т.е. как намеренное затемнение смысла собственной речи. [...]

Дело в том, что язык не только передает понятия, но и является ходом их конструирования. Поэтому, напр[имер], пересказ чужих мыслей обыкновенно яснее, чем рассказ своих.¹⁴⁶

For Tynianov, language was the ‘movement’ [*khod*], the succession of relations, by which ‘concepts’ were constructed. The convoluted prose of practitioners of *nauka*, their ‘gnomic’ [*avgurskii*] or ‘rather difficult and sometimes even unclear’ language, could be explained by the fact that they were obliged to make language follow a particular ‘movement’ in order to advance a particular argument. For that reason, it was often easier to paraphrase someone else’s thoughts than to phrase one’s own. In another passage in the foreword to the collection, Tynianov suggested that his older articles, those written towards the beginning of the 1920s, now seemed foreign to him, as if he had not been their author. The manner in which he thought, in other words, had changed during the course of the decade, such that a new relational arrangement was necessary to represent new ‘movements’. By the late 1920s, Tynianov had restricted the metaphorical repertoire of his earlier work, developing instead a limited set of more abstract terms arranged in syntactic patterns so as to represent cognitive ‘movements’, to leave in language the ‘traces of the instrument’.

¹⁴⁶ Tynianov, ‘Predislovie’, in *Arkhaisty i novatory*, pp. 3–4 (p. 4).

Although he provided a sophisticated justification for the difficulty of his prose, Tynianov nevertheless resolved in October 1928 to make his theoretical work easier to read in the future. As he was finalizing the collection for publication, he half-jokingly promised Shklovsky that, from then on, he would write with ‘excessive’ clarity: ‘Обещаюсь [...] писать не “недостаточно ясно”, а “слишком ясно”.’¹⁴⁷ The formulation was intriguingly oxymoronic: Tynianov acknowledged the need to write ‘clearly’, to avoid the ‘gnomic language’ of much literary-theoretical work, but nevertheless wanted to cultivate clarity to an excessive degree, once again to take language to its extremity.¹⁴⁸

Despite Tynianov’s brave attempt to mount a theoretical justification for the opacity of his prose, one contemporary reviewer of *Arkhaisty i novatory* nevertheless noted with annoyance the obscure language in which its articles were written. The problem was particularly acute, the reviewer noted, in the theoretical sections of the book. The review began as follows: ‘Эта книга и по языку и по цене не предназначена для широкого читателя. Язык автора, особенно в теоретических частях книги, очень сложен, затруднителен.’¹⁴⁹ Tynianov’s book was deemed linguistically inaccessible, very ‘complex’ and ‘difficult’. The reviewer concluded that *Arkhaisty i novatory* was, in addition to being an overpriced and irredeemably Formalist book, one that was unsuitable for the

¹⁴⁷ See Tynianov, letter to Shklovsky of October 1928, as quoted in Chudakov, Chudakova, and Toddes, comm. to Jakobson and Tynianov, ‘Problemy izucheniia literatury i iazyka’, in *PILK*, p. 531.

¹⁴⁸ Cf. Tynianov, ‘O literaturnom fakte’, p. 105: ‘И бывают эпохи, когда все поэты “хорошо” пишут, тогда гениальным будет “плохой” поэт.’

¹⁴⁹ ‘N. D—nyi’, [review of Tynianov, *Arkhaisty i novatory* (1929)], *Zhurnal dlia vsekh*, 5 (1929), 127.

uninitiated on account of its linguistic obscurity: ‘Для мало подготовленного читателя книга не пригодна.’¹⁵⁰

The above-quoted reviewer of *Arkhaisty i novatory* described the book by using the same adjectives that Tomashevskii had used to describe *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka* and that Shklovsky had used in *Voskreshenie slova* to describe the language of poetry.¹⁵¹ The continuity in the selection of adjectives shows that Tynianov’s application to literature of the science of language — in such texts as *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka* and ‘O literaturnoi evoliutsii’ — resulted in a linguistic performance analogous in effect to the original OPOIaZ conception of poetry. The prose of Tynianov’s *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka* and ‘O literaturnoi evoliutsii’, a language modelled syntactically on cognitive ‘movements’, one designed to exploit the relations between terms, provided an uncanny demonstration of language made ‘difficult’, ‘complex’, and ‘strange’. Although Tynianov and Shklovsky thought that Eikhenbaum had in some way denigrated *nauka* by adopting a more ‘literary’, ‘biographical’ style, Tynianov’s application to literature of the conceptual apparatus of structural linguistics brought the language of *nauka* close to that of poetry.

Tynianov had explicitly addressed the same phenomenon in an article prepared for the first volume of an edition of Khlebnikov’s collected works and published as he was compiling *Arkhaisty i novatory* in 1928. Tynianov argued that Khlebnikov had been canonized in Russian culture as a poet of ‘meaningless’ poetry, as the author

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 127.

¹⁵¹ Tomashevskii, [review of Tynianov, *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka*], p. 266; Shklovsky, *Voskreshenie slova*, p. 13.

of *zaum*'. In fact, Khlebnikov's primary concern had been meaning, the construction of a new 'semantic system' [*semanticheskaia sistema*].¹⁵² Tynianov argued that most readers could literally not understand the great poets working contemporaneously to them. Although contemporaries dismissed the work of every great poet as 'meaningless', subsequent generations of readers were eventually 'raised' to the semantic level required to understand it: 'Все поэты, даже частично менявшие семантические системы, бывали объявляемы бессмысленными, а потом становились понятными — не сами по себе, а потому что читатели поднимались на их семантическую систему.'¹⁵³ The same had recently been true of Aleksandr Blok: 'Стихи раннего Блока не стали понятнее сами по себе; а кто их теперь не "понимает"?'¹⁵⁴ Given that Tynianov went on in the article to claim that poetry and *nauka* were 'very close in method', it could be argued that he understood his own language of *nauka*, the 'semantic system' of his theoretical work of the late 1920s, to be analogous to Khlebnikov's poetry, unintelligible to contemporaries on account of its novelty.¹⁵⁵

Tynianov commented in the article about the similarity between *nauka* and art. He argued that Khlebnikov's experimentation with mathematics had been a way of developing his new 'semantic system', his 'strange' new poetry, concluding that the manner in which art developed was analogous to that in which *nauka*

¹⁵² Iu. Tynianov, 'O Khlebnikove', in *Sobranie proizvedenii Velimira Khlebnikova*, 5 vols, ed. by Iu. Tynianov and N. Stepanov (Leningrad: Izd. pisatelei, 1928–33), vol. 1 (1928), pp. 17–30 (p. 26).

¹⁵³ Ibid., p. 26.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 26.

¹⁵⁵ Cf. Eikhenbaum, diary entry of 24 January 1925, as quoted in Chudakova, 'Sotsial'naiia praktika', p. 108: 'Витя [sc. Шкловский] хорошо говорит о том, что мы должны заново писать непонятные работы — как лисица, которая сворачивает резко вбок, а собака продолжает нестись дальше.'

developed. His explanation of the distinction between the two, however, was ambiguous: ‘Совсем не так велика пропасть между методами науки и искусства. Только то, что в науке имеет самодовлеющую ценность, то оказывается в искусстве резервуаром его энергии.’¹⁵⁶ Tynianov presumably meant that Khlebnikov’s mathematical innovations had served, for art, as a ‘reservoir of energy’ from which he could produce new innovations in semantics, whereas those same mathematical innovations would, for *nauka*, have been sufficient in themselves.¹⁵⁷ Nevertheless, the word *samodovleiushchii* was significant. It once again seemed to evoke the early work of the OPOIaZ on poetry as language in which sound was ‘valuable in itself’.¹⁵⁸ Tynianov’s rereading of Khlebnikov’s poetry gave him the opportunity to consider in greater detail the relationship between *nauka* and poetry. It can be conjectured that the contemporaneous experience of rereading his old articles for inclusion in *Arkhaisty i novatory*, and thus of making sense of his own language as something ‘foreign’, was a decisive factor in his self-reflection.

Thus, in the period 1924–30, Tynianov overcame the division in his theoretical work of 1924 by adopting the conceptual apparatus of structural linguistics, a strategy that empowered him with a unified language of analysis. Whereas

¹⁵⁶ Tynianov, ‘O Khlebnikove’, p. 28.

¹⁵⁷ Cf. Eikhenbaum, in *Iurii Tynianov*, ed. by Kaverin, p. 84: ‘Статья эта [sc. “Архаисты и Пушкин”] оказалась подлинным “резервуаром” для художественной энергии, направленной на постановку и освежение тех проблем, которые оставались за пределами научного метода.’

¹⁵⁸ Cf. Iakubinskii, ‘O zvukakh stikhotvornogo iazyka’, p. 16 (emphasis in original): ‘существуют [...] другие языковые системы, в которых [...] языковые представления приобретают *самоценность*.’ Cf. also Shklovsky, ‘Iskusstvo kak priem’, p. 8 (emphasis in original): ‘*воспринимаемый процесс в искусстве самоцелен*’.

Eikhenbaum adopted a 'lighter' style in his historical and theoretical work towards the end of the 1920s, one self-consciously presented as novelistic, Tynianov saw such stylistic lightness as impossible in the conduct of *nauka*, since he believed that concepts were formed through language. Indeed, whereas Eikhenbaum attempted in the late 1920s to synthesize *nauka* and literature, Tynianov kept his theoretical work and his historical fiction very separate. His strategy could nevertheless not prevent the convergence of *nauka* and poetry in his work, the disintegration of the linguistic polarization originally developed by the OPOIaZ.

It has been argued that, on the question of a distinct 'language of *nauka*', a single thread can be traced, via the seminal work of the OPOIaZ, from the work of Potebnia and other Russian literary scholars of the late imperial period to the work of the Formalists in the late 1920s. In the 1910s, Shklovsky and Iakubinskii inherited Potebnia's theory of language and, with it, the juxtaposition of poetry and prose, *nauka* being categorized as an extreme form of the latter. Initially, their conception of *nauka* served principally as a foil against which their conception of *zaum'* could be brought into focus. They thought that the language of *nauka* was, unlike the ambiguous language of poetry, a laconic, algebraic language, a language made referentially precise. In the early 1920s, Tynianov developed the same opposition in greater detail by synthesizing ideas from the works of theorists as varied as Andrei Bely, Wilhelm Wundt, and Joseph Vendryes. In *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka* and 'Slovar' Lenina-polemista', his two major theoretical works on language, he identified terminology, the 'word-term', as the paradigmatic example of proseness. Simultaneously, however, he was beginning to problematize his own conceptual prose, the language of his theoretical work. He and those who

reviewed his works in 1924 perceived an unbridgeable chasm in his oeuvre between theoretical work on language and theoretical work on literary history, characterizing the former as an example of a terminologically dense, abstract discourse and the latter as an example of a more metaphorical, 'literary' one. Tynianov conceptualized the division in his own theoretical work in linguistic terms, by analogy with the same division between a supposed language of *nauka* and one of literature. In the late 1920s, he overcame that division by developing a highly abstract language with which he was able to describe different periods of literary history in the same terms, as demonstrations of the same set of laws. As he made clear in reservations expressed about Eikhenbaum's more 'literary' style of *nauka*, Tynianov believed that, as a representation of thought, language had to follow its movements, to leave, as Shklovsky put it, 'traces of the instrument'.

The discussion in the present chapter of the conception of *nauka* to which the Formalists ascribed provides additional evidence of the pervasive cognitivism of their intellectual project. Shklovsky and Iakubinskii, like Potebnia before them, conceptualized poetry and prose as modes of cognition. The difference between them could be explained in terms of generalized cognitive laws and *nauka*, as an extreme example of prose, was considered an extreme example of a particular way of thinking. Even in the late 1920s, Tynianov and Shklovsky continued to understand *nauka* as a representation of thought in language, a reproduction in syntax of cognitive 'movements'. Eikhenbaum's new, 'biographical' studies of Tolstoy were linguistically suspicious precisely because they effaced such movements.

The interdependence of poetry and *nauka*, the strategy of defining them in contradistinction to each other, was of major methodological significance for the development of Formalism. It allowed the members of the OPOIaZ, keen to lay claim to *nauka*, to implicate their own work in the production of a theory of literature, such that, the more they isolated *poetichnost'*, the more they affirmed their *nauchnost'*. The same strategy of self-representation continued into the 1920s. Tynianov's terminologically dense work on language of 1924, for example, constituted a performance of what he understood to be the very essence, the 'ideal', of proseness; to analyse verse, the structural opposite of prose, in a provocatively abstract terminology was to stage a juxtaposition between the analysing text and the analysed text.

The most significant development, however, was the increasing convergence of *nauka* and poetry in Tynianov's work, the increasing proximity of his abstract theoretical language to poetry as it had been imagined by the OPOIaZ. It is illuminating in that regard to consider Jakobson's later, structuralist work on the 'grammar of poetry' and the 'poetry of grammar'.¹⁵⁹ Jakobson wrote about the 'grammatical texture' of poetry, the quality responsible for, among other features, the high frequency of pronouns in poems: as 'purely grammatical, relational units', pronouns could become components in the 'geometrical order' of the poetic construction.¹⁶⁰ The language of Tynianov's mature, 'structuralist' theoretical work was, like poetry, dependent to a high degree on 'grammar', on the relations

¹⁵⁹ Roman Jakobson, 'Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry' (1960), in *Selected Writings*, vol. 3: Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry, ed. by Stephen Rudy (The Hague: Mouton, 1981), pp. 87–97.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 95.

among its components. For Tynianov, the theorization of poetry resulted in the collapse of the polarization of *poeticheskii iazyk* and *nauchnyi iazyk* as they had originally been conceived. He came instead to see *poeticheskii iazyk* and *nauchnyi iazyk* as languages that, while structured analogously, were defined by different functions.

Chapter Two

The Science of History (1919–24)

From 1919, the members of the OPOIaZ began to expand their early focus on literature ‘as such’ by giving more explicit consideration to the problem of history. They wanted to know how literature changed from one epoch to the next. Literary history represented a methodological challenge for the Society because, as was explored in the previous chapter, Shklovsky and Iakubinskii’s original theory of poetry had been based on a model of cognition: they had avoided having to theorize historical change because they had defined the specificity of poetry — and that of art more generally — in terms of cognitive mechanisms. But the problem of history soon became unavoidable. Eikhenbaum would later write that the first Formalist work on literary history, the ‘escape’ [*vykhod*] from the field of ‘theoretical poetics’ into the history of literature, had been Shklovsky’s ‘*Sviaz’ priemov siuzhetoslozheniia s obshchimi priemami stil’ia*’.¹ It was first published in *Poetika*, the third collection of the *Sborniki po teorii poeticheskogo iazyka*, in May 1919.² Tynianov’s entry into the Society coincided with — and could be said to have helped to accelerate — the turn towards the problem of history.

The increasingly historical orientation of the theoretical work of the OPOIaZ in the period 1919–21 was inseparable from its members’ increasingly historical

¹ B. M. Eikhenbaum, ‘Teoriia “formal’nogo metoda”’, in *Literatura: teoriia, kritika, polemika* (Leningrad: Priboi, 1927), pp. 116–48 (p. 131).

² Month of publication as given in A. V. Krusanov, *Russkii avangard: 1907–1932 (Istoricheskii obzor)*, 2 vols (Moscow: NLO, 2003), vol. 2: *Futuristicheskaia revoliutsiia* (1917–1921), kn. 1, pp. 287–304 (p. 295).

conception of their own work. They were beginning to show much greater interest in the nature of their own movement as a product of the historical process. The year 1921, for example, saw the publication not only of Shklovsky's *Rozanov* and Tynianov's *Dostoevskii i Gogol'*, two early contributions to the theory of literary history, but also of Eikhenbaum's 'Mig soznaniia', an article in which he mused on his own experience of the historical process in the wake of the death of symbolism.³ They began to look backwards, to present the founding of the Society as an event of enormous significance in history. In an article published in January 1922, Eikhenbaum wrote unequivocally that the Society had been formed in the spirit of the Revolution.⁴ History, they thought, was the force that united the Revolution and the *nauka* of the OPOIaZ as components of a larger force of modernity. As the focus of their work expanded to encompass history, then, their conception of their own practice of *nauka* shifted with it.

The present chapter addresses the question of how the increasingly historical orientation of the work of the OPOIaZ in the period 1919–24 affected their realization of *nauka*, the aim being to reconstruct a natural-scientific paradigm in the early work of the Society on literary history. The Society had originally aligned its theory of perception with the natural sciences — and especially with experimental psychology and a natural-scientific brand of linguistics concerned primarily with the mechanical production of sound.⁵ Its members had often been

³ B. Eikhenbaum, 'Mig soznaniia', *Knizhnyi ugol*, 7 (1921), 9–17.

⁴ B. Eikhenbaum, '5 = 100', *Knizhnyi ugol*, 8 (1922), 38–41. Month of publication as given in M. O. Chudakova, comm. to Tynianov, 'Zapiski o zapadnoi literature', in *PILK*, pp. 441–46.

⁵ On this type of linguistics, see Sergueï Tchougounnikov, 'Éduard Sievers et la phonétique allemande du début du XX-e siècle. Les sources allemandes des

compared to natural scientists, usually in an attempt to discredit their project.⁶ The turn towards the problem of literary history offered the Formalists an opportunity to use the natural sciences for provocation. For philosophers of science such as Wilhelm Windelband and Heinrich Rickert, historicity was the fundamental principle in the division of the sciences. The sciences of nature and those of history were separated by an unbridgeable division: nature, it was thought, could be mastered by general laws; history, by contrast, proliferated specific events. Windelband and Rickert were widely influential at St Petersburg University during the 1910s.⁷ In early 1919, however, Eikhenbaum gestured towards a reconceptualization of such a dichotomy by proposing the application of the ‘natural-scientific method’ to the history of art: ‘Можно, исходя из Риккерта, представить себе, что и в истории искусства необходимо применение естественнонаучного метода’.⁸ If it could be shown that Eikhenbaum’s suggestion had been put into practice in the early 1920s, that an attempt had been

théorisations russes de la charpente sonore du langage’, *Histoire Épistémologie Langage*, 29 (2007), 145–62.

⁶ See, e.g., Mikhail Slonimskii, ‘S. A. Vengerov’, *Dom iskusstv*, 1 (1921), 64–66 (where the Formalists are likened to anatomists, p. 64); and A. Gornfel’d, ‘Formalisty i ikh protivniki’, *Literaturnye zapiski*, 3 (1922), 5–6 (where they are sarcastically called ‘brave Russian Newtons’, p. 5). See also B. V. Tomashevskii, ‘Formal’nyi metod: vmesto nekrologa’, given in ‘Beseda o formal’nom metode v petrogradskoi assotsiatsii 10 dekabria 1922 goda’, *Zvezda*, 8 (2004), 145–60 (ed. by V. G. Belous) (pp. 148–53), where the author compares the historical significance of Formalism to the work of Dmitrii Mendeleev in chemistry and draws a parallel between literariness and electricity.

⁷ On the OPOIaZ and Neo-Kantianism at St Petersburg University in the 1910s, see M. O. Chudakova, comm. to Tynianov, ‘Literaturnaia mysl’. Al’manakh II’, in *PILK*, pp. 454–56; and M. O. Chudakova and E. A. Toddes, ‘Tynianov v vospominaniakh sovremennika’, in *TS*, 1 (1984), pp. 78–104 passim. See also Patrick Flack, ‘Le formalisme russe entre ferment néo-kantien et linguistique structurale’, in *L’arrière-plan linguistique du formalisme russe*, ed. by Sylvie Archambault and Sergeï Tchougounnikov (forthcoming).

⁸ Eikhenbaum, diary entry of 12 January 1919, as quoted in Chudakova, comm. to Tynianov, ‘Literaturnaia mysl’. Al’manakh II’, in *PILK*, p. 455.

made to align literary history with the natural sciences, it would be possible to conclude that the members of the Society had set out to defy the philosophical orthodoxy of the early twentieth century by reformulating the dichotomy between the sciences of nature and those of history. Eikhenbaum's suggested application of the natural sciences to history, that is, offered the Society the possibility of a revolutionary act in itself. As Tynianov wrote in 1923, Rickert's philosophy of science was in need of 'reconsideration', 'deepening'.⁹

To explore the possible implementation of Eikhenbaum's above-quoted suggestion, the present chapter establishes parallels between the early work of the OPOIaZ on literary history and models of change prevalent in early twentieth-century evolutionary biology and physics. The focus is on Tynianov, the leading Formalist theorist of history, though Shklovsky and Eikhenbaum are also considered in some detail. It must be stressed at the outset that, as was discussed in the previous chapter with reference specifically to Tynianov, the early work of the Society on literary history was characterized above all by metaphor, a strategy of 'meaning-making' [*smysloobrazovanie*] characteristic of an ideological struggle in *nauka* in the 1920s.¹⁰ It was also characteristic of their entry into largely unexplored intellectual territory.¹¹ For that reason, the parallels established here

⁹ Iu. Tynianov, [review of *Literaturnaia mysl'*, 2 (1923)], *Kniga i revoliutsiia*, 3 (1923), 71–72 (signed 'Iu. T.'): 'относя науку о литературе к "наукам о духовном творчестве", автор [*sc.* Смирнов] жестоко упрощает риккерттианство [...]. В наше время такие критерии [классификации наук] нуждаются не в вульгаризации, а в пересмотре — либо углублении.'

¹⁰ See L. D. Gudkov, 'Poniatie i metafory istorii u Tynianova i opoiazovtsev', in *TS*, 3 (1988), pp. 91–108, for a discussion of the function of metaphor in the theorization of history.

¹¹ Cf. Aleksandr Veselovskii's comment about the history of literature as '*res nullius*', uncharted 'territory', as quoted in Igor Shaitanov, 'Aleksandr

between their early work on the question and the natural sciences do not amount to a considered ‘natural-scientific method’, but suggest only an attempt in some way to align the study of literary history with the natural sciences; furthermore, they in no way exclude the possibility of other influences on the work of the OPOIaZ on literary history.

Galin Tihanov observes astutely that both Russian and Western scholars of Formalism have taken pains to emphasize the clear differences between the movement and positivism. He argues that Formalism nonetheless wanted in one sense to be ‘more positivistic than positivism’, since, despite different epistemological stances, they shared the aim of cultivating a scientificity.¹² It could be said that the same anxiety about positivism has encouraged intellectual historians of the work of the OPOIaZ to downplay the significance of natural-scientific concepts in its development, particularly with regard to the theory of history, and to consider them, if at all, only via the mediation of various philosophical authorities. Jan Levchenko, for example, argues for the existence of an affinity between Shklovsky and Eikhenbaum’s work and nineteenth-century vitalism, but is careful to stress that vitalism was a reaction against positivism.¹³

Veselovskii’s Historical Poetics: Genre in Historical Poetics’, *New Literary History*, 32 (2001), 429–43 (p. 430).

¹² Galin Tihanov, ‘Zametki o dispute marksistov i formalistov 1927-ogo goda’, *NLO*, 50 (2001), 279–86 (trans. by M. Poliakova) (p. 281): ‘отдаление формалистов от позитивистов было симптомом соперничества. Русский формализм, в некотором смысле, хотел быть позитивнее позитивизма.’

¹³ Jan Levchenko, *Drugaia nauka: russkie formalisty v poiskakh biografii* (Moscow: Izdatel'skii dom NIU VShE, 2012), pp. 43–58 (p. 46). See also Aleksandr Dmitriev and Jan Levchenko, ‘Nauka kak priem: eshche raz o metodologicheskome nasledii russkikh formalistov’, *NLO*, 50 (2001), 195–245 (pp. 221–22).

Viach. Vs. Ivanov (1986), S. L. Kozlov (1990), Boris Gasparov (1996), and Rad Borislavov (2011) nevertheless make important contributions to our understanding of evolutionary-biological concepts, in particular, in the work of the OPOIaZ on literary history. Ivanov provides, with sporadic references to Tynianov, a wide-ranging discussion of the application to culture of evolutionary models.¹⁴ Kozlov explores the points of convergence between the metaphors of revolution and evolution as applied to literary history, discussing Aristotle, John Addington Symonds, and the late nineteenth-century French literary scholar Ferdinand Brunetière, among others.¹⁵ Gasparov identifies numerous metaphors borrowed from the field of genetics in Shklovsky's work of the late 1920s.¹⁶ Borislavov systematically examines Shklovsky's references to Brunetière before analysing the evolutionary-biological metaphors in his literary history.¹⁷ Sergej Davydov and Peter Steiner were the first scholars to explore the connections between biology and Formalism, though they focus on Goethe's concept of morphology in Viktor Zhirmunskii and Vladimir Propp's work.¹⁸ The studies cited here show that the

¹⁴ Viach. Vs. Ivanov, 'Ob evoliutsionnom podkhode k kul'ture', in *TS*, 2 (1986), pp. 173–80.

¹⁵ S. L. Kozlov, 'Literaturnaia evoliutsiia i literaturnaia revoliutsiia: k istorii idei', in *Tynianovskii sbornik*, vyp. 5: chetvertye Tynianovskie chteniia (Riga: 1990), pp. 112–19.

¹⁶ Boris Gasparov, 'Development or Rebuilding: Views of Academician T. D. Lysenko in the Context of the Avant-Garde', in *Laboratory of Dreams: The Russian Avant-Garde and Cultural Experiment*, ed. by John E. Bowl and Olga Matich (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1996), pp. 133–50.

¹⁷ Rad Borislavov, 'Revolution is Evolution: Evolution as a Trope in Šklovskij's Literary History', *Russian Literature*, 69 (2011), 209–38.

¹⁸ Sergej Davydov and Peter Steiner, 'The Biological Metaphor in Russian Formalism: The Concept of Morphology', *SubStance*, 6/7 (1977), 149–58.

Formalists were inspired by various intermediaries, and especially by Brunetière, in their application of evolutionary-biological models to the history of literature.¹⁹

The present chapter builds on the above-cited studies in order to reconstruct a natural-scientific paradigm in the early work of the OPOIaZ on literary history. The chapter is divided into three unequal parts. The first describes the field of the natural sciences as Tynianov would have experienced it as a student in the 1910s. The second and largest part establishes parallels between the early work of the OPOIaZ on literary history and natural-scientific models of change. The third widens the focus to provide a more historically contextualized interpretation of those parallels.

**

Shklovsky, Eikhenbaum, and Tynianov are likely to have encountered natural-scientific models of change during their time as students at St Petersburg University in the 1910s. Their university experiences, and those of the other future participants of the OPOIaZ, have long been recognized as having been highly significant in the development of Formalism. While considerable attention has been given to the significance of the unique culture of the Historical-Philological

¹⁹ Note also that Aage A. Hansen-Löve gave a paper entitled ‘Evolution vs. Genesis: Tynjanov, Darwin and the Struggle for Survival of Literary Genres’ at a conference in Paris in October 2015, though it was unfortunately not possible for me to attend.

Faculty for their later work,²⁰ and especially to that of Professor Semen A. Vengerov's Pushkin seminar,²¹ much less has been given to the possible significance of their engagement with fields other than philology and linguistics during the same period.²² With a focus on Tynianov, it can be shown that they would likely also have encountered natural-scientific models of change, both within the natural sciences themselves — at a critical moment in the history of the field — and in their application to other fields.

Tynianov enrolled at St Petersburg University in 1912.²³ He went to the university with Lev Zil'ber, one of his two closest gymnasium friends from Pskov and the elder brother of Veniamin Zil'ber (who would later publish as Veniamin Kaverin).²⁴ Although Tynianov was officially attached to the Historical-Philological Faculty,²⁵ and Zil'ber to the Physical-Mathematical Faculty,²⁶ they both embraced the interdisciplinary spirit of the university. Zil'ber later

²⁰ See, e.g., Carol Any, *Boris Eikhenbaum: Voices of a Russian Formalist* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1994), pp. 7–27; Catherine Depretto, *Le Formalisme en Russie* (Paris: Institut d'Études Slaves, 2009), pp. 45–76.

²¹ See esp. Depretto, pp. 68–76.

²² One exception is the discussion of Tynianov's university years in Larry Philip Joseph, 'From Literary Theory to Fiction: An Interpretive Biography of Yury Tynyanov in the 1920s' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Stanford University, 1994), Chapter 2: Tynyanov and Heine (1912–1919), pp. 50–106. Though concerned principally with Tynianov's time at university as a formation in philosophy, the author also gives some consideration to the other faculties whose lectures Tynianov attended (including those of the natural sciences).

²³ Iurii Tynianov, 'Avtobiografiia' (1939), in *Iurii Tynianov: pisatel' i uchenyi. Vospominaniia, razmyshleniia, vstrechi*, ed. by V. Kaverin (Moscow: Molodaia gvardiia, 1966), pp. 9–20 (p. 18).

²⁴ See V. Kaverin, 'Detstvo' and 'Gimnaziia', in V. Kaverin and Vl. Novikov, *Novoe zrenie: kniga o Iurii Tynianove* (Moscow: Kniga, 1988), pp. 12–35.

²⁵ Tynianov, 'Avtobiografiia', in *Iurii Tynianov*, ed. by Kaverin, p. 18.

²⁶ L. A. Zil'ber, 'Studencheskie gody. Peterburgskii i Moskovskii universitety. (Iz vospominanii L. A. Zil'bera)', in L. L. Kiselev and E. S. Levina, *Lev Aleksandrovich Zil'ber (1894–1966): zhizn' v nauke* (Moscow: Nauka, 2004), pp. 40–64 (p. 40).

remembered that, despite never having had enough money, he had been able to indulge his every intellectual interest during his time at university.²⁷ He later recalled having attended lectures given by, among others, the histologist Aleksandr S. Dogel', the chemist Lev A. Chugaev, the geologist Aleksandr A. Inostrantsev, the linguist I. A. Baudouin de Courtenay, the legal scholar Lev I. Petrazhitskii, the literary scholar Il'ia A. Shliapkin, and the historian Sergei F. Platonov.²⁸ In 1939, Tynianov recalled that he, too, had gone to lectures at various faculties other than his own during his university years.²⁹ Like Zil'ber, Tynianov remembered having gone to lectures given by both Chugaev and 'the biologist Dogel'.³⁰ He also singled out the physicist Ivan I. Borgman and the sociologist Maksim M. Kovalevskii.³¹

Platonov and Kovalevskii both addressed problems of change from an 'evolutionist' perspective as explicitly opposed to a materialist one. Platonov, whose university textbook *Leksii po russkoi istorii* had been through nine editions by 1915,³² explained on his arrest in 1930 that 'evolutionary theory' had been the foundation of his historical approach. Even his university courses, he explained, had been strongly informed by theoretical biology: 'эволюционная теория легла в основу моих представлений о сущности исторического процесса и

²⁷ Ibid., p. 46.

²⁸ Ibid., pp. 41–42.

²⁹ Tynianov, 'Avtobiografiia', in *Iurii Tynianov*, ed. by Kaverin, p. 18.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 18.

³¹ Ibid., p. 18.

³² S. F. Platonov, *Leksii po russkoi istorii professora S. F. Platonova*, 10th edn (Petrograd: Senatskaia tip., 1917).

обусловила весь строй моих университетских курсов.³³ Even in the face of the ‘political dominance of the theory of Marxism’ after the Revolution, he could not change such a fundamental component of his thought.³⁴ In much the same way, although Kovalevskii had met Marx and spoke very highly of him personally, as Tynianov remembered,³⁵ he did not endorse Marx’s philosophy of history. He adopted instead an approach closer to evolutionary anthropology. He introduced his two-volume *Sotsiologiia* (1910), for example, as a work of ‘genetic sociology’, a discipline defined as the ‘science of the origin of social institutions’.³⁶ He wrote that his approach was indebted to evolutionary biologists for the conceptual tools with which to understand change. In a piece produced for the occasion of the Darwin centenary in 1909,³⁷ Kovalevskii provided a comprehensive history of the various ways in which sociologists had appropriated theories of biological evolution.³⁸ He demonstrated a sophisticated understanding of the history of evolutionary thought, stretching as far back as Plato, and distinguished clearly between the evolutionary theories of Jean-Baptiste Lamarck, Charles Darwin, Ernst Haeckel, and others.

³³ As quoted in B. S. Brachev and A. Iu. Dvornichenko, *Kafedra russkoi istorii Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta, 1834–2004* (St Petersburg: Izd. Sankt-Peterburgskogo Universiteta, 2004), p. 99.

³⁴ Ibid., p. 99.

³⁵ Tynianov, ‘Avtobiografiia’, in *Iurii Tynianov*, ed. by Kaverin, p. 18.

³⁶ M. M. Kovalevskii, *Sotsiologiia*, 2 vols (St Petersburg: tip. M. M. Stasiulevicha, 1910), vol. 2: *Geneticheskaia sotsiologiia, ili Uchenie ob iskhodnykh momentakh v razvitii sem'i, roda, sobstvennosti, politicheskoi vlasti i psikhologicheskoi deiatel'nosti*, p. 1.

³⁷ See Eduard I. Kolchinsky, ‘Darwin’s Jubilees in Russia’, in *The Literary and Cultural Reception of Charles Darwin in Europe*, ed. by Thomas F. Glick and Elinor Shaffer (London and New York: Bloomsbury, 2014), pp. 288–315.

³⁸ M. M. Kovalevskii, ‘Darvinizm v sotsiologii’, in *Pamiati Darvina* (Moscow: Nauchnoe slovo, 1910), pp. 117–58.

By the end of the nineteenth century, Lamarckism and Darwinism were widely seen as two opposing sides in the evolutionary debate, though they by no means excluded additional theories. The major point of contention between Lamarckism and Darwinism concerned what Darwin termed ‘acquired characters’. Lamarck’s followers thought that ‘acquired characters’ could be inherited. The best-known explanation of the theory concerns the cause of the giraffe’s long neck: after a lifetime of straining to reach ever-higher branches on trees, the individual giraffe will grow a longer neck, a ‘character’ subsequently inherited by its offspring. Darwin and his disciples, by contrast, had argued instead that ‘natural fluctuations’ led to variation, but could not be acquired, though they were not able to explain exactly what caused them. They did, however, identify the mechanism — ‘natural selection’ — by which the individual fluctuation could become the norm for a species in the longer term: if a particular ‘fluctuation’ were to cause a particular organism to be better able to survive than other members of its species, it would be afforded more opportunities to reproduce and its offspring would somehow — again, they could not say exactly how — inherit that ‘fluctuation’. Since the ‘fluctuations’ that he described were extremely slight, Darwin thought that evolution must be an extremely slow, gradual process.³⁹

The emergence of genetics at the very beginning of the twentieth century revolutionized evolutionary biology. Genetics was seen by many as a threat to Darwin’s theory of evolution by natural selection. Some of its early exponents

³⁹ For a full account of the debate in the nineteenth century, see Ernst Mayr, ‘Prologue’, in *The Evolutionary Synthesis: Perspectives on the Unification of Biology*, ed. by Ernst Mayr and William B. Provine (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980), pp. 1–48.

proposed the concept of the genetic mutation as an alternative mechanism of evolution: the mutation was thought not simply to produce variations which were subsequently subjected to natural selection as the primary mechanism of evolution; instead, the variations were thought to be sufficient to constitute its primary mechanism in themselves. In the early 1900s, the Dutch botanist Hugo de Vries advanced what became known as the ‘mutation theory’ of evolution: mutations, he proposed, were capable of producing discrete variations large enough to override the principle of natural selection.⁴⁰ It followed that the evolutionary process had to occur not slowly and gradually, as Darwin had thought, but as the result of sudden, dramatic mutations between generations. The theory came to be known as ‘saltationism’, or evolution by leaps, from the Latin *saltus* (‘leap’).⁴¹

While St Petersburg and Moscow Universities had been ‘fortresses of Darwinism’ in the 1890s,⁴² the emergence of genetics was followed with great interest. In 1913, the entomologist Iurii A. Filipchenko, another professor at St Petersburg University, began offering the first course in genetics at any Russian university.⁴³ From 1914 until 1921, the period of the First World War, Revolution, and Civil War, however, Russian scientists had limited access to the results of important research in genetics being conducted abroad — and notably to Thomas H.

⁴⁰ Ibid., pp. 1–48.

⁴¹ In his *Nomogenez* (1922), the evolutionary theorist L. S. Berg discussed and dismissed such theories, tracing the metaphor of the ‘leap’ back to the middle of the nineteenth century. See L. S. Berg, ‘Nomogenez’, in *Trudy po teorii evoliutsii, 1922–1930* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1977), pp. 95–311 (esp. pp. 296–99). On Roman Jakobson’s interest in Berg’s theories, see Patrick Sériot, ‘The Impact of Czech and Russian Biology on the Linguistic Thought of the Prague Linguistic Circle’, *Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Prague*, 3 (1999), 15–24.

⁴² Alexander Vucinich, *Darwin in Russian Thought* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1988), pp. 151–95 (p. 152).

⁴³ Kolchinsky, ‘Darwin’s Jubilees in Russia’, p. 295.

Morgan's experiments in the United States.⁴⁴ The turning point was the publication in 1922 of a series of papers by Filipchenko in which he summarized Morgan's research.⁴⁵

Tynianov remembered having attended lectures given by the 'biologist Dogel', but it is unclear whom he had in mind. Zil'ber began to work in the laboratory of the histologist Aleksandr S. Dogel' during his second year at the university,⁴⁶ but Tynianov could also have been referring to the zoologist Valentin A. Dogel'.⁴⁷ In an unpublished draft of his autobiography, however, Tynianov named a different lecturer in biology altogether: 'Слушал вначале всякие лекции — физика Боргмана, биолога Шимкевича.'⁴⁸ Vladimir M. Shimkevich was an expert on invertebrates, especially marine arachnids, and an evolutionary theorist. He wrote the textbooks *Biologicheskie osnovy zoologii* (1901) and *Kurs sravnitel'noi anatomii pozvonochnykh zhivotnykh* (1905), both of which went through many subsequent editions. Shimkevich was a prominent defender of the theory of evolution by natural selection at the beginning of the twentieth century. In the introduction to his gruesomely illustrated study of the evolutionary significance of physical deformity, *Urodstva i proiskhozhdenie vidov* (1906), for example, he attacked 'mutationism', arguing that what de Vries had termed 'mutations' were

⁴⁴ Theodosius Dobzhansky, 'The Birth of the Genetic Theory of Evolution in the Soviet Union in the 1920s', in *The Evolutionary Synthesis*, ed. by Mayr and Provine, pp. 229–41 (p. 233).

⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 233.

⁴⁶ Zil'ber, 'Studencheskie gody', in Kiselev and Levina, p. 41.

⁴⁷ On V. A. Dogel', see B. N. Mazurmovich and Iu. N. Polianskii, *Valentin Aleksandrovich Dogel': 1882–1955* (Moscow: Nauka, 1980). Larry Philip Joseph, pp. 63–65 passim, takes 'the biologist Dogel' mentioned in Tynianov's autobiography to be V. A. Dogel' and raises the possibility of his direct influence on Tynianov's later work on the question of evolution.

⁴⁸ RGALI, f. 2224, op. 1, ed. kh. 104, l. 3.

not qualitatively different from Darwin's 'natural fluctuations'.⁴⁹ In a speech delivered on 30 December 1909, he explained that mutations and natural fluctuations were two names for the same mechanism, the difference between them being merely one of degree: 'я не считаю мутационные изменения за нечто sui generis. [...] Пути, по которым идет видообразование, в сущности те же, по которым направляются и уродливые уклонения.'⁵⁰

Tynianov is also likely to have engaged with evolutionary biology outside the lecture hall, in his conversations with Zil'ber, a student of biology, aspiring doctor,⁵¹ and future microbiologist. Tynianov married Zil'ber's sister, Elena, in 1916, and the two men remained close throughout the 1910s.⁵² The likelihood of Tynianov's continued interest in biology is supported by Zil'ber's dedication to him of his first monograph, *Paraimmunitet* (1928), a study of secondary immunity: 'Юрию Николаевичу Тынянову, автору "Кюхли", в память нашей молодости посвящаю.'⁵³ Two years earlier, Tynianov had dedicated 'Arkhaisty i Pushkin' to Zil'ber.⁵⁴

⁴⁹ V. M. Shimkevich, *Urodstva i proiskhozhdenie vidov* (Moscow and St Petersburg: Vol'f, 1906), pp. 4–33.

⁵⁰ V. M. Shimkevich, *Embrional'nye plasty i teoriiia mutatsii* (Moscow: tip. G. Lissnera i D. Sobko, 1910), p. 10.

⁵¹ Kiselev and Levina, p. 20.

