

Writer`s Laboratory, Censorship and Publication

Abstract: The article deals with the writer's creativity in academic publishing, which is done by the author and the author's last will of the complete study of creativity. There is shown how harmfully influenced the Tsar censorship, the Bolshevik-Menshevik censorship and a censorship full of Soviet ideology on a single creation or on the whole edition. Writer's academic edition of the works chronologically displays the whole creativity of the author. The full collection of the publisher is obliged to inform the reader of his entire classic laboratory. No religious, social, political and subjective opinion should not interfere with the creativity of the writer's full presentation.

Key words: Academic edition, Censorship, publisher, laboratory, last will.

Writer`s Laboratory, Censorship and Publication

Textology is a branch of philology which includes the study of texts, survey of the history of their creation and preparation of the final version for academic edition. In academic edition it is necessary that the established text be the last will of the author (if the changes occurred due to the intervention of censorship). The author`s will is established by means of thorough and in-depth study of the creative laboratory of the writer. Laboratory work of the writer is manifested well in the department of the academic edition which represents variety of versions and editions. Such multiple readings evidence author`s attitude not only in relation to linguistic and literary norms but interventions of censorship are clearly revealed in this or that epoch because of political or other considerations.

If we trace a creative laboratory of classics, we will have the following picture: Iliia Chavchavadze is known in the history of Georgian literature as a conductor and defender of modern literary and linguistic norms. This is well seen in his creative laboratory too. In the majority of cases his works have more than 4 and 6 variant sources which indicate by itself the author`s attitude to this or that composition. However, there are also such cases when one text has 8, 10, 16 versions; e.g.:

the verse “Worker” (On mourning day in Tbilisi...) has 8-variant multiple reading of which 2 (BC) autographs are handwritten and the rest ones are the printed sources published during the author’s lifetime; the poems “Mother of Kartli”, “Elegy” and “Since Why” have 12 versions, of which 2 (BC) are handwritten autographs; the verse “Nana” has 16 versions, of which 4 (BCDE) are handwritten autographs. We can also find multiple readings in I. Chavchavadze’s poems: “The Ghost” has 14 versions of which 5 (BCDEF) is a handwritten autograph and the poem “The Mother of Kartli” of 16 variant multiple reading 5 (BCDEF) are handwritten autographs (Chavchavadze 1989). The author’s text was especially frequently changed while working at the poems. This is well seen during the acquaintance with variant comparison of the “Ghost”. The D version of this poem also had several handwritten texts of which several of them rewritten by unknown person have not come down to us. This “Ghost” flayed me alive, I do not know what to do. I say to give up this “Ghost”. That cruel our history... It is the history of only wars and kings, the nation is not seen anywhere. And I am of such a constitution that kings and wars do not attract me. People do things, and people are nowhere to be seen in our history”, remarks Ilia in a letter written to D.Eristavi (Chavchavadze 1961; 34). Ilia started to work at this poem in January, 1859. In the process of work the author changed separate lines, strophes and even chapters. The work was finished in 1972, though up to 1881 the stylistic or poetic changes still occurred.

Akaki Tsereteli worked much at his works. He also changed the words, rhythms, passages, unless he gave a finished form to his piece of work. For instance, of 7 sources of the verse “Mechongure” 6 (BCDEFG) autographs are handwritten; the verse “Amirani” has 9 sources, of which A and B are autographs and, C and D are copies; the rest are printed sources. It is interesting to note that even after publication the authors did not stop and later made new changes in the printed version. For instance, in the autograph (“Amirani”) the word “so much” in the printed source was first changed with the word “very much” (H), and then was printed - “in very mach” (N) (Tsereteli 2011; 487). A. Tsereteli’s verses “In Response to Armenians” and “Paris” have 8 to 8 sources of which in the first verse 7 autographs and in the second one 2 (AB) autographs and 5 (DEFGH) copies (Tsereteli 2012). In the same way the poet treated the poems. For instance, 5 of 12 sources in the dramatic poem “The Insidious Tamar” are handwritten source (Tsereteli 2014 b).

