

# Nabokov's Infernos

## Schizomythology, promiscuous textuality, plagiarism by anticipation

« La mémoire de la littérature marche ainsi tout naturellement à reculons, chaque texte venant s'éclairer de la lecture d'autres qui lui sont pourtant postérieurs. » (H. Le Tellier, *Esthétique de L'Oulipo*. Bordeaux, Le Castor Astral, 2006: 174.)

EDITIONS MSS

[View my complete profile](#)

## Copyright

Being a collaborative project, this ludict is authored by a plurality of hands and minds under the schizomythic, sinemotic, and promiscuously textual coordination of M. S. Strickland to whom all relevant rights revert and all inquiries should be directed.

## Collaborators

Ouida Willoughby Johnson

Gennifer Schlame

Sagarch Flawndol

M. S. Strickland

D. I. Swopes

Editions MSS

ISocPhys

Ludict

## Ludict List

- 2010 (7)
- 2009 (12)
- ▼ 2008 (4)
  - ▼ November (2)
    - A **plagium of a plagium**
    - Chronogrammatical encryptions (I)
  - September (2)

10 NOVEMBER 2008

## A **plagium of a plagium**

Nous te remercions, Ouida, pour avoir remarqué la lacuna envers Lécureur (2002) in the list of references from our previous two installments (from the most recent of which the list, alas, was lacking, like, totally). We will rectify this oversight by appending a full list of all works consulted thus far at the end of this very floret of our carmina nabokoviana. However, the cryptotextual trident—1916 via the setting of *Un rude hiver*, 1939 by way of its date of publication, and 1940 through its failure to obtain le prix du Roman populiste—of the cryptolexical chronogram, or chronogrammatical encryption,<sup>[1]</sup> evocative of Queneau (cf. our installment of 8 November 2008) that Nabokov embedded in *Lolita* by way of Humbert's step-descending *flamme* and his *oncle d'Amérique*, as well as Quilty's *Little Nymph*, will have clatalysed the curette of our schizomythological enflure, thus goading us on to violate the animus of our current ludict, namely: To what extent can we consider *Lolita* to be a **plagium of a plagium**? That is, would a schizomythological clatalysis of the altarity of the text (scat) be more or less fruitful if we conceived of *Lolita* as the story of a **plagium** (kidnapping of a child) told by means of **plagium** (**plagiary**)? The duplicity of the term surely did not escape Nabokov, and, indeed, we contend that the term's duplicity reticulates and chiasmifies throughout the entire plaited, patchwork, and plexiform texture of that particular instar of Nabokov's opus.

**§1.1.** Let us recapitulate the marrow of our installment of 23 September 2008, “It happened on the tram.”

**§1.1.** On a tram in Vienna, Ulrich falls in love with a girl of twelve; recounting this incident to his sister Agathe, he couples it to his childhood fantasy, qualified as “banal,” of adopting a girl and raising her to be his wife (Musil 1960, 1978, 1995: §28).

**§1.2.** On a tram in Le Havre, Bernard Lehameau remarks two children—“quelle imprudence de laisser deux enfants se déplacer ainsi seuls à travers une grande ville”—a boy and a girl, aged, respectively, six or seven, and thirteen or fourteen, and singles out the latter as “bonne proie pour un satyre” (Queneau 1939: I, 16).

**§1.3.** In Barcelona, with no tram in sight, Walter Flores, a thirty-one-year-old Bolivian, was sentenced to ten years in prison for having subjected an eleven-year-old girl “a un régime de esclavitud sexual” (*La Vanguardia*, 18 septiembre 2008).

**§1.4.** These examples clearly show that the institution of human **plagium** is but a **plagium** of the tendencies of certain hamadryas baboon males, and is thus a phylogenetically ancient offshoot of the full repertoire of potential human behavior.

