

Function of the scandal in literary-critical circles

N.N. Shabalina

Kazan Federal University, Russia

G.N. Bozhkova

Kazan Federal University, Russia

ABSTRACT: in this study the phenomenon of literary scandal is discussed as a particular way of Declaration of views and the views of critics and writers of the second half of the XIX century. The purpose of the research is to analyze the category of scandal from the literary point of view, to identify features and duplicate entries of literary scandal. The study was conducted on the material of the controversy between the newspaper "Sankt-Peterburgskie Vedomosti" and the magazine "Order" between writers of the second row and the classics. Literary scandal is known to all the creative personalities. The obtained results allow us to make a conclusion that the scandal is the main dominant of the critic V. P. Burenin, with which he defended his literary and critical position. In the same literary circles he gets the value of "PR-action", rarely associated with the discrediting of literary opponent.

1. INTRODUCTION

Scandal as a literary phenomenon appeared long ago. As it's noted in the book "semiotics of the scandal" "It is born with the literature and is an indispensable companion, almost a basic component" (Penskaya 2008). Noteworthy is the fact that, until recently, this category was considered only from the point of view of branches of psychology, although there are different kinds of scandal: political, everyday, literary. Therefore, valuable observations are contained in the collection of scientific articles «Semiotics of scandal», where it's presented differently: analyzed as a literary category. We are relying on the point of view presented in this collection of articles, considering the scandal as a literary phenomenon. At the same time, this category in the Russian literature began to carry out an essential function at the end of the XX century, but in the XIX century it was not the case. It's connected with the fact that the main interest to the phenomenon of the literary scandal appears in 1870-1890 as the basis of all the aesthetics of literary trends of the "Silver Age" lay shocking, which became a kind of means of PR, self-promotion and had an influence on the success. So, if in the beginning of the XIX century, the term "PR" was not used, and the title "rowdy" was treated very negatively, by the end of the century, the situation changes dramatically.

1.1.Objectives of the study

In this article our main task is to pay attention to the scandal as a national phenomenon and reveal

new facets of the literary scandal and its inherent permanent components.

1.2.Research objective

Objective of the study is to reveal the peculiarities of the functioning of the forms of literary scandal in criticism V.P. Burenina, to analyze the basic principles of literary "battlefield".

1.3.Literature review

The main principles of the study of phenomenon of literary scandal were presented in a book Land Myrick "The Fine Art of Literary Mayhem"(San Francisco, 1983), O.A. Proskurina "Literary scandals of the Pushkin epoch" (Moscow, 2001), article V.A. Milovidova, A.S. Solovieva "Semiotics scandal" (Tver, 2006), and a collection of articles "Semiotics of the scandal. Mechanisms of culture" (Paris - Moscow, 2008).

1.4.Methods

In our study, there are elements of the biographical method, as it was necessary to consider personal contacts criticism with contemporaries.

2. THE PHENOMENON OF LITERARY SCANDAL IN THE CRITICISM

Shocking in the literature draws critics', writers' and readers' attention, it is the most effective way to become recognizable, so you can take it to a form of national. In the west, the scandal will lead to shame, dismissal from the position, silencing of the creative person, but in Russia the so-called attack on the reputation has usually the opposite effect, which is explained by mental peculiarities. This identity is

composed of socio-cultural and moral-psychological characteristics (social life in its various forms: aesthetic, moral, religious, legal). There are numerous conflicts in literary-critical circles of the XIX century. For example, in 1872, a fierce debate broke between V.P. Burenin and N.K. Mikhailovsky (see more on this debate is discussed in the article "Literary scandal in criticism VP Burenin"), in 1881 there was a grand debate with M.M. Stassiulevitch, and in 1886 - a discussion with S.Y. Nadson, after which Burenin got a reputation of a "rowdy" and a literary bully. The performances of many critics usually start with polemic, however Burenin often goes beyond standard norms, becoming a literary scandal that violates standards and stereotypes and turns ordinary consciousness (Shabalina 2012).

