Lóránt Kabdebó

On the Borderline of Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Poetic Discourses: The Appearance of the Dialogical Poetic Paradigm

In the late 1920s Hungarian poetry displayed signs of change through which appeared what now we can call the "dialogical poetic paradigm". Lőrinc Szabó (1900-1957) was the first to introduce this new type of poetic discourse opposed to the earlier, monologized kind which relied on the unity of tone and the unquestionability of sentences being identifiable as statements or conclusions.[1] Its novelty lay in self-interpretation realized by means similar to the Heideggerian "Über-sich-sprechen", that is, self-expression through dialogue with some other about something. The present paper intends to analyze the same kind of poetic discourse in works written by two other European and an American poet, as a wider background to Hungarian literary developments.

***

The poems I have selected represent different cultures at different points of time within the first two decades of our century, but share the feature that they focus on persons. At the same time there can be found some philological link between them and the poetry of Lőrinc Szabó. If there exists a describable change between the poetic discourses of the 19th and 20th centuries, in these lyrical works it is certainly present in a marked way. On the thematic level they display motifs that elicit the appearance of poetic characteristics of 20th century validity on the textual level. The time and cultural context of their writing may not have revealed the significance for which, in my view, they can be considered within the poetics of lyrical works as we understand it today.

My first example is W. B. Yeats's *An Irish Airman Foresees His Death*, written in 1918, a widely known poem because of its political implications.[2] The poet, described as a neo-Romantic, a symbolist and even as a realist by various critics,[3] composed his poem using the key-words of the 19th century political ethos, which build up Thomas Moore-type lyrics as well. It was the reference literature and a colleague's analysis of Lőrinc Szabó's Hungarian translation of this basically monological poem[4] that called my attention to its being more than a national elegy of

Romantic orchestration using parallelisms in its rhetorical structures. Untypically, here Lőrinc Szabó interjects the word "egyszerüen" ("simply") into the translation of the original, emphasizing that the choice of death is a *personal* gesture, and thereby creating another poetic level. Is this arbitrary act of the translator justifiable by a closer inspection of Yeats's text? Does the identity crisis appearing in the context of a "public" theme prepare a kind of dialogicity in tone which warrants such arbitrariness in a translation completed towards the middle of the century?

The critical studies of *An Irish Airman* usually focus only on part of the above raised issue. Though not directly about the poem, Seamus Deane's comments on the dialogicity of the thematic and poetic representation in Yeats's mature work are worth considering: "From l910 onwards, Yeats remained loyal to double narrative that generated conflict and regenerated energy in his poems. One was the narrative of revival, especially associated with Ireland and the occult; the other was the narrative of degeneration, especially associated with the modern world and science."[5] In addition to "loyalty", we must emphasize that in Yeats's poetic composition a paradigm becomes manifest. Going further, I will attempt to find the motif which disrupts the harmony of 19th century themes and their poetic representation, and opens the poem toward the integration of 20th century problems.

The word quoted above ("egyszerűen") in Szabó's translation points to the gap between the thematic and poetic levels, anticipating Deane's remark. Its otherness in the text seems to emphasize that the "public" and "personal" sides of the individual are no longer in harmony. Within the traditionally "national" theme a personality-based frustration becomes voiced. The solution of the translator is attributable to his having found the Nietzsche-inspired line "A lonely impulse of delight" to distance the poem from its original 19th century characteristics, the leading ideas of those times. Szabó emphasizes the dialogical situation in the poem, which is so prevalent in his own poetry as well, by confronting the community-determined identity crisis with the freedom-searching gesture of the personality. The *dialogue* in Yeats means that the identity crisis defined in 19th century terms and structured with the help of grammatical-rhetorical parallels appears embedded in 20th century "impersonality", forming a simultaneous view of the same facts from more than one possible level. There arises the question whether the dialogical quality of the intellectual aspect manifests itself in the poetic discourse as well. A change in the *tone* is recognisable and powerfully marked by the twelfth line: "Drove to this tumult in the clouds;". The word "tumult" seems to be a pivotal point from which a tonal plurality radiates on the rest of the poem.

The grammar of the poem distances the word "tumult" from the textually represented natural environment dominated by "clouds": it is there but not as part of

them, in contrast with the same word appearing in a possessive structure in the great 19th century poem, Shelley's *Ode to the West Wind*, as "The tumult of thy mighty harmonies". In Yeats's poem there is no such grammatical bond, the "tumult" is an alien, independent element "*in* the clouds". On the level of the linear narrative this alien element may mean a battle fought among the clouds, but at the same time it might refer to the mental event in which all the contradictions are concentrated, since it is as much a focal point of the story as of the accompanying mental process. This way a tonal duality can appear in the poem, because the word "tumult" means both external and internal phenomena - "a disorderly commotion or disturbance; tempestuous act, as an uprising", and/or "agitation of the mind or emotions" ─ as given in the dictionary.[6] It ties up with the Romantic beginning of the poem where the speaker declares: "I shall meet my fate / Somewhere among the clouds above"; but it can also refer to the "disorderly commotion or disturbance" that he experiences inside his self. The word is used in a similar sense by Joyce, who personifies it at one point in *Finnegans Wake*: "seeing the whirling dervish, Tumult, son of Thunder, self exiled in upon his ego". In our times Brian Friel's 1979 play, *Faith Healer*, offers an example when a nervously exhausted character, Grace says: "Now I want that man to come [...] and put his white hands on my face and still this tumult inside me".[7]