**§1.5.** Humbert's crime, in other words, lacks neither for precedents<sup>[2]</sup> nor sequelæ.

**§1.6.** We may thus define Humbert's (and Flores's) crime as **phylogenetic plagium**: the practical urge manifested by an adult male primate, or dreamed about by a subadult male imagining himself to be adult, to abduct a prepubescent female conspecific for the purposes of sexual exploitation, which exploitation may be carried out in the immediate present (the usual case) or in some distant future (wishful thinking).<sup>[3]</sup>

**§2.** As Humbert himself points out, and as Dolinin (2005) has graciously elaborated upon, the **plagium** recounted by Nabokov was what we may term a **plagium by amplification** of “what Frank Lasalle, a fifty-year-old mechanic, had done to eleven-year-old Sally Horner in 1948” (Nabokov 1991: II, 33, 289).<sup>[4]</sup> In Oulipian terms, in other words, Frank La Salle's crime was a **plagiary by anticipation** (*plagiat par anticipation* [Oulipo 1973: 23]; or anticipatory **plagiary** [Mathews and Brotchie 2005: 211]) of Humbert's **plagium**.

**§2.1.** Maar (2005) draws a connection between Nabokov's *Lolita* and Heinz von Lichberg's short story, “Lolita.” Neither as **plagium** nor **plagium** does this connection interest us, as, apart from the Ibero-gitanian chromaticisms shimmering between the two (more amply riffed upon in Nabokov's *Ada*), the link seems largely onomastic.

**§2.1.1.** However, as cryptolexical chronogram, or chronogrammatical encryption, the potential seems richer: Lichberg's "Lolita" was published in German in 1916—the very year in which Queneau's *Rude hiver* takes place.<sup>[5]</sup>

**§2.2.** Not unlike our observations anent the opening of *Lolita* and the closing of *Un rude hiver* (see our installment of 17 September 2008, "Light of my life"), the translexical piste of the SCAT we embarked upon during the course of our second Parisian exile (from early printemps 1999 jusqu'à late autumn 2000) has put us on the clitalytical track of an altarian parallelism entre un passage de Larbaud (1927: 889) and the memorable second paragraph of *Lolita* (Nabokov 1991: I, 1, 9):

**LARBAUD** Lolita est une petite fille; Lola est en âge de se marier; Dolores a trente ans; doña Dolores a soixante ans.

**NABOKOV** She was Lola in slacks. She was Dolly at school. She was Dolores on the dotted line.

**LARBAUD** Ou encore : je me permets de demander à don José des nouvelles de la jeune veuve, sa sœur, doña Dolores. Reçu « avec toute confiance », en ami de la maison, je ne tarde pas à appeler : *Dolores* ? Un jour, inspiré par l'amour, je murmurerai : *Lola*. Et, le soir des noces, j'aurai Lolita dans mes bras.

**NABOKOV** She was Lo, plain Lo, in the morning, standing four feet ten in one sock. She was Lola in slacks. She was Dolly at school. She was Dolores on the dotted line. But in my arms she was always Lolita.

**LARBAUD** C'est le principe; mais il y a aussi des formes, et des déformations, locales : Loliú, Lolin... La gamme entière.

**§2.2.1.** In addition to the obvious, notice how Larbaud's *gamme entière* rhymes, not just with the quenellian *flamme* (Queneau 1939: XIV, 175, antepenultimate paragraph) of nabokovian pelvic *fire* (Nabokov 1991: I, 1, 9, first paragraph), but also with the musical scale implied in "the tip of the tongue taking a trip of three steps down the palate to tap, at three, on the teeth" (Nabokov 1991: I, 1, 9, first paragraph), as well as the legs (*gams*) covered by Lola's slacks.

**§2.2.2.** We are pleased to report that our observations have been independently confirmed by Couturier (2001: 3), and thus are artifacts, of neither the translexical apparatus conceived between the left thigh of dusk and the right thigh of dawn in our chambermaid's bedchamber (chambre de bonne) in Paris, nor the schizomythological approach to the subject we have since refined at ISOCPHYS and elsewhere in our exile in Owlstain and the wider Tetrastic region at large.

**§2.3.** The particular mode of plagium by which one may reduce, as demonstrated in **§2.2**, a lovely litany of nominal nuances by Larbaud into an armful of pithy epithets by Nabokov, we may call **translexical rhythmic plagium**.<sup>[6]</sup> Such translexical rhythmic plagium is a sister species of the **inverted translexical plagium**<sup>[7]</sup> which took us from the antepenultimate paragraph of Queneau (1939) to the initial ditto of Nabokov (1991) (explored, natürlich, in our installment of 17 September 2008, "Light of my life").