⁵² See Kaverin, 'Universitet' and 'Grecheskii, 15', in Kaverin and Novikov, pp. 35–43.

⁵³ L. A. Zil'ber, *Paraimmunitet* (Moscow: 1928), p. 3. The dedication is also given in Kiselev and Levina, p. 113.

⁵⁴ Iu. N. Tynianov, 'Arkhaisty i Pushkin', in *Pushkin v mirovoi literature* (Leningrad: Gos. izd., 1926), pp. 215–86 (p. 215). On the dedication of 'Arkhaisty i Pushkin' to Zil'ber, see A. P. Chudakov, comm. to Iu. N. Tynianov, 'Arkhaisty i Pushkin', in Iu. N. Tynianov, *Pushkin i ego sovremenniki*, ed. and comm. by A. L. Grushunin and A. P. Chudakov (Moscow: Nauka, 1969), pp. 382–93 (p. 385); and A. P. Chudakov, M. O. Chudakova, and E. A. Toddes, comm. to 'Literaturnyi fakt', in *PILK*, pp. 507–18 (p. 511).

The physicist whom Tynianov named in his autobiography, Ivan I. Borgman, had been known as a brilliant lecturer and had even taught physics to Nicholas II.⁵⁵ Borgman and O. D. Khvol'son were the two most senior physicists affiliated to St Petersburg University in the first decade of the twentieth century.⁵⁶ Although Borgman, in particular, was initially suspicious of certain aspects of Albert Einstein's work on the theory of relativity, to the extent that some of his students thought it necessary to keep their discussions of the theory of special relativity secret from him,⁵⁷ he and Khvol'son were later involved in the publication of some of the very first explanations of the theory for a Russian audience. Borgman oversaw the publication of a six-volume series of collections of articles, *Novye idei v fizike* (1911–13), whose third volume, *Printsip otnositel'nosti* (1912), was dedicated to special relativity and included what was apparently the first translation of Einstein into Russian.⁵⁸ Borgman had himself described special relativity in a contribution to the second volume in the series, *Efir i materiia* (1912).⁵⁹ Two years later, Khvol'son wrote the first popularization of Einstein's theory to appear in Russian for the non-specialist, a short pamphlet entitled *Teoriia otnositel'nosti* (1914).⁶⁰

⁵⁵ Paul R. Josephson, *Physics and Politics in Revolutionary Russia* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1991), p. 22.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 33.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 33.

⁵⁸ V. P. Vizgin and G. E. Gorelik, 'Relativity in Russia and the USSR', in *The Comparative Reception of Relativity*, ed. by T. F. Glick (Dordrecht: D. Reidel, 1987), pp. 265–326 (trans. by Paul R. Josephson) (p. 272).

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 272.

⁶⁰ For an evaluation of the publication, see Alexander Vucinich, *Einstein and Soviet Ideology* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2001), p. 8. See also the revised edition: O. D. Khvol'son, *Teoriia otnositel'nosti A. Einshteina i novoe miroponimanie* (Petrograd: Izd. M. i S. Sabashnikovych, 1922).

Given Borgman's role in facilitating the publication of Einstein's work and the widespread admiration for Einstein among students in St Petersburg in the 1910s, it is likely that Tynianov would have become aware of his ideas soon after arriving at the university in 1912, though the appropriation of relativistic-physical ideas by the literary avant-garde, beyond the universities, did not begin in earnest until later in the decade.⁶¹ Roman Jakobson, for example, mentioned Einstein's theory of special relativity, and quoted extensively from Khvol'ston's popular pamphlet cited above, in an article of 1919, one of his earliest publications.⁶²

The selective account of Tynianov's university years given above shows that he would likely have encountered theoretical biology, including its application to history and sociology, and theoretical physics. He attended lectures given by eminent professors in both fields. Furthermore, it emerges that Tynianov (and other future members of the OPOIaZ) arrived at the university during a critical phase for biology and physics and, indeed, for the natural sciences generally. The historian of science I. Bernard Cohen, who has described a distinct 'scientific revolution' of the period 1887–1927, identifies the early twentieth century as a critical stage in the revolution that he observes, one that saw the publication of the results of the earliest experimental work in genetics and the acceptance of the

⁶¹ See Vucinich, *Einstein and Soviet Ideology*, pp. 13–35.

⁶² R. O. Jakobson, 'Futurizm', *Iskusstvo*, 2 August (1919) (signed 'R. Ia. '); also in two halves as 'Priemy staroi zhivopisi', *Zhizn' iskusstva*, 199–200 (27 July 1919), 2, and 'Futurizm kak esteticheskaia i nauchnaia sistema', *Zhizn' iskusstva*, 226 (26 August 1919), 2; trans., as 'Futurism', by Stephen Rudy, in Stephen Rudy, 'Jakobsonian Poetics of the Moscow and Prague Periods' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Yale University, 1978), pp. 205–14 (where the full publication history of the article is given).

theories of special and general relativity in physics.⁶³ By the early 1910s, Russian natural scientists were beginning to teach in accordance with the discoveries of the paradigm-shifting work done by Western scientists in the rapidly expanding fields of genetics and relativity theory.

**

When they came to the problem of literary history, the members of the OPOIaZ described the process as a perpetual ‘struggle’ [*bor'ba*] between generations, and they turned to narratives of social development for an appropriate rhetoric. In *Rozanov* (1921), Shklovsky concluded that legacy in literature was passed ‘not from father to son, but from uncle to nephew’, the history of literature moving forward ‘in an interrupted, broken line’ [*po preryvistoi perelomistoi linii*].⁶⁴ In *Dostoevskii i Gogol'* (1921), Tynianov argued that literary succession was above all one of ‘struggle’, a ‘destruction of the old totality and a new construction from the old elements’.⁶⁵ The early work of the Society on literary history was filled with many other political, military, and revolutionary metaphors.⁶⁶ Much of the

⁶³ I. Bernard Cohen, *Revolutions in Science* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985), p. 96.

⁶⁴ Viktor Shklovsky, *Rozanov: iz knigi 'Siuzhet, kak iavlenie stilia'* (Petrograd: OPOIaZ, 1921), p. 5.

⁶⁵ Iu. N. Tynianov, *Dostoevskii i Gogol': k teorii parodii* (Petrograd: OPOIaZ, 1921), p. 5. The work was presented as a paper in June 1921 and was published ‘no later than August 1921’ according to A. P. Chudakov, comm. to Tynianov, ‘Dostoevskii i Gogol'’, in *PILK*, pp. 483–89. Shklovsky’s *Rozanov* had originally been published in *Zhizn' iskusstva* in March and April of the same year.

⁶⁶ For a discussion of the power-political metaphors in the early work of the OPOIaZ, see Ann Jefferson, ‘Literariness, Dominance, and Violence in Formalist Aesthetics’, in *Literary Theory Today*, ed. by Peter Collier and Helga Geyer-Ryan (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1990), pp. 125–41; and Klaas-Hinrich

rhetoric of the early work of the OPOIaZ on literary history was suggestive specifically of the Marxist theory of social development. Shklovsky, for instance, wrote that the emergence of every new literary ‘school’ was equivalent to a ‘revolution, something like the appearance of a new class’.⁶⁷ Tynianov used the telling adverb ‘dialectically’ to describe the resolution of the tension between two literary genres.⁶⁸ The emphasis on groupings of literary works — ‘schools’, ‘forms’, and ‘genres’ — allowed the Formalists to model the development of literature in terms of the ‘struggle’ among them, to picture the history of literature in terms of mutually hostile units.

Jurij Striedter, Aage A. Hansen-Löve, and Peter Steiner show that the early theory of literary history developed by the Formalists amounted to a generalization, an expanded application, of the principle of *ostranenie*.⁶⁹ Whereas Shklovsky had argued in 1917 that the purpose of art was to make our experience of life seem strange, he, Eikhenbaum, and Tynianov argued in their work on literary history of the period 1919–24 that art had either to make life seem strange more successfully than had older art, or to make older art itself seem strange. Steiner argues that the

Ehlers, *Das dynamische System. Zur Entwicklung von Begriff und Metaphorik des Systems bei Jurij N. Tynjanov* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1992), pp. 223–31.

⁶⁷ Shklovsky, *Rozanov*, p. 7: ‘Каждая новая литературная школа — это революция, нечто вроде появления нового класса.’

⁶⁸ See, e.g., Iurii Tynianov, ‘O literaturnom fakte’, *Lef*, 2 (6) (1924), 101–16 (p. 107). Cf. the critique of Tynianov’s use of that word in P. N. Medvedev, *Formal’nyi metod v literaturovedenii (Kriticheskoe vvedenie v sotsiologicheskuiu poetiku)* (Leningrad: Priboi, 1928), p. 222.

⁶⁹ Jurij Striedter, *Literary Structure, Evolution, and Value: Russian Formalism and Czech Structuralism Reconsidered* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989), pp. 30–35; Aage A. Hansen-Löve, *Der russische Formalismus: Methodologische Rekonstruktion seiner Entwicklung aus dem Prinzip der Verfremdung* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1978), pp. 369–76; Peter Steiner, *Russian Formalism: A Metapoetics* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1984), pp. 53–63.

application of *ostranenie* to literary history gave rise to a banal, ‘mechanical’ account of the process as an ‘infinite permutation of the same poetic forms’.⁷⁰ He sees the origin of their early theory of history in the metaphor of the machine, one originating in the cult of technology of the Italian and Russian futurists.⁷¹ Shklovsky, Eikhenbaum, and Tynianov tended to conceptualize literary history mechanically, as a process in which the phenomena of literature endlessly swapped positions in a hierarchy without ever developing.⁷²

Despite the lack of development in the early stage of their historical thinking, Shklovsky, Eikhenbaum, and Tynianov slipped easily into a Darwinian narrative of evolution in their work on literary history. They took their inspiration from Ferdinand Brunetière, the literary scholar who first established the analogy between literary genre and biological species. An outsider in academic circles, Brunetière wrote many books about literary history, the best known of which was *L'Évolution des genres dans l'histoire de la littérature* [*The Evolution of Genres in the History of Literature*] (1890).⁷³ In the book, widely derided on its publication in France,⁷⁴ Brunetière explained that, if literary scholarship aspired to ‘become a

⁷⁰ Steiner, p. 59.

⁷¹ Ibid., p. 45.

⁷² On the absence of development in the Formalist theory of history, see also Medvedev, pp. 213–31; Fredric Jameson, *The Prison-House of Language: A Critical Account of Russian Formalism and French Structuralism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1972), pp. 96–98; John Frow, *Marxism and Literary History* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986), pp. 83–102; and Galin Tihanov, *The Master and The Slave: Lukács, Bakhtin, and the Ideas of Their Time* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), pp. 128–40.

⁷³ Ferdinand Brunetière, *L'Évolution des genres dans l'histoire de la littérature: leçons professées à l'École normale supérieure*, vol. 1: Introduction. L'évolution de la critique depuis la renaissance jusqu'à nos jours (Paris: Hachette, 1890).

⁷⁴ See, e.g., Antoine Compagnon, *La Troisième République des lettres, de Flaubert à Proust* (Paris: Seuil, 1983), p. 37, where it is noted that the allegedly Darwinian

science', it must look for a supplement to its approach 'in the means, in the methods, and in the techniques of natural history'.⁷⁵

In a recent article on the biological metaphors in Shklovsky's literary history, Rad Borislavov includes several pages on Shklovsky's engagement with Brunetière.⁷⁶ He shows convincingly that some of Shklovsky's best-known metaphors of the period, such as that of the canonization of the 'junior line' [*mladshaia liniia*], must have originated in the jargon of evolutionary biology. However, despite acknowledging that many contemporary literary scholars, including Zhirmunskii and Propp, made comments in the 1920s specifically about the 'Darwinism' of the work of the OPOIaZ on literary history, Borislavov does not explore the defining feature of Darwinism as an account of natural history: selection as the primary mechanism of evolution. This caution is understandable: Shklovsky, Eikhenbaum, and Tynianov frequently contradicted one another — and even themselves — in the conduct of their evolutionary musings, a fact that makes it tempting to dismiss their evolutionism as nothing but rhetoric. It can nevertheless be shown that Shklovsky and Tynianov's work on literary history of the period 1919–24 seems to have relied on a modified model of evolution in which selection was the primary mechanism.

Let us first deal with Brunetière. In the preface to the first volume of *L'Évolution des genres*, Brunetière claimed to have developed a model of literary history

framework of Brunetière's study was widely interpreted as a cynical strategy to acquire 'scientific' credibility.

⁷⁵ Brunetière, *L'Évolution des genres*, vol. 1, pp. 17–18.

⁷⁶ Borislavov, pp. 209–15.

founded on the ‘natural history of Darwin and Haeckel’.⁷⁷ Despite the promised specificity, the model that he developed in the volume cannot be classified as Darwinian because it lacks the necessary mechanism of selection: the genres that Brunetière described seemed to ‘evolve’ in isolation from one another, with no need for any ‘struggle’, as they morphed inexplicably into new forms.⁷⁸ Nevertheless, despite Brunetière’s poor execution of a specifically Darwinian model, Shklovsky strongly associated the idea of ‘literary evolution’ with him.

Shklovsky ended his article ‘Sviaz’ priemov siuzhetoslozheniia s obshchimi priemami stilia’ (1919) with a long quotation from Brunetière. Although it was taken from Brunetière’s *Manuel de l’histoire de la littérature française* [*Manual of French Literary History*] (1898), a book written some years after Brunetière had abandoned his allegedly Darwinian project,⁷⁹ the quotation outlined an approach to literary history more consistent with the principles of Darwinism.

Я не пренебрегал другими влияниями — теми, которые обычно выдвигаются, влияниями расы или среды [milieu]; но имея в виду, что из всех влияний, действующих в истории литературы [dans l’histoire d’une littérature], главное — влияние произведения на произведение, я следил, главным образом, за ним. Мы хотим сделать иначе, чем те, которые нам предшествовали, — вот происхождение и действующий принцип как изменения вкуса, так и литературных революций.⁸⁰

⁷⁷ Brunetière, *L’Évolution des genres*, vol. 1, pp. 17–18.

⁷⁸ For a critique of Brunetière’s model of literary evolution, see David Fishelov, *Metaphors of Genre: The Role of Analogies in Genre Theory* (University Park: Penn State University Press, 1993), pp. 19–52 passim.

⁷⁹ See Compagnon, pp. 35–42.

⁸⁰ As quoted in Viktor Shklovsky, ‘Sviaz’ priemov siuzhetoslozheniia s obshchimi priemami stilia’, in *Poetika. Sborniki po teorii poeticheskogo iazyka* (Petrograd: Gos. tip., 1919), pp. 113–50 (p. 150). Cf. Ferdinand Brunetière, *Manuel de l’histoire de la littérature française* (Paris: Delagrave, 1898), iii.

The interactions between literary works, according to Brunetière, were the principal motor of literary evolution, the struggle for literary survival. The relentless pursuit of novelty, of something different from that which had come before, represented a form of Darwinian adaptation to the unstable ‘taste’ of the literary public. Shklovsky thus associated Brunetière with the analogy between literary history and natural history. The following year, Shklovsky alluded to Brunetière’s concept of ‘literary evolution’ in a short article, ‘Staroe i novoe’, published in *Zhizn' iskusstva*. He ended a discussion of the ‘life’ and ‘death’ of literary forms by making the following comment: ‘Кстати, это из Брюнетьера.’⁸¹

Darwinism had, however, so permeated European culture that Brunetière was not necessarily the only intermediary between the theory and the OPOIaZ. A number of prominent Russian Marxists, for example, had tried to fuse Darwin and Marx, exploiting the shared idea of ‘struggle’ and attempting to draw parallels between the concepts of biological species and social class.⁸²

To get to the origin of the Darwinism of the OPOIaZ, however, it is necessary to go back further to the article in which Shklovsky had introduced the term *oshchushchenie*, since it later became the mechanism of selection in his theory of literary history.

In ‘Iskusstvo kak priem’ (1917), Shklovsky first used the term *ostranenie*. He explained that the purpose of art was to make our experience of the world

⁸¹ Shklovsky, ‘Staroe i novoe’ (1920), as quoted in Borislavov, p. 209.

⁸² On the reception of Darwin by Russian Marxists before the Revolution, see Vucinich, *Darwin in Russian Thought*, pp. 330–69.

‘strange’. In his exposition of the concept of *ostranenie*, Shklovsky made use of the concept of *oshchushchenie*.

И вот для того, чтобы вернуть ощущение жизни, почувствовать вещи, для того, чтобы делать камень каменным, существует то, что называется искусством. Целью искусства является дать ощущение вещи, как видение, а не как узнавание; приемом искусства является прием ‘остранения’ вещей и прием затрудненной формы, увеличивающий трудность и долготу восприятия, так как восприимательный процесс в искусстве самоцелен и должен быть продлен.⁸³

In the initial exposition, Shklovsky stated that the purpose of art was to return to the perceiver the original ‘feeling’ (of ‘life’ or of a ‘thing’). The intensity of the feeling produced by an object was proportional to the difficulty of the process by which it was perceived, such that, if the object in question were to be perceived by a series of cognitive shortcuts (algebraic symbols, for example), which would serve to facilitate the process of perception (in line with the principle of the economy of effort), it would barely be ‘felt’ at all. Although the ultimate aim of art was apparently to intensify the ‘feeling’ provoked, the artist could do so only indirectly by making more difficult the process of perception to which it was proportional. *Ostranenie* was the term used to categorize the ways in which perception could be made more difficult.

A few words should be said about the origin of the term *oshchushchenie*.

Shklovsky borrowed the term from late nineteenth-century German psychology.⁸⁴

⁸³ Viktor Shklovsky, ‘Iskusstvo kak priem’, in *Sborniki po teorii poeticheskogo iazyka*, vyp. 2 (Petrograd: OPOIaZ, 1917), pp. 3–14 (pp. 7–8).

⁸⁴ For a discussion of the origin of the concept, see Hansen-Löve, pp. 215–24. Although Ilona Svetlikova does not examine it specifically in her study of Russian Formalist psychologism, *oshchushchenie* appears in several of the quotations that she supplies from works of German psychology in Russian translation. See, e.g.,

It is likely that he borrowed it from Broder Christiansen's *Philosophie der Kunst* [*Philosophy of Art*] (1909), a book long known as an important source of Formalist ideas.⁸⁵ Shklovsky was familiar with Georgii P. Fedotov's Russian translation (1911) of *Philosophie der Kunst*.⁸⁶

In 'Sviaz' priemov siuzhetoslozheniia s obshchimi priemami stilii', the article that he ended with a quotation from Brunetière, Shklovsky included a fifteen-line quotation from Fedotov's translation of *Philosophie der Kunst* in which the German *Differenzempfindungen*, a fundamental concept in Christiansen's aesthetics,⁸⁷ had been translated by the Russian *differentzial'nye oshchushcheniia*. Below is part of the passage in question.

Я выделяю только одну группу нечувственных форм [eine Gruppe der nicht-sinnlichen Formen] — самую важную, думаюется мне: дифференциальные ощущения или ощущения различий [die Differenzempfindungen]. Когда мы испытываем что-нибудь как отклонение от обычного, от нормального, от какого-нибудь действующего канона [von einem irgendwie geltenden Kanon], в нас рождается эмоциональное впечатление особого качества, которое по типу своему не отличается от эмоциональных элементов чувственных форм, с той только разницей, что его антецедентом является ощущение несходства, то есть нечто, недоступное чувственному восприятию.⁸⁸

Ilonia Svetlikova, *Istoki russkogo formalizma: traditsiia psikhologizma i formal'naia shkola* (Moscow: NLO, 2005), pp. 44, 55.

⁸⁵ See, e.g., Viktor Zhirmunskii, 'Formprobleme in der russischen Literaturwissenschaft', *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie*, 1 (1925), 117–52 (p. 124).

⁸⁶ For more on Shklovsky's use of the Russian translation of *Philosophie der Kunst*, particularly in relation to the origin of *ostranenie*, see Douglas Robinson, *Estrangement and the Somatics of Literature: Tolstoy, Shklovsky, Brecht* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008), pp. 79–132.

⁸⁷ On Christiansen, see Horst-Jürgen Gerigk, 'Wer ist Broder Christiansen? Drei Schlüsselbegriffe seiner *Philosophie der Kunst*', in *Figurationen der literarischen Moderne*, ed. by Carsten Dutt and Roman Luckscheiter (Heidelberg: Winter, 2007), pp. 85–106.

⁸⁸ Broder Christiansen, *Filosofia iskusstva*, trans. by Grigorii P. Fedotov (St Petersburg: Shipovnik, 1911), as quoted in Shklovsky, 'Sviaz' priemov', p. 120.

Christiansen makes the argument that ‘differential feelings’ are one category of ‘unfelt forms’ produced when we ‘experience’ something as a deviation from what is ‘normal’, from a ‘canon’. He made a distinction between *sinnliche Formen* and *Empfindungen*, one that was translated into Russian as a distinction between *chuvstvennye formy* and *oshchushcheniia*. Christiansen’s emphasis on *oshchushchenie* as a cognitive response to novelty, to the abnormal, anticipated Shklovsky’s later use of the concept, as did his mention of the ‘canon’.

Shklovsky made the link between Brunetière and Christiansen explicit: he presented the passage from Brunetière’s *Manuel de l’histoire de la littérature française*, quoted on page 150 of his article, as a ‘supplement to page 120’ [*prilozhenie k str. 120*], that is, as further context in which to understand the passage from Christiansen quoted on page 120.⁸⁹ Shklovsky thus associated the historical application of the concept of *oshchushchenie* — its transformation into the basic mechanism of literary history — with Brunetière’s notion of literary evolution. In 1926, Eikhenbaum would draw attention to the significance of the concept of *differentzial'nye oshchushcheniia* for Shklovsky’s literary history in particular.⁹⁰

Cf. Broder Christiansen, *Philosophie der Kunst* (Hanau: Clauss und Feddersen, 1909), p. 118. For a discussion of the Russian translation of the passage in question, and an English translation, see Robinson, p. 280.

⁸⁹ Shklovsky, ‘Sviaz’ priemov’, pp. 120, 150.

⁹⁰ Eikhenbaum, ‘Teoriia “formal'nogo metoda”’, in *Literatura*, p. 130: ‘Шкловский пользуется указанием Б. Христиансена на особые “дифференциальные ощущения” или “ощущения различий” — этим обосновывается характерный динамизм искусства, выражающийся в постоянных нарушениях создаваемого канона.’ Cf. Christiansen, *Philosophie der Kunst*, p. 120: ‘Ein Jedes, was Kanon sein kann, wird zum Ausgangspunkt wirksamer Differenzempfindungen.’

The concept began to occupy an increasingly important function in Shklovsky's theoretical work of the late 1910s and early 1920s.⁹¹ In 'Stroenie rasskaza i romana', he identified various categories of *oshchushchenie*: certain literary devices in prose, he explained, gave the 'feeling of closure' [*oshchushchenie okonchennosti*], others, the 'feeling of novellanness' [*oshchushchenie novelty*], and, others still, the 'feeling of plotness' [*oshchushchenie siuzheta*].⁹² *Oshchushchenie* served its most important function, however, as a definition of art: only that which was art, argued Shklovsky, was 'felt'. He employed the term 'feltness' [*oshchutimost'*] to describe the quality. He also used the word as a verb in impersonal constructions. In 'Sviaz' priemov siuzhetoslozheniia s obshchimi priemami stilia', he wrote — in an analogy for the relation between poetic language and everyday language — that a dance was a walk that had been 'made to be felt': 'танец — это ходьба, которая ощущается; еще точнее — ходьба, которая построена так, чтобы ощущаться.'⁹³ By using the word as a noun and as a verb only in impersonal constructions, Shklovsky kept the concept very abstract: *oshchushchenie* applied to the generalized capacity of an artwork to make itself felt, not to any actual instance of its being felt by any historical person.

Shklovsky chose not to include a dedicated entry for the term *oshchushchenie* in the index to either the 1925 or the 1929 editions of the major collection of his theoretical articles to be published in his lifetime, *O teorii prozy*. However, Pavel Medvedev identified *oshchushchenie* as a fundamental component of Shklovsky's

⁹¹ Hansen-Löve, pp. 215–24, isolates two distinct categories of *oshchutimost'*.

⁹² Shklovsky, 'Stroenie rasskaza i romana', in *Razvertyvanie siuzheta* (Petrograd: OPOIaZ, 1921), pp. 3–22 (pp. 3, 7, 6).

⁹³ Shklovsky, 'Sviaz' priemov', p. 115.

theory of literary history, dedicating a paragraph to the concept. Medvedev argued that, by defining the aim of the work of art as the evocation of *oshchushchenie*, Shklovsky had reduced it to a mere ‘apparatus’ for that purpose: ‘сама ощутимость как таковая, совершенно равнодушная к тому, что собственно ощущается, становится единственным содержанием художественного восприятия’.⁹⁴ For Medvedev, it was methodologically inadmissible for the work of literature to be defined teleologically in terms of the ultimate effect that it had been constructed to produce. The work of art could not be reduced to a mere ‘apparatus for the evocation of *oshchutimost*’.⁹⁵

By projecting his theory of aesthetic experience onto history, Shklovsky transformed its basic cognitive mechanism, *oshchutimost*, into a mechanism of selection. In *Rozanov* (1921), he argued that, over time, the ‘forms’ comprising the literature of a given era lost their capacity to evoke *oshchushchenie*, losing with it their place in the ‘canon’ (in which positions were determined by the capacity to be felt). Eventually, forms would cease to qualify as literature at all. He drew an analogy between such forms and ‘grammatical forms in speech’: although grammatical forms had presumably once been felt, that is, they had once had the capacity to induce an aesthetic experience, they had since lost the capacity to do so, becoming instead an ‘instrumental, unfelt phenomenon’ [*iavlenie sluzhebnoe, vneoshchutimoe*].⁹⁶ New forms, those capable of inducing such an experience, were created to replace them: ‘создаются новые формы взамен форм старого

⁹⁴ Medvedev, p. 201. Note that Medvedev discusses the concept of *oshchutimost* in the context of a broader discussion of the Formalist theory of literary history.

⁹⁵ Ibid., p. 201.

⁹⁶ Shklovsky, *Rozanov*, p. 6.

искусства'.⁹⁷ Two features of Shklovsky's model must be stressed: first, some historically and culturally specific notion of what was not strange, such that strangeness could be identified as such; second, a finitude of *oshchushchenie*, such that there was not enough for all texts to be 'felt' at any given time.

Although Darwin and the members of the OPOIaZ used a mechanism of selection as part of two very different models of change, it is nonetheless possible to draw broad parallels between them. The implicitly Darwinian features in the early work of the Society on literary history are the following: the focus on groupings of more than one literary work (which, in 1921, Shklovsky called 'forms' or 'schools' and, in 1924, Tynianov called 'genres') as the basic unit of historical analysis (an analogy for species inherited from Brunetière), the implied 'struggle' among them (a metaphor conveniently shared with Marxist narratives of social development), and *oshchutimost'* as a mechanism of selection.

The two theories could be described analogously as follows. The organisms (works) of a given species (genre) reproduce, creating further organisms (works) of that species (genre), which are subject to variation. Should any of the variations cause one of the members of that species (one of the works of that genre) to be better adapted to its environment (to have a greater capacity to 'make strange' and therefore to be 'felt') than other members of the same species (other works of the same genre), the organism (work) will be afforded more opportunities to multiply. Should any variation cause the organism (work) to be less well adapted to its environment (to have a lesser capacity to 'make strange' and therefore to be 'felt'),

⁹⁷ Ibid., p. 6.

the opposite will be true. Over time, the advantageous variation (device) will become the new norm for the species (genre), unless the environment to which the species must adapt (the reading public in whom the genre must evoke *oshchutimost'*) changes, changing with it what constitutes an advantageous variation (device).

The implicit Darwinism in Shklovsky and Tynianov's early work on literary history made it possible for them to avoid describing in any detail the 'environment' in which selection occurred. It had not been necessary for Darwin to reconstruct fully the particular environmental conditions to which a particular organism had had to adapt at a particular time and in a particular place. It would not only often have been impossible to do so, since the geological record is so imperfect, 'a poor collection made at hazard and at rare intervals',⁹⁸ but it would also have been largely irrelevant, since the process of evolution modelled only the changes of 'organic forms'.⁹⁹ In a similar way, Shklovsky avoided 'environmental' questions of precisely why particular literary genres were 'felt' intensely at particular times, questions that would inevitably have been reduced to a sociological interpretation, because, on the one hand, he could not reconstruct the countless factors potentially implicated in literary selection, and, on the other, his task as a literary scholar was only to trace changes in what he called literary 'forms'.

⁹⁸ Charles Darwin, 'On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or The Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life', in *Evolutionary Writings*, ed. by James A. Secord (Oxford: Oxford University Press: 2010), pp. 107–211 (p. 209).

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 209.

Unlike Darwin, however, Shklovsky and Tynianov did not allow for any development in their model of evolution. They envisaged an infinite chain of revolutions, an endless process of ‘struggle’, in which development was not possible. Genres never became extinct; indeed, they never really changed.¹⁰⁰ As Tynianov notes, the Formalists described merely the changes in the positions of genres in the literary hierarchy rather than addressing the problem of their ‘genesis’.¹⁰¹ Their early model of literary history could thus be considered an application to literary history of a modified form of Darwinism, one purged of the concept of origin. Darwin had presented the theory of evolution by natural selection as a process beginning with some original Ur-form and developing through a progression of increasingly ‘beautiful’ and ‘wonderful’ forms.¹⁰² He wrote that biological species were thereby progressively made ‘complicated’ and ‘perfect’.¹⁰³ Shklovsky and Tynianov were keen to foreground the mechanism of selection involved in the resolution of any given ‘struggle’ among the constituent genres of literature, but they showed little interest in the question of the origin of its genres or, indeed, of genre as such.¹⁰⁴

It is illuminating to consider the modified Darwinism of the early work of the OPOIaZ on literary history in light of the reception of the theory of evolution by

¹⁰⁰ See, e.g., Shklovsky, *Rozanov*, p. 7: ‘Побежденная “линия” не уничтожается, не перестает существовать.’

¹⁰¹ Tynianov, *The Master and the Slave*, p. 132.

¹⁰² Darwin, p. 211: ‘There is grandeur in this view of life, with its several powers, having been originally breathed into a few forms or into one; and that [...] from so simple a beginning endless forms most beautiful and most wonderful have been, and are being, evolved.’

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, p. 183.

¹⁰⁴ For Tynianov’s explanation of the necessity of studying ‘tradition’ rather than ‘genesis’ in the history of literature, see Iu. Tynianov, ‘Tiutchev i Geine’, *Kniga i revoliutsiia*, 4 (1922), 13–16 (p. 13).

natural selection in nineteenth-century Russia. Darwin referred to his theory as the ‘doctrine of [Thomas] Malthus applied with manifold force to the whole animal and vegetable kingdoms’,¹⁰⁵ though the phrase ‘survival of the fittest’, coined by Herbert Spencer, was not included until the fifth edition (1869) of *On the Origin of Species*.¹⁰⁶ Daniel Philip Todes argues that it was precisely the Malthusian elements in *On the Origin of Species* that threatened Darwin’s success in Russia. For various reasons, Russian thinkers of the nineteenth century reacted badly to the concept of ‘struggle’ in Darwin’s theory, a metaphor ‘so foreign to their culture and so laden with negative associations’.¹⁰⁷ Todes argues that the metaphor of ‘struggle’ was strongly associated in nineteenth-century Russia with economics and with the ‘British enthusiasm for competition’ in that sphere.¹⁰⁸ It is therefore significant that the Formalists emphasized the concept of struggle, while downplaying that of origin, since they thereby reversed the reaction to Darwin of pre-revolutionary Russian thinkers.

Related to the problem of the erasure of origin is that of the pace of the evolutionary process. Darwin theorized a gradual process, since species developed through ‘insensibly fine gradations’ of change, ‘not by miraculous acts of creation and by catastrophes’.¹⁰⁹ Shklovsky and Tynianov, however, clearly envisaged a rapidly changing process, a ceaseless succession of ‘revolutions’. For this reason,

¹⁰⁵ Darwin, p. 110.

¹⁰⁶ James Allen Rogers, ‘Russia: Social Sciences’, in *The Comparative Reception of Darwinism*, ed. by Thomas F. Glick, 2nd edn (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1988), pp. 256–68 (p. 260).

¹⁰⁷ Daniel Philip Todes, *Darwin Without Malthus: The Struggle for Existence in Russian Evolutionary Thought* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), p. 44.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

¹⁰⁹ Darwin, pp. 173, 209.

Kozlov and Ehlers argue that Tynianov effectively merged the concepts of evolution and revolution.¹¹⁰ He and Shklovsky sacrificed development, in other words, to produce a permanent state of upheaval.

Despite the incoherence of their Darwinism, Shklovsky and Tynianov were quick to adopt more generalized metaphors of 'life' and 'death' in their work on literary history.¹¹¹ Their mechanistic theory of literary history by selection was nevertheless at odds with organicist theories of development, such as that of Propp's 'morphological' approach.¹¹²

Tynianov had challenged organicism directly in two articles published in late 1921. In 'O slonenke', an article published under the pseudonym G. Montelius in December 1921 in the first issue of *Peterburg*, an experimental journal that survived for only one further issue, Tynianov drew a whimsical analogy between Western civilization and a dying elephant at Copenhagen Zoo.¹¹³ Although the elephant was sick, and doctors recommended that it be euthanized and its corpse subsequently dissected, the elephant had not yet died: 'Слоненок жив. Мы еще

¹¹⁰ Kozlov, 'Literaturnaia evoliutsiia i literaturnaia revoliutsiia', pp. 112–19; Ehlers, pp. 240–48 (p. 242).

¹¹¹ The word *priznak* represents another example of a generalized classificatory discourse and has been interpreted as a borrowing from biology by Mikhail Iampol'skii, 'Istoriia kul'tury kak istoriia dukha i estestvennaia istoriia', *NLO*, 59 (2003), 22–89. Note also that the word 'function', an important concept in Tynianov's mature theoretical work, is discussed as a term of possibly biological origin in the introduction to Michael R. Sosa, 'Jurij Tynjanov: Method and Theory' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1987), pp. 5–7.

¹¹² For a detailed discussion of Propp's concept of 'morphology', see Davydov and Steiner.

¹¹³ Authorship of the feuilleton is attributed to Tynianov in Chudakova, comm. to Tynianov, 'Zapiski o zapadnoi literature', in *PILK*, pp. 441–46. The two issues of the journal were published in Petrograd in December 1921 and January 1922.

услышим о нем. Слоненок жив.’¹¹⁴ It could not yet be cut open, coldly, as a lifeless specimen. In the same way, despite the ravages of war, the world had not yet seen the last of the West: ‘Жив ли Запад? Я отвечу: несмотря на холод, на борьбу, на роскошь, на грязь — Запад жив.’¹¹⁵ By casting doubt on the severity of the elephant’s condition, Tynianov was implicitly polemicizing with the idea — widespread after the Great War — of the inevitable and terminal ‘decline’ of Western civilization, especially as popularized by Oswald Spengler in *Der Untergang des Abendlandes* [*The Decline of the West*] (1918–23). Spengler had developed an organicist model of development in which, like biological organisms, civilizations grew, came into their prime, and inevitably declined. The first volume of Spengler’s book had been met with great interest in Russia and was published in Russian in 1923.¹¹⁶ By asserting that the elephant at Copenhagen Zoo still lived, Tynianov was positioning himself in opposition to Spengler and, therefore, to his organicist theory of development.

In the first part of the article ‘Zapiski o zapadnoi literature’, which had been published one month previously under the pseudonym Iu. Van-Vezen, Tynianov explained his opposition to Spengler’s theory in greater detail. He was dismissive of Spengler’s book, whose title he translated as *Gibel’ Zapada*, and lamented the

¹¹⁴ Iu. N. Tynianov, ‘O slonenke’, *Peterburg: Dvukhnedel’nyi literaturno-populiarno-nauchnyi illiustrirovannyi zhurnal*, 1 (1921), 20–21 (p. 21) (signed ‘G. Montelius’). The discussion of Spengler was continued in Viktor Shklovsky, ‘Toska ostrovitian’, *Peterburg: Dvukhnedel’nyi literaturno-populiarno-nauchnyi illiustrirovannyi zhurnal*, 2 (1922), 15–16.

¹¹⁵ Tynianov, ‘O slonenke’, p. 21.

¹¹⁶ For more on Spengler in early Soviet Russia, including a discussion of the reception of his book by Marxist intellectuals, see Stuart Finkel, *On the Ideological Front: The Russian Intelligentsia and the Making of the Soviet Public Sphere* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2007), pp. 126–35.

proliferation of similarly ‘cataclysmic’ theories to which it had given rise.¹¹⁷ He argued that Spengler had taken too wide an angle on the history of European culture and, as such, had failed to anchor his analysis in any contemporary reality. Spengler’s was a history writ too large: ‘Мерило историческое для него [*sc.* Шпенглера] не сотни, а тысячи лет. [...] Бесприютная, черная человеческая мысль выброшена из орбит и, подобно беззаконной комете, блуждает.’¹¹⁸ Not long afterwards, Tynianov began work on a translation of Georges Duhamel’s *Civilization*, a Goncourt Prize-winning collection of short stories about the destruction of European civilization by the Great War.¹¹⁹ As he was developing his theory of literary history as a process of ‘evolution’ by selection, Tynianov was explicitly polemicizing with organicist models of change.

Several contemporary commentators recognized the ‘Darwinism’ of the work of the OPOIaZ on literary history. In 1923, Zhirmunskii wrote that the members of the Society had conceptualized literary history as a ‘mechanistic process’, one that bore a ‘seductive resemblance to Darwin’s teachings’ [*soblaznitel'noe skhodstvo s ucheniem Darvina*].¹²⁰ In a sustained invective against the Formalists in her work *Poetika siuzheta i zhanra* (1936), Ol'ga Freidenberg accused them of having taken

¹¹⁷ Tynianov, ‘Zapiski o zapadnoi literature’, *Knizhnyi ugol*, 7 (1921), 31–36 (signed ‘Iu. Van-Vezen’). For the continuation of the article, see *Knizhnyi ugol*, 8 (1922), 41–47. Dates of each part as given in Chudakova, comm. to Tynianov, ‘Zapiski o zapadnoi literature’, in *PILK*, pp. 441–46.

¹¹⁸ Tynianov, ‘Zapiski o zapadnoi literature’, p. 34.

¹¹⁹ Georges Duhamel, *Tsivilizatsiia, 1914–1917*, trans. by Iu. N. Tynianov (Moscow and Petrograd: Gos. izd., 1923). For a typically cynical sentiment, see, e.g., the following sentence (p. 190): ‘Я ненавижу двадцатый век, как ненавижу гниющую Европу и весь мир, на котором растянута эта несчастная Европа на манер сального пятна.’ Tynianov signed the contract for the translation (RGALI, f. 2224, op. 1, ed. kh. 190, l. 1), on 6 February 1923.

¹²⁰ V. Zhirmunskii, ‘K voprosu o “formal'nom metode”’ (1923), in *Voprosy teorii literatury: stat'i 1916–1926* (Leningrad: Academia, 1928), pp. 154–74.

an eclectic approach to history involving ‘positivist applications of Darwin to literature’ [*pozitivnye perelozheniia Darvina na literaturu*].¹²¹

In June 1923, while Shklovsky was still in exile in Berlin, having fled in March 1922, Lev Trotsky’s article ‘Formal’naia shkola poezii i marksizm’ was published in *Pravda*. In the article, Trotsky compared Shklovsky, whom he presented as ignorant of historical materialism, to those who had opposed Darwinism on religious grounds.¹²² Trotsky thereby presented Darwinism and Marxism as a united front against Formalism. Borislavov has studied the materials relating to Trotsky’s attack on the ‘Formal school’ in Shklovsky’s personal *fond* at the Russian State Archive of Literature and Art.¹²³ His research reveals that Shklovsky responded to the accusation of anti-Darwinism in Trotsky’s article with a single word scribbled underneath the relevant passage: ‘Непонятно.’¹²⁴ Borislavov speculates that, after the publication of Trotsky’s article, Shklovsky became determined to appeal in his work on literary history to the very latest advances in evolutionary biology. He shows, for example, that Shklovsky’s work of the late 1920s contains several references to the genetic ‘mutation’ [*mutatsiia*] and numerous others to the randomness of literary history.¹²⁵

¹²¹ Ol’ga Freidenberg, *Poetika siuzheta i zhanra*, ed. by Nina Braginskaia (Moscow: Labirint, 1993), p. 10; partially quoted (in English) in Katerina Clark and Galin Tihanov, ‘Soviet Literary Theory in the 1930s: Battles over Genre and the Boundaries of Modernity’, in *A History of Soviet Literary Theory and Criticism: The Soviet Age and Beyond*, ed. by Evgeny Dobrenko and Galin Tihanov (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2011), pp. 109–43 (p. 131).