The duality described above becomes fully represented in semantic and rhetorical terms by the last four lines. It implies the traditional distinction of the narrative making evaluation possible from the viewpoint of participation, seeing life and death as contrasting phases of human existence ("In balance with this life, this death"), which both are equally considered empty ("waste of breath"). This way the romantic story contains also the annihilation of the *narrative*. The poet repeats the Biblical phrase "a waste of breath", which has been favoured by both the Romantics and the 20th century, forming part of the "vanity of vanities", "vanitatum vanitas", etc., as Patrick J. Keane points out in his book on Yeats.[8]

In support of the above it is worth mentioning that Ezra Pound, who was a friend of Yeats at the time of the poem's inception, used similar poetic discourse and context to destroy outdated historical Romanticism in his *Mauberley*:

> Daring as never before, wastage as never before.
> Young blood and high blood,
> fair cheeks, and fine bodies;

The two poems emphasizing "waste" and "wastage" in addressing history and its meaning barely preceded the deservedly famous *The Waste Land* of T. S. Eliot (and Pound), where "waste" refers to not one particular narrative but to the entire

human existence.

With the help of parallel structuring, the use of a word with dual meaning produces an arrangement in accordance with the central principle of classical modernity. The duality of life and death, as well as the balancing of looking forward and searching into the past, again lead to a dialogue in the tone: the Romantic and 20th century discourses are opposed to each other. "Balance" is used in contrasted ways: on the one hand it emphasizes a participating hero's act of will to make his *last balance* in a morally didactic, conventional poem ("I balanced"), and it creates an inner, spiritually "disorderly" existential situation on the other. The latter makes it possible for man to face his existence in terms of 20th century poetic situations ("In balance").

The essential dialogicity affects also the generic features of the poem. In his book Dr. Ramazani makes a distinction between dramatic and lyrical tragedy,[9] defining the latter as rooted in the confrontation with death in poetic thinking, which is best exemplified, according to him, by Yeats's *An Irish Airman*.[10] Thereby he suggests a parallel between the poem and the Heideggerian idea of "facing death".[11] Ramazani, however, continues to emphasize the *monologue*, replacing a traditional, utility-based subject matter with another, existential philosophical concept that can have relevance to the personality. His line of argument does not step outside the *subject*. My own question is whether the thematically described otherness appears on the poetic level as well. Does the monologue remain an occasion for reconsidering a thesis (whether on the patriotic/political or philosophical level is all the same now) in the sense of 19th century traditions, or is the dialogical poetic situation produced also within the text itself?

The narrative in Yeats's elegy makes the dead pilot detail his personal choice in the form of a monologue. But if I accept the Heideggerian "den Anderen *bin ich nie*"[12], the identity of text and its fictitious hero is split <u>in the work</u>, leading to a dialogue between the discourses of the heroic narrative and the meditation about "eigentlich" life. In this case "wir gerade in dem Nicht-ausweichen vor der Verlegenheit uns in die Möglichkeit bringen, das *Dasein in der Eigentlichkeit seines Seins* zu ergreifen."[13] The pilot's story presented in a fictive monologue, and ending in death, is also a poetic occasion to encounter time in an "eigentlich" way: "Das Dasein hat in sich selbst die Möglichkeit, sich mit seinem Tod zusammenzufinden als der äußersten Möglichkeit seiner selbst."[14] At the same time: "Sofern das Vorlaufen zu dem Vorbei dieses im Wie der Jeweiligkeit festhält, wird das Dasein selbst sichtbar in seinem Wie. Das Vorlaufen zu dem Vorbei ist das Anlaufen des Daseins gegen seine äußerste Möglichkeit; und sofern dieses »Anlaufen gegen« ernst ist, wird es in diesem Laufen zurückgeworfen in das Noch-dasein seiner selbst."[15]

The very same text is apposite to the representation of the irreversibility ("Nicht-Umkehrbarkeit"), and fragmentation ("die Vergangenheit der Gegenwart des Alltags"; "die Homogenisierung auf Jetzpunkte") of natural time, as well as the experience of "eigentlich" time when "Dasein" can become itself in the "Zukünftigsein" of "Vorlaufen". "das Dasein (...) im Vorlaufen wird es sichtbar als die einzige Diesmaligkeit seines einzigen Schiksals in der Möglichkeit seines einzigen Vorbei."[16] It is at this "delightful" moment that the persona can gain freedom from the narrative in which situations create identity crisis: "Alles Gerede, das, worin es sich hält, alle Unrast, alle Geschäftigkeit, aller Lärm und alles Gerenne bricht zusammen."[17] In the poem, the confrontation with death, emphasized also by the title, is individualized in two ways: the pilot of the monologue, in consequence of his Romantic identity crisis, has an exceptional fate ("sie es zu einer Individuation kommen läßt im Sinne der phantastischen Herausbildung von Ausnahmeexistenzen"); while his story included in the poem "sie individuiert so, daß sie alle gleich macht." - as the point can be emphasized by quoting the Heideggerian opposites.[18] Death can be comprehended as a chance of quitting circumstances, but the grammatically and tonally shaped text of the poem can be read in the following way as well: "Im Zusammensein mit dem Tode wird jeder in das Wie gebracht, das jeder gleichmäßig sein kann; in eine Möglichkeit, bezüglich der keiner ausgezeichnet ist; in das Wie, in dem alles Was zerstäubt."[19] The tragic discourse generates the catharsis in itself; the poem can be considered as quitting time but also a work where, in the Heideggerian sense, time can be most adequately grasped.

This philosophically describable distance between Romantic storytelling and 20th century meditation is embodied in Yeats's theory of narrative and mask: "»Reality«, for Yeats, is neither to be found in that buried self which directs and orders a man's life nor in its Mask, the anti-self, but in the product born of their struggle."[20] Yeats himself wrote the following: "It was part of their purpose to affirm that all the gains of man come from conflict with the opposite of his true being."[21] This appears in *An Irish Airman* as well, anticipating the later mythical poems' (e. g. *Leda and the Swan*, *The Mother of God*, *The Gyres*, *Lapis Lazuli*, etc.) dialogized discourse.