**§3.** Let us now put child's plagium (of the phylogenetic type) behind us, and move on to what we may call **plagium by repetition**, taking as our paradigm that celebrated section of iterative longing, Nabokov (1991: I, 26, 109). Concomitantly, perhaps, our Hypothesis of Familiarity (HoF) of 8 November 2008 will find collateral substance in and on which to peg its "Token of Truth" (ToT).

**§3.1.** The penultimate sentence of our type specimen consists of exactly 27 (twenty-seven) syllables packaged into syllabic triplets having the form of "Lolita," as follows: "Lolita, Lolita, Lolita, Lolita, Lolita, Lolita, Lolita, Lolita, Lolita" (Nabokov 1991: I, 26, 109).

**§3.2.** The entirety of chapter XX, of the first part of Ronald Firbank's second novel, *Inclinations*, originally published in 1916, takes the form of two (2) sets of four (4) instars each of bisyllabic units labeled "Mabel:"

"Mabel! Mabel! Mabel! Mabel!  
Mabel! Mabel! Mabel! Mabel!"

**§3.2.1.** "Lolita" repeated eight (8) times in Nabokov (1991: I, 26, 109), giving us a total of nine (9) instantiations of that name, no doubt serves as a further cryptolexical chronogram invoking both Queneau (1939) and Firbank (1916).

**§3.3.** Astute readers will notice that the specimen under consideration does not content itself with its 9(L), that is, “nine times Lolita,” formula, but rather augments its tagmemes both fore and aft with what are none other than words, of which the following interest us: “This daily headache in the opaque air of this tombal jail is disturbing, but I must persevere. [...] Don’t think I can go on. Heart, head—everything. Lolita, Lolita, Lolita, Lolita, Lolita, Lolita, Lolita, Lolita, Lolita. Repeat till the page is full, printer” (Nabokov 1991: I, 26, 109).

**§3.4.** Though in terms of repetition, the plagium (of the anticipatory sort) that follows is rather paltry, having as it does a structure of only (1+3), it surely compensates by matching its “Amanda” to the syllable count of “Lolita,” as well as rhythmically augmenting its rostral and caudal extremities with similar arrangements of words in the manner we came across in §3.3: “He had resolved to emancipate himself from fear, indulgence, and that instinctive preoccupation with the interests and dignity of self which he chose to term Jealousy, and with the one tremendous exception of Amanda he had to a large extent succeeded. Amanda. Amanda. Amanda. He stuck the more grimly to his Research to drown that beating in his brain” (Wells 1915: VI, 1: 382).

**§3.4.1.** The similar sorts of words which interest us in terms of rhythmic plagium may be sorted into three sets, a, b, c, and d, as follows, with culls from Nabokov (1991: I, 26, 109) at stage right and those from Wells (1915: VI, 1: 382) at stage left: a) *This daily headache in the opaque air of this tombal jail is disturbing :: that instinctive preoccupation with the interests and dignity of self which he chose to term Jealousy*; b) *persevere :: fear*; c) *Repeat till the page is full :: Research to drown that beating*; and d) *Heart, head—everything :: beating in his brain*.

**§3.5.** A similar combination of **rhythmic and repetitive plagium** is put into a **translexical mode** throughout the latter two-thirds of Queneau (1939). Recall that, at the same time that he is taking the childish pair Annette and Polo for outings to the cinema and such, Lehameau is pursuing an English nurse, Helena Weeds, whom he met in the book’s opening pages. From page 62, when she tells Lehameau her first name, until pages 158–159, when he apprises, but refuses to believe in, her likely death in a torpedoed hospital ship, the name “Helena” rhythmically and insistently insinuates itself into Lehameau’s heart and head (for the sake of clarity, we dispense with quotation marks wherever appropriate):

**§3.5.1.** L’uniforme lui allait en effet à ravir, ce sont les termes mêmes qu’employa Lehameau qui, dans son ravisement croissant, osa lui demander son prénom.

— Helena, répondit-elle.

Elle avait répondu sans fioritures. Helena. Lehameau se détourna et appuya son front contre la vitre pour regarder dans la nuit, et l’obscurité pendait aux vitres en longs lambeaux noirs qu’agitait le vent, et les deux uniques consommateurs du café désert restèrent ainsi quelque temps silencieux. Helena (Queneau 1939: V, 62–63).