Ioseb Grishashvili’s attitude to his own texts is well-known in Georgian poetry. His thoughts on verses never gave him peace. The poet used to send his verses to the friends and followed them with letters; neither had they lacked his attention from distance. In the devoted verses he asked to make

adjustments to a particular place or a title. In spite of the fact that I. Grishashvili's texts do not differ by a great variety of versions, it is clearly seen how much the poet works at sophistication of words, rhythms and forms of the text in his creative laboratory. Here are just a few examples of this: in the verse of fighting character "Leningrad" the author did not like the word "warmly said" any more and changed it to the word "like a tension bar". The final line of the same verse "You are the same, proudly standing" was changed into "You are standing proudly fire bullets". The verse "The Dream and Reality" was changed twice by the author. Once for the first publication (journal Ganatleba, 1914) and later for the collection of 1922. In the manuscript autograph there was: "I don't remember correctly, beauty/ I don't remember what I have devoted to you/ I don't remember our past,/ I don't remember again". In the 1922 Collection this passage of the verse takes the following form: "I don't remember correctly, beauty/our spring past,/ "I don't remember correctly again/ what I have written to you ... what I have devoted" (Kusrashvili 19876; 3-30).

Galaktion Tabidze worked much at his writings that is evidenced from his creative laboratory. Tabidze's vers "Akaki's Shadow" has 15 version sources of which 5 (BCDEF) are manuscripts. The poems "The Moon above Mtatsminda", "October Symphony", (Tabidze 1966 a) and "Revolutionary Georgia" (Tabidze 1966 b) have 20-20 version readings of which in the first case there are 9 (BCDEFGHIJ), in the second case 16 (BCDEF¹GGHIJKLMN¹OP) and in the third case 13 (BCDEFGHIJ) manuscript autographs.

Besides author's individual approach to the text, one's own wish, the perfection of the work from literary, grammatical or stylistic viewpoints, the multiplicity of variation and editorial different readings is also caused by censorship intervention. If we observe Akaki Tsereteli's poem "Amirani" censor manuscript (C), we will see that 8 whole lines are crossed out with red ink. These lines are: "On the high peak of the Caucasus/ chained Amirani/ is the whole Georgia/ and the enemies are ravens! / Right time will come and he will break the chains, the hero of heroes/ The joy will substitute the trouble". (Tsereteli 2011:458). The expression of patriotic feeling by a Georgian and foresee the future with hope, of course, must have been unacceptable for the tsarist Russia.

A. Tsereteli's dramatic poem "Patara Kakhi" (little Kakhi) experienced complicated metamorphosis because of the intrusion of censorship. Initially this poem was written in prose. The remaking of the work from prose to versification was not unusual for the poet. With poetic form Akaki added highly artistic feature to the text. However, not only the love for rhythms became the cause of the existence of three versions of the "Patara Kakhi". For the first time the composition was

written in the form of prose under the title “Irakli Batonishvili”. A Censorship Board tsarist Russia rejected the drama because of bringing to the fore Georgia’s history, resuscitate heroic deeds of forefathers. The author was forced to change the title (“Gela”) and put forward a simple peasant as main character, renovate the list of characters, add the passages of everyday life and put historical events to the background. This did not help the poet to distract censor’s attention and finally presented the work with completely new form and edition – a poem entitled “Patara Kakhi” (Arveladze 2005).