In view of the above, in the poetically realized dialogism of Airman the historical and philosophical levels form a counterpoint to, and complement, each other. For the reader of today, this polyphony seems to be its most salient characteristic.

***

The other poem I have chosen for close inspection is Rainer Maria Rilke's

Orpheus. Eurydike. Hermes. Supposedly, it was written in Rome, in the autumn of 1904, inspired by the sight of a three-figure relief.[22] It was published in *Neue Gedichte*, a double volume, in 1907--8. According to his own dating, Lőrinc Szabó translated this Parnassian-type poem between 6th February and 14th June in 1953, after he had completed his own sonnet sequence in which his beloved, who had committed suicide, was mourned. Inspired by a new love, he began the last significant creative period of his life at the beginning of the same year. In my monographic study of Szabó, I gave a thematic explanation for his choice of this particular Rilke poem: it appealed to him because it addresses the fatality of death, the divergence and diversity of diverging lives.[23] This view seems justified by a few recent approaches, which emphasize the distinction between the living and the dead, the *différence* of the presentation of Eurydike, which is "non-individualized" according to Charles Segal and marked by "Unpersönlichkeit" according to Hans Jürgen Tschiedel.[24]

Lőrinc Szabó may have selected Rilke's work for translation in order to overcome his own sorrow with the help of a poem that was conceived in an artefacts-inspired Parnassian situation and suggested an acceptance of the traditional order of nature. Or are both the author and the translator concerned with other issues as well? For example with the extent to which the dead can share the order of survival, and the "song", the work of art, can contain the essence of being dead. The split between the poet and his work also appears as a poetic problem.

The issues, to which my attention was directed by the translation, seem all the more relevant for opening a new field of discussion, as they have been treated in a recent analysis by Ernő Kulcsár Szabó as well. He contends that the split between the states of living and being dead, which becomes manifest with the presentation of Eurydike, can be observed in the grammar and discourse as well.[25] Since differentiation between the two states is not a thematic issue but one of discourse, the poem is removed from the biographically defined problem of life and death and its interpretation can focus on the dialogism of the poetic discourse and the relationship between poet and song. The present tense and the narrated story of the poem underline the fact that the characters have no roles, because the roles are relevant only on other levels of time. To examine its grammar and discourse, Kulcsár Szabó's essay chose one stanza-long sentence from the poem, where Eurydike's different states of existence are thematically opposed:

> Sie war schon nicht mehr diese blonde Frau,
> die in des Dichters Liedern manchmal anklang,
> nicht mehr des breiten Bettes Duft und Eiland
> und jenes Mannes Eigentum nicht mehr.

In the extract one sees the characteristically emphatic, so called "oceanic," type of sentence which is familiar from the introduction to *The Gospel According to John*. It emerges as an "islet" with the threefold repetition of "nicht mehr", which is surrounded by the text of the sentence-ocean characterising Eurydike.

As a poet markedly conscious of textual possibilities, Rilke can be thought of as special significance to something when he uses one kind of sentence in his poem and then builds one of the keywords ("Eiland") into the very same sentence, with which it can be stylistically described. The sentence is negative, therefore two poles come into being: grammatically the "Eiland" does not exist any more ("nicht mehr"), while it remains significant poetically. What is negated poetically counterbalances the fact of negation. The tension between the two can be seen as a form-creating principle with regard to the whole poem, showing the distinction made between the present of the factual description of the plot and the art nouveau similes decorating the participants. As far as their *actions* are considered, the existential planes of Eurydike, Orpheus and Hermes are separated from each other by their lack of communication, which is indicated by the full stops between their names in the title. They are placed in the poem as if they were parts of a relief, without any kind of traditional relationship. At the same time, the <u>similes</u> taken from nature and valid on different time levels, which are used to describe the physical and metaphysical terrains regarded as real in the poem, suppose the unified order of existence through the timelessness suggested by language.

There is a dialogue between the time structure of the poem and its ornamentational mode of description. The present tense plot presents characters without roles, who are real only on different time levels.

In the present Eurydike appears only as <u>sie</u>[26]; her existence as "blonde Frau" was acceptable when she "in des Dichters Liedern manchmal anklang". But twice, in reference to this "blonde Frau"-existence and also to the "Dichter"-existence, the narrative present declares: "nicht mehr". On *another* past tense level Orpheus can exist as an authentic, albeit degraded, poet already without Eurydike. It is not the partner, the "Dichter", who sings about the dead spouse, but the text signifies a kind of transition: not the "Dichter", but not even the poem presenting the plot speaks: "aus einer Leier / mehr Klage kam als je aus Klagefrauen;". At this stage the poem itself can still have transitional quality; its theme is no longer the "blonde Frau", and not the communication-lacking otherness either: "eine Welt aus Klage".

In the distant past the <u>poet</u> sang about the living woman, and in a closer past his *lyre* mourned the dead, thereby making a "Klage-Welt" of this world. As a result we have the present, the "sie" in a state of being dead, and the man walking anxiously in

front of us ("der schlanke Mann im blauen Mantel"), whose musical instrument is a mere sign of his deformity.

> seine Hände hingen
> schwer und verschlossen aus dem Fall der Falten
> und wußten nicht mehr von der leichten Leier,
> die in die Linke eingewachsen war
> wie Rosenranken in den Ast des Ölbaums.