¹²² L. D. Trotsky, ‘Formal’naia shkola poezii i marksizm’, *Pravda*, 166 (26 July 1923), 2–4 (p. 3).

¹²³ Borislavov, esp. pp. 217–18.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 218.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, esp. pp. 219–31.

Tynianov was the first to make use of concepts from genetics, having adopted them in the preparation of his article ‘O literaturnom fakte’ (1924). Tynianov worked on the article in late 1923,¹²⁶ soon after Shklovsky had returned from Berlin, and later dedicated it to him.¹²⁷ Although *Lef* did not publish the article until the summer of 1924, it had been requested in February of that year.¹²⁸ There had been a surge of interest in the field of genetics in 1922, the year in which Filipchenko’s papers on Morgan’s experiments were published.¹²⁹

Whereas Shklovsky tended to borrow from genetics only extravagant metaphors, Tynianov attempted to make use of concepts from that field, however allusively, to improve the modified Darwinism in his work on literary history. Chudakov, Chudakova, and Toddes make note in passing of the traces in the article of an engagement with genetics, supplying a major piece of evidence in support of the claim: one of his notebooks, they reveal, includes the phrase ‘genre as gene’ [*zhanr kak gen*].¹³⁰ It must be said that this formulation seems a little confused, since an analogy is more often drawn between genre and species.

Tynianov’s most productive borrowing from genetics was the concept of the ‘mistake’ [*oshibka*]. Shklovsky was also interested in mistakes, but he understood

¹²⁶ Date of composition as given in Chudakov, Chudakova, and Toddes, comm. to Tynianov, ‘Literaturnyi fakt’, in *PILK*, pp. 507–18.

¹²⁷ Tynianov, ‘Literaturnyi fakt’, in *Arkhaisty i novatory* (Leningrad: Priboi, 1929), pp. 5–29 (p. 5).

¹²⁸ Chudakov, Chudakova, and Toddes, comm. to Tynianov, ‘Literaturnyi fakt’, in *PILK*, p. 507.

¹²⁹ Dobzhansky, ‘The Birth of the Genetic Theory of Evolution’, in *The Evolutionary Synthesis*, ed. by Mayr and Provine, p. 233.

¹³⁰ Chudakov, Chudakova, and Toddes, comm. to Tynianov, ‘Literaturnyi fakt’, in *PILK*, esp. pp. 510–11. They also suggest that L. A. Zil’ber might have been an intermediary between Tynianov and the field of genetics.

the concept rather differently. For Shklovsky, in the early 1920s, the term ‘mistake’ referred to a misunderstanding between literary characters, a plot device of the kind fundamental to the ‘comedy of errors’.¹³¹ The following, for example, was his telegraphic analysis of Chekhov’s ‘V bane’, a story in which the inability of some visitors to the bathhouse to recognize one another through the steam leads to an amusing case of mistaken identity: ‘Дано: у священников и у социалистов длинные волосы. Необходимо смешать их. Мотивировка: баня.’¹³² For Tynianov in ‘О литературном факте’, mistakes performed a more abstract function: his were mistakes not on the part of the protagonist of a literary work in relation to an expected course of action, but on the part of the literary process in relation to its own conventions. Some literary texts, according to Tynianov, constituted mistakes in relation to the conventions of the genres to which they purported to belong. He wrote that, occasionally, a literary text was produced that by chance failed to satisfy the conventions of its genre: although it was ‘felt’ as, for example, an ode, and qualified as an ode by superficial criteria, it was nevertheless also ‘felt’ as a deviation from its genre.

Genres functioned in Tynianov’s model as conventions. Since conventions were historical, so too were any exceptions to them: the literary ‘mistake’ could only be

¹³¹ On the idea of the ‘mistake’ in a more general sense in Formalism (e.g. the ‘mistake’ in the spelling of *ostranenie*), see Yuri Tsivian, ‘The Gesture of Revolution or Misquoting as Device’, in *Ostrannenie: On ‘Strangeness’ and the Moving Image: the History, Reception, and Relevance of a Concept*, ed. by Annie van den Oever (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2010), pp. 21–32. On Shklovsky’s use of the trope of admitting to having made a mistake (e.g. his ‘Pamiatnik nauchnoi oshibke’, 1930), see Richard Sheldon, ‘Viktor Shklovsky and the Device of Ostensible Surrender’, *Slavic Review*, 34 (1975), 86–108. The participants of the ‘Retro-formalism’ workshops, organized by Anke Hennig since 2013, have recently been working on the concept of the mistake.

¹³² Viktor Shklovsky, ‘Roman tain’, *Lef*, 4 (1924), pp. 125–42 (p. 129).

identified as such in a particular historical period, against the background of the historically unstable notion of literary ‘correctness’. In his interest in the historical significance of individual violations of literary genres, Tynianov can be seen to have developed another of Shklovsky’s ideas from *Rozanov*. In an often-quoted passage, Shklovsky wrote that it was difficult to assign the greatest works of literature, those of greatest historical significance, to a particular genre, since their greatness was a function of their violation of genre.¹³³ Tolstoy’s *Voina i mir* was a novel because, although it frustrated the expectations of that genre, its historical significance could be understood only in relation to them.

Tynianov took Shklovsky’s observation and fashioned it into the law of literary history by adding other concepts associated with genetics. Since the literary mistake was by definition produced by accident, its function in the literary process could not be predicted: some mistakes would ultimately prove successful in the literary process, causing a text to be ‘felt’ more strongly than other examples of the genre to which it purported to belong; others would prove detrimental, causing a text to be ‘felt’ less strongly; still others would prove neither successful nor detrimental, having no effect on how strongly a text was ‘felt’. The successful literary mistake would ultimately reproduce itself, though Tynianov did not attempt to explain exactly how. Over time, it would cease to be ‘felt’ as a mistake at all, becoming instead the measure of correctness against which a new mistake could be identified, and so on. Literature, he explained, evolved by means of happy accidents.

¹³³ Shklovsky, *Rozanov*, pp. 12–13.

одним из ‘случайных’ результатов большой формы будет осознание недоконченности, отрывочности как приема, как метода конструкции, что прямо ведет к малой форме. Но эта ‘недоконченность’, ‘отрывочность’, ясное дело, будет восприниматься как ошибка, как выпад из системы, и только когда сама система автоматизуется, на ее фоне вырисовывается эта ошибка как новый конструктивный принцип. Собственно говоря, каждое уродство, каждая ‘ошибка’, каждая ‘неправильность’ нормативной поэтики есть — в потенции — новый конструктивный принцип.¹³⁴

In the above-quoted passage, the literary mistake is presented as a random occurrence, a ‘chance result’ of the evolutionary process. Each ‘mistake’ or ‘incorrectness’, thought Tynianov, could potentially become the new index of correctness for its genre, or, in Tynianov’s jargon, the new ‘constructive principle’. Its success was determined by how strongly it was ‘felt’. Tynianov’s choice of the word ‘mutant’ or ‘monster’ [*urodstvo*] was significant, since it not only evoked the study of physical deformity, an important area of research for evolutionary biologists, including Shimkevich, whose lectures he had attended as a student, but it also made clear that he understood literary mistakes to represent very large deviations from their genres. Literature, according to Tynianov, evolved very rapidly by massive shifts from one generation to the next. His model of evolution thus contained elements both of the theory of evolution by natural selection (the implicit mechanism of selection) and of saltationism (the emphasis on an uneven pace of evolution).

In another passage in the article, Tynianov explicitly linked the concept of the literary mistake with that of an uneven process of evolution, a series of enormous ‘leaps’. He focussed on a specific example of a literary ‘mistake’, Pushkin’s

¹³⁴ Tynianov, ‘O literaturnom fakte’, p. 109.

Ruslan i Liudmila (1820), a text presented as a violation of the conventions of the *poema*. The appearance of the text, he continued, represented ‘not a regular evolution, but a leap’ in the literary process of the early nineteenth century.

Вся революционная суть пушкинской ‘поэмы’ ‘Руслан и Людмила’ была в том, что это была ‘не-поэма’ [...]. И опять критика воспринимала это как выпад из системы, как ошибку, и опять это было смещением системы. [...] Не планомерная эволюция, а скачок, не развитие, а смещение. Жанр неузнаваем, и все же в нем сохранилось нечто достаточное для того, чтобы и эта ‘не-поэма’ была поэмой. И это достаточное — не в ‘основных’, не в ‘крупных’ отличительных чертах жанра, а во второстепенных, в тех, которые как бы сами собою подразумеваются и как будто жанра вовсе не характеризуют.¹³⁵

Tynianov described *Ruslan i Liudmila* as a ‘dislocation’ of the genre of the *poema*, a ‘non-*poema*’. He continued to use the term ‘mistake’ to describe the exceptionality of *Ruslan i Liudmila*, but introduced the concept of the ‘leap’ to model its broader evolutionary significance. Pushkin’s *poema*, according to his saltationist narrative, represented a mistake large enough to obviate the need for any mechanism of selection by a readership over a large number of generations. The choice of the word *skachok* was significant because it preserved the equivalent Slavic root to the Latin *saltus* in the word *saltationism*, a fact that could be interpreted as evidence of a direct allusion on Tynianov’s part to contemporary debates in evolutionary biology. It is also notable that he made reference to the ‘primary defining characteristics’ [*osnovnye otlichitel'nye cherty*] and ‘secondary defining characteristics’ [*vtorostepennnye otlichitel'nye cherty*] of the genre of the *poema*, both formulations evoking the classificatory discourse of nineteenth-century biology.

¹³⁵ Ibid., p. 101.

An examination of the handwritten manuscript of ‘O literaturnom fakte’, as it was submitted to Osip Brik for publication in *Lef*, reveals two further points of relevance to the argument made here about Tynianov’s engagement with theories of biological evolution and specifically with those advanced by geneticists. First, the manuscript includes one enigmatic sentence in which reference is made to the ‘evolutionary element’ [*evoliutsionnyi element*] of a literary work. The sentence was deleted from and therefore not included in the version of the article as printed in *Lef*. The mysterious concept of the ‘evolutionary element’ seems to have been based on that of the gene in genetics. It modelled a unit of hereditary information. Although he did not develop the concept in detail, he argued that the literary text could be conceptualized as the host of this essential ‘element’: ‘Каждое новое литературное произведение расценивается (и изучается) не в себе, а по тому эволюционному элементу, который оно в себе заключает.’¹³⁶ The development of the concept of the ‘evolutionary element’ would have allowed Tynianov to model texts in terms of their ultimate evolutionary significance. It is unclear why the sentence was deleted from the manuscript. Second, several of the most revealing lexical choices in the article, including most of those cited above as evidence of an interest in genetics, were inserted into the manuscript at a late stage in the drafting process. The most significant late additions to the article were the words *skachok* and *urodstvo* and the phrases ‘evolutionary genesis’ [*evoliutsionnyi genezis*] and ‘evolutionary line’ [*evoliutsionnaia liniia*].¹³⁷ Another late addition to

¹³⁶ RGALI, f. 2852, op. 1, ed. kh. 485, l. 9.

¹³⁷ Ibid., l. 2, 19. Note also that, on one occasion, the three-word phrase *sluchainye vypady, oshibki* was inserted (l. 18) and, on two occasions, the word *vtorostepennyi* was added to replace the original *vtorichnyi* (both l. 2).

the article was the metaphor of the literary fact as one that was ‘alive’ [*zhivoi*].¹³⁸ It can be conjectured that, at a relatively late stage in the drafting of the article, Tynianov decided to allude directly to evolutionary biology — and, specifically, to the work of geneticists in the field — by inserting a handful of highly loaded terms.

Thus, in ‘O literaturnom fakte’, Tynianov combined the concept of the mistake with other historically contentious concepts in evolutionary biology. By incorporating a concept from genetics into a theory of evolution by selection, Tynianov was not borrowing from evolutionary biology indiscriminately. Rather, he was adopting a considered position in the debates of the day. Although many leading Russian evolutionary biologists working in the 1920s, including Lev Berg and Trofim Lysenko, argued against the ‘mechanistic’ theories being developed by geneticists, proposing instead that biological ‘forms’ ‘developed’ teleologically towards perfection, Tynianov instead embraced genetics. We can therefore confirm Chudakov, Chudakova, and Toddes’s original conjecture about the possible presence in the article of evolutionary-biological concepts associated with genetics. Tynianov used genetics to modify the model of literary history that he and Shklovsky had first advanced in 1921: he was able to preserve the violence of a ‘struggle’ for survival among literary forms, as described so evocatively in his earlier *Dostoevskii i Gogol'*, since the necessity of appealing to the affections of a readership remained implicit, but was able to overcome the pedestrian gradualism of any Darwinian theory of evolution by modelling ‘mistakes’ as massive ‘leaps’. Tynianov did not attempt simply to fuse the concepts of social revolution and

¹³⁸ Ibid., l. 4, 5.

biological evolution, then, but sought out a ready-made branch of evolutionary biology whose models were well suited to the representation of a process of rapid change.

In Tynianov's later work, the mistake played a less prominent role, as did the associated concepts of evolutionary-biological origin. However, his continued interest in the 'failures' [*neudachi*] of literary history preserved something of the analogy. Towards the end of 1924, in the concluding paragraph of his article 'Promezhutok', part of the article that was not published until 1929,¹³⁹ he wrote that the 'failures' of literature should be celebrated, since they made possible its 'successes': 'Мы не знаем, что нам делать с хорошими вещами, как дети не знают, что им делать со слишком хорошими игрушками. [...] "Вещи" же могут быть "неудачны", важно, что они приближают возможность "удач".'¹⁴⁰ Tynianov became interested in V. B. Kiukhel'beker, and made him the subject of his first historical novel, begun in late 1924, precisely because he had been a 'failure' by comparison with Pushkin.¹⁴¹ In the article "'Argiviane": neizdannaiia tragediia Kiukhel'bekera' (1924–27), Tynianov argued that the 'failure' of

¹³⁹ For information about the incomplete initial publication of 'Promezhutok', see M. O. Chudakova, comm. to Tynianov, 'Promezhutok', in *PILK*, pp. 471–82.

¹⁴⁰ Iu. N. Tynianov, 'Promezhutok', in *Arkhaisty i novatory*, pp. 541–80 (p. 580).

¹⁴¹ Tynianov's pupils at GIII remembered that he encouraged them to research the mechanisms by which literary 'success' was determined. See Tamara Khmel'nitskaia, 'Emkost' slova', in *Vospominaniia o Iu. Tynianove*, ed. by V. Kaverin (Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1983), pp. 121–37 (p. 123): 'Что заставляло иногда менее самобытных, традиционных поэтов включать в историю литературы, а более оригинальных и интересно-нелепых — начисто вычеркивать из памяти?'

Kiukhel'beker's tragedy 'Argiviane' was ultimately productive for Russian literature, comparing it to the analogous 'failure' of Griboedov's lyric poetry.¹⁴²

Tynianov made most spectacular use of the concept of the mistake, however, in *Podporuchik Kizhe* (1927), a work of historical fiction based on two anecdotes from the time of Paul I.¹⁴³ In the novella, an apparently innocuous mistake in the copying of a list of lieutenants' names results in the accidental creation of a new lieutenant, the eponymous Kizhe. As the plot progresses, the emperor's courtiers become ever more reluctant to admit to having allowed a mistake to occur in the copying of an official document, which allows Kizhe, while stubbornly non-existent, to go on to enjoy a brilliant career in the army. One miniscule mistake gives rise by chance to an entire biography, a chain of events in which Kizhe rapidly advances through the ranks to greatness.

In the period 1919–21, Shklovsky and Tynianov thus developed a theory of literary history strongly reminiscent of Darwin's theory of evolution by natural selection. They attempted to remove the concept of origin, however, by shifting their emphasis onto the 'struggle' among literary genres to evoke *oshchutimost'*. Their original reworking of evolution was nevertheless incoherent, since the endless

¹⁴² Tynianov, "'Argiviane": neizdannaiia tragediia Kiukhel'bekera', in *Arkhaisty i novatory*, pp. 292–329 (p. 329). (Date of article as given by Tynianov in *Arkhaisty i novatory*.) See also Tynianov, 'Predislovie', in *Dnevnik V.K. Kiukhel'bekera: materialy k istorii russkoi literaturnoi i obshchestvennoi zhizni 10–40 godov XIX veka*, ed. by V. N. Orlov and S. I. Khmel'nitskii (Leningrad: Priboi, 1929), pp. 3–6 (p. 3, emphasis in original): 'в состав славы входят, повидимому, не только готовые или удавшиеся *вещи*, но и те неудачи, те затраченные силы, без которых не могли бы эти вещи осуществиться.'

¹⁴³ See B. O. Kosteliansky, comm. to Tynianov, 'Podporuchik Kizhe', in Iu. N. Tynianov, *Sochineniia v trekh tomakh*, ed. by B. O. Kosteliansky (Moscow and Leningrad: Gos. izd. khudozhestvennoi literatury, 1959), vol. 1, pp. 537–9.

revolutions that they envisaged were incompatible with a theory of evolution by natural selection. In 1924, Tynianov seemed to have been moving towards a more sophisticated engagement with evolutionary biology by borrowing concepts from the nascent science of genetics. His saltationist narrative of evolution made it possible for selection to be supplemented by another mechanism, the ‘mistake’.

The frequent characterizations of the early work of the OPOIaZ on literary history as ‘mechanistic’ or ‘mechanical’, as being regulated by ‘mechanisms’, suggest the possibility of a further natural-scientific parallel, that with the laws of classical mechanics. Shklovsky often used metaphors of motion in his early work, such as those of ‘slowing down’ [*zamedlenie*] and ‘holding back’ [*zaderzhanie*] in his theory of plot construction, and he, Eikhenbaum, and Tynianov sometimes spoke of the inherent ‘energy’ of literature.¹⁴⁴ Several commentators on the work of the Formalists have interpreted such metaphors in a philosophical context with reference in particular to Bergson and vitalism.¹⁴⁵ While the significance of Bergson for the development of Formalism is incontestable, especially in relation to the theory of perception, and Eikhenbaum and Shklovsky both made explicit reference to his work, there are nevertheless grounds to argue that, in the work of

¹⁴⁴ See, e.g., Shklovsky, ‘Sviaz’ priemov’, pp. 122, 132.

¹⁴⁵ James M. Curtis, ‘Bergson and Russian Formalism’, *Comparative Literature*, 28 (1976), 109–121; Levchenko, pp. 43–58. On Bergson and Tynianov’s theory of verse, see M. L. Gasparov, ‘Pervochtenie i perechtenie: k tynianovskomu ponimaniu suksessivnosti stikhotvornoï rechi’, in *TS*, 3 (1988), pp. 15–23. On the concept of energy, see Sergei Zenkin, ‘Veshch’, forma i energii (russkie formalisty i Diurkgeim)’, in *Evropeiskii kontekst russkogo formalizma: K probleme esteticheskikh peresechenii. Frantsiia, Germaniia, Italiia, Rossiia*, ed. by Ekaterina Dmitrieva, Michel Espagne, and Valerii Zemskov (Moscow: IMLI RAN, 2009); and Tihanov, *The Master and the Slave*, pp. 128–40 (where it is argued that the work of the Formalists on literary history presupposed the ‘Humboldtian idea of an ever-present form-building energy’, p. 131).

the OPOIaZ on literary history in particular, such metaphors of motion acquired a distinctly Newtonian — and therefore more literally ‘mechanical’ — slant.

In the early 1920s, Eikhenbaum and Tynianov both frequently described literature as ‘dynamic’. The figurative senses of the word *dynamic* have, at least in English, become so prevalent as to obscure the origin of the word in natural philosophy. In the late seventeenth century, Leibniz coined the word *dynamique* in French as a calque of the Greek *dynamikos* (‘powerful’).¹⁴⁶ The noun *dynamics* came to denote the branch of physics concerned with motion and was contrasted against the ancient tradition of statics.¹⁴⁷

Eikhenbaum developed a ‘dynamic’ theory of the work of literature, an understanding of the literary text as an arrangement of ‘elements’ subordinated to a particular ‘function’. In *Melodika russkogo liricheskogo stikha* (1922), the study in which he first advanced such a theory systematically, Eikhenbaum explained that the various ‘elements’ that constitute an artistic work existed in a ‘struggle’ with one another.¹⁴⁸ One element in the literary work would predominate, ‘ruling over’ the remaining elements and ‘subordinating’ them. Eikhenbaum referred to the victorious element as ‘the organizing “dominant”’ [*organizuiushchaia* “*dominanta*”], a term borrowed, as he explained in a footnote, from Christiansen’s

¹⁴⁶ See the etymological section in the entry for ‘*dynamic*, a. and sb.’, in the *Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd edn, 20 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), vol. 5, p. 6.

¹⁴⁷ See the entry for ‘*dynamism*, n.’, *ibid.*, vol. 5, p. 7.

¹⁴⁸ B. M. Eikhenbaum, *Melodika russkogo liricheskogo stikha* (Petrograd: OPOIaZ, 1922), p. 9.

Philosophie der Kunst.¹⁴⁹ The ‘dynamic’ approach was especially productive in the analysis of individual genres. Eikhenbaum applied the concept to the lyric, a genre whose dominant, he argued, was intonation: the production of intonation, in other words, deformed everything else in a lyric poem.

Tynianov, too, wrote that the ‘form’ of the literary text was perceived as a ‘dynamic whole’.¹⁵⁰ He used the term ‘constructive principle’ [*konstruktivnyi printsip*] to describe a concept similar to Eikhenbaum’s ‘dominant’: the constructive principle, he explained, organized the ‘factors’ comprising a work of literature around a particular goal.¹⁵¹

Tynianov argued that the dynamism of the literary text was experienced atemporally. In *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka*, he wrote that the dynamism of verse, the tension among the constituent forces of the verse construction, was independent of time. It was instead a ‘flow’, a process of ‘pure motion’, one realized ‘beyond time’: ‘В понятие этого протекания [...] вовсе не обязательно вносить временной оттенок. Протекание, динамика может быть взято само по себе, вне времени, как чистое движение.’¹⁵² The perception of the atemporal ‘flow’ or ‘pure motion’, argued Tynianov, the ‘feeling of the interaction of the

¹⁴⁹ For detailed discussions of Eikhenbaum’s concept of the dominant, see esp. Hansen-Löve, pp. 312–15. For a development of the concept, see Roman Jakobson, ‘The Dominant’ (1935), in *Selected Writings*, vol. 3: Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry, ed. by Stephen Rudy (The Hague: Mouton, 1981), pp. 751–56.

¹⁵⁰ Iu. N. Tynianov, *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka*, *Voprosy poetiki*: vyp. 5 (Leningrad: Academia, 1924), p. 10.

¹⁵¹ Cf. also the concept of the ‘orientation’ [*ustanovka*] of a genre, as advanced in Tynianov, ‘Oda kak oratorskii zhanr’, *Poetika. Vremennik otdela slovesnykh iskusstv GIII*, 3 (1927), 102–28.

¹⁵² Tynianov, *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka*, p. 10.

factors' [*oshchushchenie vzaimodeistviia faktorov*],¹⁵³ was the aesthetic experience itself, that which gave 'life' to art.¹⁵⁴ The 'dynamism of form' was synonymous with the literary: 'Динамика формы — есть непрерывное нарушение автоматизма'.¹⁵⁵ In other words, to experience the interaction of the forces in a text was to experience it as literary.

Eikhenbaum and Tynianov soon expanded the application of their dynamic conception of literature — the literary text conceptualized as the interaction of its constituent forces — to include literary history. Just as Shklovsky had expanded the application of his cognitive conception of aesthetic experience to include literary history, thereby producing a mechanism of literary selection (in the form of *oshchushchenie*), Eikhenbaum and Tynianov produced a conception of literary history as the dynamic interaction of its constituent forces. In 'O literaturnom fakte', Tynianov wrote about literary history as a process of perpetual 'motion' [*dvizhenie*], describing it as an unstable constellation of genres engaged in a ceaseless struggle for dominance.¹⁵⁶ In one section of the article, he drew a comparison between the early work of the futurists and a bullet. Neither futurism nor the bullet, he argued, could be understood from a purely static perspective, since they were inherently dynamic phenomena. Later in the article, he compared the early work of the futurists to an explosive shell. Although the military metaphor — early futurism as a round of ammunition fired through literary history — strikes the ear as little more than an avant-garde trope, it can also be understood

¹⁵³ Ibid., p. 10.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 10.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 27.

¹⁵⁶ Tynianov, 'O literaturnom fakte', p. 106.

in the context of Tynianov's dynamic thinking. To qualify as a bullet, an object had to be capable of moving through physical space; to qualify as a literary fact, Tynianov reasoned, a text had to be capable of moving through the space of history.

Тот бесплодный литературный критик, который теперь осмеивает явления раннего футуризма, одерживает дешевую победу: оценивать динамический факт с точки зрения статической — то же, что оценивать качества ядра вне вопроса о полете. 'Ядро' может быть очень хорошим на вид и не лететь, т. е. не быть ядром, и может быть 'неуклюжим' и 'безобразным', но лететь хорошо, т. е. быть ядром.¹⁵⁷

Tynianov argued that the 'appearance' of a literary phenomenon bore no relation to its function in the literary system. Literary critics should therefore be wary of mocking the futurists, whose early work might have seemed inelegant to some contemporary observers, since its superficial imperfections were of no consequence to its significance in the grand scheme of literature, its significance as motion across the space of history. It was only possible to evaluate a literary text or genre, in other words, in terms of its capacity to 'move'.

The development of a 'dynamic' conception of literary history made it possible for the Formalists to dispense with the category of time, to conceptualize history in purely spatial terms. In the theoretical introduction to *Lermontov* (1924), Eikhenbaum wrote eloquently about the elimination of the category of time from his theory of history. He argued that the interaction of the constituent forces of literary history, much like those of the literary text in Tynianov's model, was a process beyond time. Eikhenbaum claimed that his focus as a theorist of history

¹⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 106.

was on ‘motion as such’, an expression similar to Tynianov’s comment about ‘pure motion’. The category of time, he explained, was nothing but a fiction in history.

Время в истории — фикция, условность, играющая роль вспомогательную. Мы изучаем не движение во времени, а движение как таковое — динамический процесс, который никак не дробится и никогда не прерывается, но именно поэтому реального времени в себе не имеет и измеряться временем не может. Историческое изучение открывает динамику событий, законы которой действуют не только в пределах условно выбранной эпохи, но повсюду и всегда. В этом смысле, как это ни звучит парадоксально, история есть наука о постоянном, о неизменном, о неподвижном, хотя имеет дело с изменением, с движением. Наукой она может быть только в той мере, в какой ей удастся превратить реальное движение в чертеж.¹⁵⁸

The language of the above-quoted passage is overtly Newtonian. Eikhensbaum imagined a process that ‘nothing could break and could not be interrupted’, one governed by ‘laws’ operating ‘everywhere and always’. Space, he argued, could not be ‘measured’ in temporal terms, a comment consistent with the fact that time and space did not elapse relatively to each other in classical mechanics.¹⁵⁹ Just as, for Newton, space had been governed by the laws of motion, time being a category that elapsed in complete isolation, so too, for the Formalists, did the constituent genres of literary history interact without regard for time. Eikhensbaum fashioned literary history into a sort of literary physics, setting those who studied the process the task of discovering the laws according to which literary genres moved. Indeed, he went as far as to argue that the scientificity of the discipline of history was conditional on its successful elimination of the category of time: history was a science, he argued, only to the extent that it was capable of translating the historical process onto a spatial model of change. Arkadii Gornfel'd’s earlier,

¹⁵⁸ B. M. Eikhensbaum, *Lermontov: Opyt istoriko-literaturnoi otsenki* (Leningrad: Gos. izd., 1924), p. 8.

¹⁵⁹ See John Earman, *World Enough and Space-Time: Absolute Versus Relational Theories of Space and Time* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1989), pp. 6–26.

sarcastic description of the Formalists as ‘brave Russian Newtons’¹⁶⁰ could thus be said to have been realized, albeit rather crudely, in their theoretical work on literary history of 1924.

The parallel drawn here between Eikhenbaum and Tynianov’s early work on literary history and classical mechanics could be said to shed light on the more generalized metaphors of motion in the work of the OPOIaZ on the question. Shklovsky, for example, wrote in *Rozanov* that the history of literature ‘moves forward’.¹⁶¹ Tynianov often made reference to the various ‘directions’ [*napravleniia*] in which literature moved.¹⁶² He ended ‘Literaturnoe segodnia’ (1924), an article on contemporary Russian prose-writing published before ‘O literaturnom fakte’,¹⁶³ with a striking metaphor about the many ‘paths’ in which literature was moving simultaneously. Its movements could not be planned, he argued, since they were caused by an inherent dynamism: ‘Литература идет многими путями одновременно [...]. Она не поезд, который приходит на место назначения.’¹⁶⁴

In the article ‘Promezhutok’, the first half of which was published in the final issue of *Russkii sovremennik*, Tynianov developed a more sophisticated model of literary motion through an application of concepts associated with relativistic

¹⁶⁰ Gornfel'd, p. 5.

¹⁶¹ Shklovsky, *Rozanov*, pp. 4–5.

¹⁶² See, e.g., Tynianov, ‘O literaturnom fakte’, p. 103.

¹⁶³ For the months of publication of the four issues of *Russkii sovremennik*, see J. A. E. Curtis, *The Englishman from Lebedian': A Life of Evgeny Zamiatin (1884–1937)* (Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2013), pp. 142–46.

¹⁶⁴ Iu. Tynianov, ‘Literaturnoe segodnia’, *Russkii sovremennik*, 1 (1924), 291–306 (p. 306).

physics. His new understanding of the category of literature as historically relative required an appropriately relativistic conceptual apparatus. Several decades later, Tamara Khmel'nitskaia, one of Tynianov's pupils at GIII, would allude to an affinity between his conception of literary 'motion' and Einstein's theory of relativity: 'У Тынянова своя своеобразная теория относительности и соотнесенности всей жизни литературы и ее движения в истории.'¹⁶⁵

There was a surge of interest in Einstein in 1921, the year in which he won the Nobel Prize in Physics. In the years immediately afterwards, several prominent literary journals carried articles about him and published bibliographies of literature on the theory of relativity.¹⁶⁶ Tynianov's 'Literaturnoe segodnia', published in the first issue of *Russkii sovremennik*, includes a section on Evgenii Zamiatin's *My* (1924), a book profoundly influenced by Einstein.¹⁶⁷ One factor in Tynianov's decision to apply concepts from relativistic physics to the history of literature in 'Promezhutok' could well have been Zamiatin's position on the editorial board of *Russkii sovremennik*.¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁵ Khmel'nitskaia, 'Emkost' slova', in *Vospominaniia o Iu. Tynianove*, ed. by Kaverin, p. 121. Note also the title of Marc Weinstein's monograph, *Tynianov, ou la poétique de la relativité* (Saint-Denis: Presses universitaires de Vincennes, 1996), though the analogy is not explored.

¹⁶⁶ See, e.g., Ia. Perel'man, 'Novosti nauchnoi literatury. Prostranstvo i vremia', *Literaturnye zapiski*, 2 (1922), 17; and Nikolai Koialovich, 'Obzor literatury po teorii otnositel'nosti na russkom iazyke', *Kniga i revoliutsiia*, 10 (1922), 29–34, and 11–12 (1923), 26–32. See also M. Ikhteiman, 'Chto chitat' po fizike i estestvoznaniuu', *Zvezda*, 1 (1924), 281–84. For additional context on Einstein in early Soviet literary culture, see also Jonathan Stone, 'Polyphony and the Atomic Age: Bakhtin's Assimilation of an Einsteinian Universe', *PMLA*, 123 (2008), 405–21.

¹⁶⁷ On Einstein and Zamiatin, see W. J. Leatherbarrow, 'Einstein and the Art of Yevgeny Zamyatin', *Modern Language Review*, 82 (1987), 142–51.

¹⁶⁸ On Zamiatin's involvement on the editorial board of the journal *Russkii sovremennik*, see Curtis, *The Englishman from Lebedian*, pp. 142–46.

‘Promezhutok’ offered a general survey of Russian poetry. Tynianov discussed how poetry and prose had developed in recent years, arguing that the flourishing of prose had led to less poetry, fewer poets, and even fewer readers of poetry.¹⁶⁹ Tynianov once again expressed literary ‘success’ in terms of motion: the difference between poetry and prose at the beginning of the 1920s, he argued, could be expressed in terms of the respective velocities at which they were moving through the space of literary history. He wrote that, whereas poetry had almost come to a halt, and was languishing in an ‘intermediary period’ [*promezhutok*], prose was continuing to move at a rapid velocity by the sheer force of ‘inertia’.

Tynianov had applied the concept of ‘inertia’ to literature before, in ‘Literaturnoe segodnia’. He had argued that Zamiatin had been led to writing science fiction, and the novel *My*, by the sheer ‘inertia of style’ [*inertsiiia stilia*].¹⁷⁰ He applied the concept to literary history itself in ‘Promezhutok’.

Проза живет сейчас огромной силой инерции. С большим трудом, по мелочам удастся преодолевать ее, и это делается все труднее и, по-видимому, бесполезнее. Иногда кажется, что это не писатель, а сама инерция написала рассказ [...]. Для поэзии инерция кончилась. [...] Школы исчезли [...]. Нарастали в геометрической прогрессии, дифференцировались, распадались [...]. И рост [...] новых явлений происходит только в те промежутки, когда перестает действовать инерция.¹⁷¹

Prose continued to move at a rapid velocity through the space of literary history, whereas poetry had come to a standstill. Whereas some prose-writers, such as the

¹⁶⁹ Tynianov, ‘Promezhutok’, *Russkii sovremennik*, 4 (1924), 209–21 (pp. 208–13).

¹⁷⁰ Tynianov, ‘Literaturnoe segodnia’, *Russkii sovremennik*, 1 (1924), 291–306 (p. 297). See also the discussion of the ‘inertia’ of European civilization in Tynianov, ‘Zapiski o zapadnoi literature’, p. 33.

¹⁷¹ Tynianov, ‘Promezhutok’, p. 210.

Serapion Brothers, were, Tynianov explained, churning out story after story, some of which were translated into Italian almost immediately after having been written in Russian, poets were by contrast struggling to produce even a few words.¹⁷²

Tynianov aligned himself, as a critic of contemporary poetry, with those for whom it was difficult to write: 'Писать о стихах теперь почти так же трудно, как писать стихи.'¹⁷³ The stasis in which poetry found itself would nevertheless prove to be the cause of a new 'direction'. Stasis required poets to search for the force with which a new motion could be raised. The inertia undergone by prose, however, prevented anything new from being cultivated, since its continued motion required no further force to be exerted; for this reason, some prose works gave the impression of having been written by 'inertia itself'.

It seems that, in 'Promezhutok', Tynianov had nuanced his conception of literary motion from that expressed in 'O literaturnom fakte': whereas motion, in 'O literaturnom fakte', was held to encapsulate the essence of the literary, and it was thought necessary for a genre to be 'felt' as moving in order for it to be 'felt' as literary, it was argued in 'Promezhutok' that motion, which led eventually to inertia, resulted in a form of automatization. Dynamism had allowed prose-writers to become complacent, to stagnate; stasis had obligated poets to create something new. Indeed, Tynianov argued that it was the destiny of the literary revolutionary to become canonized, to be made to remain in motion: 'В конечном счете, каждый новатор трудится для инерции, каждая революция производится для

¹⁷² Ibid., p. 209.

¹⁷³ Ibid., p. 209.

канона.¹⁷⁴ He used a strikingly Newtonian metaphor to describe the relativity of literary velocity, that of the ‘optical laws of history’: ‘мы знаем, собственно, только действие инерции — промежуток, когда инерции нет, по оптическим законам истории кажется нам тупиком.’¹⁷⁵ The metaphor of the optical laws was used to describe the unequal velocities at which poetry and prose were moving across the space of history.

In addition to the generalized relativism of Tynianov’s comments about motion in ‘Promezhutok’, his treatment of time and mass in the article, while limited to a handful of suggestive metaphors, suggests a familiarity on his part with the basic principles of special and general relativity respectively.

First, Tynianov wrote about the experience of time as being relative to motion. Although Eikhenbaum and Shklovsky had made provocative comments about the flexibility of time in previous articles,¹⁷⁶ Tynianov gave them a distinctly Einsteinian emphasis. He described poetry and prose as two clocks going at different speeds: ‘У прозаиков и поэтов часы идут по-разному.’¹⁷⁷ The example of the two synchronized clocks had become a common trope in discussions of the theory of special relativity: one clock was usually stationary and the other made to move. The example originated in the thought-experiments of Poincaré, Einstein,

¹⁷⁴ Ibid., p. 210.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid., p. 210.

¹⁷⁶ See, e.g., Eikhenbaum, ‘5 = 100’, *Knizhnyi ugol*, 8 (1922), 38–41; and Shklovsky, ‘Sovremenniki i sinkhronisty’, *Russkii sovremennik*, 3 (1924), 232–37.

¹⁷⁷ Tynianov, ‘Promezhutok’, p. 210.

and others involved in the development of the theory.¹⁷⁸ Khvol'son used the example of the two clocks extensively in his popularization of the theory of special relativity (from which Jakobson quoted at length in his article of 1919).¹⁷⁹ Prose and poetry were experiencing time differently, according to Tynianov's reworking of the example, because they were moving at vastly different velocities through the space of history. Prose was in a 'rush' [*speshka*].¹⁸⁰ Every hour that elapsed changed the relationship between them: 'Один поэт-одиночка говорил мне, что "каждый час меняет положение".'¹⁸¹ Tynianov had thus developed his earlier theory of literary history as an interaction of forces in space by introducing the category of time as relative to motion. Indeed, the very concept of an 'interval' [*promezhutok*] in history would seem to play into a relativistic understanding of time. The difference between how poets and prose-writers experienced time could be explained in terms of the difference between the respective velocities at which they were moving. Given Tynianov's interest in the relativity of the experience of time in relation to motion, it was perhaps appropriate that 'Promezhutok' was published in the long-delayed final issue of *Russkii sovremennik*.¹⁸²

¹⁷⁸ See esp. the repeated use of the clock example in Albert Einstein, 'On the Electrodynamics of Moving Bodies' (1905), in *The Principle of Relativity: A Collection of Original Memoirs on the Special and General Theory of Relativity* (London: Methuen, 1923), pp. 37–65 (trans. by W. Perrett and G. B. Jeffery).

¹⁷⁹ Jakobson, 'Futurizm kak esteticheskaia i nauchnaia sistema', *Zhizn' iskusstva*, 331 (31 Dec. 1919), 2. Note the mention of Poincaré, and of how he removed the 'scaffolding' [*lesa*] on which his mathematical proofs had been constructed, in Viktor Shklovsky, 'Andrei Belyi', *Russkii sovremennik*, 2 (1924), 231–45 (p. 245).

¹⁸⁰ Tynianov, 'Promezhutok', p. 209.

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 210.

¹⁸² The fourth and final issue of *Russkii sovremennik* was not actually published until January 1925, despite having been typeset by early November 1924. See Curtis, *The Englishman from Lebedian*, pp. 142–46, for a full account.

Second, it is possible to see in Tynianov's concept of literary 'inertia' a borrowing from the conceptual apparatus of general relativity, Einstein's theory of gravitation finalized in 1915. The origin of inertia had become one of the principal problems of relativistic physics, as formulated in what was known as the 'Mach principle'.¹⁸³ Tynianov's metaphor of inertia acquired a gravitational pull of its own in light of what he had to say about prose having a greater mass than poetry, and about the fact that more prose was being produced than poetry: 'Стихов становится все меньше и меньше'.¹⁸⁴ Nevertheless, Tynianov did not develop the possible parallel with general relativity and it is as such more speculative.

Tynianov thus complicated his earlier, 'dynamic' conception of literary history by tentatively introducing the categories of velocity, mass, and time in 'Promezhutok'. Although he and Eikhenbaum had purged their literary history of time by the summer of 1924, he decided, later that year, to use concepts borrowed from relativistic physics in order to represent literary time as relative to the velocity at which a genre was moving through the space of literary history.

**

The mechanical theory of literary history developed by Shklovsky, Eikhenbaum, and Tynianov in the early 1920s thus supports parallels with natural-scientific theories of change. Indeed, in several passages of their early articles on the problem of history, they adopted metaphors associated with evolutionary biology

¹⁸³ Earman, pp. 91–110.