**§3.5.2.** Il se sentait malade de désir. Helena.

Helena. Helena.

Helena (Queneau 1939: V, 67).

**§3.5.3.** Lehameau s’arrêta là, regardant distrairement l’inexplicable activité de deux ou trois marins ou stewards abandonnés sur le pont. Il nota soigneusement le lieu exact du débarquement, sa situation, ses approches, puisqu’il pensait à Helena.

C’était là.

C’était là que, pour la première fois, elle avait touché le sol de France.

La France. Helena.

Helena. Helena.

Helena (Queneau 1939: VI, 75).

**§3.5.4.** Lehameau demeura rêveur. Helena.

Helena. Helena.

Helena.

Prochain rendez-vous, lundi. La posséderait-il? Posséder! Quel mot. Posséder posséder, posséder. Posséder une femme. Helena.

Helena. Helena.

Helena (Queneau 1939: XI, 130).

**§3.5.4.1.** “Humbert Humbert sweating in the fierce white light, and howled at, and trodden upon by sweating policemen, is now ready to make a further “statement” (*quel mot!*) as he turns his conscience inside out and rips off its innermost lining” (Nabokov 1991: I, 17, 70). Just as Humbert’s definition of *posséder* as being “trodden upon by sweating policemen” is not without its interest, neither too is the trope of turning inside out lacking in some sort of connection with the item that follows.

**§3.5.5.** Mais ces borborygmes de l’espace n’étaient en aucune façon des échos de sa

rumination : l'oreille gardait sa netteté, le charme de ses courbes, le fini de son dessin, une oreille petite et délicate et jeune, croquante et nacrée, câlinement serrée contre la paroi du crâne, une fleur de chair merveilleuse et translucide. Helena.

Helena. Helena.

Queneau 1939: XII, 135).

**§3.5.5.1.** Lehameau's detailed evocation of Helena's nacreous ear leads to Humbert's spleen against nature for refusing to accommodate his longing to turn Lolita "inside out and apply voracious lips to her young matrix, her unknown heart, her nacreous liver, the sea-grapes of her lungs, her comely twin kidneys" (Nabokov 1991: II, 2, 165).

**§3.5.5.2.** Humbert's vain and visceral longing leads naturally back to Lehameau's malaise du désir qui "l'étranglait, lui vidait la capsule crânienne, lui pétrissait l'estomac comme une faim, lui contractait les entrailles et lui meurtrissait les reins" (Queneau 1939: IX, 99–100).

**§3.5.5.3.** "Ces borborygmes de l'espace" lead us to a plagium by refraction, as well as amplification, involving a gimmal of Swiss cousins: one who garrulously presides preprandially at the Palearctic salon chez Lehameau's frère from which endroit the borborygmes arise, tandis que l'autre leers at Lo in an optically wobbly mise en scène around a Nearctic swimming pool in Elphinstone which precedes Quilty's plagium of Humbert's plagium:

**§3.5.5.3.1.** "He was no longer the satyr but a very good-natured and foolish Swiss cousin, the Gustave Trapp I have mentioned more than once, who used to counteract his 'sprees' (he drank beer with milk, the good swine) by feats of weight-lifting—tottering and grunting on a lake beach with his otherwise very complete bathing suit jauntily stripped from one shoulder" (Nabokov 1991: II, 21, 237–238).

**§3.5.5.3.2.** "Il entendait dans le lointain le cousin suisse bouillonner de jusqu'auboutisme et tenter de faire raconter à Charles ses exploits guerriers, Sénateur qui l'encourageait, Thérèse et Lalie qui bavardaient parallèlement" (Queneau 1939: XII, 135).

**§3.5.5.3.3.** "Even the dog seemed puzzled by the extravagance of her reactions. I put a gentle hand to my chest as I surveyed the situation. The turquoise blue swimming pool some distance behind the lawn was no longer behind that lawn, but within my thorax, and my organs swam in it like excrements in the blue sea water in Nice" (Nabokov 1991: II, 21, 237).