So, let's turn to concrete examples and present circumstances of the situation: in the feuilleton of 1881, Burenin announced that the magazine "Poryadok" (edited by Stasyulevich), is published on the capitals of the Jews Gunzburg and Bliokhova, and later he wrote a comic play called "bifurcated Stasyulevich" which clearly showed the division of money. All this, according to the critic, deprives these publications, and journalism in a general number of desirable qualities such as honesty, truthfulness, topicality. Taking into consideration the fact that Burenin was an acrid and caustic critic, inclined to ridicule, though initially he did not allow himself too much, electing one of the most important means of combating- irony. In addition, he seeks to draw attention to the false position of the newspaper "Novoe vremya", realistically depicting the situation of journalism in general, as it applies to other subsidized publications such as the "Golos", the "Bereg", the "Novosty". Burenin was accused of libel, as it refers to the raw data, "note-journalists, as can be seen from the excerpts made in newspapers № 1909, 1986 the "Novoe Vremya" and from the provincial newspapers "Vostok" and "Kyivlyanyn", thought the above mentioned idea is not only understandable, but taken at face value <...>" (Burenin 1884). According to the consciousness of Burenin's enemies, writes B.B. Glinski, it was taken as "a scandal", although the arguments of criticism are not unfounded, but the initial stage controversy with Stassiulevitch altogether different political correctness (Glinski 1914).

The first stage is the initial stage of controversy, which provides a justification of the reasons for the "duel" and the position of opponents, does not violate the traditions and socially accepted rules of polemical "battle", as literary opponents do not allow themselves incorrect attacks (Land Myrick 1983).

The second stage is a public showdown: Stasyulevich sued, accusing critics of "Novoe vremya" of defamation. Stories with the Mikhailovsky and Nadson had a great public resonance. If initially Burenin in his struggle is passive, it only parries precise strikes

of antagonists, but on the second stage of a dispute each of the participants is defending not only corporate, but also his personal interests, so opponents defending themselves use unacceptable means of struggle, so the debate turns into a scandal-revenge. Mikhailovsky, for example, tries to humiliate the opponent, "you are a varmint", "I almost said buf-foon <...>" (Mikhailovsky 1872).

Burenin is also restrained in the estimates and tries to show his opponents intellectual and moral superiority. Constant component of his speeches is admonitory, patronizing ironic tone: "respectful body", "we have heard that the editor of the "Poryadok", Mr. Stasyulevich, is not content with a subsidy of Baron Gunzburg, that's why he intends to apply for a grant to Mr. Poliakov" (1884 Burenin). The publicity of attacks, gives the rowdy the right to use any means, but "dramatic" glow and conciseness time frame, eliminating the detailed reasoning, helps to ensure that the whole system of beliefs reduced to visibility, which acts as an eccentric, impulsive speech and a way of disputing.

The next stage of the controversy grows into a scandal, because the sides are not intended to reach a compromise - there are accusations of personal nature, opponents transgress moral norms. Burenin often used, in campaigns organized by him, such means as an attack on a person. So criticizing the editor of the "Vestnik Evropy," Burenin brands not only Stasyulevich' professional qualities: "<...> The editor is hurriedly walking round the huge desk, tidying and sweeping off different things lying on it <...>", Burenin seeks to rebuke Stasyulevich relations with Jews (Burenin 1884). In a critical essay ("Literary Process") the author focuses attention on the idea of national intolerance, "places for the audience are completely occupied. The audience is the most intelligent and liberal: all of them are Jews" (Burenin 1884).

It's connected not only with a personal dislike or desire to conquer the audience, but also with the fact that Burenin perceives real human behavior as something inseparable from the behavior of the creative person (a poet, novelist, critic, publisher, editor). Therefore, the relationship of Stasyulevich with the Jews discredits him not only as an individual, but as the editor of the magazines the "Poryadok" and the "Vestnik Evropy" The true impression of the much-needed columnist who creates hints system, where the main character is revealed only through the actions needs no commentary: "Oh, we will take a different form / They will contribute to the" Order "share", "Nonsense! That's because you're a Russian servant. But I'm a Jewish servant <...>" (Burenin 1884).

Another effective mean is slander, the use of extra-literary gossip, which allows to the critic to present the situation in a false light. There is a standard for a scandalous situation, where he is the victim of the

attack, and the enemy is the executioner. The initiators of the scandals, according to critics, are opponents: N.K. Mikhailovsky, S.J. Knudson, M.M. Stasyulevich, V.V. Stasov. In this sense, shocking in its cynicism is a story with Stassiulevitch: accusing opponents in bad faith and making fun of his actions, turning the situation inside out, claiming that Stasyulevich wrote a humorous piece, and a trial is only necessary to the editor of the "Vestnik Evropy" as a certain "PR move" (Wessling Robert 2003). In his feuilleton the critic describes the situation as "With a Liberal scandal, we can achieve everything: to hold any sort of filth, disgrace, dishonor your any honest figures <...>" (Burenin 1884). In the situation with Stassiulevitch : Burenin makes a real event, of primary importance to the Editor of the "Vestnik Evropy", of course, wanting to protect himself from attacks by critics into a farce, a fun game. Columnist in his comic play "Stasyulevich the hoof" represents his behavior as a certain pile of absurdities, but the most important areas of Stasyulevich's activity are represented in a grotesque world, "Lackey goes out and coming back, brings a dog "Evropochka" ... Editor takes "Evropochkua" on his knees and releases lackey with the grand gesture. Well, now it's time to take the leadership of Russian public opinion <...> Hello, "Evropochka," Hello ! Now I will bind a piece of paper your tail" (Burenin 1884).