¹⁸⁴ Tynianov, 'Promezhutok', p. 209.

or physics in order to explain the interactions of literary genres. The fact is significant because it shows evidence of an attempt to problematize the dichotomy of the sciences of nature and those of history. The Formalists were toying with the possibility of a new, revolutionary *nauka* in which the old, German divisions of the sciences would no longer have any relevance.¹⁸⁵ The problem of history offered them an opportunity to gesture towards a unified model of all change.

They were attempting ultimately to produce a model of history in which development had been eliminated. To that end, they thought it necessary even to purge their thinly veiled Darwinism of the concept of origin, to allow literary genres to engage in the struggle to win the affections of an implied readership without ever becoming extinct. As shown above, Eikhenbaum argued that the discipline of history could become a science only by mapping change onto a spatial model.¹⁸⁶ Tynianov was the most experimental of the Formalist theorists of literary history in that regard. In two articles of 1924, ‘O literaturnom fakte’ and ‘Promezhutok’, he appealed to genetics and relativistic physics for concepts with which to theorize the history of literature. He was able to do so, however, only because the conceptual groundwork had already been done: he, Shklovsky, and Eikhenbaum had already formulated conceptions of literary history structured similarly to the theory of evolution by natural selection and Newton’s conception

¹⁸⁵ Note that, in his diary and correspondence of the 1920s, Eikhenbaum occasionally wrote dismissively about ‘German’ or ‘Germanic’ science, by which he presumably meant philosophical aesthetics or the tradition of philology with which Zhirmunskii aligned himself. See, e.g., Eikhenbaum, diary entry of 7 February 1928, as quoted in Ewa Bérard-Zarzycka, ‘La genèse des travaux sur le *literaturnyj byt* d’après le *Journal* d’Èjxhenbaum’, *Revue des études slaves*, 57 (1985), 83–89 (p. 86): ‘Реакция с двух сторон: чиновники со своим “марксизмом” и эпигоны-неудачники с германской наукой.’

¹⁸⁶ Eikhenbaum, *Lermontov*, p. 8.

of space, such that he had simply to translate the early twentieth-century natural-scientific revolution onto a pre-prepared mechanistic model of change.

In one sense, Tynianov's interest in genetics and relativistic physics was a self-representational gesture typical of the Russian avant-garde of the 1910s. The natural-scientific revolution of the early twentieth century was seen by some in Russia as a manifestation of a wider revolutionary shift in human culture, the dawn of a new age. The spirit of the Revolution, it was thought, had spread to encompass all human activity. In his 1919 article on futurism, Jakobson heralded Einstein's work and futurism as two of the many revolutionary 'fronts' from which the 'old culture' was under attack: 'Изживание статики, изгнание абсолюта — главный пафос нового времени, злоба текущего дня. [...] принцип относительности и футуристический "долой" рушат огороды старой культуры. Единство фронтов изумляет.'¹⁸⁷ Tynianov could be said to have borrowed from genetics and relativistic physics in order to perform a revolutionary theoretical act. With the help of concepts associated with the natural-scientific revolution, he was able not simply to describe revolutions in the history of literature, but also to become a participant in the same revolutionary process.

In another sense, Tynianov's engagement with genetics and relativistic physics was a way of tempering some of the more mechanical elements of the very earliest work of the OPOIaZ on literary history. By 1924, Tynianov had developed a historically more relativistic understanding of the concept of literature, arguing in 'O literaturnom fakte' that what was literary in one era was not necessary so in the

¹⁸⁷ Jakobson, 'Futurizm kak esteticheskaia i nauchnaia sistema', p. 2.

next. The concept of the ‘mistake’ and that of a relative relationship between motion and time allowed him to nuance his earlier model of literary history by emphasizing the historical relativity of the category of literature itself.

In their early work on literary history, the Formalists were at times incoherent, proliferating conflicting metaphors. The mechanical, natural-scientific paradigm in their work on literary history made it possible for them to slip into and out of the rhetoric of evolutionary biology, that of physics, and various other sciences of nature. As was shown in the previous chapter, their work on literary history of the period 1919–24 was of a more exploratory nature than Tynianov’s later, ‘structuralist’ work on the question. Their early work represented a metaphorical, conceptually less restrained approach to the problem of change.

The theorization of literary history without recourse ultimately to Marxist philosophy threatened to bring the Formalists into conflict with their opponents. As Eikhenbaum noted in May 1924, a few months before the publication of the attack on the ‘Formal method’ in *Pechat' i revoliutsiia*,¹⁸⁸ the expansion of Formalism into the field of literary history was one step too far for its Marxist opponents: ‘Против теоретической поэтики не возражают; возражения начинаются, когда речь заходит об истории.’¹⁸⁹ The Formalists’ flirtation with the natural sciences made their mechanical literary history even more provocative, since it

¹⁸⁸ P. Sakulin, ‘Iz pervoistochnika’, *Pechat' i revoliutsiia*, 5 (1924), 12–15; S. Bobrov, ‘Metod i apologet’, *ibid.*, 16–19; A. Lunacharsky, ‘Formalizm v nauke ob iskusstve’, *ibid.*, 19–32; P. Kogan, ‘O formal'nom metode’, *ibid.*, 32–35; V. Polianskii, ‘Po povodu B. Eikhenbauma’, *ibid.*, 35–38.

¹⁸⁹ Eikhenbaum, diary entry of 6 May 1924, as quoted in Bérard-Zarzycka, p. 86.

signalled a rejection of historical materialism in the study of literature.¹⁹⁰ In *Materializm i empiriokrititsizm* (1909), Lenin had denounced the application of natural-scientific concepts to socio-economics and to those disciplines dependent on socio-economics. He strongly disapproved, for example, of Georgii Plekhanov's attempt to incorporate elements of the Lamarckist theory of evolution into the Marxist theory of social development and of Aleksandr Bogdanov's attempt to do the same with Darwin's principle of natural selection.¹⁹¹ Lenin did not reject the natural-scientific concepts in themselves; rather, he disapproved of their use beyond the natural sciences, writing that their application to socio-economic problems was nothing more than 'hot air' [*pustaia fraza*].¹⁹² Lenin's staunch opposition to the plundering of the natural sciences by thinkers in other fields could have been one of the reasons why Tynianov, publishing 'O literaturnom fakte' in the second issue of *Lef* to appear after Lenin's death in January 1924, chose not to make more of a fanfare of the natural-scientific concepts in his narrative of history.

Although the accusations of 'formalism' and of a 'mechanical' or 'mechanistic' conception of change became standard tropes of the rhetoric of high Stalinism, it is

¹⁹⁰ Cf. V. Shklovsky, 'Prostranstvo v iskusstve i suprematisty' (part 1), *Zhizn' iskusstva*, 196 (July 1919), 2: 'Исторический материализм очень хорош для социологии, но им нельзя заменить знания математики и астрономии и при одной его помощи нельзя ни рассчитать мост, ни определить законы движения кометы.'

¹⁹¹ See Vucinich, *Darwin in Russian Thought*, pp. 330–69.

¹⁹² V. I. Lenin, 'Materializm i empiriokrititsizm', in *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, 5th edn, 55 vols (Moscow: Gos. izd. politicheskoi literatury, 1958–65), vol. 18 (1961), p. 348. He also described a 'denigration of historical materialism through pretentious and vacuous energeticist and biological verbosity' [*iskazhenie istoricheskogo materializma pretentsiozno-pustoi energeticheskoi i biologicheskoi slovesnost'iu*] (pp. 349–50).

nevertheless instructive to compare the ways in which Marxist philosophers attempted from the late 1920s to ward off the challenges to the supremacy of materialism presented by Formalism in literary studies and by genetics and relativistic physics in the natural sciences. In the 1930s, it became politically unwise to endorse ‘mechanistic’ theories of change, or ‘formalism’, even within the natural sciences. It became increasingly necessary for any conception of change to conform to the principles of dialectical materialism.¹⁹³

Trofim Lysenko’s biological ‘theory of development’ [*teoriia razvitiia*] offered an appropriately materialist theory of biological evolution. As Boris Gasparov notes, Lysenko reserved his most venomous criticism for the work of geneticists in the field of evolutionary biology, referring disparagingly to the ‘mechanistic laws’ of the ‘formalist science’ of genetics.¹⁹⁴ Gasparov shows the uncanny parallels between Lysenko’s ‘neo-Romantic’ Marxist critique of genetics in the 1930s and Medvedev and Voloshinov’s similarly ‘neo-Romantic’ Marxist critique of Formalism in literary studies in the late 1920s.

If Lysenko and his disciples saw genetics as a ‘formalist’ science of ‘mechanistic laws’, others interpreted relativistic physics, at least as derived mathematically by Einstein, as an ‘idealist’ science. Einstein’s conceptual debt to the physicist and philosopher of science Ernst Mach was well known,¹⁹⁵ which, given Lenin’s

¹⁹³ See Daniel Todes and Nikolai Kremmentsov, ‘Dialectical Materialism and Soviet Science in the 1920s and 1930s’, in *A History of Russian Thought*, ed. by William Leatherbarrow and Derek Offord (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 340–67.

¹⁹⁴ Gasparov, ‘Development or Rebuilding’, p. 134.

¹⁹⁵ See Earman, pp. 27–30.

objections to Machian ‘empirio-criticism’, automatically made him a suspicious figure. In the 1930s and 1940s, a number of prominent Marxist philosophers expressed suspicion of Einstein’s excessive faith in mathematics, seeing it as evidence of Machist idealism.¹⁹⁶ They thought that Einstein had, like Kant, developed an edifice of pure thought rather than one grounded in the experience of physical reality, having wrongly presupposed that reason preceded nature.¹⁹⁷ As late as 1953, the Stalinist philosopher A. A. Maksimov accused Einstein of ‘mechanistic views and mathematical formalism’.¹⁹⁸ Marxist philosophers had levelled identical charges against the Formalists in the 1920s. Trotsky, for example, had accused them of a typically idealist ignorance of the process of historical development, claiming that Kant had been the first Formalist.¹⁹⁹ They had, he argued, blindly followed St John in thinking that in the beginning had been the Word, that the Word had preceded the deed.²⁰⁰

For Shklovsky, Eikhenbaum, and Tynianov, the turn towards the problem of literary history in the period 1919–24 coincided with the beginnings of a heightened historical self-awareness. Their increasingly historical understanding of their work and its decisive role in the development of *nauka* was accompanied by the construction of a curiously ‘mechanical’ theory of literary history. In the present chapter, we have read the early work of the OPOIaZ on literary history in light of Eikhenbaum and Tynianov’s comments about the need to reconsider the division of the sciences into those of nature and those of history. From such a

¹⁹⁶ As quoted in Vucinich, *Einstein and Soviet Ideology*, pp. 60–61.

¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 60–61.

¹⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 116.

¹⁹⁹ Trotsky, p. 4.

²⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

perspective, the ‘mechanical’ elements in their theorization of history can be seen as evidence not of an intellectual naïvety, but of an attempt to experiment with the application of natural-scientific models of change. Their aim was to uncover the ‘laws’ of literary history, but to do so in such a way as to make a break with how the process had traditionally been theorized. In other words, they sought to have their theorization of history come into being as a revolution, an act of defiance against the old order and its intellectual conventions. To undertake to apply natural-scientific concepts to history was, to borrow Tynianov’s phrase, to attempt to effect a ‘shift of the system’ [*smeshchenie sistemy*] in (intellectual-)historical terms.²⁰¹ Such a strategy caused the Formalists to complicate the fundamental division between the object and the subject of theoretical investigation: their work on history was taking shape in accordance with its own laws, both stating and enacting its central argument. It is striking that Eikhenbaum and Tynianov toyed with the possible self-referentiality even of the two relatively obscure natural-scientific concepts at the centre of the analysis in the present chapter, the productive ‘mistake’²⁰² and literary ‘inertia’²⁰³. The use of theory simultaneously

²⁰¹ Tynianov, ‘O literaturnom fakte’, p. 101.

²⁰² See, e.g., Iu. Tynianov, ‘O Khlebnikove’, in *Sobranie proizvedenii Velimira Khlebnikova*, 5 vols, ed. by Iu. Tynianov and N. Stepanov (Leningrad: Izd. pisatelei, 1928–33), vol. 1 (1928), pp. 17–30 (p. 25): ‘Так бывает и в науке. Маленькие ошибки, “случайности”, объясняемые старыми учеными как отклонение, вызванное несовершенством опыта, служат толчком для новых открытий: то, что объяснялось “несовершенством опыта”, оказывается действием неизвестных законов.’ Cf. Omri Ronen, in ‘Anketa k 100-letiiu so dnia rozhdeniia Iu. N. Tynianova’, in *Tynianovskii sbornik*, vyp. 9: Sed'mye Tynianovskie chteniia. Materialy dlia obsuzhdeniia (Riga and Moscow: 1995–96), pp. 47–49 (p. 48): ‘Даже и ошибки Тынянова действенной тьмы низких истин в нашей области.’

²⁰³ See Eikhenbaum, in *Iurii Tynianov*, ed. by Kaverin, p. 78: ‘Литературная наука жила своей инерцией — и инерция эта кончилась; образовался своего рода “промежуток”. [...] Тынянову, при его отношении к истории [...] и к слову, необходимо было вырваться из этой традиции, преодолеть инерцию.’

as a means of understanding revolutions in the history of literature and of performing a revolutionary act makes it possible to see the early work of the Society on literary history as a reconfiguration of the original relation of interdependence between *nauka* and literature on which the OPOIaZ had been founded.

Chapter Three

The Collection of Articles as Science (1924–30)

From 1924 or 1925 until the late 1920s, Shklovsky, Eikhenbaum, and Tynianov all experienced a period of stagnation in their theoretical work, one often since termed a ‘crisis’ in the history of Formalism.¹ Having rapidly developed an original theoretical approach towards the study of literature in the late 1910s and early 1920s, they were confronting new challenges, both methodological and political.² Indeed, the methodological and the political had become almost synonymous, since their principal challenge was that of how to model social factors in the development of literature, how to explain the interactions between literature and such categories as everyday life [*byt*]. As was mentioned in the first chapter, Eikhenbaum expanded his theoretical interests to encompass biographical questions, such as that of the socio-historical function of the *literator*, and Tynianov developed a theory of ‘literary evolution’.

¹ On the theoretical challenges faced by the Formalists in the late 1920s, see esp. A. P. Chudakov, M. O. Chudakova, and E. A. Toddes, comm. to Tynianov, ‘O literaturnoi evoliutsii’, in *PILK*, pp. 518–30. For a discussion of the ‘crisis’ with relevance specifically to Eikhenbaum, see Carol Any, *Boris Eikhenbaum: Voices of a Russian Formalist* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1994), pp. 80–103.

² On the methodological debate between the Formalists and Marxist literary critics, see esp. ‘Materialy disputa “Marksizm i formal'nyi metod” 6 marta 1927 g.’, *NLO*, 50 (2001), 247–78 (ed. by D. Ustinov); and Galin Tihanov, ‘Zametki o dispute marksistov i formalistov 1927-ogo goda’, *ibid.*, 279–86 (trans. by M. Poliakova).

Roman Jakobson thought that the ‘crisis of Formalism’ could more accurately be described as a ‘crisis of the Formalists’.³ He meant that the crisis had a more personal, existential quality, that it was not limited to the purely intellectual task of constructing new theoretical models. The Formalists were looking for a new direction, a new means of securing historical relevance in a much-changed intellectual climate.⁴ Their greater uncertainty about the future entailed a corresponding effort of self-historicization on their part. As the decade progressed, Eikhenbaum and Tynianov were ever more conscious of the historical specificity of their theoretical work of the late 1910s and early 1920s. In 1927, Tynianov quipped that his students at GIII, the younger generation of ‘Formalists’, had simply come too late to the table: ‘они пришли к столу, когда обед съеден.’⁵ The Formalists thought that they had achieved something remarkable, but that their hour of revolutionary glory had ultimately passed. They were nevertheless uneasy with what several contemporaries described as the ‘canonization’ of the work of the Society.⁶ Eikhenbaum strongly associated the crisis of the late 1920s with the institutionalization of the ‘Formal method’. He complained of being surrounded by

³ Quoted in Shklovsky, letter to Tynianov of 27 November 1928, as quoted in A. P. Chudakov, M. O. Chudakova, and E. A. Toddes, comm. to Jakobson and Tynianov, ‘Problemy izucheniia literatury i iazyka’, in *PILK*, pp. 530–36 (p. 531).

⁴ The search for a new direction is referenced in the title of Shklovsky’s *Tret’ia fabrika* (Moscow: Krug, 1926): having been ‘made’ in the first factory of his youth, and the second of the OPOIaZ, he was looking for a ‘third factory’ in which the process of his ‘making’ could be completed.

⁵ Quoted in Lidiia Ginzburg, *Chelovek za pis'mennym stolom* (Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel', 1989), p. 32.

⁶ See, e.g., P. Medvedev, ‘Uchenyi sal'erizm: O formal'nom (morfologicheskom) metode’, *Zvezda*, 3 (1925), 264–76 (p. 264): ‘несомненен процесс канонизации формального метода. Он становится догмой. У него уже имеются не только учителя и ученики, но ученики и эпигоны.’

‘epigones’, by those who wanted to reduce the work of the Society to a finalized, ‘static system’ of concepts.⁷

In their search for a new direction, the Formalists experimented with new modes of *nauka*. Eikhenbaum wrote in late 1925 of his desire to overcome the *nauka* ‘of the old type’ [*prezhnego tipa*].⁸ Shklovsky’s *Tret’ia fabrika* (1926) and *Gamburgskii schet* (1928) and Eikhenbaum’s *Moi vremennik* (1929) provided a clear realization of a new ‘type’ of *nauka*. In these works, they framed theoretical observations in a more literary-autobiographical prose. Their strategy was in itself theoretically significant in light of their heightened interest in the question of biography in relation to literature: they were not only making arguments of theoretical significance, therefore, but were in effect demonstrating or performing them. In a monograph dedicated to the question, Jan Levchenko argues that Shklovsky and Eikhenbaum thereby practised ‘*inoskazanie teorii*’ or an ‘alternative form of reflection on material’.⁹ Broadly similar arguments have been made about Shklovsky, Eikhenbaum, and Tynianov’s correspondence of the late 1920s, a largely unpublished body of letters of theoretical significance in light of what the Formalists had to say, in their literary-theoretical articles, about the letter as a peripherally literary genre.¹⁰

⁷ Eikhenbaum, ‘Teoriia “formal’nogo metoda”’, in *Literatura: teoriia, kritika, polemika* (Leningrad: Priboi, 1927), pp. 116–48 (pp. 116–17).

⁸ Eikhenbaum, diary entry of 2 December 1925, as quoted in Ewa Bérard-Zarzycka, ‘La genèse des travaux sur le *literaturnyj byt* d’après le *Journal d’Èjxenbaum*’, *Revue des études slaves*, 57 (1985), 83–89 (p. 87).

⁹ Jan Levchenko, *Drugaja nauka: russkie formalisty v poiskakh biografii* (Moscow: Izdatel’skii dom NIU VShE, 2012), pp. 38, 10.

¹⁰ See esp. Catherine Depretto, *Le Formalisme en Russie* (Paris: Institut d’Études Slaves, 2009), pp. 147–61; and Levchenko, pp. 67–79. On Shklovsky and letters, see Asiya Bulatova, “I’m Writing to You in this Magazine”: The Mechanics of

Despite the interest shown in the historical significance of the new ‘types’ of *nauka* pioneered by Shklovsky and Eikhenbaum in the late 1920s, commentators have overlooked the possible theoretical significance of the five apparently more conventional authorial collections compiled by them and Tynianov, largely from already-published articles, during the same period. The collections in question are Eikhenbaum’s *Skvoz’ literaturu* (1924) and *Literatura* (1927), the two editions of Shklovsky’s *O teorii prozy* (1925, 1929), and Tynianov’s *Arkhaisty i novatory* (1929).¹¹ Shklovsky could be said to have provided the very earliest example among his peers of a work made of already-published material in the form of his *Khod konia* (1923), a book of many short pieces originally published during the Civil War, to which he gave the descriptive subtitle ‘collection of articles’ [*sbornik statei*]. Given that its constituent pieces were much shorter, more numerous, and ultimately more journalistic in nature than those in the collections named above, however, it must be considered a collection of a different kind, one less oriented towards the theory of literature.

Modernist Dissemination in Shklovsky’s Open Letter to Jakobson’, *Comparative Critical Studies*, 11 (2014), 185–202; and idem, ‘Neumestnyi modernizm Viktora Shklovskogo: “Pis'ma ne o liubvi” i granitsy literatury’, *NLO*, 133 (2015), 182–96. On the OPOIaZ and Arzamas as analogously structured societies of epistolary correspondents, see Efim Kurganov, *Arzamas i OPOIaZ* (St Petersburg: Zvezda, 1998), pp. 7–14 passim. On the significance of Tynianov and his pupil N. L. Stepanov’s foundational theoretical work on the letter as a literary genre, see William Mills Todd III, *The Familiar Letter As a Literary Genre in the Age of Pushkin* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1976), pp. 3–18.

¹¹ B. Eikhenbaum, *Skvoz’ literaturu: sbornik statei*, Voprosy poetiki: vyp. 4 (Leningrad: Academia, 1924); Viktor Shklovsky, *O teorii prozy* (Moscow and Leningrad: Krug, 1925); B. Eikhenbaum, *Literatura: teoriia, kritika, polemika* (Leningrad: Priboi, 1927); Iu. N. Tynianov, *Arkhaisty i novatory* (Leningrad: Priboi, 1929); Viktor Shklovsky, *O teorii prozy*, 2nd edn (Moscow: Federatsiia, 1929).

During the late 1920s, other figures associated with Formalism, including Zhirmunskii and Tomashevskii, also compiled collections of their earlier literary-theoretical articles.¹² A. P. Chudakov argues that the proliferation of collections of already-published material at the close of the decade was a symptom of a universal ‘time of stock-taking’ [*vremia itogov*], a time at which those who had participated in the literary-theoretical debates of the decade looked back on what had been accomplished.¹³ The various collections produced by literary theorists in the late 1920s could to some extent be considered analogous in function to the textual ‘monuments’ produced in commemoration of literary scholars in the late imperial period.¹⁴

There are two principal reasons why Shklovsky, Eikhenbaum, and Tynianov’s authorial collections have been overlooked in the critical literature on Formalism. The first is that they were for the most part compiled from articles already published elsewhere, though the articles were usually edited before inclusion. The second is the existence of more comprehensive, posthumous editions of their articles accompanied by scholarly commentaries. One recent exception to the general trend of overlooking the collections is Jessica Merrill’s discussion of the ‘folkloric’ origins of Shklovsky’s *O teorii prozy*. Merrill nevertheless does not focus on the book as a whole; it serves instead, as it and the other examples cited

¹² V. Zhirmunskii, *Voprosy teorii literatury: stat'i 1916–1926* (Leningrad: Academia, 1928); B. Tomashevskii, *O stikhe: stat'i* (Leningrad: Priboi, 1929).

¹³ A. P. Chudakov, ‘V. V. Vinogradov i teoriia khudozhestvennoi rechi pervoi treti XX veka’, in V. V. Vinogradov, *Izbrannye trudy: O iazyke khudozhestvennoi prozy*, ed. by E. V. Dushechkina et al. (Moscow: Nauka, 1980), pp. 285–315 (p. 285).

¹⁴ See Andy Byford, *Literary Scholarship in Late Imperial Russia: Rituals of Academic Institutionalization* (London: Legenda, 2007), pp. 74–126.

above have generally for the majority of commentators, as an author-approved corpus of literary-theoretical texts.¹⁵ The significance of Shklovsky, Eikhenbaum, and Tynianov's authorial collections as original works in themselves remains to be considered.

The present chapter expands the scope of recent research on Formalist *inoskazanie teorii* in the late 1920s by approaching the four — or, if the second edition of *O teorii prozy* is included, five — collections cited above as examples of an emerging genre, one that was theoretically significant in itself. The aim is to present that genre as another instrument of *inoskazanie teorii* characteristic of the period of crisis from 1924. Although the collections in question could be read as little more than old wine in new bottles, and their authors were paid less for them than they would have been for new material,¹⁶ they were nevertheless original publications. The selection of articles to be included represented an original authorial act, as did the sequence in which they were arranged, the manner in which they were edited, and the foreword with which they were framed. The collections were inescapably autobiographical in their orientation: their authors were collecting articles written at various stages in their careers, such that, even if not made explicit, the chronological progression among them reflected a process of development. For the Formalists, the authorial collection of articles acquired a further, historically specific resonance in that the compilation of such a collection was an act of

¹⁵ Jessica Merrill, 'Fol'kloristicheskie osnovaniia knigi Viktora Shklovskogo "O teorii prozy"', *NLO*, 133 (2015), 197–213 (trans. by Natal'ia Movnina).

¹⁶ Note, e.g., that, on the contract (dated 30 June 1930) between Tynianov and the publishing house Academia for a planned collection of articles, *Russkaia literatura v parodiiakh i karikaturakh*, he was offered three times as much per *pechatnyi list* of new material than he was per *pechatnyi list* of old material. (RGALI, f. 2224, op. 1, ed. kh. 190, l. 16.)

making a ‘whole’ from a selection of ‘parts’. The process thus nostalgically recalled the famous early work of the OPOIaZ on the ‘making’ of such works as *Don Quixote*, on the literariness of large-scale works of prose. The use of literary devices to orient the genre towards autobiography endowed it with a theoretical significance in its own right, making each collection into a contribution to *nauka* independent of the contributions of its constituent articles.

Skvoz' literaturu was the first such authorial collection. Eikhenbaum had been seeking a publisher for a collection of his own articles since early 1922,¹⁷ the beginning of a period of greater self-reflection on his part. His short article ‘Mig soznaniia’, which had appeared towards the end of the previous year, had been the first published testament to his self-historicizing turn, an eloquent account of his personal experience of the work of history.¹⁸ Eikhenbaum saw himself, as someone who wrote about literature, as subject to the same laws as those who wrote literature; just as poets had their day on which to shine, so too did those who wrote about poetry have theirs. In so doing, he blurred the boundary between literary works and literary-theoretical ones, thereby inscribing himself, a theorist of literature, into the same narrative of history. The process of historical self-reflection intensified after Shklovsky fled Russia in March 1922, leading to a historicization of the OPOIaZ itself. In Tomashevskii’s speech to the Petrograd

¹⁷ M. O. Chudakova, comm. to Eikhenbaum, ‘Leskov i sovremennaia proza’, in *O literature: raboty raznykh let*, ed. by M. O. Chudakova, E. A. Toddes, and A. P. Chudakov (Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1987), pp. 514–18 (p. 514).

¹⁸ For an analysis of the article and the estimate of its month of publication, see M. O. Chudakova, ‘Sotsial'naia praktika, filologicheskaiia refleksiiia i literatura v nauchnoi biografii Eikhenbauma i Tynianova’, in *TS*, 2 (1986), pp. 103–31 (esp. pp. 103–10).

Association (1922), for example, the OPOIaZ was represented triumphantly as a piece of revolutionary history, as a decisive historical event.¹⁹

Skvoz' literaturu can be traced to the same self-historicizing turn. Although Eikhenbaum had entrusted the collection to a different publisher in 1922,²⁰ it was eventually published in April 1924 by Academia,²¹ the publishing house officially attached to RIII (later GIII) as of late 1923.²² It became the fourth title in 'Voprosy poetiki', an irregular series intended to showcase the work of the faculty at the institute. The series was widely — even internationally — seen as an unofficial mouthpiece of the “‘formal’ school’ in Russia.”²³ The first three titles, all published in late 1923, had been original monograph-length studies either of Russian literature or of the language of verse.²⁴ Tynianov’s *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka*, another original monograph on verse, was the fifth title in the series and was published a few months after Eikhenbaum’s collection.²⁵ The addition to the series of *Skvoz' literaturu* must thus have been seen as an unexpected editorial

¹⁹ B. V. Tomashevskii, ‘Formal'nyi metod: vmesto nekrologa’, given in ‘Beseda o formal'nom metode v petrogradskoi assotsiatsii 10 dekabria 1922 goda’, *Zvezda*, 8 (2004), 145–60 (ed. by V. G. Belous) (pp. 148–53).

²⁰ A. P. Chudakov, comm. to Tynianov, ‘Predislovie k knige “Problema stikhovoi semantiki”’, in *PILK*, pp. 501–07 (pp. 501–02).

²¹ Date of publication as given in M. O. Chudakova and E. A. Toddes, ‘Nasledie i put' B. Eikhenbauma’, in Eikhenbaum, *O literature*, pp. 3–32 (p. 17).

²² See T. D. Ismagulova, notes to V. P. Zubov, *Stradnye gody Rossii: vospominaniia o revoliutsii, 1917–1925*, ed. by T. D. Ismagulova (Moscow: Indrik, 2004), pp. 90–110 (p. 103). (V. P. Zubov was the director of RIII.)

²³ See, e.g., D. S. Mirsky, [review of *Voprosy poetiki*: vyp. 1–5 (1923–24)], *Slavonic Review*, 2 (1924), 658–59, and 3 (1924), 227–28.

²⁴ A. Slonimskii, *Tekhnika komicheskogo u Gogolia*, *Voprosy poetiki*: vyp. 1 (Petrograd: Academia, 1923); B. Tomashevskii, *Russkoe stikhoslozhenie. Metrika*, *Voprosy poetiki*: vyp. 2 (Petrograd: Academia, 1923); V. Zhirmunskii, *Rifma, ee istoriia i teoriia*, *Voprosy poetiki*: vyp. 3 (Petrograd: Academia, 1923).

²⁵ Date of publication as given in Chudakov, comm. to Tynianov, ‘Predislovie k knige “Problema stikhovoi semantiki”’, in *PILK*, p. 502.

decision, a departure from the usual pattern in which the work of the faculty at the Institute had until then been packaged. It was, therefore, perhaps inevitable that some contemporary readers were left perplexed by the collection. Fedor Zhits, for example, began his review of *Skvoz' literaturu* with an expression of complete incomprehension of the purpose of the book before him: 'Ясность цели, нужная для всякой работы, у автора данной книги, повидимому, отсутствует.'²⁶

Eikhenbaum's collection comprised fifteen articles all originally published between 1916 and 1922, a period of great change in his work: in 1916, Eikhenbaum had not yet joined the OPOIaZ and was still producing articles strongly informed by philosophical aesthetics; by 1922, however, when he was the official vice-president of the Society, he had changed the fundamental principles of his approach to the study of literature, having shifted his focus to quintessentially Formalist problems of what he later, and somewhat dismissively, termed 'composition'.²⁷

He chose to demonstrate his intellectual development by arranging the articles included in *Skvoz' literaturu* chronologically. In the foreword, he described the progression of the articles as a six-year 'path' [*put'*] through his career to date, one divided clearly into two halves by a 'break' [*perelom*] in 1917–18.²⁸ Despite the range of historical periods and topics covered across the articles, from Schiller to

²⁶ Fedor Zhits, [review of Eikhenbaum, *Skvoz' literaturu* (1924)], *Krasnaia nov'*, 5 (1924), 327–29 (p. 327).

²⁷ Eikhenbaum, letter to Shklovsky of spring 1927, as quoted in Chudakova, 'Sotsial'naiia praktika', p. 113: 'Не могу больше ни говорить, ни читать о "композиции".'

²⁸ Eikhenbaum, 'Predislovie', in *Skvoz' literaturu*, pp. 3–4 (p. 3).

Tolstoy, it was nevertheless possible, to use Eikhenbaum's choice of verb, for the reader to 'feel' [*oshchushchat'*] a deeper meaning in their chronological sequence.²⁹ He identified the tenth chapter, 'Kak sdelana "Shinel"' Gogolia' (1918), as the turning point, the beginning of his work on 'problems of poetics in itself' [*problemy poetiki samoi po sebe*].³⁰ There is evidence to suggest that Eikhenbaum had finalized the sequence of the articles to be included in the collection before the last few had even been written: at least one, 'Nekrasov', was — before its completion — planned as a chapter in a future collection.³¹ The article thus came into being as the logical conclusion to a retrospectively constructed career trajectory, as an illumination of his earlier work with the benefit of hindsight. In the final paragraph of the foreword, Eikhenbaum suggested that his personal development during the period 1916–22 was representative of a more general development in Russian literary scholarship, the emergence of a true *nauka* of literature.³²

While Eikhenbaum's *Skvoz' literaturu* was not a wholly original work in the sense that its constituent articles had already been published elsewhere, it nevertheless constituted an original reworking of them in retrospect. His use of old, unaltered articles from different moments in his career gave the collection a historical perspective, one accentuated by its chronological ordering of them. Although he used the foreword to alert the reader to the definitive historical 'break' represented

²⁹ Ibid., p. 3.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 3.

³¹ See Eikhenbaum, diary entry of 24 January 1922, as quoted in Chudakova, comm. to Eikhenbaum, 'Leskov i sovremennaiia proza', in *O literature*, p. 514.

³² Eikhenbaum, 'Predislovie', in *Skvoz' literaturu*, p. 3.

by its tenth article,³³ his celebrated study of Gogol's 'Shinel', at no point in the collection did he make explicit precisely what the article represented: his entry into the OPOIaZ. The omission can be explained by the fact that, by 1924, 'Kak sdelana "Shinel"' Gogolia' had become so inseparable from the work of the Society that it was no longer necessary to explain what, for Eikhenbaum and his career, it represented.³⁴ Indeed, the article had become so well known by 1924 that Eikhenbaum did not even need to supply its full title, making reference in the foreword simply to 'the article on "Shinel"''.³⁵ It was sufficient for him to allude to the title in order to evoke the Society from whose work it was inseparable. The collection was thus structured around an article standing as a cipher for the OPOIaZ, a historical event, or 'break', of decisive significance not only in Eikhenbaum's development as a scholar of literature, but also, according to the foreword, in the development of poetics into *nauka*. Indeed, the collection was structured such that it was unintelligible as a whole without reference ultimately to the work of the Society, the missing piece in the puzzle. Eikhenbaum's decision not to include in the collection any articles written after 1922, the year in which Shklovsky fled Russia, served further to accentuate the break by dividing it cleanly into the articles completed before he had joined the Society and those completed in its heyday, before the process of its historicization had begun in 1922.

³³ Ibid., p. 3.

³⁴ Even Mirsky, writing in English in the *Slavonic Review*, 3 (1924), 227–28 (p. 228), noted that the article on 'Shinel' was well known for having had a 'decisive influence on the direction of literary studies in Russia'.

³⁵ Eikhenbaum, 'Predislovie', in *Skvoz' literaturu*, p. 3. Note that the original title of the article, 'Kak sdelana "Shinel"' (under which it was published in 1919), was expanded to 'Kak sdelana "Shinel"' Gogolia' for publication in *Skvoz' literaturu*.

It was highly significant that Eikhenbaum used a compositional device to represent the historical ‘break’ caused by the work of the OPOIaZ. He had decided to reproduce an intellectual revolution in the structure of a book, to model a historical event in ‘compositional’ terms. He thus had to adopt the same techniques of construction that he and Shklovsky had studied in their early work on prose. Indeed, as he was compiling *Skvoz' literaturu*, Eikhenbaum was also writing *Lermontov*, a monograph in one chapter of which he examined *Geroi nashego vremeni*. Eikhenbaum wrote about the ambiguity of Lermontov’s book as simultaneously a novel and a collection of short stories [*tsep' povestei*], describing it as a struggle between the ‘small form’ [*malaia forma*] and the ‘large form’ [*bol'shaia forma*]. He also discussed the function of the pseudo-authorial preface as a device for ‘framing’ [*obramlenie*].³⁶ The compilation of *Skvoz' literaturu* required Eikhenbaum to adopt the same compositional strategies. By turning his old articles into such a collection, a ‘whole’ comprising individual ‘parts’, he was staging a battle of his own between the ‘large form’ and the ‘small form’.

The act of compiling the collection forced Eikhenbaum to treat his own work as that of another, to turn it into the object of a new authorial act. His relation, as author of the collection, towards its constituent articles can thus be said to have mirrored his relation, as author of its constituent articles, towards the literary works analysed in them. The compilation of the collection required of Eikhenbaum the implementation of a range of literary ‘devices’, such as the sequencing of its constituent articles and their framing by a foreword. In 1924, then, Eikhenbaum

³⁶ Eikhenbaum, *Lermontov: opyt istoriko-literaturnoi otsenki* (Leningrad: Gos. izd., 1924), pp. 127–56 (esp. pp. 134–44).

was adopting a self-consciously ‘literary’ mode of presentation in order to repackage the old products of *nauka*. Indeed, he was adopting the very kind of literary devices that had been studied in the best-known work of the OPOIaZ, work in which the literariness of a text had been reduced to the manner of its ‘making’. *Skvoz' literaturu* was thus a homage in ‘composition’ to the Society.

Eikhenbaum made further allusions to the conceptual apparatus of the OPOIaZ in his foreword to the collection. The most striking example was the very concept of a historical ‘break’, a metaphor associated with the revolutionary rhetoric of Shklovsky and Tynianov’s early works on literary history. Another example was Eikhenbaum’s choice of the word ‘path’ to describe what he perceived as his historical development, a word that evokes the title of his earlier article on Pushkin’s turn from poetry to prose, ‘Put' Pushkina k proze’.³⁷ Even the choice of the verb ‘feel’ to describe how the reader should experience the collection is significant: Shklovsky, Eikhenbaum, and Tynianov had, as was shown in the previous chapter, originally applied that verb to the experience of reading literature. Such lexical choices reveal that Eikhenbaum had begun to interpret his own career in the same terms in which he and his colleagues wrote about literature. The title of the collection, *Skvoz' literaturu*, thus acquired a double meaning: in addition to the obvious meaning of a journey through literature in the form of a succession of articles on various themes, it acquired the meaning of a prism with which literary-theoretical articles could be observed through literature, as if they were themselves literary.

³⁷ Eikhenbaum, ‘Put' Pushkina k proze’, in *Pushkinskii sbornik pamiati Professora S. A. Vengerova*, ed. by N. V. Iakovlev (Moscow: Gos. izd., 1923), pp. 59–74.

Like Eikhenbaum himself, reviewers sympathetic to Formalism wrote about the collection in terms curiously reminiscent of the rhetoric of the OPOIaZ. Vladimir Sillov, for example, who thought the collection excellent, wrote that the decision to order the articles chronologically had had the advantage of showing how the author had ‘evolved’ [*evoliutsioniroval*] as a theorist.³⁸ He conceptualized the ‘evolution’ in Eikhenbaum’s work in terms of a shift in its ‘decisive principle’ [*reshaiushchii printsip*],³⁹ a formulation reminiscent of Tynianov’s ‘constructive principle’ [*konstruktivnyi printsip*]. Sillov noted that the reading strategies recommended by Eikhenbaum in the foreword to the collection had already found their most brilliant realization in its constituent articles: ‘основной интерес сборника не только в самих статьях [...] — сколько в органической эволюции методов и принципов изучения литературы у одного из виднейших современных научных исследователей эволюции’.⁴⁰ *Skvoz' literaturu*, according to Sillov, represented the evolution of a brilliant student of evolution. Eikhenbaum, he argued, had provided — in the articles comprising the collection — a string of *mises-en-abyme* of how he wanted it to be read as a whole.

Vinokur was a similarly enthusiastic reviewer, praising *Skvoz' literaturu* so highly that, in the final paragraph of his review, he came close to accusing contemporary Russian writers of being inadequate to Eikhenbaum’s brilliance as a theorist of literature: just as Viazemskii had had a Pushkin to serve as his muse, so did

³⁸ V. Sillov, [review of Eikhenbaum, *Skvoz' literaturu* (1924)], *Lef*, 2 (6) (1924), 157.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 157.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 157.

Eikhenbaum deserve literary contemporaries worthy of his pen.⁴¹ Vinokur, too, slipped seamlessly into the rhetoric of the OPOIaZ in his analysis, writing that the very nature of the book called for a different style of review.⁴² Like Sillov, he described Eikhenbaum's 'evolution' in terms borrowed from the work of the Society on literary history: 'Эволюция Эйхенбаума по своему закономерна. Но говорить о ней, как об эволюции, — можно только условно: здесь срыв, переворот, "перелом", а не последовательная прямая линия.'⁴³ Vinokur also described Eikhenbaum's foreword to *Skvoz' literaturu* as both a 'canonical compositional frame' [*kanonicheskaia kompozitsionnaia ramka*] and a 'literary device' [*literaturnyi priem*], two unambiguous allusions to Shklovsky's early articles on plot construction.⁴⁴

Those who reviewed *Skvoz' literaturu* thus read the book exactly as Eikhenbaum had intended: they not only accepted the sequence of the articles as representative of the development of his career, but also knowingly slipped into the rhetoric of the Society in their descriptions of it.⁴⁵

⁴¹ G. Vinokur, [review of Eikhenbaum, *Skvoz' literaturu* (1924)], *Russkii sovremennik*, 2 (1924), 293–94 (p. 294).