**§3.5.5.3.4.** "Tout ça ça faisait du brouhaha, mais un brouhaha peu solide, et qui ne l'offusquait point. Il l'écoutait sans que cela troubât l'image qui l'enchantait, au contraire du chien qui bouleverse son reflet en buvant l'eau qui le mire" (Queneau 1939: XII, 135).

**§3.5.5.4.** As we leave off this image of a dog's snout in shimmering water, compare the following refraction involving smiling masks:

**§3.5.5.4.1.** "Imagine me, reader, with my shyness, my distaste for any ostentation, my inherent sense of the comme il faut, imagine me masking the frenzy of my grief with a trembling ingratiating smile while devising some casual pretext to flip through the hotel register" (Nabokov 1991: II, 23, 247–248).

**§3.5.5.4.2.** "Il l'agitait par les deux épaules et son visage prenait la forme du masque de la joie" (Queneau 1939: XII, 134).

**§3.5.6.** Le délicat coquillage de son oreille tremblait au fond de sa mémoire. Helena.

Helena. Helena.

Helena. Elle serait perdue. L'absence s'enflerait de toutes les catastrophes et dans la masse opaque des malheurs du monde cette séparation se perdrait indiscernable. Elle serait engloutie (Queneau 1939: XII, 141).

**§3.5.6.1.** Compare in particular "dans la masse opaque des malheurs du monde" (Queneau 1939: XII, 141) with "This daily headache in the opaque air of this tombal jail" (Nabokov 1991: I, 26, 109).

**§3.5.7.** Lorsque Lehameau arriva au bout de la jetée près du sémaphore, la *Zbelia* s'engageait entre les deux digues. Il n'en pouvait plus voir que la poupe blanche qui disparaissait graduellement, un fantôme qui marchait sur les eaux, et s'en allait à reculons, en le regardant. Helena.

Helena. Helena.

Helena.

Puis les deux transports traversèrent l'avant port et disparurent, suivis d'un torpilleur (Queneau 1939: XIII, 152).

**§3.5.7.1.** Pay particular attention to the final sentence of the above, “Puis les deux transports traversèrent l'avant port et disparurent, suivis d'un torpilleur.” Its parallel play of p’s and r’s, its rhythmic resonance with the terminal command of our specimen of Nabokov (1991: I, 26, 109) is unmistakeable: “Repeat till the page is full, printer.”

**§3.5.8.** Saine et sauve Helena.

Saine : ce corps, ce visage, cet espoir, ces yeux. Ces dents. Ses dents n'étaient pas très bien rangées, ce n'est pas un signe de bonne santé, cela ne fait rien. Cette oreille : son oreille : le lobule sain d'une oreille saine. La fermeté de sa croupe.

Sauve : vivante. Re-vivante.

Cela lui parut très évident, Helena saine et sauve, Helena.

Helena. Helena.

Helena.

Cela lui parut tellement évident que cela ne pouvait le détourner de son projet (Queneau 1939: XIV, 158–159).

Nor us from our project too, printer.

**NOTES**

1. To our knowledge, these chronogrammatical encryptions are not chronograms in the technical sense qua Mathews and Brotchie (2005: 126), but rather, shall we say, roundabout maneuvers to “Bare one’s Devices” (BoD) by suggesting a literary date (of setting, publication, prize, and so on) that somehow points to the devices one has bared.

2. Recall that Robert Musil’s *Der Mann ohne Eigenschaften*, Dritter Teil, “Ins tausendjährige Reich (Die Verbrecher),” was first published in 1932.

3. The simian SCAT brimming over in *Lolita* and other works, so allusive of phylogenetic plagiūm, may or may not be scooped up in a subsequent installment.