Certainly, the negative self-promotion ensured the success and popularity of Burenin's critical voices, but, in our opinion, it is not without profound meaning: the scandal as the most prominent form of exposure (has the effect of explosion) allowed to draw attention of the audience and contemporaries to important issues in literary and public life.

3. FUNCTION SCANDAL IN RUSSIAN LITERATURE OF THE XIX CENTURY

Not only in critical, but also in the literary circles of the scandal played a decisive role in shaping the personality of a creative way. However, it should be noted that inter-personal scandal in literature rarely reached the second stage (a public showdown, shame), staying at the stage of disagreement, so the components of such conflicts are: the latent jealousy, indifference, shame, verbal humiliation, self-interest. We are interested in the view of the classic writers and critics of the "second series".

At the heart of the biblical story of a human history is the violation of the prohibition. From the violation of norms starts the relationship of the Yelabuga writer D.I. Staheev with the Russian classics. Up to the end of his life he was an original writer, erased from the history of Russian literature. Without personal meetings with the classics, agreement or rejection of their views, the novelist wouldn't have had great talent, he wouldn't have been the author of twelve volume collected works. In "D.I. Staheev's biography" compiled by Nikolskiy, expressly de-

fining a circle of acquaintances of the writer, who has formed his friendship with the great critic N.N. Strakhov (Nikolsky 1902). In the pieces of memories of the "Group and portraits" Staheev tells about visiting apartments of Dostoyevsky : "<...> he amazed me with his extraordinary excitement, <...> I used to listen as he never ceased to make scandals the whole evening, and with fear I thought that he's about to go crazy, so excited was his <...>" (Staheev 1907). The writer visited Strakhov very seldom, "uncomfortable" because he did not like to be interrupted (Staheev 1907). Staheev recalls meeting of V.S. Soloveva with Dostoevsky, which ended with the scandal. Fyodor Mikhailovich has experienced hard labor and was able to talk about it with the full knowledge of the facts, "Oh, Vladimir Sergeevich! What you are, I see you're a good man <...> I will add to my praise, that you ought to be for three years at hard labor <...> for the fact that you're still not good enough: that's when, after prison, you would be an absolutely perfect and pure Christian" (Staheev 1907). Solovyov first silently endured insult, and then, wanting to get away from the conflict, understanding the painful perception of the world by the writer, decided to turn it into a joke remark. Staheev prophesies: "<...> I suppose, if Vladimir Sergeevich exclaimed something, Dostoevsky would develop his idea into a serious and detailed explanation. Trying to insert a remark in his speech, he would nervously whispered," Be quiet, do not mind <...> Do not get smart !" <...>" (Staheev 1907).

Despite the respect and sympathy for Fyodor Dostoevsky, Staheev believed that adherence to the scandal is just a reaction of insecurity, vulnerability and pain. No wonder the perfect portrayer scandal in the Russian literature is considered to be Dostoevsky, in the nature of which epileptic and hysterical features were combined "Hysterical start gives sharpness to the scandal scenes in Dostoevsky's works, epileptic gives necessary aggressiveness to the scandal" (Penskaya 2008).

Tolstoy also visited Strakhov and Staheev's flat. The relationship of Staheev and Tolstoy had a special character. Visiting Strakhov, Tolstoy did not cause Staheev special respect because of his repulsive "teaching". In Tolstoy's teaching, he saw the desire for spiritual obedience, deeply alien to him, and therefore avoided contact with him, demonstrating "the underlined indifference". Staheev admits: "<...> I've never talked to Tolstoy, <...> I avoided meeting him, because after "War and Peace "and "Anna Karenina" I didn't like a lot in his personality and his works. And when he visited our apartment, I deliberately went for the back door to avoid him and probably escape the scandal" (Staheev 1907). Later, in his "Kreutzer Sonata," Tolstoy expresses his belief that life as it is today, cannot continue. And the writer is firmly opposed to procreation, condemns sex as depravity. This rejection of the personality of

the great writer in the world today is considered to be public relations or "publicity", which is set to determine the socio-psychological behavior of a group of people with opposing views. Staheev obviously tried without taking a recognized authority of Tolstoy, to attract the attention of the public.