This is no longer the Dichter, but instead a miserable memory of him. The more he is involved in action, the less important he is in the representation. Finally this acting Orpheus, paradoxically, is incapable of action: the text does not report decision, the <u>will</u> to turn; the fact is only registered by the words of the contemplating God ("der Gott [...] sprach: Er hat sich umgewendet ─,").

According to the Hölderlinian tradition Orpheus would belong with those, "Welche von Lande zu Land zogen in heiliger Nacht". He would have been granted the success Hölderlin considered to be the poet's share:

> Nemlich es reichen
> Die Sterblichen eh' in den Abgrund. Also wendet es sich
> Mit diesen. Lang ist
> Die Zeit, es ereignet sich aber
> Das Wahre.

If we view Rilke's poem in this light, it seems the opposite of the concept of the poet described in Hölderlin's hymns. This position is halfway between Hölderlin and Heidegger, who interpreted Rilke on his anniversary.[27] At this time Rilke voices only his doubt, but Heidegger feels that even the question ("... und wozu Dichter in dürftiger Zeit?") is senseless. Thus Orpheus's return in Rilke is not the Romantic hero's freely chosen tragic error, but the elegiac gesture of the man who has become helpless against fate.

In the present-tense narrative even Hermes is not identical with the collaborator of the bargaining Gods: he follows events as a *sympathetic* observer. It is as if he illustrates Hölderlin's words in his hymn-fragment *Mnemosyne*: "[...] Nicht vermögen / Die Himmlischen alles." He expresses feelings in the poem, but without acquiring *God's* omnipotence, which is suggested through the use of the capital letter in the German original as well as in the final version of its Hungarian translation[28]: "der Gott sie anhielt und mit Schmerz im Ausruf / die Worte sprach: Er hat sich

umgewendet ─,".

A kind of pain or confusion is to be felt in Rilke's Hermes, because the action does not take place according to the predescribed rules. It is as if he were a scientist who realizes the danger of his discovery for the previously valid, classical describability of the world's facts. Planck's dilemma was worded at about the same time as Rilke drew his picture of Hermes: "Von Plancks Sohn soll später erzählt worden sein, daß sein Vater ihm, als er Kind war, auf einem langen Spaziergang durch den Grunewald von seinen neuen Ideen gesprochen hätte. Auf diesem Weg hätte er ihm auseinandergesetzt, daß er das Gefühl habe, entweder eine Entdeckung allerersten Ranges gemacht zu haben, vielleicht vergleichbar mit den Entdeckungen Newtons, oder sich völlig zu irren. Planck muß sich also um diese Zeit darüber klargeworden sein, daß seine Formel die Grundlagen der Naturbeschreibung erschütterte; daß diese Fundamente eines Tages in Bewegung geraten und von ihrer gegenwärtigen, durch die Überlieferung bestimmten Stelle aus in eine neue und damals noch völlig unbekannte neue Gleichgewichtslage übergehen würden. Planck, in seinem ganzen Anschauungen ein konservativer Geist, war keineswegs erfreut über diese Folgerungen; aber er veröffentlichte seine Quantenhypothese im Dezember 1900."[29] This is how Heisenberg immortalized Planck's dilemma.

Heisenberg also gives an answer to the question of what kind of presentiment is rendered by this Hermes─Planck's pain: "Die klassiche Physik beruhte auf der Annahme ─ oder sollten wir sagen auf der Illusion? ─ , daß wir die Welt beschreiben können oder wenigstens Teile der Welt beschreiben können, ohne von uns selbst zu sprechen."[30] With this the question is formed: "Inwieweit sind wir also schließlich zu einer objektiven Beschreibung der Welt, besonders der Atomvorgänge, gekommen?"[31] The introduction of the probability relation divides the world into object and the rest, where "die Beobachtung eine entscheidende Rolle bei dem Vorgang spielt und daß die Wirklichkeit verschieden ist, je nachdem, ob wir sie beobachten oder nicht."[32]

Heisenberg's summary claims: "Unsere tatsächliche Lage bei der Untersuchung eines atomaren Vorganges ist gewöhnlich die folgende: Wir wollen ein bestimmtes Phänomen verstehen, wir wollen erkennen, wie dieses Phänomen aus den allgemeinen Naturgesetzen folgt. Daher ist der Teil der Materie oder Strahlung, der an der Erscheinung teilnimmt, der natürliche »Gegenstand« in der theoretischen Behandlung und sollte in dieser Hinsicht von den Werkzeugen getrennt werden, die man benützt, um die Erscheinungen zu studieren. Damit wird wieder ein subjektives Element in der Beschreibung der atomaren Vorgänge hervorgehoben, denn die Meßanordnung ist ja vom Beobachter konstruiert worden; und wir müssen uns daran erinnern, daß das, was wir beobachten, nicht die Natur selbst ist, sondern Natur, die

unserer Art der Fragestellung ausgesetzt ist. Unsere wissenschaftliche Arbeit in der Physik besteht darin, Fragen über die Natur zu stellen in der Sprache, die wir besitzen, und zu versuchen, eine Antwort zu erhalten durch Experimente, die wir mit den Mitteln ausführen, die zu unserer Verfügung stehen. In dieser Weise erinnert uns, wie Bohr es ausgedrückt hat, die Quantentheorie daran, daß man beim Suchen nach der Harmonie im Leben niemals vergessen darf, daß wir im Schauspiel des Lebens gleichzeitig Zuschauer und Mitspielende sind."[33]

Heisenberg wrote his interpretation after the "Copenhagen formula" which coincided (1927) with the publication of Heidegger's main work and the appearance of the dialogical poetic paradigm. Rilke's portrayal of Hermes presents, as yet, the pain of acknowledging the need to introduce the method, rather than the joy felt over finding it. The poet behind Hermes experiences the pain of what is implied by Einstein's famous saying in reaction to the probability relation: "Gott würfelt nicht". Like Planck, Rilke publishes this shockingly preparing experience. Without this discovery he could not reach the poetic harmony of the Orpheus-sonnets, and the realization that the actor and spectator were one.