⁴² Ibid., p. 294: 'О книге Эйхенбаума менее всего хочется говорить языком ученых рецензий'.

⁴³ Ibid., p. 293. The metaphor of the broken 'line' of history, for example, can be traced to Viktor Shklovsky, *Rozanov: iz knigi 'Siuzhet, kak iavlenie stilia'* (Petrograd: OPOIaZ, 1921), p. 5. See also Iu. N. Tynianov, *Dostoevskii i Gogol': k teorii parodii* (Petrograd: OPOIaZ, 1921), p. 5.

⁴⁴ Vinokur, p. 293.

⁴⁵ Note that the same was true even of those who disliked the book. See Zhits, [review of Eikhenbaum, *Skvoz' literaturu*], *Krasnaia nov'*, 5 (1924), 327–29 (p. 329); and P. Kogan, 'O formal'nom metode', *Pechat' i revoliutsiia*, 5 (1924), 32–35 (p. 35). (Both make dismissive comments about Eikhenbaum's developmental 'path'.)

Skvoz' literaturu can be seen to have initiated a distinct genre among the Formalists, one that would be developed in different ways, as shall be shown presently, by Shklovsky and Tynianov. Although Eikhenbaum's collection was primarily read as an instrument of self-historicization, analogous in function to such articles as his '5 = 100', it differed from those texts in its performativity: it was a tool not with which to describe the development of Formalism, as had already been done in '5 = 100', but with which to allow his reader to experience, or 'feel', its development. As shall be shown, the same, performative mode would characterize Shklovsky's *O teorii prozy* and Tynianov's *Arkhaisty i novatory*. The old products of *nauka* were historicized in a self-consciously literary manner, thereby allowing Eikhenbaum to cultivate a genre oriented ultimately towards the self in history, towards biography. In light of Eikhenbaum's heightened interest in the 1920s in autobiography as a theoretical problem, his collection can be read as a contribution to *nauka* in itself. Indeed, it is possible to consider Eikhenbaum's collection an example of the same strategy of *inoskazanie teorii* examined by Levchenko in his monograph on Shklovsky and Eikhenbaum's experimental prose.

Skvoz' literaturu was published on the eve of Eikhenbaum's 'crisis', a period of several years in which he struggled to find a new direction in his theoretical work. In one sense, the publication of *Skvoz' literaturu* could be said to have precipitated the ensuing period of self-doubt, since it was a moment for which he had been waiting for more than two years and it represented the culmination of a clearly delineated phase in his career. The publication of the collection forced him to consider his next step. In a diary entry of late 1925, Eikhenbaum described his dissatisfaction with his work of the immediately preceding years, writing that

Lermontov, a monograph published in the spring of 1924, had been written ‘coldly’ [*kholodno*].⁴⁶ The almost simultaneous publication of *Skvoz' literaturu* would have exaggerated his sense of dissatisfaction by reproducing, in stark contrast to the ‘coldly’ written monograph, a dramatization in ‘composition’ of the revolution caused by the OPOIaZ.⁴⁷

Shklovsky's *O teorii prozy*, the second example of the collection of articles among the Formalists, was published in the second half of 1925, just over a year after *Skvoz' literaturu*. Shklovsky's collection has proved the most internationally successful authorial collection of articles of all those compiled by the Formalists in the 1920s, the only one, for example, to have been translated into a Western European language in its entirety.⁴⁸ Shklovsky's collection can be considered an example of the same, performative mode characteristic of *Skvoz' literaturu*, albeit by different means. Whereas Eikhenbaum had structured his collection in accordance with compositional devices associated with the early theoretical work of the OPOIaZ, his strategy being to dramatize the ‘break’ caused by the Society in

⁴⁶ Eikhenbaum, diary entry of December 1925, as quoted in Chudakova, ‘Sotsial'naiia praktika’, p. 111. For a discussion of the troubled publication history of *Lermontov*, see Any, pp. 80–103 passim.

⁴⁷ Contemporaries also compared and contrasted the two books. They were reviewed together by, e.g., V. Pereverzev, [review of Eikhenbaum, *Skvoz' literaturu* (1924) and *Lermontov* (1924)], *Kniga i revoliutsiia*, 1 (1925), 269–70.

⁴⁸ See Viktor Shklovsky, *Theory of Prose*, trans. by Benjamin Sher (Elmwood Park, IL: Dalkey Archive Press, 1990). See the translator's introduction, xv–xix (xix), for an explanation of the decision to translate the expanded 1929 edition of *O teorii prozy*. See also the following German, Italian, and French editions: *Theorie der Prosa*, trans. by Gisela Drohla (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1966); *Una teoria della prosa*, trans. by Maria Olsoufieva (Bari: De Donato, 1966); and *Sur la théorie de la prose*, trans. by Guy Verret (Lausanne: L'Age d'Homme, 1973). Note also that many of the articles in Tynianov's *Arkhaisty i novatory* have been published in Italian as *Avanguardia e tradizione*, trans. by Sergio Leone (Bari: Dedalo, 1968).

a manner conducive with its doctrine, Shklovsky allowed his collection to ‘fail’ in the exposition of the advertised ‘theory of prose’ and thereby to succeed in revealing the working of prose in practice.

O teorii prozy had eight chapters, almost half as many as had been included in Eikhenbaum’s collection: they had all first been published in some form over the period 1917–21. Although the pieces comprising *O teorii prozy* had originally been written contemporaneously with those comprising *Skvoz’ literaturu*, the selection of articles to be included in *O teorii prozy* was more homogenous: with the exception of the first piece included in the collection, the manifesto article ‘Iskusstvo kak priem’, the remaining pieces were all studies of plot construction in various large-scale prose works. The primary concern of the articles included in *O teorii prozy* was the question of how prose works were ‘made’. Indeed, Shklovsky’s interest in the ‘construction’ of literary things frequently led him to compare the production of literature to industrial manufacturing processes.⁴⁹ He wanted to show that the literariness of a work of prose was reducible to the manner of its ‘making’, to the process by which its ‘parts’ had been fashioned into a ‘whole’. In ‘Iskusstvo kak priem’, he argued that the work of art existed so as to allow its ‘making’ to be experienced: ‘искусство есть способ пережить деланье вещи, а сделанное в искусстве не важно.’⁵⁰ The remaining articles in *O teorii prozy* were all explorations of the ‘making’ of various works of prose. The

⁴⁹ On the metaphor of the machine in Russian Formalism, see Peter Steiner, *Russian Formalism: A Metapoetics* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1984), pp. 44–67.

⁵⁰ Shklovsky, ‘Iskusstvo kak priem’, in *O teorii prozy* (1925), pp. 7–20 (p. 12). The sentence is emphasized in the original.

canonical writers examined in the collection — including Cervantes, Dickens, Tolstoy, Sterne, and Rozanov — were thus portrayed as masters of construction. Shklovsky strongly associated the literariness of the great prose works studied in *Teorii prozy* with parody and especially with the undoing of narrative conventions of (chrono)logical linearity. In the chapter on *Don Quixote*, he likened the structure of that novel to an iconostasis and an encyclopaedia, arguing that the logic of its structure was independent of the chronology of the events that it narrated.⁵¹ He showed that it comprised a succession of ‘episodes’, ‘inserted novellas’ [*vstavnye novelly*], that the whole had been made by a process of ‘stringing-together’ [*nanizyvanie*].⁵² In the chapter on *Tristram Shandy*, he compared those who could not understand Sterne’s novel to those for whom only opera qualified as music, to those for whom the sound of an orchestra was nothing but ‘chaos’ [*besporiadok*].⁵³ For Shklovsky, the essence of prose was the ‘laying bare of the device’ [*obnazhenie priema*], the exposing — and neutralizing — of an original device.⁵⁴ He argued that much of the narrative of *Tristram Shandy*, for example, comprised a commentary on its own progress. Shklovsky argued paradoxically that the most exceptional works of prose were therefore crystallizations of convention. *Tristram Shandy*, for example, was so inextricably bound to the conventions of the novel — conventions that it had been ‘made’ in order to flout — that it was the ‘most typical’ novel in the history of literature.⁵⁵

⁵¹ Shklovsky, ‘Kak sdelan Don-Kikhot’, *ibid.*, pp. 70–96 (pp. 70–71).

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 81.

⁵³ Shklovsky, ‘Parodiinyi roman’, *ibid.*, pp. 139–61 (p. 161).

⁵⁴ See, e.g., *ibid.* p. 142.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 161. Cf. Shklovsky, ‘Literatura vne “siuzheta”’, *ibid.*, pp. 162–78 (p. 165): “‘Война и мир’ Льва Толстого, “Тристрам Шенди” Стерна [...] могут быть названы романом только за то, что они нарушают именно законы романа.’”

Just as Cervantes had ‘made’ a string of episodes into a novel, Shklovsky ‘made’ old pieces of his work into a book. Some of his articles were either combined or split into two before inclusion.⁵⁶ His authorial act, the ‘making’, also involved the addition to the chapters of a ‘framing’ foreword, an alphabetical index of names and terms, and a title. He signalled the ultimate aim of his ‘making’ in the title: he wanted the chapters to amount to a ‘theory of prose’.⁵⁷

Nowhere in the collection, however, did Shklovsky state that the collection comprised chapters that had already been published as articles or short pamphlets. Whereas Eikhenbaum had given *Skvoz' literaturu* a descriptive subtitle (a ‘collection of articles’ [*sbornik statei*]) and had used the foreword to explain the historical specificity of the articles comprising the collection, Shklovsky did nothing of the sort. Indeed, whereas Eikhenbaum had referred to *Skvoz' literaturu* as a ‘collection’ [*sbornik*],⁵⁸ a term making clear the construction of the ‘whole’ from a series of ‘parts’, Shklovsky referred to *O teorii prozy* as a ‘book’ [*kniga*],⁵⁹ a term disguising the fact. To use Shklovsky’s terminology, the ‘motivation’ for the ‘making’ of the book had been to advance a unified theory of prose.

⁵⁶ Two pieces on *Don Quixote*, which had both originally been published in *Razvertyvanie siuzheta* (Petrograd: OPOIaZ, 1921), were amalgamated into a single chapter before inclusion in the collection. ‘*Tristram Shendi*’ *Sterna i teoriia romana* (Petrograd: OPOIaZ, 1921) had its last few pages removed.

⁵⁷ By a curious editorial oversight, the wording printed on the front cover, *Teoriia prozy*, is different from that printed on the title page, *O teorii prozy*. One reviewer speculated that the publisher, Krug, having decided at the last minute to change the title from *Teoriia prozy* to the slightly more modest *O teorii prozy*, had simply forgotten to correct the front cover. See I. Sergievskii, [review of Shklovsky, *O teorii prozy* (1925)], *Novyi mir*, 5 (1926), 187–89 (pp. 187–86).

⁵⁸ Eikhenbaum, ‘Predislovie’, in *Skvoz' literaturu*, pp. 3–4 (p. 3).

⁵⁹ Shklovsky, ‘Predislovie’, in *O teorii prozy* (1925), p. 5.

The end result, however, could not be called a coherent exposition of a theory of prose. Individually, the chapters comprising the collection were characterized above all by digression and quotation; their arguments were advanced through paradox and aphorism.⁶⁰ The chapter on Rozanov was perhaps the most extreme example.⁶¹ ‘Kak sdelan Don-Kikhot’ was another: it was marked by the progressive encroachment of a discursive, self-referential commentary. Shklovsky made many first-person interjections including one in which he advertised the ‘influence’ of Cervantes on the progression of his argument.⁶² Furthermore, although it ran to only twenty-six pages, the chapter on *Don Quixote* included many disorientatingly long quotations from that novel. One quotation supplied from the novel was over five hundred words long.⁶³ In the chapter on *Tristram Shandy*, Shklovsky lamented that it was not possible for him to supplement his analysis of the novel with a wholesale reproduction of it: ‘К сожалению, не могу переписать всего Стерна’.⁶⁴ Some contemporaries lamented Shklovsky’s

⁶⁰ Cf. Shklovsky’s description of the compositional shortcomings of ‘old’ literary scholarship in *Rozanov*, p. 55 (the penultimate page of the pamphlet, i.e. one of those excluded from *O teorii prozy*): ‘старый канон сведенной статьи или лекции умер. Мысли, сведенные в искусственные ряды, превращаются в одну дорогу, в колеи мысли писателя. Все разнообразие ассоциаций, все бесчисленные тропинки, которые бегут от каждой мысли во все стороны, сглаживаются.’

⁶¹ For a discussion of Shklovsky’s *Rozanov* (1921), which was included in *O teorii prozy* (1925), as the turning point on his ‘path towards prose’, see A. Razumova, ‘Put’ formalistov k khudozhestvennoi proze’, *Voprosy literatury*, 3 (2004), 131–50.

⁶² Shklovsky, ‘Kak sdelan Don-Kikhot’, in *O teorii prozy* (1925), pp. 70–96 (p. 85): ‘Но я начинаю чувствовать, что на мне уже сказывается влияние разбираемого романа: я вставляю эпизод за эпизодом, забыв об основном движении статьи.’

⁶³ *Ibid.*, pp. 92–93.

⁶⁴ Shklovsky, ‘Parodiinyi roman’, *ibid.*, pp. 139–61 (p. 143). Cf. Shklovsky, ‘Kak sdelan Don-Kikhot’, *ibid.*, pp. 70–96 (p. 75): ‘К сожалению, недостаток места мешает мне привести эту речь, занимающую около половины XVI главы третьего тома.’

fondness for quotation,⁶⁵ though it can in part be attributed to the manner in which he had been forced to write during the chaotic years of the Civil War.⁶⁶ The disorientating experience of reading the eight chapters individually was increased exponentially when they were taken together as a collection. *O teorii prozy* turned a selection of stylistically provocative articles into a bewildering patchwork of many hundreds of fragments of prose, both Shklovsky's own and those of others.

Jan Mukařovský described *O teorii prozy* as a 'disquieting book' in a 1934 piece about the Czech translation of the collection.⁶⁷ He explained that, while the book had served to formulate the 'epistemological stance' of a new paradigm in literary studies, it could by no means be considered the coherent exposition of a theory.⁶⁸ Shklovsky 'requires the public to figure out the total plan and direction of his attack from fragmentary allusions', he wrote.⁶⁹ 'Instead of full-blown proofs', Mukařovský continued, 'he [*sc.* Shklovsky] provides only synecdochic

⁶⁵ See, e.g., V. Khovin, "'Smontirovannaia" poetika', *Knizhnyi ugol*, 8 (1922), 29–38 (p. 33): 'А потом цитаты. Цитаты без конца...' Khovin sarcastically recycled Shklovsky's comment about Sterne: 'к сожалению, не могу переписать всего Шкловского.' (p. 35) On Khovin, *Knizhnyi ugol*, and the OPOIaZ, see A. V. Krusanov, *Russkii avangard: 1907–1932 (Istoricheskii obzor)*, 2 vols (Moscow: NLO, 2003), vol. 2: *Futuristicheskaia revoliutsiia (1917–1921)*, kn. 1, pp. 287–304 (pp. 300–01).

⁶⁶ Merrill explains that Shklovsky constructed his articles by literally piecing together fragments cut both from his notebooks and from printed books (by other authors). She interprets the fact as evidence of his intertextual, 'folkloristic' understanding of the concept of authorship. O. N. Panchenko attributes Shklovsky's conversational tone in part to the fact that he dictated some of his work. See O. N. Panchenko, 'O teorii poezii i poezii prozy V. B. Shklovskogo', *Izvestiia AN SSSR*, 49 (1990), 126–35 (p. 134).

⁶⁷ Jan Mukařovský, 'A Note on the Czech Translation of Šklovskij's *Theory of Prose*', in *The Word and Verbal Art: Selected Essays by Mukařovský*, trans. and ed. by John Burbank and Peter Steiner (New Haven, CN, and London: Yale University Press, 1977), pp. 134–42 (p. 139).

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 142.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 135.

illustrations.’⁷⁰ Mukařovský argued that the lack of systematization in *O teorii prozy* was a consequence of the chaos of the historical period in which its constituent pieces had originally been written. Shklovsky nevertheless made no reference to the historical origin of the chapters comprising the collection. He achieved the effect of chaos by bringing together pieces originally written as independent articles or pamphlets and attempting to disguise that fact, by presenting the natural incoherence of a succession of disparate pieces on prose construction as being the product of his own ‘making’.

Shklovsky wrote a densely theoretical foreword for *O teorii prozy*, one very different in tone from the more personal foreword to Eikhenbaum’s *Skvoz’ literaturu*. He made no reference whatsoever to the context in which the articles had been written or to the development of his thought, but instead launched immediately into a justification of the ‘Formal method’ as the only valid approach to the ‘word’ as such. Without any frame of reference, the effect was one of disorientation. Whereas Eikhenbaum had ended the foreword to *Skvoz’ literaturu* with a few remarks about the contemporary state of Russian philology, a contextual frame of reference in which his articles could be situated, Shklovsky chose to end the foreword to *O teorii prozy* with a highly abstract analogy between the theory of literature and the cotton industry.⁷¹ The purpose of the opaque analogy was to serve as preparation for a series of articles quite different from the advertised ‘theory of prose’: the analogy conditioned readers to make great leaps

⁷⁰ Ibid., p. 135. On the reverence in which *O teorii prozy* was held in Prague in the late 1920s, see Tynianov’s letter to Shklovsky from that city of ‘late 1928’, as given in ‘Iz perepiski Iu. Tynianova i B. Eikhenbauma s V. Shklovskim’, *Voprosy literatury*, 12 (1984), 185–218 (ed. by O. Panchenko) (pp. 95–96).

⁷¹ Shklovsky, ‘Predislovie’, in *O teorii prozy* (1925), p. 5.

of thought between disparate things, somehow to conjure forth a theory of prose from the peculiar assortment of articles with which they had been supplied.

O teorii prozy thus came to resemble such novels as *Don Quixote* and *Tristram Shandy*. Indeed, Shklovsky's descriptions of the great novels of history could be said to have been equally accurate descriptions of his own collection. He described one of Don Quixote's speeches as a 'chrestomathy' and a 'collection of quotations' [*nabor tsitat*], a judgment equally true both of 'Kak sdelan Don Kikhot' and of the collection as a whole. In much the same way, Shklovsky explained that *Tristram Shandy* created an impression of 'chaos' [*khaos*], since Sterne undid the conventions of narrative: 'автор все время возвращается назад и делает прыжок вперед, в основную новеллу, которую к тому же не сразу и найдешь, все время вторгаются десятки страниц, наполненных причудливыми рассуждениями.'⁷² *O teorii prozy* could be said to have been 'made' so as to create much the same impression: Shklovsky shifted his focus from episode to episode, supplying a succession of quotations so lengthy as to threaten to supplant his analysis, but gave ultimately only sporadic snippets of 'theory'. Furthermore, Shklovsky nudged his reader towards other, non-linear reading strategies by appending to the chapters an index of names and terms. It was possible, for example, immediately to jump to the handful of passages in which Tolstoy's *Voina i mir* was mentioned and to extract them as if to create a new chapter.

Before coming to a final judgment on the significance of *O teorii prozy* in the development of the genre of the collection of articles, let us briefly consider the

⁷² Shklovsky, 'Parodiinyi roman', *ibid.*, pp. 139–61 (p. 139).

reactions to the book of some contemporary reviewers.⁷³ Those who reviewed *O teorii prozy* reacted with surprise to the presentation of a succession of disparate articles as a ‘theory of prose’. I. Sergievskii wrote that, whatever its merits, the collection could not be considered a ‘systematic exposition’ [*sistematicheskoe izlozhenie*] of the problem of prose.⁷⁴ Pavel Medvedev argued that the title was profoundly misleading: ‘Несчастное “О” [в заглавии сборника] существенной роли не играет, ибо никакой теории прозы в книге В. Шкловского нет.’⁷⁵ Whereas Shklovsky had placed emphasis on the wholeness of his ‘book’, on its being a work of organized chaos, Medvedev was keen to draw attention to the cause of its incoherence: the fact that its constituent chapters had not originally been conceived as a whole. He set out to historicize the book, to show that it amounted to nothing more a ‘string of old articles’ [*riad starykh statei*].⁷⁶ He drew attention in particular to how they had aged and, much like their author, ‘gone bald’: ‘В самом деле, как полиняли, как облысели эти статьи за свою недолгую жизнь! Их нарочно-парадоксальные формулировки, их наигранное молодечество, заостренно-полемический тон — сейчас все это способно вызывать только улыбку.’⁷⁷ Medvedev was trying to prevent Shklovsky’s collection from passing as legitimate currency in the contemporary debate by

⁷³ For a discussion of the reception of the book, see O. N. Panchenko, “‘О teorii prozy’ (1925, 1929) Viktora Shklovskogo i ee avtorefleksii”, *Studia litteraria polono-slavica*, 3 (1999), 183–95.

⁷⁴ Sergievskii, [review of Shklovsky, *O teorii prozy* (1925)], pp. 187–86. The same argument was made by Zhits, [review of Shklovsky, *O teorii prozy* (1925)], *Krasnaia nov’*, 1 (1926), 267–69.

⁷⁵ P. Medvedev, [review of Shklovsky, *O teorii prozy* (1925)], *Zvezda*, 1 (1926), 265–66 (p. 265). Cf. Khovin, “‘Smontirovannaia” poetika’, p. 36: ‘в книге [Шкловского] о Розанове нет Розанова, так же, как в другой нет Стерна и как в книге о Дон-Кихоте нет Дон-Кихота.’

⁷⁶ Ibid., p. 265.

⁷⁷ Ibid., pp. 265–66.

reducing it to an item of purely historical interest. He ended the review by calling into question the scientificity of the incoherent book before him: ‘Но разве это наука?’⁷⁸

It is illuminating to read Medvedev’s review of Shklovsky’s *O teorii prozy* in light of his reviews of Boris Tomashevskii’s *Teoriia literatury* (1925) and Viktor Zhirmunskii’s *Vvedenie v metriku* (1925), two contemporaneous books of equally ambitious — and textbook-like — scope.⁷⁹ The first edition of *Teoriia literatury* had been published in early 1925, some months before *O teorii prozy*, and it would go on to enjoy great success in the coming years.⁸⁰ While Medvedev recognized both *Teoriia literatury* and *O teorii prozy* as ‘Formalist’ works, he showed a marked preference for Tomashevskii’s book. Whereas he found in Shklovsky’s effort an unsystematic, unserious, and ultimately unscientific text, a motley array of dated articles, he praised *Teoriia literatury* for its unity of purpose. He made note in particular of its ‘scientific systematization and elaboration’ of material: ‘Если видеть в ней [sc. книге Томашевского] только учебник, то нельзя не признать ее лучшим из имеющихся у нас — по богатству материала, по научной систематизации и разработке его.’⁸¹ Medvedev nevertheless concluded that Tomashevskii’s book fell short of being a ‘self-sufficient and whole work on

⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 266.

⁷⁹ B. Tomashevskii, *Teoriia literatury. Poetika* (Moscow–Leningrad: Gos. izd., 1925); V. Zhirmunskii, *Vvedenie v metriku*, *Voprosy poetiki*: vyp. 6 (Leningrad: Academia, 1925).

⁸⁰ The sixth edition of *Teoriia literatury. Poetika* was published in 1931.

⁸¹ P. Medvedev, [review of Tomashevskii, *Teoriia literatury. Poetika* (1925)], *Zvezda*, 3 (1925), 298–99 (p. 298). By contrast, Eikhenbaum disliked Tomashevskii’s book. See Eikhenbaum, diary entry of January 1925, as cited in Any, p. 244. For more on Eikhenbaum’s antipathy towards Tomashevskii in the 1920s, see Chudakova, ‘Sotsial'naiia praktika’, pp. 103–31 *passim*.

poetics' [*samostoiatel'naia i tsel'naia rabota po poetike*].⁸² In his review of Zhirmunskii's *Vvedenie v metriku*, he argued that the historical immaturity of the discipline of poetics called for the production of theoretical works of a more 'systematic' nature.⁸³ Medvedev thought that the most perfect compositional realization of *nauka* was a 'self-sufficient and whole work', one maximally systematic in its exposition. Shklovsky's *O teorii prozy* was for him a failure, not only in terms of the methodological failings of individual chapters, which were glaring, but also on its own terms, as an attempt to produce a unified work of *nauka*.

It is nevertheless possible to read *O teorii prozy* differently, as the staged 'failure' of a systematic argument or even as a parody of a scholarly monograph.

Shklovsky's sabotage of the coherent exposition of a theory of prose, in other words, could be said to have allowed it to offer a fleeting glimpse of prose in action. In an article on Andrei Bely's prose published one year before the first edition of the collection and later included in the second, Shklovsky wrote that large-scale prose works were, paradoxically, often realized in spite of their 'task', an argument that could be used to explain his own strategy in *O teorii prozy*.⁸⁴ Shklovsky's digressions, quotations, and gleeful frustration of the conventions of composition facilitated a mode of argumentation in which the essence of prose — as he understood it — could be performed in addition to being theorized. Gerald L.

⁸² Medvedev, [review of Tomashevskii, *Teoriia literatury. Poetika*], p. 298.

⁸³ P. Medvedev, [review of Zhirmunskii, *Vvedenie v metriku* (1925)], *Zvezda*, 4 (1925), 301–02.

⁸⁴ Viktor Shklovsky, 'Andrei Belyi', *Russkii sovremennik*, 2 (1924), 231–45 (p. 238): 'Я стою на той точке зрения, что произведение, особенно длинное, не создается путем осуществления своего задания.'

Bruns makes a similar comment in his introduction to the English translation of the collection: ‘His [*sc.* Shklovsky’s] theory of prose is a *prose* theory of prose, not the systematic construction of a model indifferent to its examples but heterogeneous, internally conflicting descriptions of texts strewn irreducibly throughout the history of writing.’⁸⁵ Shklovsky’s compositional strategy, his performative mode of presentation, was thus essential to the overall argument of the book: he allowed his communication of the theory of prose repeatedly to frustrate the narrative conventions of scholarly exposition and thereby to show the workings of prose in action.⁸⁶

Levchenko argues that the publication of *O teorii prozy* marked a ‘distancing from *nauka*’ in Shklovsky’s career.⁸⁷ He describes the book as a ‘gesture of farewell’ to *nauka* on the eve of Shklovsky’s definitive turn towards his literary-autobiographical work of the late 1920s.⁸⁸ It is nevertheless possible to read the book differently if it is placed in the context of the emerging Formalist genre of the collection of articles. *Skvoz’ literaturu* had been the first example of a collection of articles — one in which the products of *nauka* were presented in a performative mode with an ultimately autobiographical orientation. Shklovsky shifted the emphasis away from autobiography, but nevertheless produced an analogously performative work. It was thus not so much an end to *nauka* as it was the development of a new emerging genre, a profoundly new ‘type’ of *nauka*. *O teorii*

⁸⁵ Gerald L. Bruns, ‘Introduction’, in Shklovsky, *Theory of Prose*, ix–xiv (xii, emphasis in original).

⁸⁶ For another example of what might be called a ‘performative’ approach to the theorization of prose, see T. W. Adorno, ‘The Essay as Form’, *New German Critique*, 32 (1984), 151–71 (trans. by Bob Hullot-Kentor and Frederic Will).

⁸⁷ Levchenko, p. 85.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 85.

prozy might thus be considered — like *Skvoz' literaturu*, though by different means — another manifestation of the strategy of *inoskazanie teorii* characteristic of the period of crisis from 1924.

By the time that Shklovsky's *O teorii prozy* was published towards the end of 1925, Eikhenbaum was at the nadir of his personal crisis. He was struggling with the problem of how to find an entirely new 'type' of *nauka*, one to mark a second clear 'break' in his career.⁸⁹ Although his thirst for a renewal of *nauka* would, by 1929, lead to his generically experimental *Moi vremennik*, a path reconstructed by Chudakova and Levchenko, his second collection of articles, *Literatura: teoriia, kritika, polemika*, could be said to have represented a first step in that direction.

Literatura, a collection of thirteen articles, was published in April 1927.⁹⁰ The selection of articles to be included in the collection made it a rather different publication from both *Skvoz' literaturu* and *O teorii prozy*. First, as its subtitle suggests, *Literatura* included pieces other than literary-theoretical and literary-historical articles: it also included literary criticism, a piece on cinema, and even the self-referential 'Teoriia "formal'nogo metoda"'. Second, four of the articles in *Literatura* had never before been published in Russian, a fact advertised by Eikhenbaum in the foreword.⁹¹ Third, three of the articles in the collection had

⁸⁹ Eikhenbaum, diary entry of 2 December 1925, as quoted in Bérard-Zarzycka, p. 87.

⁹⁰ Month of publication as given in Chudakova, comm. to Eikhenbaum, 'Leskov i sovremennaia proza', in *O literature*, p. 516.

⁹¹ Eikhenbaum, 'Predislovie', in *Literatura*, p. 3. (One of the four, 'Teoriia "formal'nogo metoda"', had been published in Ukrainian the previous year. See Todd's, comm. to Eikhenbaum, 'Teoriia "formal'nogo metoda"', in *O literature*, pp. 509–14.)

already been reprinted in *Skvoz' literaturu*, including the famous article on 'Shinel'. *Literatura* thus represented an expansion of the collection of articles: whereas *Skvoz' literaturu* had included only literary-theoretical and literary-historical articles originally published over a clearly delineated timespan, *Literatura* included a greater variety of articles, some of which had never before been published and some of which had already been published more than once.

Eikhenbaum's expansion of the collection of articles can be seen as an attempted solution to his personal crisis, as part of his search for a new form of *nauka*. He was slowly turning to theoretical questions of the self in history, of biography, of the social function of the man or woman of letters. The collection was his attempt to represent himself as part of the literary process of the 1910s and 1920s and, by including a range of different kinds of article written across his career, to represent that process in its entirety. He chose to arrange the articles in a roughly thematic order (chronologically in accordance with the historical periods analysed in the articles rather than in accordance with their dates of composition or publication), a decision that served further to represent literature itself as a process of evolution.

In spite of the thematic order of the articles in *Literatura*, Eikhenbaum dated all the articles in the collection individually, as he had in *Skvoz' literaturu*, so as to make them intelligible in the terms of his intellectual development. In the foreword, he wrote that the collection stood as testament to what he had achieved in the period between the composition of its earliest article, 'Kak sdelana "Shinel"' Gogolia', and that of the most recent one, 'Teoriia "formal'nogo metoda"' : 'Для меня этот сборник имеет значение "итогов": от статьи о "Шинеле" Гоголя — до

“Теории формального метода”.⁹² However, Eikhenbaum placed less emphasis on his own development than he had in *Skvoz' literaturu*: whereas, in the first collection, a chronological order had served to set up the staging of the ‘break’ in Eikhenbaum’s career, in *Literatura*, by contrast, a thematic order served — as the title of the collection suggested — to represent literature itself, as an open, evolving sphere. Eikhenbaum thus represented literature as a process so as to inscribe himself within it as a participant, as one of many perspectives from which it could have been focalized.

The historical path to which Eikhenbaum alludes in the foreword — from ‘Kak sdelana “Shinel” Gogolia’ to ‘Teoriia “formal'nogo metoda”’ — reflects a shift from the glory days of the OPOIaZ, the days of the *Sborniki po teorii poeticheskogo iazyka*, to the period of their historicization. In fact, ‘Teoriia “formal'nogo metoda”’, an account of the development of the ‘Formal method’ in literary theory with reference uniquely to the work of the OPOIaZ, includes an evaluation of the historical significance of ‘Kak sdelana “Shinel” Gogolia’. Other articles in *Literatura*, such as the article on Blok, similarly blur the line between commentary on literature and commentary on the theory of literature. Like a set of *matryoshki*, the constituent articles offer a kaleidoscopic series of superimposed perspectives on literature: it includes ‘second-degree’ articles about literature, such as the well-known article on ‘Shinel’, in addition to a ‘third-degree’ article about those articles, a further step removed from literature itself. The fact Eikhenbaum did not respect such distinctions in the ordering of the articles exaggerates the effect.

⁹² Eikhenbaum, ‘Predislovie’, in *Literatura*, p. 3.

‘Teoriia “formal'nogo metoda”’ was the last of the articles in *Literatura* to have been written, one of its four never before to have been published in Russian. The first section of the article can be read as a key to understanding the collection as a whole. Eikhenbaum wanted to impart that *nauka*, like literature, was a process; it was not a finalized system of laws, but, like literature itself, it was an evolving practice. The epigraph selected for the article, from the work of the Swiss botanist A. P. de Candolle, reflected such a conception of *nauka*: ‘Le pire, à mon avis, est celui qui représente la science comme faite.’⁹³ In one sense, the collection reflected Candolle’s conception of *nauka* in that it was possible to trace the historical development among its articles, despite their thematic order. In another sense, the collection as a whole showed that *nauka*, theoretical work on literature, was an organic part of the literary process: it was written into the same history as was literature, part of the same process of development, and was therefore amenable to the same laws.

By the spring of 1927, when *Literatura* was published, Tynianov had seen Eikhenbaum and Shklovsky produce three collections of articles between them. He first began to prepare a collection of his own articles in early 1928. He had for some time been experiencing a dissatisfaction with his historical fiction — on which he had been working, alongside his theoretical and historical studies of

⁹³ Eikhenbaum, ‘Teoriia “formal'nogo metoda”’, in *Literatura*, p. 116. In the standard posthumous edition of Eikhenbaum’s articles, *O literature*, the following Russian translation is given: ‘Всех хуже, по моему мнению, тот, кто представляет себе науку как готовую.’ (p. 375) Eikhenbaum elaborated on that conception of *nauka* in the first section of the article: ‘Никакой [...] готовой системы или доктрины у нас не было и нет. В своей научной работе мы ценим теорию только как рабочую гипотезу [...]. Готовых наук нет’. (Eikhenbaum, ‘Teoriia “formal'nogo metoda”’, in *Literatura*, p. 117.)

Russian literature, since late 1924 — and wanted to turn back in earnest to *nauka*. In a letter to Shklovsky of early 1928, he wrote that, once he had finished *Smert' Vazir-Mukhtara*, a historical novel about Griboedov, he would begin to work on a collection of articles, a 'little scientific book' [*nauchnaia knizhka*] instead of a work of fiction.⁹⁴ He settled on a collection of articles rather than a completely original work of *nauka* primarily because, as he himself recognized, he and his colleagues had reached an intellectual impasse, a temporary 'break' [*pereryv*], and were uncertain of their next step.⁹⁵ Even Eikhenbaum's considered decision to develop a more 'biographical' *nauka*, to write about the 'literary environment', had failed to convince him, as is shown by his letters to Shklovsky of 1927.⁹⁶ Tynianov believed that, as a genre, the collection of articles offered him a means of producing a work of *nauka* without first having to find an escape from his uncertainty, a way of saying something new with old material. With the editorial assistance of one of his star students at GIII, Nikolai Stepanov, who was duly thanked in the foreword,⁹⁷ Tynianov brought the work to completion in October, the month in which he turned thirty-four. However, a suitable title had still not been found. Shklovsky eventually proposed *Arkhaisty-novatory*,⁹⁸ an appositely oxymoronic formulation later clumsily expanded — presumably, as had happened

⁹⁴ Tynianov, letter to Shklovsky of late January or early February 1928, as quoted in E. A. Toddes, comm. to Tynianov, 'Predislovie k knige "Arkhaisty i novatory"', in *PILK*, pp. 567–73 (p. 567).

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 568.

⁹⁶ For excerpts, see Chudakova, 'Sotsial'naia praktika', pp. 103–31 passim.

⁹⁷ Tynianov, 'Predislovie', in *Arkhaisty i novatory*, pp. 3–4 (p. 4).

⁹⁸ Toddes, comm. to Tynianov, 'Predislovie k knige "Arkhaisty i novatory"', in *PILK*, p. 568. On the change of title, see also Viktor Shklovsky, in *Iurii Tynianov: pisatel' i uchenyi. Vospominaniia, razmyshleniia, vstrechi*, ed. by V. Kaverin (Moscow: Molodaia gvardiia, 1966), pp. 48–72 (pp. 58–59).

with *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka*, at the request of the publisher — to *Arkhaisty i novatory* for the final publication.

Arkhaisty i novatory was the last new collection of articles to be published by one of the *revtroika* of the OPOIaZ — Shklovsky, Eikhenbaum, and Tynianov — before the capitulation of Formalism in 1930. With the benefit of hindsight, it can be considered a final exercise in the possibilities of the genre. Tynianov's expression of gratitude to Shklovsky and Eikhenbaum in the foreword to the collection, to those who had 'helped' him in his work,⁹⁹ can be interpreted as a way of including his collection in the same progression of texts. Tynianov evidently wanted *Arkhaisty i novatory* to be read with reference to *Skvoz' literaturu*, *O teorii prozy*, and *Literatura*. To the same end, the first two articles in the collection, 'Literaturnyi fakt' and 'O literaturnoi evoliutsii', were furnished with dedications to Shklovsky and Eikhenbaum respectively. At almost six hundred pages in length, however, *Arkhaisty i novatory* was more than twice as long as *Skvoz' literaturu* and *Literatura* and three times as long as *O teorii prozy*, a fact presumably justifying its high price of six roubles.¹⁰⁰ One reviewer noted wryly that, by pricing it so highly, the publisher had renounced any hope of attracting the average reader.¹⁰¹

⁹⁹ Tynianov, 'Predislovie', in *Arkhaisty i novatory*, p. 4.

¹⁰⁰ In letters to Shklovsky of late 1928, Eikhenbaum emphasized that *Arkhaisty i novatory* would be a very substantial publication. See, e.g., Eikhenbaum, letter to Shklovsky of 30 November 1928, as quoted in Eikhenbaum, 'Iz pisem k V. V. Shklovskomu', *Neva*, 5 (1987), 156–64 (ed. by M. O. Chudakova) (pp. 158–59), where the collection is described as a 'wonderful (and thick!) collection of articles'.

¹⁰¹ 'N. D—nyi', [review of Tynianov, *Arkhaisty i novatory* (1929)], *Zhurnal dlia vsekh*, 5 (1929), 127.

Tynianov chose to include seventeen articles in the collection, all but two of which, 'Pushkin' and "'Argiviane": neizdannaia tragediia Kiukhel'bekera', had already been published under his own name. He ordered the articles thematically (or chronologically by the historical periods analysed in them), as had Eikhenbaum in *Literatura*, and placed the purely theoretical ones at the beginning. In the foreword, Tynianov described the three categories of article represented in the collection as 'literary-theoretical', 'literary-historical', and 'critical'.¹⁰² In practice, the categories were somewhat porous. The 'critical' articles in the collection, by which Tynianov presumably meant such pieces as 'Promezhutok' and 'O Khlebnikove', were inescapably theoretical in nature, as indeed were such 'literary-historical' articles as 'Arkhaisty i Pushkin'. As Eikhenbaum had in both *Skvoz' literaturu* and *Literatura*, Tynianov supplied a date on the last page of every article in the collection (apart from, presumably by an editorial oversight, 'Pushkin'). One article, 'Stikhovye formy Nekrasova', has two dates: the main body of the article is dated 1921 and a three-page section tacked on at the end is dated 1928.¹⁰³

The preparation of *Arkhaisty i novatory* was a revelatory experience for Tynianov, as that of *Skvoz' literaturu*, the first example of the genre, had been for Eikhenbaum some five or so years previously: it made it possible for him to see his work afresh, to gain new perspectives on it. He began, for example, to identify

¹⁰² Tynianov, 'Predislovie', in *Arkhaisty i novatory*, p. 3.