Several vivid details to the portrait of a writer, critic and philosopher K. Leontiev also deserve attention. Leontiev, like Dostoevsky, being excited, spoke passionately and a lot, often waving his arms. Not without humor and with deep sympathy describes Staheev noble commitment to the philosopher: "<...> the last years of his life, having financial needs <...>. Occupying a place somewhere in a remote corner of a peasant hut <...>, he still wanted everything in his room was "on the gentry". The philosopher highly demanded respect from friends and domestics, and if this didn't happen, made scandals for hours. Scandalous, shocking - a part of Leontiev's personality. In this case, the social function of the scandal helps to understand the desire of caste superiority, so with all those who did not fulfill his requirements, the philosopher interrupted relationship. Strakhov always tried to warn his friend from public humiliation. Balanced and wise Nicholas Nikolaevich did not allow scandals at a meeting with fellows, trying to understand and help, giving an advice.

Friendships of N.N. Strakhov with D.I. Staheev lasted until the death of the critic, and even after his death Staheev worried about the reputation of the friend, and responded immediately to any insult to his memory, which came from Matveev. In the magazine "Historical Journal" his article "L. Tolstoy and Strakhov in Optina Desert" was published, in which Matveev seriously insulted the deceased, calling him a man of God renounced. Dazed by the published, Staheev writes: "Apparently, he is a donkey, I kick the dead, and with him - and me. It's easy to kick, but what is and honor to whom? And he lies that Strakhov didn't want to confess before death" (Valeev 2000).

4. CONCLUSIONS

Working at the material in this article, we've found that the relationships of the contemporaries, despite the complexity of them, always had a deep respect for each other, and the scandal is the result of a physical illness, social instability and the desire to "claim" about themselves or defend their honor, so it rarely goes to the moral humiliation. Otherwise, things were happening in a critical environment: a certain polemical temperament was forming (belligerence, the desire not to defend and attack, intransigence), so the first literary-critical minds were occupied with the desire to defend their own position, by all means, the dispute is becoming a way to win, to draw attention to imperfections in the literary life,

but not a desire to "overthrow" and discredit the literary personality of the antagonist.

5. PRACTICAL SIGNIFICANCE

Results of this research can be used in University courses, special courses and seminars, in studying the history of Russian literary criticism and literature of the XIX - beginning of XX centuries, the problems of poetics of the critical text, the manual course and diploma works of students.

6. REFERENCES

- Burenin, V.P. (1884). *The literary process // Critical essays and pamphlets. B. Burenina.* - C-P.: Publication A.S. Suvorina: 108-146.
- Ebbinghausen Rolf, Nickel. (1989). *Sieghard Anatomie des Politischen Scandals.* Frankfurt am Main:Suhkamp: 268.
- Glinski, B.B. (1914). *Among the writers and scholars. Biographies, features, obituaries, memories of the meeting.* - Pg.: Novoe vremya: 58-101.
- Land, Myrick. (1983). *The Fine Art of Literary Mayhem.* - San Francisco, Lexicos: 131.
- Mikhailovsky, N.K. (1872). *Literary and journal notes // Domestic notes - № 7:*143-184.
- Nicholsky, M.D. (1902). *Staheev's biography (I):* 307 p.
- Penskaya, E. (2008). *The scandal - an interdisciplinary happening // Semiotics of scandal. Compilation of articles.* - Moscow: Publishing House "Europe":14-21.
- Shabalina, N.N. (2012). *Literary scandal in criticism VP Burenin // Scientific notes of Kazan University. The Humanities.* -2: 145-152.
- Staheev, D.I. (1907). *Groups and portraits // IST. vestnik - № 1-3:*7-8.
- Staheev, D.I. (1896). *Don't quench the Spirit: A Novel D.I. Staheev // Russian Journal - № 1:* 84-86.
- Valeev, N.M. (2000). *Letters to D.I. Staheev, N.N. Strakhov and A.N. Maykov - № 3-4:* 24.
- Wessling, Robert. (2003). *Semen Iakovlevich Nadson // Russian Literature in the Age of Realism / Ed. A.D. Gillespie Detroit: Gale (Dictionary of Literary Biography. Vol. 277):* 240—246.