4. In addition to Dolinin 2005, who handily charts a truncated foundry of plagiūm (i. e., larding of newspaper articles) in which Nabokov smelts the story of Humbert’s plagiūm of *Lolita*, cf. Wikipedia entry on Florence Sally Horner and B. Dowell, 1940s sex kidnap inspired *Lolita*, *Sunday Times* of 11 September 2005. For a compact protoplast serving as paradigm of and for the mechanics of Nabokov’s practice of plagiūm per se, cf. in particular Sweeney (1985, 2000) who points out that Humbert’s offer to show us a “picture” of Virgil, “who could the nymphet sing in single tone,” is in fact a playful plagiūm of the following illustration of the entry on nymphet in the *Oxford English Dictionary*: “1855 R. C. SINGELTON tr. Virgil Wks. I. 60 Who could the nymphets sing?” However, the most ancient citation of the term “nymphet” which the *OED* provides us is the following: “1612 M. DRAYTON *Poly-Olbion* I. xi. Argt. 171 Of the Nymphets sporting there In Wyrrall, and in Delamere.” Following these two citations’ scansion, the metrical reader will clearly stress the first syllable of the term under consideration. As for the term’s significance, however, the two citations are clearly at variance. In Drayton’s case, we have an allegorically veiled allusion to mere bodies of water; in Singleton/Virgil’s, a bucolically open longing for the real bodies of live human females. As we deem it not beyond the scope of our study’s reach, allow us to array these nymphic snippets in the mantled cloaks of their contexts.

First, Drayton. The sibylline citation of the *OED* refers, in fact, to the argument of the eleventh song of Michael Drayton’s *Poly-Olbion*, which runs in full as follows:

*The Muse, her native earth to see,  
Returns to England over Dee ;  
Visits stout Cheshire, and there shows  
To her and hers, what England owes ;  
And of the Nymphets sporting there  
In Wyrrall, and in Delamere.  
Weever, the great devotion sings  
Of the religious Saxon Kings ;  
Those Riverets doth together call,  
That into him, and Mersey fall ;  
Thence bearing to the side of Peak,  
This zealous Canto off doth break* (Drayton 1876: II, 11, 67).

The nymphets of the argument would seem to insinuate themselves into lines 125–141 of the canto proper:

Which Mersey cheers so much, that with a smiling brow  
He fawns on both those Floods ; their amorous arms that throw  
About his goodly neck, and bar’d their swelling breasts :

On which whilst lull'd with ease, his pleaséd cheek he rests,  
 The *Naiades*, sitting near upon the aged rocks,  
 Are busied with their combs, to braid his verdant locks,  
 Whilst in their chrystal eyes he doth for *Cupids* look :  
 But *Delamere* from them his fancy quickly took,  
 Who shews herself all drest in most delicious flowers ;  
 And sitting like a *Queen*, sees from her shady bowers  
 The wanton Wood-Nymphs mix'd with her light-footed Fauns,  
 To lead the rural routs about the goodly lawns,  
 As over holt and heath, as thorough frith and fell ;  
 And oft at Barley-break, and Prison-base, to tell  
 (In carols as they course) each other all the joys,  
 The passages, deceits, the sleights, the amorous toys  
 The subtile Sea-Nymphs had, their *Wyrall's* love to win (Drayton 1876: II, 11, 71–72).

Now to Singleton's take on our term of enthrallment, a rendering of Lycidas's turn in his dialogue with Moeris which constitutes Virgil's ninth eclogue:

Alas ! occurs to any guilt so deep ?  
 Alas ! were consolations thine from us,  
 Well nigh along with thee, Menalcas, reft ?  
 Who could the nymphets sing ? Who strew the ground  
 With blooming plants, or mantle o'er the springs  
 With emerald shade ? Or [who could sing] the lays,  
 Which I caught up by stealth from thee of late,  
 When thou to Amaryllis, our delight,  
 Wouldest take thee (Singleton 1855: I, IX, 60).

Nor is the original entirely lacking for charm (quis caneret nymphas indeed!):

Heu, cadit in quemquam tantum scelus? Heu, tua nobis  
 paene simul tecum solatia rapta, Menalca?  
 quis caneret nymphas; quis humum florentibus herbis  
 spargeret, aut viridi fontes induceret umbra?  
 vel quae sublegi tacitus tibi carmina nuper,  
 cum te ad delicias ferres, Amaryllida, nostras?

5. See our first note above. In addition, more on the deployment of the chronogrammatical encryption, or cryptolexical chronogram, throughout other of Nabokov's infernal obras, in particular, as it or they wag a shaggy, mosquito-bitten nose at, say, Virginia Woolf and/or Raymond Roussel, may or may not appear in a subsequent installment of our œuvre.

6. Translexical rhythmic plagiūm may also be recognized by the alternative, though equivalent, terms rhythmic plagiūm in the translexical mode and translexical plagiūm with rhythm, though we prefer the former.