In Rilke's *narrative* there is no God and poet as possible roles, he presents two agitated "actors" homogenized for "Jetztpunkten der Zeit", who are incapable of performing appropriate actions as individuals in the present. To accomplish the great work, to effect communication between the living and dead modes of existence.

(wäre das Zurückschaun
nicht die Zersetzung dieses ganzen Werkes,
das erst vollbracht wird)

The sentence is put into parentheses in the text. Thereby the concept of purpose can no longer be related to the "Dichter", or if it can, it is in the sense of "nicht mehr". Consequently, in the text the Romantic authority of the "Dichter" ceases once and for all. Hölderlin endowed the "Dichter" with God's competence; Rilke's poem examines the same in human terms, looking for a passage between the physical and metaphysical modes of existence.

The text recalls a dual reality: in the linear narrative the facts testify to the lack of communication between the physical and metaphysical; (the living: "Er stand und sah."; the dead: "Sie war in sich", "Und ihr Gestorbensein erfüllte sie wie Fülle." "Sie war in einem neuen Mädchentum / und umberührbar" and "sie nichts begriff."). The similes, based on images taken from unchangeable nature which can be described lexically and grammatically in one kind of way only, draw attention to the presence of different modes of existence in one another. "Its elements and layers arrange

themselves into an independent unity, stylistic structure and work of art in terms of the [Goethean] <u>Gleichnis</u>" ─ as observed by Béla G. Németh concerning that part of 20th century Hungarian poetry which is close to Rilke.[34]

According to the narrative, the Gods' and demigods' (among them, the poets') authority ceased with the past ("nicht mehr"), the present is the scene of unaccomplishable human actions (that of play and dead existence). At the same time the <u>text</u>, through the everlasting force of language, recalls the past and makes the present complete: the "ganzen Werkes" that is put into parentheses by the narrative can be realized in the text, through language.

In Rilke the above refers also to the poet, the creator of this poem. Although the Parnassian tradition could make it possible to keep the role of "Dichter" and the writer of the poem apart, and the poet could claim presence in the work as narrator, the message of the poem affects the presence of the creator as well; as the role fades in the narrative, the *text* unfolds in a way that contains no more space for him. The poem is no longer the work of the "Dichter," it is no longer sung by the "Leir". As a Hungarian poet Mihály Babits (1883-1941) wrote later, in a poem dated 1932: "Not the singer gives life to the song: / the song gives life to its singer."

Rilke's poem simultaneously manifests the discontinuity and irreversibility of life in factual existence, in the futile present of everyday reality, and natural time, as well as its creatibility in the work of art representing "eigentlich" time. While the poem speaks without an omniscient and prejudiced narrator, the myth interpreted by the way of structuring and text-formation speaks for itself; the *différence* between the personas' problems and the time levels articulates the dissimilar discourses of the levels appearing in the myth and brings them into a dialogical situation.[35]

***

The prelude to the great change in the poetic paradigm whose prehistory is being discussed in the present paper, can perhaps be found in Ezra Pound's *Hugh Selwyn Mauberley (Life and Contact)*. In the final third of the 1910s Pound, like Eliot, seems to have become tired of free verse and returns to the Flaubertian stylistics and the Gautier-like poetic composition in such a way that his text contains also the relativization of statements. The return, therefore, gives birth to poetic innovation: the sentence is no longer identical with the statement; within the former an interpretational "atonality" is created.

Even one single line quoted from the lyrical cycle completed in 1920 can appear as very significant in 20th century literature: "Caliban casts out Ariel". It renders the change in the history of cultural symbols: the implicit factual statement

signals the change in the earlier preference representing the rules of the fable. In the professional as well as amateur play-acting (including school groups) of Europe and America, interest in the God-Prospero parallel has long been replaced by the rivalry of Ariel and Caliban, where the latter figure gains in importance. Pound's line is preceded by Browning's dramatic monologue *Caliban upon Setebos*[36] and Renan's philosophical drama[37]. Caliban's words are echoed also in Joyce's *Exiles*[38], by the protagonist, Rowen, the »portrait of the artist«, referring also to the isle of Ireland with Caliban's words. For a long time now, the audience seems to hear the deprived and the rebel when Caliban speaks. At the same time Caliban is also characterized by the original, Shakespeare-created features.

In Pound's poem the change of viewpoints is made conscious in opposition to two kinds of contexts. On the one hand it is included in the traditional dialectics of history:

> All things are a flowing,
> Sage Heracleitus says;

This voices change without any evaluation, announcing merely a fact. At the same time the announcement is framed by explanatory and complementary statements which signal the uncertainty appearing in the value relations. First a grammatically expressed »atonality« makes the sentence-statement identification impossible: "Christ follows Dionysus, / Phallic and ambrosial / Made way for macerations;" ─ later describing the reduction in value to signify the uncertainty with regard to the present level of values:

> Even the Christian beauty
> Defects ─ after Samothrace;
> We see το καλόν
> Decreed in the market place.

In *Mauberley*, the textual formation is marked by the parallel suggestion of value-levels and value-differences, and this is what interprets the character of the change preferred by Caliban or Ariel concerning power and/or value within the traditional cultural symbol.