¹⁰³ In the postscript, Tynianov responds to Kornei Chukovskii, who had, in *Nekrasov: stat'i i materialy* (Leningrad: Kubuch, 1926), pp. 134–79, objected to the basic argument of the original article, first published in 1921. See A. P. Chudakov, comm. to Tynianov, 'Stikhovye formy Nekrasova', in *PILK*, pp. 404–07.

patterns among his articles. In a letter to Shklovsky of spring 1928, by which time he had begun work on the collection, he noted with fascination that he had been drawn to the early nineteenth century, the period of the ‘archaists’, more than to any other period in Russian literary history.¹⁰⁴ Like Eikhenbaum in the forewords to both *Skvoz' literaturu* and *Literatura*, Tynianov was keen to quantify in temporal terms the work represented by the collection. In the foreword to *Arkhaisty i novatory*, he referred to the collection as the result of nine years of work: although he had first been published in 1921, he considered the year 1919, that in which he had completed his first serious study, to mark the beginning of his career.¹⁰⁵

Overall, however, the experience of preparing the collection had the effect of worsening Tynianov’s personal crisis, just as the publication of *Skvoz' literaturu* in early 1924 had plunged Eikhenbaum into self-doubt by forcing him to juxtapose the revolutionary articles that had won him fame against his more recent, ‘coldly’ written work on Lermontov. The preparation of *Arkhaisty i novatory* over the course of 1928 did the same to Tynianov by forcing him to compare, on the one hand, his literary-theoretical and literary-historical articles, most of which had been written before he had begun to write historical novels in late 1924, and, on the other, the novels themselves, the historical fiction with which he had been so occupied in recent years. Tynianov concluded privately that his novels had ultimately wasted his time by distracting him from his calling to *nauka*. In another

¹⁰⁴ Tynianov, letter to Shklovsky of late March or early April 1928, as quoted in Toddes, comm. to Tynianov, ‘Predislovie k knige “Arkhaisty i novatory”’, in *PILK*, p. 568.

¹⁰⁵ Tynianov, ‘Predislovie’, in *Arkhaisty i novatory*, p. 3.

letter to Shklovsky of October 1928, he proposed to make a fresh start and no longer to write historical fiction: ‘Теперь хочу начать новую жизнь: романов больше не писать.’¹⁰⁶ Though the collection stood as a testament to nine years of work, it represented how little, he thought, had been achieved during that period, a testament to his distancing from *nauka*. Like Eikhenbaum, then, whose *Skvoz’ literaturu* had encouraged him to find a new path, to make a second ‘break’ in his theoretical work, *Arkhaisty i novatory* led Tynianov to want to make a clean ‘break’ of his own with the past. The preparation of a collection of articles once again served as a catalyst in the process of self-reflection, in the renewal of *nauka*.

In the foreword to the collection, Tynianov described the strange experience of rereading his old articles, some of which had been written nearly a decade earlier: after nine years, he could finally see his work ‘from the side’ [*so storony*].¹⁰⁷ Although the experience had made him want to rewrite the articles, to write them ‘differently’ [*inache*], he noted that a ‘different book’ [*drugaiia kniga*] would then have resulted.¹⁰⁸ He thus reconciled himself to an imperfect text, to one whose imperfections would nevertheless stand as witness to the historical moments at which its articles had been written, to a historical self. For that reason, he asked his reader to forgive any ‘contradictions’ among the articles, to see them instead as evidence of the work of history.¹⁰⁹ In an earlier draft of the foreword, he went further in his criticism of his historical self, claiming even to disagree with much

¹⁰⁶ Tynianov, letter to Shklovsky of October 1928, as quoted in Chudakov, Chudakova, and Todd, comm. to Jakobson and Tynianov, ‘Problemy izucheniia literatury i iazyka’, in *PILK*, pp. 530–36.

¹⁰⁷ Tynianov, ‘Predislovie’, in *Arkhaisty i novatory*, p. 3.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

of what he had originally written, as if to disown his old articles entirely.¹¹⁰ Like Eikhenbaum in *Skvoz' literaturu*, Tynianov reproduced in *Arkhaisty i novatory* a number of articles that he no longer fully endorsed, if only to have them stand as a foil to later work, as the props in a staging of the narrative of his evolution.

In fact, Tynianov altered a number of the articles before their publication in *Arkhaisty i novatory*. In the foreword, Tynianov explained that he had two principal reasons for having 'edited' them: first, he had thereby been able to clarify the sometimes convoluted language of his argumentation; second, he had been able to 'restore' [*vosstanovit'*] the articles first published in an abridged version to their 'original' form.¹¹¹ His explanation does not hold entirely true because 'Dostoevskii i Gogol' was shortened before inclusion in the collection and the two longest articles, 'Arkhaisty i Pushkin' and 'Dostoevskii i Gogol', had some of their internal chapter divisions removed.

The article 'Promezhutok' is an interesting case, since, although it was indeed 'restored' for inclusion in *Arkhaisty i novatory*, only half of it having originally been published in 1924,¹¹² one of its short internal sections was removed before inclusion in the collection. The offending section had been a discussion of the poet Vasilii Kazin, one of the founders of the Kuznitsa, an organization of 'proletarian poets'. It is likely that Tynianov's decision to omit the section was due to Kazin's

¹¹⁰ Part of Tynianov's draft of the foreword to *Arkhaisty i novatory* is given in Toddes, comm. to Tynianov, 'Predislovie k knige "Arkhaisty i novatory"', in *PILK*, pp. 567–73 (p. 567).

¹¹¹ Tynianov, 'Predislovie', in *Arkhaisty i novatory*, p. 4.

¹¹² See M. O. Chudakova, comm. to Tynianov, 'Promezhutok', in *PILK*, pp. 471–82.

association with that organization, one that was, by the late 1920s, profoundly hostile to Formalism.¹¹³ More significant than the editorial decision itself, however, was the fact that Tynianov attempted to conceal it by including a misleading note on its first page in which he claimed that the article had not been altered since its original publication: ‘Статья написана в 1924 году, печатается без изменений.’¹¹⁴ Tynianov wanted the article to be read as a historical artefact, a vision of Russian poetry focalized through the year 1924, but nevertheless thought it necessary to ‘restore’ it to an imaginary original version, to manipulate the manner in which the collection exercised its autobiographical mandate.

Although it is more difficult to prove, Tynianov was equally misleading in the dating of one of the articles in *Arkhaisty i novatory*. The dates on the articles in the collection corresponded in the most part to their respective dates of first publication, though there was in a number of cases a discrepancy of one or two years. The article ‘Oda kak oratorskii zhanr’, however, was more problematic. It was dated to 1922 in *Arkhaisty i novatory*, but had first been published in 1927 in the journal *Poetika*. E. A. Toddes explains that the article originated in a paper, entitled ‘Oda i elegiia’, given at GIII in November 1922.¹¹⁵ Tynianov included a note at the beginning of the article, as printed in *Poetika*, to explain that it was

¹¹³ See Natalia Kornienko, ‘Literary Criticism and Cultural Policy During the New Economic Policy, 1921–1927’, in *A History of Russian Literary Theory and Criticism: The Soviet Age and Beyond*, ed. by Evgeny Dobrenko and Galin Tihanov (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2011), pp. 17–42.

¹¹⁴ Tynianov, ‘Promezhutok’, in *Arkhaisty i novatory*, pp. 541–80 (p. 541)

¹¹⁵ Toddes, comm. to Tynianov, ‘Oda kak oratorskii zhanr’, in *PILK*, pp. 490–501 (p. 490). Ginzburg notes that the basic argument of Tynianov’s ‘Arkhaisty i Pushkin’, dated 1926 in *Arkhaisty i novatory* (the year in which it had first been published), had in fact already been known to his students at GIII for some years. See Lidiia Ginzburg, *O starom i novom: stat'i i ocherki* (Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel', 1982), p. 306.

‘part of a re-edited work’ [*chast’ zanovo proredaktirovannoi raboty*], but he chose to omit the note on its inclusion in *Arkhaisty i novatory*.¹¹⁶ The reader of the collection was therefore led to believe that the article was written in 1922 without subsequent alteration. Conceptually and terminologically, however, the article clearly belongs to a later period in Tynianov’s career. The wording of many passages is anachronistic for 1922, bearing more than a coincidental resemblance to a number of the theses presented in ‘O literaturnoi evoliutsii’ (1927). Compare the following two extracts:

[...] как, чем соотнесен быт с литературой? Ведь быт по составу многогранен, многосторонен, и только функция всех его сторон в нем специфическая. Быт соотнесен с литературой прежде всего своей речевой стороной. Такова же соотнесенность литературных рядов с бытом. Эта соотнесенность литературного ряда с бытовым совершается по речевой линии, у литературы по отношению к быту есть речевая функция.

У нас есть слово ‘установка’.¹¹⁷

(‘O literaturnoi evoliutsii’)

Литературная система соотносится с ближайшим внелитературным рядом — речью, с материалом соседних речевых искусств и бытовой речи. Как соотносится? Другими словами, где ближайшая социальная функция литературного ряда? Здесь получает свое значение термин установка. Установка есть не только доминанта произведения (или жанра), функционально окрашивающая подчиненные факторы, но вместе и функция произведения (или жанра) по отношению к ближайшему внелитературному — речевому ряду.¹¹⁸

(‘Oda kak oratorskii zhanr’)

The two passages quoted above are similar in their terminology, a terminology associated with Tynianov’s work of the late 1920s. The term ‘series’ [*riad*] is an especially glaring example: it could not possibly have been used in the sense above

¹¹⁶ Iu. N. Tynianov, ‘Oda kak oratorskii zhanr’, *Poetika. Vremennik otdela slovesnykh iskusstv GIII*, 3 (1927), 102–28 (p. 102).

¹¹⁷ Tynianov, ‘O literaturnoi evoliutsii’, in *Arkhaisty i novatory*, pp. 30–47 (p. 42, emphasis in original).

¹¹⁸ Tynianov, ‘Oda kak oratorskii zhanr’, *ibid.*, pp. 49–50 (emphasis in original).

in 1922. Furthermore, the exposition of the concept of ‘orientation’ [*ustanovka*] is identical in both passages, introduced by the same rhetorical question. While the turning point in the development from ‘Oda i elegiia’ to ‘Oda kak oratorskii zhanr’ cannot be established for certain, the paper given in 1922 was certainly not the same text as the article printed in *Arkhaisty i novatory* in 1929. It is therefore significant that Tynianov stated 1922 as the date of the article in the collection, and that he placed it in a prominent position as its third article, immediately after its two major theoretical statements, since the date led his reader to conclude, falsely, that the ‘systemic’ model of parallel ‘orders’ had been introduced some four or five years earlier than it in fact had.

Given Tynianov’s emphasis on the autobiographical function of the collection, an emphasis so strong that he tried to conceal his editorial intervention, it seems strange that he should not have chosen to order the articles chronologically by their dates of composition or publication, since such a sequence would have made it possible for the reader to experience the historical development of his ideas. In the foreword, he explained that his ultimate decision to order them thematically and to place the theoretical articles at the beginning of the collection was due both to a predilection for ‘external order’ and a fear of appearing ‘immodest’. His explanation nevertheless has the effect of drawing attention to the question of his historical development.

Собственно, нужно бы расположить работы по времени их написания: тогда противоречия, может быть встречающиеся в некоторых, объяснились бы как постепенный пересмотр выводов, зависящий от расширения материала, а теоретические статьи, с которых начинается сборник, казались бы выводами из конкретного материала и предположениями, сделанными на основе этих выводов, а не собранием тезисов.

Ложная любовь к внешнему порядку или предположение такой любви у читателя заставили меня сгруппировать статьи по темам, перетасовав 9 лет.

Впрочем, не только поэтому. Мне казалось нескромным заставлять читателя ходить со мною по темам и выводам именно в той последовательности, в какой ходил я сам, так как сюжет этой книги прежде всего эволюция литературы, а никак не эволюция автора.¹¹⁹

Although Tynianov purports in the above-quoted passage to explain that he has decided to arrange the articles in the collection thematically as an attempt to represent the ‘evolution of literature’, his explanation of the decision has the simultaneous effect of advertising another way of reading the collection, as a representation of the ‘evolution of its author’. Tynianov was encouraging his reader to distrust his editorial interference, to deconstruct the collection in order to uncover a second ‘plot’ [*siuzhet*] within it, one signposted by the dates conveniently supplied on the final pages of all but one of the articles. He thus created a conflict between the synchronic and diachronic readings of the articles included in the collection.

It is possible to interpret Tynianov’s convoluted explanation of the order of the articles in *Arkhaisty i novatory* not only as a compositional, ‘framing’ device — one analogous to Eikhenbaum’s explanation, in the foreword to *Skvoz’ literaturu*, of the ‘break’ in the collection — but, further, as a way of revealing such a device for what it was, of exposing one of the basic conventions of the genre of the collection of articles. Tynianov’s discussion of the relative merits of two competing ways of ordering the articles in the collection served ultimately to draw attention to the device itself, the creation of the ‘whole’ from its ‘parts’. In their

¹¹⁹ Tynianov, ‘Predislovie’, *ibid.*, p. 3.

theoretical work of the early 1920s, Shklovsky and Tynianov had written about such meta-textual strategies as the very essence of parody. In ‘Dostoevskii i Gogol’, his first publication and the eleventh chapter in *Arkhaisty i novatory*, Tynianov had described parody as a ‘mechanization of the device’ [*mekhanizatsiia priema*].¹²⁰ Tynianov’s foreword to *Arkhaisty i novatory* could be said to have mechanized the device of the compositional frame on which Eikhenbaum had relied in *Skvoz' literaturu* and *Literatura*. It is significant in that respect that one of the two articles in *Arkhaisty i novatory* never before to have been published, “‘Argiviane’: neizdannia tragediia Kiukhel'bekera’, its sixth chapter, includes an analysis of how Kiukhel'beker often attached forewords to his lyrical and dramatic texts in order to provide a theoretical justification for the ‘devices’ used in them.¹²¹

The two other articles in *Arkhaisty i novatory* that were completed in 1928, the year in which Tynianov was preparing the collection for publication, reveal a broader interest on his part in the expansion of the devices of literature to other modes of writing and, more precisely, in the task of making *nauka* literary.

‘Pushkin’, its fifth article, an analysis of how Pushkin rapidly increased the number of genres in which he worked, ends with a celebration of how he expanded his repertoire to include *nauka* and *zhurnalistika*, to bring those two modes of writing within the ‘realm of literature’ [*krug literatury*].¹²² ‘O Khlebnikove’, the last article in the collection, contains sporadic comments on the convergence of *nauka* and poetry in the poet’s work, as was discussed briefly in the first chapter of the

¹²⁰ Tynianov, ‘Dostoevskii i Gogol': k teorii parodii’, *ibid.*, pp. 412–55.

¹²¹ Tynianov, “‘Argiviane’: neizdanniaia tragediia Kiukhel'bekera’, *ibid.*, pp. 292–329 (p. 296).

¹²² Tynianov, ‘Pushkin’, *ibid.*, pp. 228–291 (p. 291).

present work.¹²³ Thus, as he was compiling the collection, Tynianov was exploring how other writers had tried to introduce *nauka* into the domain of the literary. The question was of direct relevance to the collection of articles.

Arkhaisty i novatory can be interpreted in the same way, as an inclusion of the products of *nauka* within a ‘literary’ mode of presentation. The collection represents, in addition to the contributions of its constituent articles, a contribution to *nauka* in itself: it can be said to have been structured so as to perform the ‘dynamism’ that Tynianov considered the essence of literature, its historical instability. The decision to order the articles thematically, for example, served ultimately, as Tynianov recognized in the foreword, to draw attention to the ‘contradictions’, or historical slippages, between discussions of the same theme. The three consecutive articles on Tiutchev, for example, each represent a distinct stage in the development of his work on the poet, such that the theoretical language in which Tiutchev’s poetry is analysed shifts progressively from the first to the third. His poetry evades successive attempts to capture it, emerging in each case as something slightly different. In the same way, the first two articles in the collection, the theoretical statements ‘Literaturnyi fakt’ and ‘O literaturnoi evoliutsii’, are, as was shown in the first chapter, each the culmination of a distinct stage in the evolution of Tynianov’s thought. By placing them next to each other, Tynianov exaggerated the differences between them, such that fundamental concepts — genre, for instance — appeared to morph from one to the next. As did Shklovsky in *O teorii prozy*, Tynianov allowed for some degree of ‘failure’ on his own part in order to facilitate a more performative mode. It could be for that reason

¹²³ Tynianov, ‘O Khlebnikove’, *ibid.*, pp. 581–595 (esp. pp. 588–89).

that, like Shklovsky, Tynianov described *Arkhaisty i novatory* as a ‘book’ [*kniga*] rather than as a ‘collection’ [*sbornik*],¹²⁴ though, unlike Shklovsky, he chose not to include an index to the work, even though one had been prepared for publication.¹²⁵

Immediately after completing *Arkhaisty i novatory* in October 1928, Tynianov travelled to Germany to seek medical treatment. On his way back to Russia, in December, he visited Jakobson in Prague, an event of great significance in the history of structuralism: together, they co-authored the ‘Prague theses’, published as ‘Problemy izucheniia literatury i iazyka’, and their work together led to a surge of hope for the resurrection of the OPOIaZ.¹²⁶ It could be argued that the preparation of *Arkhaisty i novatory* encouraged Tynianov to push ahead in his theoretical work. The publication of the collection left him, like Eikhenbaum after that of *Skvoz' literaturu* in 1924, wanting something new.¹²⁷ In March 1929, one month after the publication of *Arkhaisty i novatory*, Tynianov described the void left in his life by its completion: ‘Я несколько растерян, нет у меня главной работы’.¹²⁸ Shklovsky praised Tynianov’s book very highly, writing that it was good enough even to justify its high price: ‘Вообще, очень хорошая книга.

¹²⁴ Tynianov, ‘Predislovie’, *ibid.*, p. 3.

¹²⁵ RGALI, f. 2224, op. 1, ed. kh. 71.

¹²⁶ On the planned relaunch of the OPOIaZ, see esp. Chudakov, Chudakova, and Toddes, comm. to Jakobson and Tynianov, ‘Problemy izucheniia literatury i iazyka’, in *PILK*, pp. 530–36; Roman Jakobson, ‘Iurii Tynianov v Prage’ (1974), in *Selected Writings*, vol. 5: On Verse, its Masters and Explorers, ed. by Stephen Rudy (The Hague: Mouton, 1979), pp. 560–68; and Depretto, pp. 133–46.

¹²⁷ Tynianov, letter to Shklovsky of 31 March 1929, as given in ‘Iz perepiski Iu. Tynianova i B. Eikhenbauma s V. Shklovskim’, pp. 199–200: ‘У нас наступает теоретическое время.’ (p. 200)

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 200.

Правильно, что она толстая и стоит 6 рублей.¹²⁹ Later that year, Shklovsky produced a second edition of his *O teorii prozy*, one that included a further two articles. The collection was otherwise unchanged, however, with the exception of the expansion of its index.

It has been shown that Shklovsky's, Eikhenbaum's, and Tynianov's collections of articles of the period 1924–30 played important roles in the lives of their authors. The publications of Eikhenbaum's *Skvoz' literaturu* in April 1924 and his *Literatura* in April 1927, for example, neatly framed the crisis in his theoretical work. Indeed, each of the collections of articles performed an important autobiographical function, representing the culmination of a defined period of work. Some of the articles included in *Skvoz' literaturu*, *Literatura*, and *Arkhaisty i novatory* were written specifically for inclusion in a collection of articles. Eikhenbaum recognized Tynianov's *Arkhaisty i novatory* as a testament to Formalism, its publication a moment of supreme importance in the history of the movement.¹³⁰

The collections examined in the present chapter shared a historical orientation, one that itself developed over the course of the 1920s. Eikhenbaum's *Skvoz' literaturu* was primarily an instrument of self-representation, a way of showing the OPOIaZ

¹²⁹ Shklovsky, letter to Tynianov of late 1928, as given in 'Iz perepiski Iu. Tynianova i B. Eikhenbauma s V. Shklovskim', pp. 196–97. Note that the same letter is dated to 4 March 1929 by Toddes, comm. to Tynianov, 'Predislovie k knige "Arkhaisty i novatory"', in *PILK*, pp. 567–73 (p. 568). The date given by Toddes is more likely to be accurate in light of the month in which *Arkhaisty i novatory* was published.

¹³⁰ See Eikhenbaum, letter to Shklovsky of 30 November 1928, as quoted in Eikhenbaum, 'Iz pisem k V. V. Shklovskomu', pp. 158–59, where *Arkhaisty i novatory* is described as part of a 'ceremonial march' for Formalism.

to have caused a rupture in the historical development of *nauka*. It was a form of autobiography, a way of turning the self into the stuff of theory. In *Literatura* and *Arkhaisty i novatory*, Eikhenbaum and Tynianov attempted to represent literature itself as a historical process. Tynianov allowed articles on the same topic, but written at different stages in his career, to be placed side by side, such that the same literary genre changed its guise from page to page. The literary was shown repeatedly to evade his attempts to capture it, inherently dynamic and historically unstable. The development of the genre of the collection of articles thus resulted in a shift in emphasis away from a narrative of the development of *nauka* towards a narrative of historical development more broadly, one in which *nauka* and literature were conjoined.

The very making of the collection of articles caused *nauka* to be treated as literature. *Skvoz' literaturu*, *O teorii prozy*, *Literatura*, and *Arkhaisty i novatory* were all constructed in dialogue with Formalist ideas about the literary.

Eikhenbaum treated *Skvoz' literaturu* analogously to such literary works as *Geroi nashego vremeni*, seeing his collection, a work of *nauka*, as a state of tension between the 'whole' and its 'parts'. Contemporary reviewers of the collection were encouraged to avail themselves of the conceptual apparatus of the OPOIaZ, the tools of Formalist analysis, in their interpretations of the book. In much the same way, Shklovsky produced in his *O teorii prozy* a book that, like *Tristram Shandy*, failed astoundingly to fulfil its intended purpose, a fact that paradoxically made it into a demonstration of the working of prose, at least as Shklovsky understood it.

For that reason, each of the collections of articles must be seen not only as a means to an end, a convenient way of republishing historical pieces of *nauka*, but also as an end in itself, an original work of *nauka* in its own right. The collections produced new narratives of the historical development of *nauka* and allowed for connections between their constituent articles to be made. *O teorii prozy*, for example, was a way of demonstrating the applicability across several national literatures of what Shklovsky understood to be the universal essence of prose. More importantly, the collections can be seen as part of a broader turn in the late 1920s towards what Levchenko calls *inoskazanie teorii*, the technique typical of Shklovsky's *Tret'ia fabrika* and *Gamburgskii schet* and Eikhenbaum's *Moi vremennik*. They were explorations of a new way of theorizing by performance, but acquired a more historical dimension in their use of old, dated theoretical articles as their 'material'. Such an interpretation allows for Tynianov to be included on an equal footing alongside Shklovsky and Eikhenbaum, for him to be considered a third exponent of the Formalist technique of *inoskazanie teorii* in the late 1920s: the Formalists' biographical turn of those years was manifest not only in the development of an experimentally 'autobiographical' practice of prose writing and in Tynianov's turn to historical fiction, but also in their representation of themselves and their movement through the implementation of literary devices in the preparation of authorial collections of articles.

Conclusion

‘j’ai traversé un rêve (euphorique) de scientificité’¹
Roland Barthes, 1971

We saw in the introduction that Boris Eikhenbaum described the work of the OPOIaZ as a ‘literary science as such’ [*literaturnaia nauka kak takovaia*].² The members of the Society were the practitioners of a science, that is, only to the extent that they were capable of specifying the proper object of their science, ‘literature as such’ [*literatura kak takovaia*].³ The Society was founded on a polarization of *nauka* and literature, one that made the two categories inseparable. The general methodology of the present work has been to enter into this distinctive self-representational logic in order to reconstruct three moments in the work of the OPOIaZ at which the relation between *nauka* and literature was felt with particular intensity. The three chapters have each explored a reconfiguration in practice of the same relation of interdependence.

In the first chapter, it was argued that *nauchnyi iazyk* had been a component of the theory of language on which the Society had been founded in the 1910s. *Nauka* featured in the work of the Society on language — and even in Shklovsky’s *Voskreshenie slova* (1914) — as the mirror image of poetry, such that the one was possible only in terms of its difference from the other. Tynianov developed the same polarization in his work on language of 1924, but seemed simultaneously to realize it in the practice of his theorizing by developing an intensely abstract

¹ Roland Barthes, ‘Réponses’, *Tel Quel*, 47 (1971), 89–107 (p. 97).

² B. Eikhenbaum, ‘Teoriia “formal’nogo metoda”’, in *Literatura: teoriia, kritika, polemika* (Leningrad: Priboi, 1927), pp. 116–48 (p. 121).

³ *Ibid.*, p. 121.

terminology. As the 1920s progressed, and he expanded the application of structural linguistics to encompass the ‘evolution’ of literature, Tynianov began explicitly to confront the widely acknowledged ‘difficulty’ of his own language. The prose of his mature theoretical work, burdened by heavy ‘traces of the instrument’, by attempts to reproduce in language the ‘movements’ of thought, came uncannily close to ‘poetic language’ as it had originally been defined. It was concluded that the original polarization of *nauka* and poetry progressively folded in on itself in his work.

The second chapter explored the reconfiguration of the same relation between *nauka* and literature in the work of the Society on literary history of the period 1919–24. The Formalists attempted to make their theorization of the endless ‘struggles’ of literary history take a correspondingly revolutionary form. It was shown that their early literary history supports parallels with natural-scientific models of change — and in particular with Darwin’s theory of evolution by natural selection and Newton’s laws of motion. In 1924, Tynianov was beginning to experiment with conceptual models associated with the sciences of genetics and relativistic physics — two examples of a broader revolution in the study of the physical universe at the beginning of the twentieth century. It was concluded that their early work on literary history showed signs of an effort to problematize the division of the sciences into those of nature and those of history.

One further reconfiguration of the interdependent relation between *nauka* and its object was explored in the third chapter. Shklovsky, Eikhenbaum, and Tynianov’s authorial collections of articles of the late 1920s were examined as examples of a

new ‘type’ of *nauka*. In the period 1924–30, they developed the collection of articles as a genre oriented towards autobiography. Since it was dependent on a tension between the ‘whole’ and its ‘parts’, the collection of articles was an inescapably ‘Formalist’ genre, nostalgically recalling the compositional focus of the OPOIaZ. It allowed the Formalists to make new theoretical contributions performatively, by recycling their old work in a ‘literary’ manner. As they turned towards the theoretical problem of biography in the late 1920s, and began to theorize the interaction between literature and life, they used the authorial collection of articles as a means of transforming their old works of *nauka* into new ones.

From an intellectual-historical perspective, the scientificity of the work of the Formalists was a function of its successful delineation of the proper object of the science of literature. The approach taken here, however, has not been a mere gimmick, an elaborate game to apply to Formalism its own conceptual tools; it has instead been motivated by an attempt to understand the ramifications for the work of the OPOIaZ of its most fundamental conceptual innovation, the conception of literature as an autonomous object. It can be concluded ultimately that *nauka* was not a pre-given category of work for the participants of the OPOIaZ, one indifferent to ‘literature as such’. It was instead constructed in dialogue with that object. To some extent, such a conclusion could be said to shed light on why many commentators on the literary theory of the Society knowingly or often unknowingly adopt elements of its own, originally literary-theoretical conceptual apparatus in order to describe the significance of its work.

It has long been recognized that Shklovsky's literary-theoretical work, work in which he asserted the autonomy of literature, was itself characterized to a high degree by 'literariness'. In 1928, for example, Pavel Medvedev noted with frustration that it was difficult to engage on an intellectual level with some of Shklovsky's more aphoristic assertions from *Rozanov* (1921); Shklovsky's description of the work of literature as 'pure form', according to Medvedev, amounted to a 'paradox of the feuilleton type', 'a little work of art' [*mal'enkoe khudozhestvennoe postroenie*].⁴ More recently, scholarship on Shklovsky's 'path to artistic prose' reconstructs his literary-theoretical articles of the late 1910s and early 1920s as a kind of creative laboratory, a space in which he could formulate an experimental, generically hybrid prose style.⁵ It has also been argued that Shklovsky and Eikhenbaum's more experimental, 'literary' prose of the 1920s represented a 'projection of theory into practice',⁶ or even a new, performative type of *nauka*.⁷

The approach taken in the present work has been to reframe the question slightly. It has been argued not that the Formalists 'turned *nauka* into literature' as the 1920s progressed or that they came to problematize the 'borders' of the one or the other, as the standard arguments go, but that the interactions of *nauka* and

⁴ P. N. Medvedev, *Formal'nyi metod v literaturovedenii (Kriticheskoe vvedenie v sotsiologicheskuiu poetiku)* (Leningrad: Priboi, 1928), p. 167.

⁵ A. Razumova, 'Put' formalistov k khudozhestvennoi proze', *Voprosy literatury*, 3 (2004), 131–50.

⁶ The phrase belongs to Aage A. Hansen-Löve, *Der russische Formalismus: Methodologische Rekonstruktion seiner Entwicklung aus dem Prinzip der Verfremdung* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1978), e.g. p. 14.

⁷ See esp. Jan Levchenko, *Drugaia nauka: russkie formalisty v poiskakh biografii* (Moscow: Izdatel'skii dom NIU VShE, 2012).

literature in the output of the Society resulted ultimately from the manner in which the two had originally been polarized. Three moments in the development of the relation between *nauka* and literature have been examined, three points at which the theorization of literature was to some degree realized as a performance. The approach taken has made it possible to shed further light on those moments, to consider the relation towards literature even of some of the most apparently conventional literary-theoretical work produced by the OPOIaZ. Thus, whereas Jan Levchenko, for example, considers Shklovsky and Eikhenbaum's autobiographical prose of the 1920s in terms of an orientation towards literature, the present work has been able to consider the orientation towards literature even of such texts as Tynianov's dense and austere *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka* (1924). In other words, even at moments when the Formalists' realization of *nauka* seemed to take the form of a provocative push away from literature, it nevertheless took place in dialogue with their conception of the literary. The difference in approach between Levchenko's monograph and the present work also explains why he chooses largely to exclude the 'scholar' Tynianov from his understanding of the 'other science' practised by the Formalists in the late 1920s, whereas, here, he has been placed at the very centre of the discussion.

From a broader perspective, the conclusion drawn in the present work could be used further to problematize the nature of the theoretical work of the OPOIaZ. Krystyna Pomorska argues that Formalism was a generalized reformulation of the poetics of Russian futurism,⁸ but to make such an argument is to imply that

⁸ Krystyna Pomorska, *Russian Formalist Theory and its Poetic Ambiance* (The Hague: Mouton, 1968), pp. 11–14.

Formalism came into being merely in order to provide theoretical justification for a poetic movement. Fredric Jameson gestures towards a more nuanced approach, writing that ‘an ultimate evaluation of Formalism as a concrete literary phenomenon will bring it much closer to genuinely creative movements such as German Romanticism or Surrealism than to a purely critical doctrine like that of the American New Criticism’.⁹ Jameson’s comparison of Formalism to German Romanticism is especially apposite with regard to the work of the OPOIaZ. Romanticism produced a mode of writing in which the production of literature and the production of the concept of literature became synonymous. Philippe Lacoue-Labarthe and Jean-Luc Nancy argue that the construction of the autonomous ‘literary absolute’ by the German Romantics, a response ultimately to the crisis of Kantian philosophy, entailed the production of ‘theory itself as literature or, in other words, literature producing itself as it produces its own theory’.¹⁰ ‘All art should become science’, according to Friedrich Schlegel’s famous fragment, ‘and all science art.’¹¹ The construction by the Formalists of a ‘literature as such’, another response to a crisis originating ultimately in philosophy,¹² produced an equivalent result. In both Romanticism and Formalism, that is, an autonomous object was constructed — ‘literature’ — by an intellectual process that entailed its production in a refracted form. Although it would be unwise to push the analogy

⁹ Fredric Jameson, *The Prison-House of Language: A Critical Account of Structuralism and Russian Formalism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1972), p. 48.

¹⁰ Philippe Lacoue-Labarthe and Jean-Luc Nancy, *The Literary Absolute: The Theory of Literature in German Romanticism*, trans. by Philip Barnard and Cheryl Lester (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1988), p. 12.

¹¹ As quoted *ibid.*, p. 13.

¹² See esp. Galin Tihanov, ‘Why did Modern Literary Theory Originate in Central and Eastern Europe? (And Why is it Now Dead?)’, *Common Knowledge*, 10 (2004), 61–81.

too far, it is nevertheless perhaps revealing of the ramifications of a particular epistemological stance towards the literary as an autonomous object of investigation. Indeed, should one wish to, the arguments made here about the construction of *nauchnost'* as the mirror image of literariness could serve as further tools with which it would be possible to present Formalism as something in some way analogous to Romanticism.

It is also possible to project such an interpretation forward in history, to consider its resonance for the project of literary theory later in the twentieth century. Formalism has long been recognized as an important precursor to structuralism, the latter a wide-ranging, if comparably short-lived, movement associated with the expansion of the application of the methods of structural linguistics, their application to all fields. Formalism could be said to have anticipated the generalizing urge characteristic of structuralism, the ease with which it expanded an original focus on language to make itself into a unified discourse capable of explaining everything. The creation of an immanent scientificity by the Formalists and its development by a number of the structuralists, their shared practice of an intellectual activity independent of any master science, could be said necessarily to have led to this colonizing tendency.

Galin Tihanov writes that ‘advances in literary theory in its second “golden age”, the 1960s and 1970s, were hardly more than elaborations and variations on themes, problems, and solutions played out in the interwar period in Central and Eastern

Europe'.¹³ Formalism was central to this anticipation of later developments in literary theory. Several commentators on the work of the OPOIaZ see profound affinities between their work and that of Jacques Derrida, for example.¹⁴ The Western experience of literary theory in the second half of the twentieth century was telescoped in the work of the Formalists into an intense fifteen-year period in the late 1910s and 1920s.

It could be said that the Formalist experience of an immanent scientificity, its repeated refashioning into a form amenable to its own laws, was mirrored in the work of the leading representatives of late twentieth-century literary theory — and above all in that of Roland Barthes.¹⁵ Like the science of the OPOIaZ, Barthes's science of structuralism was a self-consciously creative enterprise. In allusion to Nietzsche's 'gay science', Éric Marty writes that Barthes was, unlike Gérard Genette and Tzvetan Todorov, a *structuraliste heureux*, one whose work was more akin to painting than to a purely theoretical activity.¹⁶ Paul de Man even said of Barthes's structuralist legacy that it must be read 'as an intellectual adventure

¹³ Ibid., pp. 63–64.

¹⁴ See, e.g., Lawrence Crawford, 'Viktor Shklovskij: *Différance* in Defamiliarization', *Comparative Literature*, 36 (1984), 209–19; and Dragan Kujundžić, *The Returns of History: Russian Nietzscheans After Modernity* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997).

¹⁵ Analogies have often been drawn between the Formalists and Roland Barthes. Above all, see the final section in Aleksandr Dmitriev and Jan Levchenko, 'Nauka kak priem: eshche raz o metodologicheskom nasledii russkikh formalistov', *NLO*, 50 (2001), 195–245 (pp. 239–45), where they are compared in light of Pierre Bourdieu's sociology of science.

¹⁶ Éric Marty, 'Présentation', in Roland Barthes, *Œuvres complètes*, 5 vols, ed. by Éric Marty (Paris: Seuil, 2002), vol. 2: Livres, textes, entretiens, 1962–1967, pp. 9–19 (p. 18).

rather than as the scientifically motivated development of a method'.¹⁷ As Barthes himself put it in 1963, the task of his structuralism was, as the name suggests, to reconstitute an object so as to 'make manifest in that reconstitution the laws of its functioning': it was a 'simulacrum' of that object, a model constructed of its operation.¹⁸ He retrospectively described his structuralist experience as a 'euphoric dream of scientificity',¹⁹ a utopian application of the structures of language to everything, a reproduction, therefore, of language as such. His 'intellectual adventure', his 'dream of scientificity', was a rehearsal of how the original 'literary science' had played out in the work of the OPOIaZ, a trace of that original exercise in intellectual autonomy.

¹⁷ Paul de Man, 'Roland Barthes and the Limits of Structuralism' (1972), in *Romanticism and Contemporary Criticism: The Gauss Seminar and Other Papers*, ed. by E. S. Burt, Kevin Newmark, and Andrej Warminski (Baltimore, MD, and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996), pp. 164–77 (p. 166).

¹⁸ As quoted in Marty, 'Présentation', in Barthes, *Œuvres complètes*, vol. 2, pp. 14–15 (emphasis in original): 'Le but de toute activité structuraliste, qu'elle soit réflexive ou poétique, est de reconstituer un "objet", de façon à manifester dans cette reconstitution les règles de fonctionnement de cet objet. La structure est donc en fait un *simulacre* de l'objet'.

¹⁹ Barthes, 'Réponses', p. 97.