7. Likewise, infrequent sightings on the shores of our literature of translexical plagiūm by inversion should be recognized as nothing more nor less than inverted translexical plagiūm.

- A COMPLETE LIST OF REFERENCES THUS FAR CONSULTED FOR THE PURPOSES OF THIS LUDICT, PERHAPS
- COUTURIER M** (2001). *Lolita et la France*. Text of a talk given at the Nabokov Museum in St. Petersburg, Russia, in the spring of 2001. Reproduced at Zembla.
- DOLININ A** (2005). What happened to Sally Horner?: A real-life source of Nabokov's *Lolita*. Originally published in the *Times Literary Supplement*, September 9, 2005, pp. 11–12. Modified, supplemented, and reproduced at Zembla.
- DRAYTON M** (1876). *The complete works of Michael Drayton, now first collected*. With introductions and notes by the Rev. Richard Hooper, M.A. London: John Russel Smith. Volume II.
- FIRBANK R** (1916). *Inclinations*. In *Three more novels*. New York: New Directions, 1951.
- LARBAUD V** (1927). Des prénoms féminins. In *Jaune bleu blanc. Œuvres*, Bibliothèque de la Pléiade, Paris: Gallimard, 1958.
- LÉCUREUR M** (2002). *Raymond Queneau : biographie*. Paris: Belles Lettres.
- MAAR M** (2005). *The two Lolitas*. Translated by P. Anderson. London: Verso.
- MATHEWS H** and **BROTCHIE A** (2005). *Oulipo compendium*. Revised and updated. London: Atlas.

- MUSIL R** (1960). *The man without qualities*. Translated by E. Wilkins and E. Kaiser London: Secker and Warburg.
- (1978). *Der Mann ohne Eigenschaften*. Reinbeck bei Hamburg: Rowohlt.
- (1995). *The man without qualities*. Translated by S. Wilkins. New York: Knopf.
- NABOKOV V** (1991). *The annotated Lolita, revised and updated*. Edited, with preface, introduction, and notes by Alfred Appel, Jr. New York: Vintage.
- OULIPO** (1973). *La littérature potentielle*. Paris: Gallimard.
- QUENEAU R** (1939). *Un rude hiver*. Paris: Gallimard.
- SINGLETON RC** (1855). *The works of Virgil, closely rendered into English rhythm, and illustrated from British poets of the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries*. London: Bell and Daldy. Volume 1.
- SWEENEY SE** (1985). Nymphet singing in Singleton. *The Nabokovian*, vol. XV, pp. 17–18.
- (2000). Posting of 19 December 2000 on Nabokv-L listserve.
- WELLS HG** (1915). *The research magnificent*. New York: The MacMillan Company.

Copyright © 2008 Editions MSS

Posted by Editions MSS at 13:36

1 comments:

**Sagarch Flawndol said...**

Bien que votre divastigation of the dyadic nature of Lolita's plagiary spurs within me a cascade of lexical frissonages partout autour de mon petit corps littéraire, dos cosas curiosas leave me nonplussed in an impasse of puzzlement. D'abord, a chronogram, as the *Oulipo Compendium* tells us, "exploits the double significance of those letters that are also Roman numerals [...] When such letters are identified in a chronogram and added up according to their numerical value, their sum will correspond to a given year of the Christian era" (p. 126). I have thus analyzed, for instance, the first sentence—"Lolita, light of my life, fire of my loins"—of *Lolita*, and, finding, in this order, the Roman numerals L L I L I M L I I M L I, have added them up to yield the Christian year of 2255. Now, since Humbert met Lo in 1947, and died in 1952, I am left—even though 5 and 2 occur in our chronogrammatical yield, and 2 plus 2 equals 4 and 2 plus 5 equals 7—floundering in that impasse again, as the text in question purports to be no sci-fi exploration of the future or some alternative universe. How, in a word, is *Lolita* a chronogram? Deuxièmement, throughout all of your detailed divastigation of the various sorts of plagiary to be had for the diligent reader's délectage, nowhere do you touch on plagiary with variation, let alone by anticipation. What gives?

[03 December, 2008 12:25](#)

[Post a Comment](#)

Links to this post

[Create a Link](#)

[Newer Post](#)

[Home](#)

[Older Post](#)