In Hungarian literature the same appears in the work of two poets (formerly master and disciple), differing from and opposed to each other, monologically, accompanied by tonal representation. A poet of classical modernity, Mihály Babits, translated Shakespeare's *The Tempest* calling it a *fable*-play in 1916 as an antiwar

gesture, with the peacemaking and balancing Prospero in the centre of his interpretation. Supported by the authority of Babits, this historically significant act induced the emergence of a certain kind of humanist pathos in the Hungarian literature of the century, with preference for the Prospero-Ariel duet. It was Lőrinc Szabó who disturbed the tradition publishing his *Caliban*, a poem and at the same time the title of a volume. Some of his interpreters read it as a manifestation of generation rebellion, others as the constitutional and political self-portrait of a young poet. It was inspired by a suggestive stage rendering of Caliban as well as by Renan's play, as the poet later testified in his own interpretation of the poem.

The master and his disciple were merely at variance, misunderstanding each other. The aim of Babits was to register a traditional interpretation at a time when history was shattering the traditional order of cultural symbols in world literature. Seeing the change, Szabó points to its inevitability. Nevertheless, both equally despaired of the defencelessness of the poem in Europe. Babits realized that the classical modernity he also represented proved to be unresistant to the political and semantic effect of what can be described as the Caliban-syndrome. Even Stefan George, whose poetry displays structural similarities to that of Babits, saw the task of the "Sänger" in announcing the fight for a kind of "Neue Reich" in the time of *war*. His »war« poem (*Der Dichter in Zeiten der Wirren*)[39], the title of which ties up with Hölderlin's question, seems to suggest that the thematic message of the first wave of classical modernity can bear the preference of various antihumanistic and messianistic ideals. At most it is the poet's taste (manifested by exile in the case of George) or moral judgement (manifested by Babits's belief in God which contradicts any kind of political messianism)[40], that forms *extrapoetic* factors which can deter the poets from becoming overtly political in their works.

Lőrinc Szabó's poem of 1923, entitled *Caliban*, displays the features which characterized his work as a young poet between 1920 and 1928. Influenced by George, the avant-garde of the Menscheitsdämmerung and the Greek choral songs, he developed a kind of monological poem in which he united the figures of Führer and Dichter in order to transcend the social tensions and the cultural decline of the age, similar to what Kommerell, the theoretician of George's group, contended in reference to the classical phase of German poetry ending with the work of Hölderlin.[41] From the ars poetica of "Legyen a költő hasznos akarat" ("Let the poet be a useful will") he arrives at the extremity of "Kellenek a Gonosz fegyverei!" ("We need the arms of Evil!") (1926)[42]. In this poem, with admiration as well as horror, Caliban the modern technician who burns books is quoted (1923). It is through him, in first person singular, that the Leader's programme (or that of who is the general formula for the Leader) to gain world-power is declared (1928).

In *Mauberley* these two extremes can no longer appear in a tonally represented monologue: the atonality of discourse is also a kind of protection against the possible thematic commitment of the traditional poetic discourse. Therefore the problem does not lie in why there is a change of preferences in the field of power and/or values, in what way "Caliban casts out Ariel", but the fact that someone always *casts out* someone else. A new poetic paradigm could not come into being as long as the poem (either traditional, classically modern or avante-garde) represented a kind of teleology according to the principle of usefulness.

What is announced by the quoted sentence from *Mauberley*, by means of its multi-layered context, is presented by Tönnies in German philosophy, in whose theory the "Kürwille" annihilates itself as a homogeneous construction of thought. "Die Kürwillensformen stellen den vereinzelten Menschen der gesamten Natur als Geber und Empfänger gegenüber. Er versucht, die Natur zu beherrschen und mehr als das Gegebene von ihr zu empfangen: also Lustelemente aus ihr herauszuziehen, welche ihn keine Mühe und Arbeit oder andere Unlust gekostet haben. Aber innerhalb der Natur tritt ihm <u>auch</u> ein gleiches erstrebendes, <u>gleiches</u> Kürwillenssubjekt entgegen, der <u>andere</u>, welcher <u>seine</u> Mittel und Zwecke im Anschluß und Gegensatz gegen ihn hat, also durch seinen Schaden gewinnt und zu gewinnen trachtet. Sie müssen entweder sich nicht berühren oder sich vertragen, um als Kürwillenssubjekte nebeneinander zu verharren; denn wenn einer dem anderen nimmt oder ihn zwingt, so will und agiert jener allein: in dem Maße als der Zwang vorhanden ist, welches von der Beschaffenheit angewandter Mittel und Werkzeuge abhängt. Wenn dieselben nämlich nicht Lustelemente für ihn gleichwie für mich (also insoweit an sich, d. i. für uns beide) sind, so handle ich nicht <u>gütlich</u> mit ihm; ich gebe ihm nicht, was er selber begehrt. Er handelt entweder gar nicht oder gezwungen, d. h. nicht um seiner selbst willen; seine Handlung ist nicht Verwirklichung seines Kürwillens. Welches aber vorausgesetzt werden sollte. Dies will sagen: der reine Begriff der abstrakten Person treibt sein dialektisches Gegenstück aus sich selber hervor; [...] ebenso wie die Willensformen verhalten sich ganze Menschen zueinander: sofern jeder durch seinen Wesenwillen in seinem Verhalten bestimmt ist. Auch hier wird durch Zwang oder Gewalt die Freiheit und das eigene Selbst der Gezwungenen vernichtet; denn nur *durch* seine Freiheit ist ein Selbst vorhanden."[43]

Lőrinc Szabó, apolitical as he was in his private life, might well have been attracted later, if gossip by prejudiced contemporaries can be believed, by Hitler's figure, much as Pound, the politically involved private man, did in fact support Mussolini. In their respective poetic activity, however, they created a dialogical paradigm that contradicts any kind of usefulness-principled poetic achievement capable of being put into the service of messianistic historical tendencies.