Bibliography

Primary Literature

- Adorno, T. W., 'The Essay as Form', *New German Critique*, 32 (1984), 151–71
(trans. by Bob Hullot-Kentor and Frederic Will)
- Aronson, M. I., and S. A. Reiser, eds, *Literaturnye krushki i salony* (Leningrad: Priboi, 1929)
- Bakhtin, Mikhail M., *Art and Answerability: Early Philosophical Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*, ed. by Michael Holquist and Vadim Liapunov, trans. by Kenneth Brostrom (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1990)
- , *Estetika slovesnogo tvorchestva*, ed. by S. G. Bocharov (Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1979)
- , *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, ed. and trans. by Caryl Emerson (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1984)
- , *Problemy tvorchestva Dostoevskogo* (Leningrad: Priboi, 1929)
- Bakhtin, Mikhail M., and Pavel N. Medvedev, *The Formal Method in Literary Scholarship: A Critical Introduction to Sociological Poetics*, trans. by Albert J. Wehrle (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978)
- Bann, Stephen, and John E. Bowlt, eds, *Russian Formalism: A Collection of Articles and Texts in Translation* (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1973)
- Barthes, Roland, *Œuvres complètes*, 5 vols, ed. by Éric Marty (Paris: Seuil, 2002)
- , 'Réponses', *Tel Quel*, 47 (1971), 89–107
- Baudouin de Courtenay, I. A., *Izbrannye trudy po obshchemu iazykoznaniiu*, 2 vols (Moscow: Izd. Akademii nauk SSSR, 1963)
- Beletskii, A. I., 'Neskol'ko slov o razrabotke nauchnoi poetiki v Rossii i na Zapade', in R. Müller-Freienfels, *Poetika*, trans. by I. Ia. Kaganov and E. S. Paperna (Kharkov: Trud, 1923)
- Bely, Andrei, *Selected Essays of Andrey Bely*, ed. and trans. by Steven Cassedy (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1985)
- , *Simvolizm: kniga statei* (Moscow: Musaget, 1910)
- Berg, L. S., *Nauka, ee sodержanie, smysl i klassifikatsiia* (Petrograd: Vremia, 1922)
- , *Trudy po teorii evoliutsii, 1922–1930* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1977)
- Bernshtein, S. I., 'Esteticheskie predposylki teorii deklamatsii', *Poetika. Vremennik Otdela slovesnykh iskusstv GIII*, vyp. 3 (1927), 24–44
- , 'Golos Bloka', in *Blokovskii sbornik*, 2 (Tartu: 1972), 454–525 (ed. by A. Ivich and G. Superfin)

- Bobrov, S., 'Metod i apologet', *Pechat' i revoliutsiia*, 5 (1924), 16–19
- Bréal, Michel, *Essai de sémantique (Science des significations)* (Paris: Hachette, 1897)
- Brik, Osip M., 'Neumestnoe politikanstvo', *Knizhnyi ugol*, 2 (1918), 28–29
- , 'Tak nazyvaemyi "formal'nyi metod"', *Lef*, 1 (1923), 213–15
- , 'Zvukovye povtory', in *Sborniki po teorii poeticheskogo iazyka*, vyp. 2 (Petrograd: OPOIaZ, 1917), pp. 24–62
- Brunetière, Ferdinand, *L'Évolution des genres dans l'histoire de la littérature: leçons professées à l'École normale supérieure*, vol. 1: Introduction. L'évolution de la critique depuis la renaissance jusqu'à nos jours (Paris: Hachette, 1890)
- , *Manuel de l'histoire de la littérature française* (Paris: Delagrave, 1898)
- Cassirer, Ernst, 'Structuralism in Modern Linguistics', *Word. Journal of the Linguistic Circle of New York*, 1 (1945), 99–120
- Christiansen, Broder, *Philosophie der Kunst* (Hanau: Clauss und Feddersen, 1909)
- Chukovskii, Kornei I., *Nekrasov: stat'i i materialy* (Leningrad: Kubuch, 1926)
- Darwin, Charles, *Evolutionary Writings*, ed. by James A. Secord (Oxford: Oxford University Press: 2010)
- 'D—nyi', N., [review of Tynianov, *Arkhaisty i novatory*], *Zhurnal dlia vsekh*, 5 (1929), 127
- Duhamel, Georges, *Tsivilizatsiia, 1914–1917*, trans. by Iu. N. Tynianov (Moscow and Petrograd: Gos. izd., 1923)
- Eikhenbaum, Boris M., '5 = 100', *Knizhnyi ugol*, 8 (1922), 38–41
- , *Anna Akhmatova: opyt analiza* (Petrograd: Petropechat', 1923)
- , "'Budushchee — neizvestno..." Iz dnevnikov B. M. Eikhenbauma 1917–1918 godov', *Kommunist*, 5 (1991), 52–59
- , 'Illiuziia skaza', *Knizhnyi ugol*, 2 (1918), 10–13
- , 'Iz pisem k V. V. Shklovskomu', *Neva*, 5 (1987), 156–64 (ed. by M. O. Chudakova)
- , 'Kak sdelana "Shinel"', in *Poetika. Sborniki po teorii poeticheskogo iazyka* (Petrograd: Gos. tip., 1919), pp. 151–66
- , *Lermontov: opyt istoriko-literaturnoi otsenki* (Leningrad: Gos. izd., 1924)
- , *Lev Tolstoi. Piatidesiatye gody* (Leningrad: Priboi, 1928)
- , 'Literatura i pisatel', *Zvezda*, 5 (1927), 121–40
- , *Literatura: teoriia, kritika, polemika* (Leningrad: Priboi, 1927)
- , 'Literaturnyi byt', *Na literaturnom postu*, 9 (1927), 47–52
- , *Melodika russkogo liricheskogo stikha* (Petrograd: OPOIaZ, 1922)

- , 'Metody i podkhody', *Knizhnyi ugol*, 8 (1922), 13–23
- , 'Mig soznaniia', *Knizhnyi ugol*, 7 (1921), 9–17
- , *Moi vremennik: slovesnost', nauka, kritika, smes'* (Leningrad: Izd. pisatelei, 1929)
- , *Molodoi Tolstoi* (Petrograd and Berlin: 1922)
- , 'Muchitel'no rabotaiu nad stat'ei o Tolstom', *Voprosy literatury*, 3 (1978), 308–14 (ed. by Tat'iana Bek)
- , 'Osnovnye stilevyie tendentsii v rechi Lenina', *Lef*, 1 (5) (1924), 57–70
- , 'O. Genri i teoriia novelly', *Zvezda*, 6 (1925), 291–308
- , *O literature: raboty raznykh let*, ed. by M. O. Chudakova, E. A. Toddes, and A. P. Chudakov (Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1987)
- , *O proze: sbornik statei*, ed. by I. Iampol'skii (Leningrad: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1969)
- , 'Prilozhenie', in *Poetika. Sborniki po teorii poeticheskogo iazyka* (Petrograd: Gos. tip., 1919), pp. 167–68
- , 'Put' Pushkina k proze', in *Pushkinskii sbornik pamiati Professora S. A. Vengerova*, ed. by N. V. Iakovlev (Moscow: Gos. izd., 1923), pp. 59–74
- , 'Rabota nad Tolstym. Iz dnevnikov 1926–1959 gg.', in *Kontekst. 1981* (Moscow: Nauka, 1982), pp. 263–302 (ed. by S. A. Mitrokhina)
- , *Skvoz' literaturu: sbornik statei*, *Voprosy poetiki*: vyp. 4 (Leningrad: Academia, 1924)
- , 'Sud'ba Bloka', in *Ob Aleksandre Bloke* (Petrograd: Kartonnyi domik, 1921), pp. 39–63
- , 'Vokrug voprosa o "formalistakh"', *Pechat' i revoliutsiia*, 5 (1924), 1–12
- , 'V ozhidanii literatury', *Russkii sovremennik*, 1 (1924), 280–90
- , 'V poiskakh zhanra', *Russkii sovremennik*, 3 (1924), 228–31
- , *The Young Tolstoy*, trans. by Gary Kern (Ann Arbor, MI: Ardis, 1972)
- Eikhenbaum, Boris M., ed., *The Poetics of Cinema*, trans. by Richard Taylor et al., as *Russian Poetics in Translation*, vol. 9: *The Poetics of Cinema* (Oxford: 1982)
- , *Poetika kino* (Moscow and Leningrad: Kinopechat', 1927)
- Eikhenbaum, Boris M., and Iurii N. Tynianov, eds, *Russkaia poeziia XIX veka: sbornik statei*, *Voprosy poetiki*: vyp. 13 (Leningrad: Academia, 1929)
- , *Russkaia proza: sbornik statei*, *Voprosy poetiki*: vyp. 8 (Leningrad: Academia, 1926)
- Einstein, Albert, 'On the Electrodynamics of Moving Bodies', in *The Principle of Relativity: A Collection of Original Memoirs on the Special and General*

- Theory of Relativity* (London: Methuen, 1923), pp. 37–65 (trans. by W. Perrett and G. B. Jeffery)
- Engel'gardt, Boris, *Aleksandr Nikolaevich Veselovskii* (Petrograd: Kolos, 1924)
- , *Formal'nyi metod v istorii literatury* (Leningrad: Academia, 1927)
- Freidenberg, Ol'ga, *Poetika siuzheta i zhanra*, ed. by Nina Braginskaia (Moscow: Labirint, 1993)
- Ginzburg, Lidiia Ia., *Chelovek za pis'mennym stolom* (Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel', 1989)
- , 'Eshche raz o starom i novom (Pokolenie na povorote)', in *Tynianovskii sbornik*, vyp. 2: Vtorye Tynianovskie chteniia (Riga: Zinatne, 1986), pp. 132–40
- , *O starom i novom: stat'i i ocherki* (Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel', 1982)
- , 'Pis'ma B. Ia. Bukhshtabu', *NLO*, 49 (2001), 325–87 (ed. by D. V. Ustinov)
- , 'Predislovie', in P. A. Viazemskii, *Staraia zapisnaia knizhka*, ed. by L. Ginzburg (Leningrad: Izd. pisatelei v Leningrade, 1929)
- , 'Vospominaia Institut istorii iskusstv', in *Tynianovskii sbornik*, vyp. 5: Chetvertye Tynianovskie chteniia (Riga: 1990), pp. 278–89
- , 'Zapisi 20–30-kh godov. Iz neopublikovannogo', *Novyi mir*, 6 (1992), 144–86
- Gorbachev, G., 'Edinyi front burzhuaznoi reaktsii', *Zvezda*, 6 (1924), 247–51
- Gornfel'd, A., 'A. A. Potebnia i sovremennaia nauka', *Letopis' Doma literatorov*, 4 (1921), 1–2
- , 'Formalisty i ikh protivniki', *Literaturnye zapiski*, 3 (1922), 5–6
- , 'Iz novoi literatury o Dostoevskom', *Letopis' Doma literatorov*, 2 (1921), 2
- Grammont, Maurice, 'Zvuk kak sredstvo vyrazitel'nosti rechi', in *Sborniki po teorii poeticheskogo iazyka*, 1 (Petrograd: OPOIaZ, 1916), pp. 51–60 (trans. by Vl. B. Shklovsky)
- Grifitsov, B. A., *Teoriia romana* (Moscow: Gos. Akademiia khudozhestvennykh nauk, 1927)
- Grigor'ev, M., 'Krizis formalizma', *Pechat' i revoliutsiia*, 8 (1927), 84–91
- Grits, T., V. Trenin, and M. Nikitin, *Slovesnost' i kommertsii: knizhnaia lavka A. F. Smirdina* (Moscow: Federatsiia, 1929)
- Heine, Heinrich, *Satiry*, ed. and trans. by Iu. N. Tynianov (Leningrad: Academia, 1927)
- Iakubinskii, Lev P., *Izbrannye raboty. Iazyk i ego funktsionirovanie*, ed. by A. A. Leont'ev (Moscow: Nauka, 1986)
- , 'Osushchestvlenie zvukovogo edinoobrazii v tvorchestve Lermontova', in *Sborniki po teorii poeticheskogo iazyka*, 2 (Petrograd: OPOIaZ, 1917), pp. 63–70

- , ‘Otkuda berutsia stikhi’, *Knizhnyi ugol*, 7 (1921), 21–25
- , ‘O poeticheskom glossemosochetanii’, in *Poetika. Sborniki po teorii poeticheskogo iazyka* (Petrograd: Gos. tip., 1919), pp. 7–12
- , ‘O snizhenii vysokogo stil’ia u Lenina’, *Lef*, 1 (5) (1924), 71–80
- , ‘O zvukakh stikhotvornogo iazyka’, in *Sborniki po teorii poeticheskogo iazyka*, vyp. 1 (Petrograd: OPOIaZ, 1916), pp. 6–30
- , ‘Po povodu knigi V. M. Zhirmunskogo “Kompozitsiia liricheskikh stikhotvorenii”’, *Knizhnyi ugol*, 8 (1922), 54–58
- , ‘Programma kursa lektsii: evoliutsiia rechi’, *Zapiski Instituta zhivogo slova*, 1 (1919), 85–86
- , ‘Programma kursa lektsii po semantike’, *Zapiski Instituta zhivogo slova*, 1 (1919), 71
- , [review of Chernyshev, *Pravil’nost’ i chistota russkoi rechi* (1915)], *Sovremennyi mir*, 5–6 (1916), 121–22
- , [review of Shakhmatov, *Vvedenie v kurs istorii russkogo iazyka* (1916)], *Sovremennyi mir*, 5–6 (1916), 120–21
- , ‘Skoplenie odinakovykh plavnykh v prakticheskom i poeticheskom iazykakh’, *Sborniki po teorii poeticheskogo iazyka*, vyp. 2 (Petrograd: OPOIaZ, 1917), pp. 15–23
- Iarkho, B. Ia., ‘Granitsy nauchnogo literaturovedeniia’, *Iskusstvo*, 2 (1925), 45–60
- , *Metodologiia tochnogo literaturovedeniia: Izbrannye trudy po teorii literatury*, ed. by M. V. Akimova, I. A. Pil’shchikov, and M. I. Shapir (Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kul’tur, 2006)
- Ikhteiman, M., ‘Chto chitat’ po fizike i estestvoznaniuu’, *Zvezda*, 1 (1924), 281–84
- Iretskii, V., ‘Maksimalisty’, *Literaturnye zapiski*, 3 (1922), 4
- Jakobson, Roman O., ‘Briusovskaia stikhologiya i nauka o stikhe’, *Nauchnye izvestiia Akademicheskogo tsentra Narkomprosa*, 2: Filosofiia, literatura, iskustvo (1922), 222–40
- , ‘Futurizm kak esteticheskaia i nauchnaia sistema’ (part 2 of ‘Futurizm’), *Zhizn’ iskustva*, 226 (26 August 1919), 2
- , ‘Moskovskii lingvisticheskii kruzhok’, *Philologica*, 3 (1996), 361–79 (ed. by M. I. Shapir)
- , *Noveishaia russkaia poeziia. Nabrosok pervyi* (Prague: Politika, 1921)
- , ‘Priemy staroi zhivopisi’ (part 1 of ‘Futurizm’), *Zhizn’ iskustva*, 199–200 (27 July 1919), 2
- , *Selected Writings*, vol. 2: Word and Language, ed. by S. Rudy (Berlin: Mouton, 1971)
- , *Selected Writings*, vol. 3: Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry, ed. by Stephen Rudy (The Hague: Mouton, 1981)

- , *Selected Writings*, vol. 5: On Verse, its Masters and Explorers, ed. by Stephen Rudy (The Hague: Mouton, 1979)
- , ‘Vers une science de l’art poétique’, in *Théorie de la littérature: textes des formalistes russes*, ed. and trans. by Tzvetan Todorov (Paris: Seuil, 1965), pp. 9–13
- Jakobson, Roman O., and Iurii N. Tynianov, ‘Problemy izucheniia literatury i iazyka’, *Novyi Lef*, 12 (1928), 35–37
- Kanaev, I. I., P. N. Medvedev, and V. N. Voloshinov, *Stat’i*, Bakhtin pod maskoi: vyp. 5 (Moscow: Labirint, 1996)
- Kant, Immanuel, *Metaphysical Foundations of Natural Science*, ed. and trans. by Michael Friedman (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004)
- Kaverin, Veniamin, ‘Literator: iz knigi vospominanii’, *Znamia*, 8 (1987), 80–121
- Kaverin, Veniamin, ed., *Iurii Tynianov: pisatel' i uchenyi. Vospominaniia, razmyshleniia, vstrechi* (Moscow: Molodaia gvardiia, 1966)
- , *Vospominaniia o Iu. Tynianove* (Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1983)
- Kaverin, Veniamin, and V. Novikov, *Novoe zrenie: kniga o Iurii Tynianove* (Moscow: Kniga, 1988)
- Kazanskii, Boris A., ‘Ideia istoricheskoi poetiki’, *Poetika. Vremennik otдела slovesnykh iskusstv*, 1 (1926), 5–23
- , ‘Rech' Lenina’, *Lef*, 1 (5) (1924), 111–39
- Kazanskii, Boris A., and Iurii N. Tynianov, eds, *Fel'eton: sbornik statei* (Leningrad: Academia, 1927)
- Kelly, Catriona, ed., *Utopias: Russian Modernist Texts, 1905–1940*, trans. by Catriona Kelly (London: Penguin, 1999)
- Kenigsberg, M. M., ‘Iz stikhologicheskikh etiudov. 1. Analiz poniatiia “stikh”’, *Philologica*, 1 (1994), 149–85 (ed. by S. Iu. Mazur and M. I. Shapir)
- Khovin, V., ‘Bezotvetnye voprosy’, *Knizhnyi ugol*, 7 (1921), 25–30
- , ‘Bezotvetnye voprosy’, *Knizhnyi ugol*, 8 (1922), 1–9
- , ‘“Smontirovannaia” poetika’, *Knizhnyi ugol*, 8 (1922), 29–38
- Khvol'son, O. D., *Teoriia otnositel'nosti A. Einsteina i novoe miroponimanie* (Petrograd: Izd. M. i S. Sabashnikovykh, 1922)
- Kogan, P. S., ‘O formal'nom metode’, *Pechat' i revoliutsiia*, 5 (1924), 32–35
- Koialovich, Nikolai, ‘Obzor literatury po teorii otnositel'nosti na russkom iazyke’, *Kniga i revoliutsiia*, 9–10 (1922), 29–34, and 11–12 (1923), 26–32
- Kornienko, Natalia, ‘Literary Criticism and Cultural Policy During the New Economic Policy, 1921–1927’, in *A History of Russian Literary Theory and Criticism: The Soviet Age and Beyond*, ed. by Evgeny Dobrenko and Galin Tihanov (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2011), pp. 17–42

- Kovalevskii, M. M., 'Darvinizm v sotsiologii', in *Pamiaty Darvina* (Moscow: Nauchnoe slovo, 1910), pp. 117–58
- , *Sotsiologiia*, 2 vols (St Petersburg: tip. M. M. Stasiulevicha, 1910)
- Kushner, B., 'O zvukovoi storone poeticheskoi rechi', in *Sborniki po teorii poeticheskogo iazyka*, vyp. 1 (Petrograd: OPOIaZ, 1916), pp. 42–49
- Lemon, Lee T., and Marion J. Reis, eds, *Russian Formalist Criticism* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1965)
- Lenin, V. I., *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, 5th edn, 55 vols (Moscow: Gos. izd. politicheskoi literatury, 1958–65), vol. 18: Materializm i empiriokrititsizm (1961)
- Letavet, Avgust, 'Moi drug Iu. Tynianov', *Iunost'*, 7 (1987), 84–85
- Levchenko, Jan, ed., *'Mladoformalisty': Russkaia Proza* (St Petersburg: Petropolis, 2007)
- Lunacharsky, A. V., 'Formalizm v nauke ob iskusstve', *Pechat' i revoliutsiia*, 5 (1924), 19–32
- Matejka, Ladislav, and Krystyna Pomorska, eds, *Readings in Russian Poetics: Formalist and Structuralist Views* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1971)
- Medvedev, Pavel N., *Formal'nyi metod v literaturovedenii: kriticheskoe vvedenie v sotsiologicheskuiu poetiku* (Leningrad: Priboi, 1928)
- , [review of Shklovsky, *Teoriia prozy* (1925)], *Zvezda*, 1 (1926), 265–66
- , [review of Tomashevskii, *Teoriia literatury. Poetika* (1925)], *Zvezda*, 3 (1925), 298–99
- , [review of Zhirmunskii, *Vvedenie v metriku* (1925)], *Zvezda*, 4 (1925), 301–02
- , 'Sotsiologizm bez sotsiologii. (O metodologicheskikh rabotakh P. N. Sakulina)', *Zvezda*, 2 (1926), 267–71
- , 'Uchenyi sal'erizm: o formal'nom (morfologicheskom metode)', *Zvezda*, 3 (1925), 264–76
- Mirsky, D. S., [review of 'Voprosy poetiki': vyp. 1–5 (1923–24)], *Slavonic Review*, 2 (1924), 658–59, and 3 (1924), 227–28
- Morgan, T. H., et al., *The Mechanism of Mendelian Heredity* (New York: Holt, 1915)
- Mukařovský, Jan, *The Word and Verbal Art: Selected Essays by Mukařovský*, trans. and ed. by John Burbank and Peter Steiner (New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 1977)
- Mustangova, E., 'Put' naibol'shego soprotivleniia', *Zvezda*, 5 (1927), 151–54
- Nietzsche, Friedrich, *The Gay Science*, ed. and trans. by Walter Kaufmann (New York: Vintage Books, 1974)

- Nyrop, Kristoffer, 'Zvuk i ego znachenie', in *Sborniki po teorii poeticheskogo iazyka*, vyp. 1 (Petrograd: OPOIaZ, 1916), pp. 61–71 (trans. by Vl. B. Shklovsky)
- O'Toole, L. M., and Ann Shukman, eds, *Russian Poetics in Translation*, vol. 4: Formalist Theory (Oxford: 1977)
- , *Russian Poetics in Translation*, vol. 5: Formalism: History, Comparison, Genre (Colchester: 1978)
- Panchenko, O. N., ed., 'Iz perepiski Iu. Tynianova i B. Eikhenbauma s V. Shklovskim', *Voprosy literatury*, 12 (1984), 185–218
- Perel'man, Ia., 'Novosti nauchnoi literatury. Prostranstvo i vremia', *Literaturnye zapiski*, 2 (1922), 17
- Pereverzev, V., [review of Eikhenbaum, *Skvoz' literaturu* (1924) and *Lermontov* (1924)], *Kniga i revoliutsiia*, 1 (1925), 269–70
- Platonov, S. F., *Lektsii po russkoi istorii professora S. F. Platonova*, 10th edn (Petrograd: Senatskaia tip., 1917)
- Polianskii, V., 'Po povodu B. Eikhenbauma', *Pechat' i revoliutsiia*, 5 (1924), 35–38
- Polivanov, Evgenii D., 'Po povodu "zvukovykh zhestov" iaponskogo iazyka', in *Sborniki po teorii poeticheskogo iazyka*, vyp. 1 (Petrograd: OPOIaZ, 1916), pp. 29–41
- Potebnia, Aleksandr A., *Estetika i poetika*, ed. by I. Ivan'o and A. Kolodnaia (Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1976)
- , *Iz zapisok po teorii slovesnosti* (Kharkov: tip. Zil'berg, 1905)
- , *Mysl' i iazyk*, 2nd edn (Kharkhov: tip. Adol'fa Darre, 1892)
- Propp, Vladimir Ia., *Morfologiia skazki*, *Voprosy poetiki*: vyp. 12 (Leningrad: Academia, 1927)
- Rivkin, Julie, and Michael Ryan, eds, *Literary Theory: An Anthology* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1998)
- Sakulin, P. N., 'Iz pervoistochnika', *Pechat' i revoliutsiia*, 5 (1924), 12–14
- Shapir, M. I., ed., 'Protokol zasedaniia Moskovskogo Lingvisticheskogo Kruzhka 26 fevralia 1923 g.', *Philologica*, 1 (1994), 191–201
- Shimkevich, *Embrional'nye plasty i teoriia mutatsii* (Moscow: tip. G. Lissnera i D. Sobko, 1910)
- , *Urodstva i proiskhozhdenie vidov* (St Petersburg and Moscow: Vol'f, 1906)
- Shklovsky, Viktor B., 'Andrei Belyi', *Russkii sovremennik*, 2 (1924), 231–45
- , *Gamburgskii schet* (Leningrad: Izd. pisatelei v Leningrade, 1928)
- , *Gamburgskii schet: stat'i — vospominaniia — esse (1914–1933)*, ed. by A. Iu. Galushkin and A. P. Chudakov (Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1990)

- , ‘Gorod nashei iunosti’, in *Iurii Tynianov: pisatel' i uchenyi. Vospominaniia, razmyshleniia, vstrechi*, ed. by V. Kaverin (Moscow: Molodaia gvardiia, 1966), pp. 48–72
- , ‘Iskusstvo kak priem’, in *Sborniki po teorii poeticheskogo iazyka*, vyp. 2 (Petrograd: OPOIaZ, 1917), pp. 3–14
- , *Khod konia: sbornik statei* (Moscow and Berlin: Gelikon, 1923)
- , ‘Lenin kak dekanonizator’, *Lef*, 1 (5) (1924), 53–56
- , *Literatura i kinematograf* (Berlin: Russkoe universal'noe izd., 1923)
- , *Mater'ial i stil' v romane L'va Tolstogo “Voina i mir”* (Moscow: Federatsiia, 1928)
- , *Matvei Komarov: zhitel' goroda Moskvy* (Leningrad: Priboi, 1929)
- , ‘O poezii i zaumnom iazyke’, in *Sborniki po teorii poeticheskogo iazyka*, vyp. 1 (Petrograd: OPOIaZ, 1916), pp. 1–15
- , *O teorii prozy* (Moscow and Leningrad: Krug, 1925)
- , *O teorii prozy*, 2nd edn (Moscow: Federatsiia, 1929)
- , ‘Pamiatnik nauchnoi oshibke (Redaktsiia vtoraia)’, *NLO*, 44 (2000), 154–58 (ed. by Aleksandr Galushkin)
- , ‘Pis'mo Romanu Iakobsonu’, *Knizhnyi ugol*, 8 (1922), 23–24
- , ‘Plan dlia priblizitel'nogo podsчета’, *Zhizn' iskusstva*, 226 (27 Aug. 1919), 1
- , ‘Potebniia’, in *Poetika. Sborniki po teorii poeticheskogo iazyka* (Petrograd: Gos. tip., 1919), pp. 3–6
- , ‘Prostranstvo v iskusstve i suprematisty’, *Zhizn' iskusstva*, 196 (July 1919), 2, and 197 (24 July 1919), 2
- , *Razvertyvanie siuzheta* (Petrograd: OPOIaZ, 1921)
- , ‘Roman tain’, *Lef*, 4 (1924), 125–42
- , *Rozanov: iz knigi “Siuzhet, kak iavlenie stil'ia”* (Petrograd: OPOIaZ, 1921)
- , *Sentimental'noe putesthestvie. Vospominaniia, 1917–1922* (Moscow and Berlin: Gelikon, 1923)
- , *A Sentimental Journey: Memoirs, 1917–1922*, trans. by Richard Sheldon (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1970)
- , ‘Serapionovy brat'ia’, *Knizhnyi ugol*, 7 (1921), 18–21
- , ‘Sovremenniki i sinkhronisty’, *Russkii sovremennik*, 3 (1924), 232–37
- , *Sur la théorie de la prose*, trans. by Guy Verret (Lausanne: L'Âge d'Homme, 1973)
- , ‘Sviaz' priemov siuzhetoslozheniia s obshchimi priemami stil'ia’, in *Poetika. Sborniki po teorii poeticheskogo iazyka* (Petrograd: Gos. tip., 1919), pp. 113–50

- , 'Tekhnika nekrasovskogo stikha', *Zhizn' iskusstva*, 184 (9 July 1919), 2, and 185 (10 July 1919), 2
- , *Una teoria della prosa*, trans. by Maria Olsoufieva (Bari: De Donato, 1966)
- , *Theorie der Prosa*, trans. by Gisela Drohla (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1966)
- , *Theory of Prose*, trans. by Benjamin Sher (Elmwood Park, IL: Dalkey Archive Press, 1998)
- , *Third Factory*, trans. by Richard Sheldon (London: Dalkey Archive Press, 2002)
- , 'Toska ostrovitian', *Peterburg: Dvukhnedel'nyi literaturno-populiarno-nauchnyi illiustrirovannyi zhurnal*, 2 (1922), 15–16
- , *Tret'ia fabrika* (Moscow: Krug, 1926)
- , 'Tristram Shendi' *Sterna i teoriia romana* (Petrograd: OPOIaZ, 1921)
- , *Voskreshenie slova* (St Petersburg: tip. Sokolinskogo, 1914)
- , *Zhili-byli: vospominaniia, memuarnye zapisi, povesti o vremeni* (Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1964)
- , *Zoo, ili pis'ma ne o liubvi* (Berlin: Gelikon, 1923)
- Shklovsky, Vladimir B., 'Ot literaturnogo pis'ma k fel'etonu', *Knizhnyi ugol*, 8 (1922), 25–28
- , 'O ritmiko-melodicheskikh opytakh professora Siversa', in *Sborniki po teorii poeticheskogo iazyka*, 2 (Petrograd: OPOIaZ, 1917), pp. 87–94
- Sillov, V., [review of Eikhenbaum, *Skvoz' literaturu* (1924)], *Lef*, 2 (6) (1924), 157
- Slonimskii, A. L., *Tekhnika komicheskogo u Gogolia*, *Voprosy poetiki*: vyp. 1 (Petrograd: Academia, 1923)
- Slonimskii, Mikhail, 'S. A. Vengerov', *Dom iskusstv*, 1 (1921), 64–66
- Smirnov, A. A., 'Puti i zadachi nauki o literature', *Literaturnaia mysl'*, 2 (1923), 91–109
- Spencer, Herbert, *The Philosophy of Style* (Boston, MA, and Chicago, IL: Allyn and Bacon, 1895)
- Stempel, Wolf-Dieter, ed., *Texte der russischen Formalisten*, Band II: *Texte zur Theorie des Verses und der poetischen Sprache* (Munich: Fink, 1972)
- Striedter, Jurij, ed., *Texte der russischen Formalisten*, Band I: *Zur allgemeinen Literaturtheorie und zur Theorie der Prosa* (Munich: Fink, 1969)
- Todorov, Tzvetan, ed., *Théorie de la littérature*, trans. by Tzvetan Todorov (Paris: Seuil, 1965)
- Tomashevskii, Boris V., 'Formal'nyi metod. (Vmesto nekrologa)', in *Sovremennaia literatura. Sbornik statei* (Leningrad: Mysl', 1925), 144–53
- , 'Konstruktsiia tezisov', *Lef*, 1 (5) (1924), 140–48

- , 'La nouvelle école d'histoire littéraire en Russie', *Revue des études slaves*, 8 (1928), 226–40
- , *O stikhe. Stat'i* (Leningrad: Priboi, 1929)
- , [review of Istrin, *Ocherki istorii drevnerusskoi literatury domoskovskogo perioda* (1922)], *Kniga i revoliutsiia*, 4 (1923), 48–50 (signed 'Borskii')
- , [review of Tynianov, *Dostoevskii i Gogol'* (1921)], *Kniga i revoliutsiia*, 1 (1921), 66 (signed 'T. B.')
- , [review of Tynianov, *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka* (1924)], *Russkii sovremennik*, 3 (1924), 265–68
- , *Russkoe stikhoslozhenie. Metrika, Voprosy poetiki*: vyp. 2 (Petrograd: Academia, 1923)
- , *Teoriia literatury. Poetika*, 4th edn (Moscow–Leningrad: Gos izd., 1928)
- Trotsky, L. D., 'Formal'naia shkola poezii i marksizm', *Pravda*, 166 (26 July 1923), 2–4
- , *Literatura i revoliutsiia* (Moscow: Politizdat, 1991)
- Tseitlin, A., 'Marksisty i "formal'nyi metod"', *Lef*, 1 (1923), 114–31
- Tynianov, Iurii N., *Arkhaisty i novatory* (Leningrad: Priboi, 1929)
- , 'Arkhaisty i Pushkin', in *Pushkin v mirovoi literature: sbornik statei* (Leningrad: Gos. izd., 1926), pp. 215–86
- , *Avanguardia e tradizione*, trans. by Sergio Leone (Bari: Dedalo, 1968)
- , 'Avtobiografiia', in *Iurii Tynianov: pisatel' i uchenyi. Vospominaniia, razmyshleniia, vstrechi*, ed. by V. Kaverin (Moscow: Molodaia gvardiia, 1966), pp. 9–20
- , 'Blok', in *Ob Aleksandre Bloke* (Petersburg: Kartonnyi domik, 1921), pp. 237–64
- , *Dostoevskii i Gogol': k teorii parodii* (Petrograd: OPOIaZ, 1921)
- , 'Illiustratsii', *Kniga i revoliutsiia*, 4 (1923), 15–19
- , 'Iurii Tynianov', in *Kak my pishem* (Leningrad: Izd. pisatelei v Leningrade, 1930), pp. 158–68
- , *Kiukhlia: povest' o dekabriste* (Leningrad: Kubuch, 1925)
- , *Literaturnaia evoliutsiia: izbrannye trudy*, ed. by Vladimir Novikov (Moscow: Agraf, 2002)
- , 'Literaturnoe segodnia', *Russkii sovremennik*, 1 (1924), 292–306
- , 'Oda kak oratorskii zhanr', *Poetika. Vremennik otдела slovesnykh iskusstv GIII*, 3 (1927), 102–28
- , 'The Ode as an Oratorical Genre', *New Literary History*, 34 (2003), 565–96 (trans. by Ann Shukman)

- , 'O Khlebnikove', in *Sobranie proizvedenii Velimira Khlebnikova*, 5 vols, ed. by Iu. Tynianov and N. Stepanov (Leningrad: Izd. pisatelei, 1928–33), vol. 1 (1928), pp. 17–30
- , 'O literaturnom fakte', *Lef*, 2 (6) (1924), 101–16
- , 'O slonenke', *Peterburg: Dvukhnedel'nyi literaturno-populiarno-nauchnyi illiustrirovannyi zhurnal*, 1 (1921), 20–21 (signed 'G. Montelius')
- , *Poetika. Istoriia literatury. Kino*, ed. by A. P. Chudakov, M. O. Chudakova, and E. A. Toddes (Moscow: Nauka, 1977)
- , 'Predislovie', in *Dnevnik V. K. Kiukhel'bekera: Materialy k istorii russkoi literaturnoi i obshchestvennoi zhizni 10–40 godov XIX veka*, ed. by V. N. Orlov and S. I. Khmel'nitskii (Leningrad: Priboi, 1929), pp. 3–6
- , *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka*, Voprosy poetiki: vyp. 5 (Leningrad: Academia, 1924)
- , *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka: stat'i* (Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1965)
- , *The Problem of Verse Language*, ed. and trans. by Michael Sosa and Brent Harvey (Ann Arbor, MI: Ardis, 1981)
- , 'Promezhutok', *Russkii sovremennik*, 4 (1924), 209–21
- , *Pushkin i ego sovremenniki*, ed. by A. L. Grushunin and A. P. Chudakov (Moscow: Nauka, 1969)
- , 'Pushkin i Tiutchev', *Poetika. Vremennik otdela slovesnykh iskusstv GIII*, 1 (1926), 107–26
- , [review of *Literaturnaia mysl'*, 2 (1923)], *Kniga i revoliutsiia*, 3 (1923), 71–72 (signed 'Iu. T.')
- , [review of Rainov, *Aleksandr Afanas'evich Potebnia* (1924)], *Russkii sovremennik*, 1 (1924), 324 (signed 'Iu. T.')
- , 'Slovar' Lenina-polemista', *Lef*, 1 (5) (1924), 81–110
- , *Smert' Vazir-Mukhtara*, 2nd edn (Leningrad: Priboi, 1929)
- , *Sochineniia v trekh tomakh*, ed. by B. O. Kostelianets (Moscow and Leningrad: Gos. izd. khudozhestvennoi literatury, 1959)
- , 'Stikhovye formy Nekrasova', *Letopis' Doma literatorov*, 4 (1921), 3–4
- , 'Tiutchev i Geine', *Kniga i revoliutsiia*, 4 (1922), 13–16
- , 'Valerii Briusov', *Atenei. Istoriko-literaturnyi vremennik*, 3 (1926), 58–75
- , 'Vopros o literaturnoi evoliutsii', *Na literaturnom postu*, 10 (1927), 42–48
- , 'Vopros o Tiutcheve', *Kniga i revoliutsiia*, 3 (1923), 24–30
- , 'Zapiski o zapadnoi literature', *Knizhnyi ugol*, 7 (1921), 31–36, and 8 (1922), 41–47 (signed 'Iu. Van-Vezen')
- , 'Zhurnal, kritik, chitatel' i pisatel', *Zhizn' iskusstva*, 22 (1924), 14–15 (signed 'Iu. Van-Vezen')

- Ushakin, S. A., ed., *Formal'nyi metod: antologiiia russkogo modernizma* (Ekaterinburg and Moscow: forthcoming)
- Ustinov, D., ed., 'Materialy disputa "Marksizm i formal'nyi metod" 6 marta 1927 g.', *NLO*, 50 (2001), 247–78
- Vendryes, J., *Le Langage: introduction linguistique à l'histoire* (Paris: Renaissance du livre, 1921)
- Veselovskii, A. N., *Istoricheskaia poetika* (Leningrad: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1940)
- Vinokur, Grigorii O., *Filologicheskie issledovaniia: Lingvistika i poetika*, ed. by T. G. Vinokur and M. I. Shapir (Moscow: Nauka, 1990)
- , 'Futuristy — stroiteli iazyka', *Lef*, 1 (1923), 204–13
- , 'Igra v nauku', *Lef*, 2 (1923), 158–59
- , 'Moskovskii lingvisticheskii kruzhok', *Nauchnye izvestiia (akademicheskogo tsentra Narkomprosa)*, 2: Filosofiiia, literatura, iskusstvo (Moscow: Gos. izd., 1922), 289–90
- , 'Novaia literatura po poetike', *Lef*, 1 (1923), 239–43
- , 'O revoliutsionnoi frazeologii (odin iz voprosov iazykovoi politiki)', *Lef*, 2 (1923), 104–18
- , 'Poetika. Lingvistika. Sotsiologiiia (metodologicheskaia spravka)', *Lef*, 3 (1923), 104–13
- , 'Poeziiia i nauka', in *Chet i nechet. Al'manakh poezii i kritiki* (Moscow: avtorsk. izd., 1925), 21–31
- , [review of Eikhenbaum, *Skvoz' literaturu* (1924)], *Russkii sovremennik*, 2 (1924), 293–94
- , [review of Tynianov, *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka* (1924)], *Pechat' i revoliutsiia*, 4 (1924), 269–71
- Voloshinov, Valentin N., *Freidizm, Bakhtin pod maskoi: vyp. 1* (Moscow: Labirint, 1993)
- , *Marksizm i filosofiiia iazyka, Bakhtin pod maskoi: vyp. 3* (Moscow: Labirint, 1993)
- , *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, trans. by Ladislav Matejka and I. R. Titunik (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986)
- , 'Slovo v zhizni i slovo v poezii', *Zvezda*, 6 (1926), 244–67
- Wundt, Wilhelm, *Völkerpsychologie, Band 1: Die Sprache* (Leipzig: Engelmann, 1900)
- Zhirmunskaiia, N. A., and E. A. Toddes, eds, 'Perepiska B. M. Eikhenbauma i V. M. Zhirmunskogo', in *Tynianovskii sbornik*, vyp. 3: Tret'i Tynianovskie chteniia (Riga: Zinatne, 1988), pp. 256–329

- Zhirmunskii, Viktor M., 'Formprobleme in der russischen Literaturwissenschaft', *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie*, 1 (1925), 117–52
- , *Kompozitsiia liricheskikh stikhotvorenii* (Petrograd: OPOIaZ, 1921)
- , [review of Jakobson, *Noveishaia russkaia poeziia* (1921)], *Nachala*, 1 (1921), 213–15
- , [review of Shklovsky, *Rozanov* (1921)], *Nachala*, 1 (1921), 215–19
- , *Rifma, ee istoriia i teoriia*, *Voprosy poetiki*: vyp. 3 (Petrograd: Academia, 1923)
- , *Valerii Briusov i nasledie Pushkina: opyt sravnitel'no-stilisticheskogo issledovaniia* (Petrograd: El'zevir, 1922)
- , *Voprosy teorii literatury: stat'i 1916–1926* (Leningrad: Academia, 1928)
- , *Vvedenie v metriku*, *Voprosy poetiki*: vyp. 6 (Leningrad: Academia, 1925)
- , 'Zadachi poetiki', *Nachala*, 1 (1921), 51–81
- , 'Zadachi poetiki', *Zhizn' iskusstva*, 313 (9 Dec. 1919), 314 (10 Dec. 1919), 315 (11 Dec. 1919), 316 (12 Dec. 1919), 316–17 (13–14 Dec. 1919)
- Zhits, Fedor, [review of Eikhenbaum, *Skvoz' literaturu* (1924)], *Krasnaia nov'*, 5 (1924), 327–29
- , [review of Shklovsky, *O teorii prozy* (1925)], *Krasnaia nov'*, 1 (1926), 267–69
- Zil'ber, L. A., *Paraimmunitet* (Moscow: 1928)
- , 'Studencheskie gody. Peterburgskii i Moskovskii universitety. (Iz vospominanii L. A. Zil'bera)', in L. L. Kiselev and E. S. Levina, *Lev Aleksandrovich Zil'ber (1894–1966): zhizn' v nauke* (Moscow: Nauka, 2004), pp. 40–64
- , 'Studenty. (Iz vospominanii)', *Priroda*, 3 (1984), 82–87
- Zubov, Vladimir P., *Stradnye gody Rossii: vospominaniia o revoliutsii, 1917–1925*, ed. by T. D. Ismagulova (Moscow: Indrik, 2004)

**

Secondary Literature

- Adams, Mark B., 'The Founding of Population Genetics: Contributions of the Chetverikov School, 1924–1934', *Journal of the History of Biology*, 1 (1968), 23–39
- Adorno, T. W., 'The Essay as Form', *New German Critique*, 32 (1984), 151–71 (trans. by Bob Hullot-Kentor and Frederic Will)

- Akimova, M. V., 'B. I. Iarkho v polemike s tynianovskoi kontseptsiei stikhotvornogo iazyka', *Philologica*, 7 (2001/2002), 207–25
- Alexandrov, Daniel, and Elena Aronova, 'Russian Theoretical Biology between Heresy and Orthodoxy: Georgii Shaposhnikov and His Experiments on Plant Lice', in *Darwinian Heresies*, ed. by Abigail Lustig, Robert J. Richards, and Michael Ruse (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), pp. 14–47
- Any, Carol, *Boris Eikhenbaum: Voices of a Russian Formalist* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1994)
- Apter, Emily, 'Comparative Exile: Competing Margins in the History of Comparative Literature', in *Comparative Literature in the Age of Multiculturalism*, ed. by Charles Bernheimer (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995), pp. 81–96
- Archaimbault, Sylvie, 'Aperception et dialogue chez Lev Jakubinskij (1892–1945)', *Revue d'Histoire des Sciences*, 21 (2009), 69–82
- Archaimbault, Sylvie, and Sergueï Tchougounnikov, eds, *Evgenij Polivanov: penser le langage au temps de Staline* (Paris: Institut d'Études slaves, 2013)
- Belinkov, A. V., *Iurii Tynianov* (Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1965)
- Bennett, Tony, *Formalism and Marxism* (New York: Methuen, 1979)
- Bérard-Zarzycka, Ewa, 'La genèse des travaux sur le *literaturnyj byt* d'après le *Journal d'Ejxenbaum*', *Revue des études slaves*, 57 (1985), 83–89
- Berezhnaia, E. P., 'Evgenii Onegin v literaturovedcheskoj kontseptsii Iu. N. Tynianova' (unpublished candidate thesis, Novosibirsk State University, 2007)
- , 'K poetike nauchnogo teksta Iu. Tynianova', *Kritika i semiotika*, 1 (2014), 149–68
- , 'K tynianovskoi kontseptsii "geroia"', *Kritika i semiotika*, 14 (2010), 263–75
- , 'Oneginskii sloi v knige Iu. N. Tynianova "Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka"', *Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta*, 4 (2009), 152–55
- Berlin, Isaiah, 'History and Theory: The Concept of Scientific History', *History and Theory*, 1 (1960), 1–31
- Bliumbaum, Arkadii, *Konstruktsiia mnimosti. K poetike 'Voskovoi persony' Iu. Tynianova* (St Petersburg: Giperion, 2002)
- Borislavov, Rad, 'Revolution is Evolution: Evolution as a Trope in Šklovskij's Literary History', *Russian Literature*, 69 (2011), 209–38
- , 'Viktor Shklovskii — Between Art and Life' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Chicago, 2011)