The second wave of classical modernity beginning in the 1920s breaks up the traditional relation system of cultural symbols and speaks in the new language of the literary treatment of myths, leading to a change in the poetic paradigm. To illustrate this development in Hungarian poetry it is worth quoting a poem, entitled *Szun Vu Kung lázadása* ('The Rebellion of Sun Vu Kung') by Lőrinc Szabó from the mid-thirties, which has a ballad-like frame work. It opposes Sun Vu Kung the monkey-king, whose ambition is to rule the world, with the cultural symbol of peace-bringing Buddha. Despite the nursery-rhyme-like quality of the narrative there is no sign of a Caliban-contra-Ariel alternative. In the linear story Buddha "casts out" Sun Vu Kung, but the tone of the poem is definitely dialogical. The dialogue is, of course, not between the personas (that would only shift the poem toward a latent monologue), but within them. Sun Vu Kung's journey to the end of the world not only distorts traditional ideals in its "will to power", but like the *Irish Airman* enjoys "A lonely impulse of delight / Drove to this tumult in the clouds"; he is similarly shocked by the "waste" experienced in his own "tumult" at the end of the world. His agitated, eager activity does not merely destroy, but is comparable with the ambitions of Orpheus to complete the "ganzen Werkes". Buddha, on the other hand, presents not only redeeming goodness but also the ever-restricting power by his "sparingly" cruel punishment. In this poem the cultural symbol is transformed into a myth that prevents the transmission of any kind of decodable message: it takes us into a labyrinth where all is "of all kinds at the same time".[44]

With this I conclude the prehistory of the second phase of classical modernity where a new kind of discourse, the dialogical poetic paradigm appears in the late 20s and early 30s, the era of Yeats's mythical and philosophical poems, Rilke's Orpheus-sonnets, Pound's Cantoes and Lőrinc Szabó's volume *Te meg a világ* ('You and the World').

1. I discuss the appearance of the dialogical poetic paradigm in Hungarian poetry in my article *Költészetbeli paradigmaváltás a huszas évek második felében* (In: Literatura 1991, No 3, 248--272) and in my book "*A magyar kültészet az én nyelvemen beszél" (A kései Nyugat-líra összegződése Szabó Lőrinc költészetében*), Argumentum, Budapest, 1992.

2. The poem was published in the volume *The Wild Swans at Coole*, in 1919. The airman here is modelled on Major Robert Gregory, the son of Yeats's fellow-writer and friend, Lady Augusta Gregory. By mistake, the young man was killed by an Italian pilot in Jan. 1918 over the Italian front. His death is mourned in Yeats's *In*

Memory of Major Robert Gregory.

Lőrinc Szabó translated the poem on 14th Sept. 1947, after he had finished his autobiographically conceived lyrical meditation on life. His own work is also influenced by the envisioned confrontation between real life which has become historically problematic and empty, and "eigentlich" life rooted in "delight" and made complete in the creation of art. "A dream of death" as the completion of life with death is a significant idea in Szabó's work as well.

3. In his book *A szép hűtlenek. Babits, Kosztolányi, Tóth Árpád versfordításai (The Fine Unfaithful. The Verse Translations of Babits, Kosztolányi, Árpád Tóth)* (Budapest, 1969) György RÁBA refers to Yeats as "the great neo-romantic of the early 20th century." (321., 340.); In his introduction to Yeats's *Selected Poems* (Pan Books in association with Macmillan, 1990) A.Norman JEFFARES claims that "Though never abandoning symbolism, Yeats's later poetry became increasingly hard-edged and realistic." Jahan RAMAZANI's *Yeats and the Poetry of Death - Elegy, Self-Elegy and the Sublime* (Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 1990) examines Yeats's poetic genres in comparison with the English romantic elegy and calls Yeats a post-Romantic.

4. Cf. Patrick J. KEANE, *Yeats's Interactions with Tradition*, University of Missouri Press, Columbia, 1987.; Seamus DEANE, *The Second Coming: Coming Second; Coming in a Second*, In: Irish University Review 1992, No. 1.; Mária KURDI, *Szabó Lőrinc Yeats-fordításai* ('The Yeats-Translations of Lőrinc Szabó'), In: Irodalomtörténet 1993, No. 4, ... It was also she who called my attention to some of the Irish references of the present paper.

5. Seamus DEANE, op. cit. 99.

6. William MORRIS ed., *The Heritage Illustrated Dictionary of the English Language*, Boston-New York, 1973, 1381.

7. James Joyce, *Finnegans Wake*, The Viking Press, New York, 1986, 184. Brian Friel, *Faith Healer*, In: *Selected Plays*, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington D. C., 1986, 353.

8. Patrick J. KEANE, op. cit. 249.

9. Making use of the trains of thought in M. H. ABRAMS, *The Mirror and the Lamp*, University Press, Oxford, 1953. and *Natural Supernaturalism*, New York, 1971.

10. "If dramatic tragedy leads characters to an encounter with the external forces that destroy them, lyric tragedy internalizes this process by leading the poetic mind to a heroic reflection on death. Empirically, there can be no such thing as internalized tragedy, since the poet does not "die" but only encounters an obstacle troped as death and then quests onward. But in their phenomenological structure, the poems of tragic joy are staged as imaginative encounters with death, meditations at the brink of catastrophe." (Jahan RAMAZANI, op. cit. 84.)

11. "A modern and unmystified Othello, the tragic speaker of the poem reviews his life from the privileged vantage point of its final moments. Heidegger's "being-towards-death" so closely approximates Yeats's understanding of the tragic here that we might say the speaker encounters his death with anticipatory resoluteness (Enschlossenheit) as the everyday withdraws from view, its morality and purposes reduced to anonymous crowds. The airman affirms this intense life of death as his chosen fate and freedom." (Jahan RAMAZANI, op. cit. 85.)

12. Martin HEIDEGGER, *Der Begrriff der Zeit*, Vortrag vor der Marburger Theologenschaft Juli 1924.; Max Niemeyer Verlag Tübingen, 1989. 16.

13. Ibid. 15.

14. Ibid. 16.

15. Ibid. 18.

16. Ibid. 27.

17. Martin HEIDEGGER, op. cit. 19.

18. Ibid. 27.

19. Íbid. 17.

20. John UNTERECKER, *The Doctrine of the Mask*, in: *Yeats. A Collection of Critical Essays*, Ed. by John Unterecker. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J.

1963. 30.

21. W. B. YEATS, *A Vision*, Collier Books Edition, Third Printing, 1969. 13.

22. The circumstances of the poem's inception are summarized in Hans Jürgen TSCHIEDEL, *Orpheus und Euridice. Ein Beitrag zum Thema: Rilke und die Antike*. In: Rüdiger GöRNER (hrsg.): *Rainer Maria Rilke*. Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1987. 285─318.

23. *Az összegzés ideje* ('The Time of Summary'), Budapest: Szépirodalmi, 1980. 424. The translation was probably not made to meet an order. At that time, after his first heart attack, the still recovering poet was living on translation. Therefore, it must have been for a significant reason that he decided to start working on the demanding translation of that long poem by a poet whom he did not even like.

24. Charles SEGAL, *Rilke's Sonetts to Orpheus and the Orphic Tradition*, in: Literatur in Wissenschaft und Unterricht, Band XV. Heft 4. Dec. 1982. 367─380.; Hans Jürgen TSCHIEDEL: op. cit.

25. Ernő KULCSáR SZABó, *Mérték és hangzás. Az orfikus tárgyiasság Rilke kései lírájában (Measure and Sounding. The Orphic Objectivity in Rilke's Late Poetry)*. In: Orpheus, 1991. 2─3.sz. 152─169.

26. Hans Jürgen TSCHIEDEL calls attention to this in his study.

27. Martin HEIDEGGER, *Wozu Dichter?*; lecture delivered to a small public on 29th Dec., 1946, the anniversary of Rilke`s death, and published in a volume titled *Holtzwege*, in 1950.

28. It is not yet capitalized in the typed draft of Lőrinc Szabó's translation which contains his corrections. (Manuscript Library of MTA, Ms. No. 46586/60/IV.); In his posthumously published volume of translations, compiled by himself, the word is spelt with a capital letter.

29. Werner HEISENBERG, *Physik und Philosophie*, 1959, Ullstein Buch NR. 249., West-Berlin, 1961. 16─17.

30. Ibid. 38.

31. Ibid. 38.

32. Ibid. 35.

33. Ibid. 40.

34. NÉMETH G. Béla, *Hasonlóság, hasonlat, példázat* ('Similarity, Simile, Parable'). Kritika, 1968., in: *11 vers* ('11 poems'). Bp. 1977. 189─210.

35. Perhaps this gives an answer to the "why" of the translator's choice. It is the persona-using poetic discourse of the work of art that lends poetic form to Lőrinc Szabó's *A huszonhatodik év* ('The Twenty-Sixth Year'): the loser, the bereaved person, the man, describes the unchanging but elegiac story like Orpheus. The poet creates the "eigentlich", ideal space-time, in which he rearranges the facts of the past; the person who is acting takes up the role of Hermes, hoping that "Perhaps there is still a way between the Here and There?" Finally, in the concluding piece of the cycle it is *the poet* who becomes a conscious participant who, balancing between the different planes the work of art brought to life and is pondering "its" fate. At this point the cycle can be connected to the work of Rilke, because in opposition to the personas (among them the poet) the work of art gains *existence*: "s te *aere perennius*, / versem, aki csillagfénykoszorús / gyászodban már─már mosolyogni tudsz, / túléled őt!". ("And you, *aere perennius*, / my poem, who in your starlit wreathed / mourning can almost smile, / you will survive her!") Therefore, in the title of his translation Lőrinc Szabó emphasizes not separation but parallel existence: the names of the "personae" are not separated by full stops, as in Rilke, but by commas: *Orpheus, Eurydike, Hermes*.

36. Written around 1860 and published in 1864.

37.Ernest RENAN, *Caliban, suite de La Tempęte* (1878), *L'Eau de Jouvence, suite de Caliban* (1880).

38. "The isle is full of voices". James JOYCE's play was published in 1918; the line is quoted from Scene 2 of Act III of Shakespeare's *The Tempest*.

39.Stefan GEORGE's poem, *Der Krieg* was translated by Lőrinc SZABó "with the permission of the poet" and published in Nyugat entitled *A háború*; following it he translates GEORGE's *Der Dichter in Zeiten der Wirren* as well, titled *A költő a*

zőrzavar korában.

40. It was László FERENCZI who drew my attention to this decisive aspect of Babits's behaviour.

41. Max KOMMERELL, *Der Dichter als Führer in der deutscher Klassik,* Bondi, Berlin, 1928.

42. Quotations are from Lőrinc Szabó's 1926 volume of poems, *A Sátán Műremekei* ('The Masterpieces of Satan').

43. Ferdinand TÖNNIES, *Gemeinschaft und Desellschaft. Grundbegriffe der reinen Soziologie* (1887). Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt, 1979. 112.

44. The quotation is from Lőrinc SZABó's poem *Egyszerre mindenféle* ('All Kinds At the Same Time'), which was first published in a daily paper on 17th May 1931, and later in the 1932 volume entitled *Te meg a világ* ('You and the World').