- Bourdieu, Pierre, *Homo Academicus*, trans. by Peter Collier (Cambridge: Polity, 1988)
- Bowie, Andrew, *From Romanticism to Critical Theory: The Philosophy of German Literary Theory* (London: Routledge, 1997)
- Boym, Svetlana, *Death in Quotation Marks: Cultural Myths of the Modern Poet* (Cambridge, MA, and London: Harvard University Press, 1991)
- , ‘Estrangement as a Lifestyle: Shklovsky and Brodsky’, *Poetics Today*, 17 (1996), 511–30
- , ‘Poetics and Politics of Estrangement: Victor Shklovsky and Hannah Arendt’, *Poetics Today*, 26 (2005), 581–611
- Brachev, B. S., and A. Iu. Dvornichenko, *Kafedra russkoi istorii Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta, 1834–2004* (St Petersburg: Izd. Sankt-Peterburgskogo Universiteta, 2004)
- Brandist, Craig, *The Bakhtin Circle: Philosophy, Culture and Politics* (London: Pluto, 2002)
- , ‘The Origins of Soviet Sociolinguistics’, *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7 (2003), 213–31
- , ‘The Rise of Soviet Sociolinguistics from the Ashes of Völkerpsychologie’, *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, 42 (2006), 261–77
- Brandist, Craig, and Katya Chown, eds, *Politics and the Theory of Language in the USSR, 1917–1938: The Birth of Sociological Linguistics* (London: Anthem Press, 2011)
- Brandist, Craig, David Shepherd, and Galin Tihanov, eds, *The Bakhtin Circle: In the Master’s Absence* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2004)
- Breschinsky, Zinaida A., and Dimitri N. Breschinsky, ‘Jurij Tynjanov between *Kjuxlja* and *Puškin*: The Making of a Novelist’, *Slavic and East European Journal*, 26 (1982), 287–301
- , ‘On Tynjanov the Writer and His Use of Cinematic Technique in *The Death of the Wazir Mukhtar*’, *Slavic and East European Journal*, 29 (1985), 1–17
- Brintlinger, Angela, *Writing a Usable Past: Russian Literary Culture, 1917–1937* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2000)
- Buchanan, Ian, *A Dictionary of Critical Theory* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010)
- Bulatova, Asiya, ‘“I’m Writing to You in this Magazine”: The Mechanics of Modernist Dissemination in Shklovsky’s Open Letter to Jakobson’, *Comparative Critical Studies*, 11 (2014), 185–202
- , ‘Neumestnyi modernizm Viktora Shklovskogo: “Pis'ma ne o liubvi” i granitsy literatury’, *NLO*, 133 (2015), 182–96

- Byford, Andy, *Literary Scholarship in Late Imperial Russia: Rituals of Academic Institutionalization* (London: Legenda, 2007)
- Cassedy, Steven, *Flight from Eden. The Origins of Modern Literary Criticism and Theory* (Berkeley, CA, and Oxford: University of California Press, 1990)
- Chudakov, A. P., 'V. V. Vinogradov i teoriia khudozhestvennoi rechi pervoi treti XX veka', in V. V. Vinogradov, *Izbrannye trudy: O iazyke khudozhestvennoi prozy*, ed. by E. V. Dushechkina et al. (Moscow: Nauka, 1980), pp. 285–315
- Chudakova, M. O., *Izbrannye raboty*, vol. 1: Literatura sovetskogo proshlogo (Moscow: Iazyki russkoi kul'tury, 2001)
- , 'K poniatiu genezisa', *Revue des études slaves*, 55 (1983), 409–18
- , 'Sotsial'naia praktika, filologicheskaiia refleksii i literatura v nauchnoi biografii Eikhenbauma i Tynianova', in *Tynianovskii sbornik*, vyp. 2: Vtorye Tynianovskie chteniia (Riga: Zinatne, 1986), pp. 103–31
- , 'Utopiia Tynianova-kritika', in *Tynianovskii sbornik*, vyp. 10: Shestye, sed'mye, vos'mye Tynianovskie chteniia (Moscow: 1998), pp. 388–405
- Chudakova, M. O., and E. A. Toddes, 'Pervyi russkii perevod "Kursa obshchei lingvistiki" F. de Sossiura i deiatel'nost' Moskovskogo lingvisticheskogo kruzhka. (Materialy k izucheniiu bytovaniia nauchnoi knigi v 1920-e gody)', *Fedorovskie chteniia 1978* (Moscow: Nauka, 1981), pp. 238–40
- , 'Tynianov v vospominaniakh sovremennika', in *Tynianovskii sbornik*, vyp. 1: Pervye Tynianovskie chteniia (Riga: Zinatne, 1984), pp. 78–104
- Chudakova, M. O., and V. N. Sazhin, 'Arkhivnyi dokument v rabote Tynianova i problema sokhraneniia i izucheniiia arkhivov', in *Tynianovskii sbornik*, vyp. 2: Vtorye Tynianovskie chteniia (Riga: Zinatne, 1986), pp. 141–56
- Clark, Katerina, *The Soviet Novel: History as Ritual* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1981)
- Cohen, I. Bernard, *Revolutions in Science* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985)
- Cohen, Ralph, 'Genre Theory, Literary History and Historical Change', *Theoretical Issues in Literary History*, ed. by David Perkins (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991), pp. 85–113
- Compagnon, Antoine, *La Troisième République des lettres, de Flaubert à Proust* (Paris: Seuil, 1983)
- Crawford, Lawrence, 'Viktor Shklovskij: Différance in Defamiliarization', *Comparative Literature*, 36 (1984), 209–19
- Curtis, James M., 'Bergson and Russian Formalism', *Comparative Literature*, 28 (1976), 109–121
- Curtis, J. A. E., *The Englishman from Lebedian': A Life of Evgeny Zamiatin (1884–1937)* (Boston, MA: Academic Studies Press, 2013)

- Daly, Robert, 'Metaphors of Genre Inequality in Iurii Tynianov's "The Literary Fact"', *MHRA Working Papers in the Humanities*, 8 (2013), 10–18
- Davydov, Sergej, and Peter Steiner, 'The Biological Metaphor in Russian Formalism: The Concept of Morphology', *SubStance*, 6/7 (1977), 149–58
- Dawkins, Richard, 'Universal Darwinism', in *The Philosophy of Biology*, ed. by David L. Hull and Michael Ruse (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. 15–35
- Depretto, Catherine, 'La destinée de l'œuvre de Ju. N. Tynjanov', *Revue des études slaves*, 55 (1983), 405–08
- , *Le Formalisme en Russie* (Paris: Institut d'Études Slaves, 2009)
- Derrida, Jacques, 'The Law of Genre', *Critical Inquiry*, 7 (1980), 55–81 (trans. by Avital Ronell)
- Dmitriev, Aleksandr, 'Le contexte européen (Français et Allemand) du formalisme russe', *Cahiers du monde russe*, 43 (2002), 423–40
- Dmitriev, Aleksandr, and Jan Levchenko, 'Nauka kak priem: eshche raz o metodologicheskom nasledii russkikh formalistov', *NLO*, 50 (2001), 195–245
- Dmitrieva, Ekaterina, Michel Espagne, and Valerii Zemskov, eds, *Evropeiskii kontekst russkogo formalizma: K probleme esteticheskikh peresechenii. Frantsiia, Germaniia, Italiia, Rossiia* (Moscow: IMLI RAN, 2009)
- Dobrenko, Evgeny, and Galin Tihanov, eds, *A History of Russian Literary Theory and Criticism: The Soviet Age and Beyond* (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2011)
- Dobzhansky, Theodosius, 'The Birth of the Genetic Theory of Evolution in the Soviet Union in the 1920s', in *The Evolutionary Synthesis: Perspectives on the Unification of Biology*, ed. by Ernst Mayr and William B. Provine (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980), pp. 229–41
- Dubin, B. V., and L. D. Gudkov, 'Poniatie literatury u Tynianova i ideologii literatury v Rossii', in *Tynianovskii sbornik*, vyp. 2: Vtorye Tynianovskie chteniia (Riga: Zinatne, 1986), pp. 208–26
- , 'Soznanie istorichnosti i poiski teorii: issledovatel'skaia problematika Tynianova v perspektive sotsiologii literatury', in *Tynianovskii sbornik*, vyp. 1: Pervye Tynianovskie chteniia (Riga: Zinatne, 1984), pp. 113–23
- Duff, David, 'Maximal Tensions and Minimal Conditions: Tynianov as a Genre Theorist', *New Literary History*, 34 (2003), 553–63
- Duff, David, ed., *Modern Genre Theory* (Harlow: Pearson Education, 2000)
- Eagleton, Terry, *Literary Theory: An Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1983)
- Earman, John, *World Enough and Space-Time: Absolute versus Relational Theories of Space and Time* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1989)

- Ehlers, Klaas-Hinrich, *Das dynamische System. Zur Entwicklung von Begriff und Metaphorik des Systems bei Jurij N. Tynjanov* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1992)
- Eisen, Samuel D., 'Politics, Poetics, and Profession: Viktor Shklovskii, Boris Eikhenbaum and the Understanding of Literature (1919–1936)' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Stanford University, 1994)
- , 'Whose Lenin is it Anyway? Viktor Shklovsky, Boris Eikhenbaum and the Formalist-Marxist Debate in Soviet Cultural Politics (A View from the Twenties)', *The Russian Review*, 55 (1996), 65–79
- Emerson, Caryl, 'Bakhtin, Lotman, Vygotsky, and Lydia Ginzburg on Types of Selves: A Tribute', in *Self and Story in Russian History*, ed. by Laura Engelstein and Stephanie Sandler (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000), pp. 20–45
- , 'Shklovsky's *ostranenie*, Bakhtin's *vnenakhodimost'* (How Distance Serves an Aesthetics of Arousal Differently from an Aesthetics Based on Pain)', *Poetics Today*, 26 (2005), 637–64
- Emerson, Caryl, and Gary Saul Morson, *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a Prosaics* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1990)
- Erlich, Victor, 'On Being Fair to Viktor Shklovsky or the Act of Hedged Surrender', *Slavic Review*, 35 (1976), 111–18
- , *Russian Formalism: History – Doctrine*, 4th edn (The Hague and New York: Mouton, 1981)
- Etkind, Efim, '"Veselyi primer Geine" (Geine – Tynianov – Maiakovskii)', *Revue des études slaves*, 55 (1983), 457–81
- Feyerabend, Paul, *Against Method: Outline of an Anarchistic Theory of Knowledge* (London: Verso, 1978)
- Finer, Emily, *Turning into Sterne: Viktor Shklovskii and Literary Reception* (Leeds: Legenda, 2010)
- Finkel, Stuart, *On the Ideological Front: The Russian Intelligentsia and the Making of the Soviet Public Sphere* (New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 2007)
- Fishelov, David, *Metaphors of Genre: The Role of Analogies in Genre Theory* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1993)
- Fizer, John, *Aleksandr A. Potebnja's Psycholinguistic Theory of Literature* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986)
- Flack, Patrick, 'Le formalisme russe entre ferment néo-kantien et linguistique structurale', in *L'arrière-plan linguistique du formalisme russe*, ed. by Sylvie Archambault and Sergeï Tchougounnikov (Paris: forthcoming)
- Friedman, Michael, *Kant and the Exact Sciences* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992)

- Frow, John, *Marxism and Literary History* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986)
- Gasparov, Boris, 'Development or Rebuilding: Views of Academician T. D. Lysenko in the Context of the Avant-Garde', in *Laboratory of Dreams: The Russian Avant-Garde and Cultural Experiment*, ed. by John E. Bowlt and Olga Matich (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1996), pp. 133–50
- Gasparov, M. L., 'Nauchnost' i khudozhestvennost' v tvorchestve Tynianova', in *Tynianovskii sbornik*, vyp. 5: Chetvertye Tynianovskie chteniia (Riga: 1990), pp. 12–20
- , 'Pervochtenie i perechtenie: k tynianovskomu ponimaniuu suksessivnosti stikhotvornoï rechi', in *Tynianovskii sbornik*, vyp. 2: Vtorye Tynianovskie chteniia (Riga: Zinatne, 1986), pp. 15–23
- , 'Tynianov i problema semantiki metra', in *Tynianovskii sbornik*, vyp. 1: Pervye Tynianovskie chteniia (Riga: Zinatne, 1984), pp. 105–112
- Gerigk, Horst-Jürgen, 'Wer ist Broder Christiansen? Drei Schlüsselbegriffe seiner *Philosophie der Kunst*', in *Figurationen der literarischen Moderne*, ed. by Carsten Dutt and Roman Luckscheiter (Heidelberg: Winter, 2007), pp. 85–106
- Gindin, S. I., 'Pervyi konflikt dvukh pokolenii osnovatelei russkogo stikhovedeniia', *NLO*, 86 (2007), 64–69
- Glanc, Tomáš, 'The Russian Formalists as a Community', in *Theoretical Schools and Circles in the Twentieth-Century Humanities. Literary Theory, History, Philosophy*, ed. by Marina Grishakova and Silvi Salupere (New York and London: Routledge, 2015), pp. 1–22
- Glare, P. G. W., ed., *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1982)
- Gorman, David, 'Bibliography of Russian Formalism in English', *Style*, 26 (1992), 554–76
- , 'Supplement to a Bibliography of Russian Formalism in English', *Style*, 29 (1995), 562–64
- Graham, Loren R., *Science in Russia and the Soviet Union: A Short History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993)
- Gudkov, L. D., 'Poniatie i metafory istorii u opoiazovtsev', in *Tynianovskii sbornik*, vyp. 3: Tret'i Tynianovskie chteniia (Riga: Zinatne, 1988), pp. 91–108
- , 'Sotsial'nye mekhanizmy dinamiki literaturnoi kul'tury', in *Tynianovskii sbornik*, vyp. 5: Chetvertye Tynianovskie chteniia (Riga: 1990), pp. 120–32
- Hansen-Löve, Aage A., '"Bytologiya" mezhdû faktami i funktsiiami', *Revue des études slaves*, 57 (1985), 91–103

- , *Der russische Formalismus: Methodologische Rekonstruktion seiner Entwicklung aus dem Prinzip der Verfremdung* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1978)
- Heil, Jerry Tyrone, 'The Russian Literary Avant-Garde and the Cinema (1920s and 1930s): The Film-Work of Isaak Babel' and Jurij Tynjanov' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of California, Berkeley, 1984)
- Hickey, Martha, *The Writer in Petrograd and the House of Arts* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2009)
- Hoeges, Dirk, *Literatur und Evolution. Studien zur französischen Literaturkritik im 19. Jahrhundert. Taine – Brunetière – Hennequin – Guyau* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1980)
- Iampol'skii, Mikhail, 'Istoriia kul'tury kak istoriia dukha i estestvennaia istoriia', *NLO*, 59 (2003), 22–89
- , 'Maska i metamorfozy zreniia (Zametki na poliakh "Voskovoi persony")', in *Tynianovskii sbornik*, vyp. 8: Piatye Tynianovskie chteniia (Riga: 1994), pp. 40–99
- , 'Razlichie, ili Po tu storonu predmetnosti (Estetika Geine v teorii Tynianova)', *NLO*, 80 (2006), 30–53
- Ivanov, Viach. Vs., 'K zhanrovoi predystorii preni i sporov', in *Tynianovskii sbornik*, vyp. 8: Piatye Tynianovskie chteniia (Riga: 1994), pp. 8–21
- , 'Ob evoliutsionnom podkhode k kul'ture', in *Tynianovskii sbornik*, vyp. 2: Vtorye Tynianovskie chteniia (Riga: Zinatne, 1986), pp. 173–80
- , *Ocherki po istorii semiotiki v SSSR* (Moscow: Nauka, 1976)
- Jackson, Robert Louis, and Stephen Rudy, eds, *Russian Formalism: A Retrospective Glance. A Festschrift in Honor of Victor Erlich* (New Haven, CT: Yale Center for International and Area Studies, 1985)
- Jameson, Fredric, *The Prison-House of Language: A Critical Study of Russian Formalism and French Structuralism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1972)
- Jefferson, Ann, 'Literariness, Dominance, and Violence in Formalist Aesthetics', in *Literary Theory Today*, ed. by Peter Collier and Helga Geyer-Ryan (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1990), pp. 125–41
- , 'Russian Formalism', in *Modern Literary Theory: A Comparative Introduction*, ed. by Ann Jefferson and David Robey (London: Batsford Academic, 1982)
- Joravsky, David, *Soviet Marxism and Natural Science* (London: Routledge, 1961)
- Joseph, Larry Philip, 'From Literary Theory to Fiction: An Interpretive Biography of Yury Tynyanov in the 1920s' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Stanford University, 1994)
- Josephson, Paul R., *Physics and Politics in Revolutionary Russia* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1991)

- Kalinin, Ilya, 'Istoriia kak iskusstvo chlenorazdel'nosti (istoricheskii opyt i metaliteraturnaia praktika russkikh formalistov)', *NLO*, 71 (2005), 103–31
- , 'Istoriia literatury kak *Familienroman* (russkii formalizm mezhdru Edipom i Gamletom)', *NLO*, 80 (2006), 64–84
- , 'Istoriia literatury: mezhdru parodiei i dramoi. K voprosu o metaistorii russkogo formalizma', *NLO*, 50 (2001), 287–95
- , 'Priem ostraneniia kak opyt vozvyshennogo (ot poetiki pamiaty k poetike literatury)', *NLO*, 95 (2009), 39–57
- Karcz, Andrzej, *The Polish Formalist School and Russian Formalism* (New York: University of Rochester Press, 2002)
- Khmel'nitskaia, Tamara, 'Emkost' slova', in *Vospominaniia o Iu. Tynianove*, ed. by V. Kaverin (Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1983), pp. 121–37
- , *Golosa vremeni. Stat'i o sovremennoi sovetskoi i zarubezhnoi literature* (Moscow and Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel', 1963)
- Kolchinsky, Eduard I., 'Darwin's Jubilees in Russia', in *The Literary and Cultural Reception of Charles Darwin in Europe*, ed. by Thomas F. Glick and Elinor Shaffer (London and New York: Bloomsbury, 2014), pp. 288–315
- Kornienko, Natalia, 'Literary Criticism and Cultural Policy During the New Economic Policy, 1921–1927', in *A History of Russian Literary Theory and Criticism: The Soviet Age and Beyond*, ed. by Evgeny Dobrenko and Galin Tihanov (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2011), pp. 17–42
- Korpan, Barbara D., 'Jurij Tynjanov and Cleanth Brooks: A Comparative Study in Russian Formalism and Anglo-American New Criticism' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Indiana University, 1970)
- , 'Literary Evolution as Style: The "Intrinsic Historicity" of Northrop Frye and Yuri Tynianov', *Pacific Coast Philology*, 2 (1967), 47–52
- Kozlov, S. L., 'Literaturnaia evoliutsiia i literaturnaia revoliutsiia: k istorii idei', in *Tynianovskii sbornik*, vyp. 5: Chetvertye Tynianovskie chteniia (Riga: 1990), pp. 112–19
- Krementsov, Nikolai, *Stalinist Science* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997)
- Krusanov, A. V., *Russkii avangard: 1907–1932 (Istoricheskii obzor)*, 2 vols (Moscow: NLO, 2003)
- Kuhn, Thomas, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 2nd edn (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1970)
- Kujundžić, Dragan, 'Parodiia kak povtornaia pererabotka (literaturnoi) istorii', *NLO*, 80 (2006), 84–90 (trans. by Evgeniia Kanishcheva)
- , *The Returns of History: Russian Nietzscheans After Modernity* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997)

- Kurganov, Efim, *Arzamas i OPOIaZ* (St Petersburg: Zvezda, 1998)
- Lacoue-Labarthe, Philippe, and Jean-Luc Nancy, *The Literary Absolute: The Theory of Literature in German Romanticism*, trans. by Philip Barnard and Cheryl Lester (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1988)
- Lanne, Jean-Claude, 'Les principes de la critique littéraire chez Tynjanov', *Revue des études slaves*, 55 (1983), 437–49
- Leatherbarrow, W. J., 'Einstein and the Art of Yevgeny Zamyatin', *Modern Language Review*, 82 (1987), 142–51
- Levchenko, Jan, *Drugaiia nauka: Russkie formalisty v poiskakh biografii* (Moscow: Izdatel'skii dom NIU VShE, 2012)
- , *Istoriia i fiktsiia v tekstakh V. Shklovskogo i B. Eikhenbauma v 1920-e gg.* (Tartu: Tartu University Press, 2003)
- , 'Kak possorilsia Viktor Maksimovich s Borisom Mikhailovichem', *Russian Literature*, 72 (2012), 503–23
- , 'Poslevkusie formalizma: Proliferatsiia teorii v tekstakh Viktora Shklovskogo 1930-kh gg.', *NLO*, 128 (2014), 125–43
- , 'Towards the Formalist Dimension of War, or How Viktor Šklovskij Used to Be a Soldier', *Studies in East European Thought*, 66 (2014), 89–100
- Levinton, G. A., 'Griboedovskie podteksty v romane "Smert' Vazir-Mukhtara"', in *Tynianovskii sbornik*, vyp. 5: Chetvertye Tynianovskie chteniia (Riga: 1990), pp. 21–34
- , 'Istochniki i podteksty romana "Smert' Vazir-Mukhtara"', in *Tynianovskii sbornik*, vyp. 3: Tret'i Tynianovskie chteniia (Riga: Zinatne, 1988), pp. 6–14
- , 'K poetike Iakobsona (poetika filologicheskogo teksta)', in *Roman Iakobson: Teksty, dokumenty, issledovaniia*, ed. by Henryk Baran et al. (Moscow: RGGU, 1999), pp. 744–60
- Lotman, Iu. M., and B. A. Uspenskii, 'Rol' dual'nykh modelei v dinamike russkoi kul'tury (do kontsa XVII veka)', in B. A. Uspenskii, *Izbrannye trudy*, 2 vols (Moscow: Gnozis, 1994), vol. 1, pp. 219–53
- , 'Spory o iazyke v nachale XIX v. kak fakt russkoi kul'tury', in B. A. Uspenskii, *Izbrannye trudy*, 2 vols (Moscow: Gnozis, 1994), vol. 2, pp. 331–467
- Lovell, Stephen, 'Tynianov as Sociologist of Literature', *Slavonic and East European Review*, 79 (2001), 415–33
- Macé, Marielle, ed., *Le Genre littéraire* (Paris: Flammarion, 2004)
- Maguire, Muireann, 'Post-Lamarckian Prodigies: Evolutionary Biology in Soviet Science Fiction', *New Zealand Slavonic Journal*, 43 (2009), 23–54
- Maguire, Robert A., *Red Virgin Soil: Soviet Literature in the 1920s* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1968)

- Man, Paul de, *Romanticism and Contemporary Criticism: The Gauss Seminar and Other Papers*, ed. by E. S. Burt, Kevin Newmark, and Andrej Warminski (Baltimore, MD, and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996)
- Mandelker, Amy, 'Russian Formalism and the Objective Analysis of Sound in Poetry', *Slavic and East European Journal*, 27 (1983), 327–38
- Markov, V. A., 'Modelirovanie literaturnoi evoliutsii v svete idei Iu. N. Tynianova', in *Tynianovskii sbornik*, vyp. 3: Tret'i Tynianovskie chteniia (Riga: Zinatne, 1988), pp. 83–90
- Mayr, Ernst, and William B. Provine, eds, *The Evolutionary Synthesis: Perspectives on the Unification of Biology* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980), pp. 1–48
- Mazurmovich, B. N., and Iu. N. Polianskii, *Valentin Aleksandrovich Dogel': 1882–1955* (Moscow: Nauka, 1980)
- Merrill, Jessica, 'Fol'kloristicheskie osnovaniia knigi Viktora Shklovskogo "O teorii prozy"', *NLO*, 133 (2015), 197–213 (trans. by Natal'ia Movnina)
- , 'The Role of Folklore Study in the Rise of Russian Formalist and Czech Structuralist Literary Theory' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of California, Berkeley, 2012)
- Molok, Iu. A., "'Tri vozrasta" odnoi stat'i Tynianova', in *Tynianovskii sbornik*, vyp. 2: Vtorye Tynianovskie chteniia (Riga: Zinatne, 1986), pp. 44–48
- Morson, Gary Saul, 'Bakhtin, Genres, and Temporality', *New Literary History*, 22 (1991), 1071–92
- , *The Boundaries of Genre: Dostoevsky's Diary of a Writer and the Traditions of Literary Utopia* (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1981)
- , 'Narrativeness', *New Literary History*, 34 (2003), 59–73
- Novikov, Vladimir, 'Les lois naturelles de la littérature', *Littérature*, 95 (1994), 65–74 (trans. by Marc Weinstein)
- Oever, Annie van den, ed., *Ostrannen: On 'Strangeness' and the Moving Image: the History, Reception, and Relevance of a Concept* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2010)
- Panchenko, O. N., 'O teorii poezii i poezii prozy V. B. Shklovskogo', *Izvestiia AN SSSR*, 49 (1990), 126–35
- , "'O teorii prozy" (1925, 1929) Viktora Shklovskogo i ee avtorefleksii', *Studia litteraria polono-slavica*, 3 (1999), 183–95
- Pike, Chris, ed., *The Futurists, the Formalists and the Marxist Critique* (London: Ink Links, 1979)
- Pil'shchikov, I. A., "'Vnutrenniaia forma slova" v teoriiakh poeticheskogo iazyka', *Kritika i semiotika*, 1 (2014), 54–76

- Piper, D. G. B., 'Formalism and the Serapion Brothers', *Slavonic and East European Review*, 47 (1969), 78–93
- , 'Russian Formalism and the *Nouveau Roman*', *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, 3 (1967), 36–48
- Pomorska, Krystyna, *Russian Formalist Theory and its Poetic Ambiance* (The Hague: Mouton, 1968)
- Proskurin, Oleg, 'Dve modeli literaturnoi evoliutsii: Iu. N. Tynianov i V. E. Vatsuro', *NLO*, 42 (2000), 63–77
- Pyman, Avril, 'Yury Tynyanov and the Literary Fact', in *Mapping Lives: The Uses of Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), pp. 158–76
- Razumova, A., 'Put' formalistov k khudozhestvennoi proze', *Voprosy literatury*, 3 (2004), 131–50
- Razumova, A., and Mikhail Sverdlov, 'Shklovskii — personazh v proze V. Kaverina i L. Ginzburg', *Voprosy literatury*, 5 (2005), 32–52
- Renfrew, Alastair, 'Against Adaptation? The Strange Case of (*Pod*)*Poruchik Kizhe*', *Modern Language Review*, 102 (2007), 157–76
- , 'The Dialectics of Parody', *Poetics Today*, 33 (2012), 301–28
- , *Towards a New Material Aesthetics: Bakhtin, Genre and the Fates of Literary Theory* (Oxford: Legenda, 2006)
- , 'A Word about Material (Bakhtin and Tynianov)', *Slavonic and East European Review*, 84 (2006), 419–45
- Renfrew, Alastair, and Galin Tihanov, eds, *Critical Theory in Russia and the West* (London and New York: Routledge, 2010)
- Ringer, Fritz, *The Decline of the German Mandarins: The German Academic Community, 1890–1933* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969)
- Robinson, Douglas, *Estrangement and the Somatics of Literature: Tolstoy, Shklovsky, Brecht* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008)
- Rogers, James Allen, 'Russia: Social Sciences', in *The Comparative Reception of Darwinism*, ed. by Thomas F. Glick, 2nd edn (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1988)
- Romand, David, and Sergueï Tchougounnikov, 'Le formalisme russe: une séduction cognitive', *Cahiers du monde russe*, 51 (2010), 521–46
- Ronen, Omri, in 'Anketa k 100-letiiu so dnia rozhdeniia Iu. N. Tynianova', in *Tynianovskii sbornik*, vyp. 9: Sed'mye Tynianovskie chteniia. Materialy dlia obsuzhdeniia (Riga and Moscow: 1995–96), pp. 47–49
- Rosengrant, Sandra, 'The Theoretical Criticism of Ju. N. Tynjanov', *Comparative Literature*, 32 (1980), 355–89
- , 'The Theoretical Criticism of Ju. N. Tynyanov' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Stanford University, 1976)

- Rudy, Stephen, 'Jakobsonian Poetics of the Moscow and Prague Periods' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Yale University, 1978)
- Rush, Anna, 'The generic originality of Iurii Tynianov's representation of Pushkin in the novels *Pushkin* and *The Gannibals*' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of St Andrews, 2011)
- Savitskii, Stanislav, 'Spor s uchitelem: nachalo literaturnogo/issledovatel'skogo proekta L. Ginzburg', *NLO*, 82 (2006), 129–54
- Schaeffer, Jean-Marie, *Qu'est-ce qu'un genre littéraire?* (Paris: Seuil, 1987)
- Schwartz, Matthias, 'How *Nauchnaia Fantastika* Was Made: The Debates about the Genre of Science Fiction from NEP to High Stalinism', *Slavic Review*, 72 (2013), 224–46
- Seifrid, Thomas, *The Word Made Self: Russian Writings on Language, 1860–1930* (Ithaca, NY, and London: Cornell University Press, 2005)
- Selden, Raman, ed., *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, vol. 8: Formalism to Poststructuralism (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995)
- Sériot, Patrick, 'The Impact of Czech and Russian Biology on the Linguistic Thought of the Prague Linguistic Circle', *Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Prague*, 3 (1999), 15–24
- , 'La pensée nomogénétique en URSS dans l'entre-deux-guerres: l'histoire d'un contre-programme', *Cahiers de l'ILSL*, 14 (2003), 183–19
- Serman, Il'ja Z., 'B. M. Eikhenbaum i problema istorii', *Revue des études slaves*, 57 (1985), 73–82
- Shaitanov, Igor, 'Bakhtin i formalisty v prostranstve istoricheskoi poetiki', in *M. Bakhtin i perspektivy gumanitarnykh nauk: materialy nauchnoi konferentsii (Moscow: RGGU, 1–3 fevralia 1993 goda)*, ed. by V. L. Makhlin (Vitebsk: So-bytie v nauke, 1994)
- , 'Veselovskii's Historical Poetics: Genre in Historical Poetics', *New Literary History*, 32 (2001), 429–43
- , 'Zhanrovoe slovo u Bakhtina i formalistov', *Voprosy literatury*, 3 (1996), 89–114
- Shapir, M. I., "'...Domashnii, staryi spor...': (B. I. Iarkho protiv Iu. N. Tynianova vo vzgliadakh na prirodu i semantiku stikha)", *Philologica*, 7 (2001/2002), 239–44
- , 'M. M. Kenigsberg i ego fenomenologiiia stikha', *Russian Linguistics*, 18 (1994), 73–113
- Sheldon, Richard, 'Shklovsky's "Zoo" and Russian Berlin', *Russian Review*, 29 (1970), 262–74
- , 'Viktor Borisovich Shklovsky: Literary Theory and Practice, 1914–1930' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Michigan, 1966)

- , 'Viktor Shklovsky and the Device of Ostensible Surrender', *Slavic Review*, 34 (1975), 86–108
- , *Viktor Shklovsky: An International Bibliography of Works By and About Him* (Ann Arbor, MI: Ardis, 1977)
- Simon, Walter M., *European Positivism in the Nineteenth Century* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1963)
- Sosa, Michael, 'Gogol' from the 1920s: Tynjanov's Scenario for "Šinel'", *Slavic and East European Journal*, 30, (1986), 553–58
- , 'Jurij Tynjanov: Method and Theory' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1987)
- Stacy, R. H., *Defamiliarization in Language and Literature* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1977)
- , *Russian Literary Criticism: A Short History* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1974)
- Steiner, Peter, 'Praktika ironii: "Zoo, ili pis'ma ne o liubvi" Viktora Shklovskogo', *NLO*, 133 (2015), 169–81 (trans. by Dmitrii Kharitonov)
- , *Russian Formalism: A Metapoetics* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1984)
- Stempel, Wolf-Dieter, 'Zur formalistischen Theorie der poetischen Sprache', in *Texte der russischen Formalisten*, Band II, ed. by Wolf-Dieter Stempel (Munich: Fink, 1972), ix–liii
- Stone, Jonathan, 'Polyphony and the Atomic Age: Bakhtin's Assimilation of an Einsteinian Universe', *PMLA*, 123 (2008), 405–21
- Striedter, Jurij, *Literary Structure, Evolution, and Value: Russian Formalism and Czech Structuralism Reconsidered* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989)
- Svetlikova, Ilona, *Istoki russkogo formalizma: traditsiia psikhologizma i formal'naia shkola* (Moscow: NLO, 2005)
- Tchougounnikov, Sergueï, 'Éduard Sievers et la phonétique allemande du début du XX-e siècle. Les sources allemandes des théorisations russes de la charpente sonore du langage', *Histoire Épistémologie Langage*, 29 (2007), 145–62
- , 'Quelques éléments ethnopsychologiques et psychophysiques dans les sciences du langage russes de l'entre-deux-guerres', *Revue d'histoire des sciences humaines*, 21 (2009), 83–101
- Terras, Victor, *Belinskij and Russian Literary Criticism: The Heritage of Organic Aesthetics* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1974)
- Thompson, Ewa, [review of Pomorska, *Russian Formalism and its Poetic Ambiance* (1968)], *Slavic and East European Journal*, 14 (1970), 224–26

- , *Russian Formalism and Anglo-American New Criticism: A Comparative Study* (The Hague: Mouton, 1971)
- Thomson, R. D. B., [review of Stacy, *Defamiliarization in Language and Literature* (1977)], *Canadian Slavonic Papers*, 21 (1979), 129–30
- Tihanov, Galin, ‘Contextualising Bakhtin: Two Poems by Mandelstam’, *Russian Literature*, 50 (2001), 165–84
- , *The Master and The Slave: Lukács, Bakhtin, and the Ideas of Their Time* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000)
- , ‘The Politics of Estrangement: The Case of the Early Shklovsky’, *Poetics Today*, 26 (2005), 665–96
- , ‘Russian Formalism’, in *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*, 4th edn, ed. by Roland Greene et al. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2012), pp. 1239–42
- , ‘Viktor Shklovskii and Georg Lukács in the 1930s’, *Slavonic and East European Review*, 78 (2000), 44–65
- , ‘Why did Modern Literary Theory Originate in Central and Eastern Europe? (And Why is it Now Dead?)’, *Common Knowledge*, 10 (2004), 61–81
- , ‘Zametki o dispute marksistov i formalistov 1927-ogo goda’, *NLO*, 50 (2001), 279–86 (trans. by M. Poliakova)
- Todd, William Mills, III, *The Familiar Letter As a Literary Genre in the Age of Pushkin* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1976)
- , *Fiction and Society in the Age of Pushkin* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986)
- , ‘Institutions of Literature in Early-Nineteenth-Century Russia: Boundaries and Transgressions’, in *Literature and History: Theoretical Problems and Case Studies* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1986), pp. 57–89
- Toddes, E. A., ‘B. M. Eikhenbaum v 30–50-e gody (K istorii sovetskogo literaturovedeniia i sovetskoi gumanitarnoi intelligentsii)’, in *Tynianovskii sbornik*, vyp. 11: *Deviatye Tynianovskie chteniia* (Moscow: 2002), pp. 563–691
- , ‘Neosushchestvlennye zamysly Tynianova’, in *Tynianovskii sbornik*, vyp. 1: *Pervye Tynianovskie chteniia* (Riga: Zinatne, 1984), pp. 25–45
- Todes, Daniel Philip, *Darwin Without Malthus: The Struggle for Existence in Russian Evolutionary Thought* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1989)
- Todes, Daniel, and Nikolai Kremmentsov, ‘Dialectical Materialism and Soviet Science in the 1920s and 1930s’, in *A History of Russian Thought*, ed. by William Leatherbarrow and Derek Offord (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 340–67
- Todorov, Tzvetan, *Poétique de la prose* (Paris: Seuil, 1971)

- Tsivian, Yuri, 'The Gesture of Revolution or Misquoting as Device', in *Ostrannenie: On 'Strangeness' and the Moving Image: the History, Reception, and Relevance of a Concept*, ed. by Annie van den Oever (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2010), pp. 21–32
- Tsyrlin, L., *Tynianov-belletrist* (Leningrad: Izd. pisatelei v Leningrade, 1935)
- Umnova, Mariia, 'Dela' veshchi nuzhnye i veselye': *Avangardnye ustanovki v teorii literatury i kritike OPOIaZa* (Moscow: Progress-Traditsiia, 2013)
- , 'Literaturnaia kritika formal'noi shkoly: teoreticheskie osnovaniia i praktika, na mater'iale kriticheskikh rabot Iu. N. Tynianova' (unpublished candidate thesis, Moscow State University, 1996)
- , 'Relativistskie ustanovki v sisteme idei OPOIaZa', in *Roman Iakobson: Teksty, dokumenty, issledovaniia*, ed. by Henryk Baran et al. (Moscow: RGGU, 1999), pp. 815–25
- Ustinov, Denis, 'Formalizm i mladoformalisty. Stat'ia pervai: postanovka problemy', *NLO*, 50 (2001), 296–321
- Veldhues, Christoph, *Formalistischer Autor-Funktionalismus: wie Tynjanovs "Puškin" gemacht ist* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2003)
- Veresova, T. V., *V nachale zhizni shkolu pomniu ia: Lev Zil'ber, Veniamin Kaverin, Avgust Letavet, Nikolai Neigauz, Iurii Tynianov — o vremeni i o sebe* (Moscow: Moskovskaia tip., 2003)
- Vizgin V. P., and G. E. Gorelik, 'Relativity in Russia and the USSR', in *The Comparative Reception of Relativity*, ed. by T. F. Glick (Dordrecht: D. Reidel, 1987), pp. 265–326 (trans. by Paul R. Josephson)
- Vucinich, Alexander, *Darwin in Russian Thought* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1988)
- , *Einstein and Soviet Ideology* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2001)
- Wachtel, Andrew, *An Obsession with History: Russian Writers Confront the Past* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1994)
- , 'Zamechaniia o vzaimootnoshenii khudozhestvennykh i nauchnykh proizvedenii Tynianova', in *Tynianovskii sbornik*, vyp. 9: Sed'mye Tynianovskie chteniia. Materialy dlia obsuzhdeniia (Riga and Moscow: 1995–96), pp. 222–30
- Warner, Nicholas O., 'In Search of Literary Science: The Russian Formalist Tradition', *Pacific Coast Philology*, 17 (1982), 69–81
- Weinstein, Marc, 'Le débat Tynjanov / Baxtin ou la question du matériau', *Revue des études slaves*, 64 (1992), 297–322
- , 'Tynianov: le concept de contemporanéité et ses enjeux', *Littérature*, 95 (1994), 75–83
- , *Tynianov, ou la poétique de la relativité* (Saint-Denis: Presses universitaires de Vincennes, 1996)

- Zenkin, Sergei, 'Forma vnutrenniaia i vneshniaia (Sud'ba odnoi kategorii v russkoi teorii XX v.)', in *Russkaia teoriia. 1920–1930-e gody. Materialy 10-kh Lotmanovskikh chtenii (Moskva, dekabr' 2002 g.)*, ed. by Sergei Zenkin (Moscow: RGGU, 2004), pp. 147–67
- , 'Filologiiia v sporakh o nauchnosti', *NLO*, 50 (2001), 325–31
- , 'Priklucheniia teoretika: Avtobiograficheskaia proza Viktora Shklovskogo', *Druzhba narodov*, 12 (2003), 170–83
- , *Raboty o teorii* (Moscow: NLO, 2012)
- Zenkin, Sergei, ed., *Russkaia teoriia, 1920–1930-e gody. Materialy 10-kh Lotmanovskikh chtenii (Moskva, dekabr' 2002 g.)* (Moscow: RGGU, 2004)
- Zolian, S. T., "‘Edinstvo i tesnota stikhovogo riada’ i poeticheskii sintaksis", in *Tynianovskii sbornik*, vyp. 5: Chetvertye Tynianovskie chteniia (Riga: 1990), pp. 100–11
- Zorin, Andrei L., 'Proza L. Ia. Ginzburg i gumanitarnaia mysl' XX veka', *NLO*, 76 (2006), 45–68