In 1913, the II book of A.Tsereteli’s “My Writings” (I. Minashvili publishing-house) became ideological victim of the tsarist Russia. As it is known, in July, 1909 Akaki arrived to Paris to his family and stayed there till January 1910. Here the writer creates numerous compositions which are gathered in the so-called “Parisian Notebook”. This notebook includes the well-known poem “Vorontsov” (the notebook is kept at the National Centre of Manuscripts - # 83). Book II of the “My Writings” started just with this poem. When the book was printed and took the final form the Censorship Board required Russian translation of “Vorontsov”. As soon as translation was read it was banned and 2800 copies of printed version were destroyed. The thing is that Mikhail Vorontsov in the poem was shown as a friend of our country and advocated of Russo-Georgian relations. Really, approximately for 10 years (1845-1855) the viceroy Vorontsov had done much for Georgia, built the theatre, public library, bookshops were opened, gymnasiums, “Caucasian Museum” was founded, etc. Vorontsov even concerned with publication of the old Georgian texts and generally he appreciated Georgia and its culture. Despite the fact that the text was written in 1909, it describes the period of Vorontsov’s arrival to Georgia. In the poem, Vorontsov could not hide his frustration, that a Georgian had lost the pride and determination and slavishly dropped his head (Tsereteli 2014b; 308). According to the text, Georgian public men express despair and concerned much with the current poor state of Georgia brought by the colonial oppressive policy of the imperial Russia. A.Tsereteli expressed this concern more intensely through the mouth of Dimitri Kipiani: “Being deceived in the hands of Russia/ today Georgia is dying” (Tsereteli 2014; 309). At the end of the poem the author laments over Vorontsov’s time and again denounces the current state of things, grieves that “Georgian language has been disregarded”, that the priesthood again appeared in the hands of Russia and “people have lost the faith” (Tsereteli 2014b; 322). The description of such attitude to Russia became the reason to ban this piece of work.

Imperial censorship followed by the Soviet censorship did equal harm to a lot of A.Tsereteli's works which had been kept at the shelves for almost one century and were not known to the modern reader. In 2001 the publishing-house of the Tbilisi State University issued a book "The Unknown Akaki" (the publishers Iuza Evgenidze and Nana Fruidze) which includes those of Akaki's works that either do not enter or appeared as small fragments in A.Tsereteli's complete collections. There were 31 verses, 1 poem, 1 prosaic composition, publicist papers or personal letters. For instance, in the verse "Voice" (Khma) included in the book the poet laments over poor Georgia pressed by the tsarist Russia, which "believes neither icon, nor cross" and "All that was given to Iverian Church by World Meeting today is destroyed by external forces". This verse was not printed in Akaki's lifetime due to the known reasons. However, shortly after the poet's death, in 1916 it came out journal "Megobari" (#94) under the title "Khalkhuri" (folk). The change of a title was one of the ways to escape the censorship. Naturally, the condemnation of Russia and "display" of religious motifs were unacceptable for Soviet conjecture either. Thus, the verse remained hidden for several decades. In the complete 20-volume edition of A.Tsereteli's works which is being prepared at the Institute of Georgian Literature includes all forgotten or unknown works of Akaki. Among them is the verse "The Voice" (Tsereteli 2011; 346).

The harmful policy of the tsarist Russia is sharply criticized in A.Tsereteli's poem "A Centenary Story". Only the beginning fragment of this poem entered the third volume of the seven-volume collection (1940). In Akaki's lifetime in 1912, probably again for the purpose of deceiving the censor, only the fragment of the poem was printed in the newspaper "Temi" (#92) under the title "Racha-Lechkumi". The poem with full text and textological apparatus is included in IV volume of the complete twenty-volume of A.Tsereteli's works (Tsereteli 2014a:403). The censorship of the tsarist Russia was followed by Menshevik-Bolshevik and eventually censor of the soviet ideology. An example of banning the author's works by censorship represents the collection of I. Grishashvili's poems "The Lost Poems". These poems did not enter the poet's academic edition too. The cause was a diversity of opinions since the beginning of the 90s expressed by the specialists in study of literature, critics and public men on I. Grishashvili as an erotic or pornographic author. In the twenties of the 20th century the Mensheviks, Bolsheviks and Orthodox priesthood strongly criticize the young poet for poetry built on a "kiss". Surprising as it may seem, even a public figure with European education, Ms.Kato Mikeladze called Grishashvili's creativity pornographic. Kita Abashidze, Geronti Kikodze, Simon Chikovani and the Tsisperkantslebi (Blue Horns) separated from erotic and pornographic understanding and recognized I. Grishashvili as a poet expressing the

freedom of soul (Tsitsishvili 2010: 480-491). It was just the freedom of soul that fears the communist regime which aim and requirement was the advancement of the Marxist-Leninist ideology in the creativity and it is quite clear why such kinds of works were banned for a long time. The mentioned collection of I. Grishashvili came out only in 1992 (Grishashvili 1992).

Unfortunately, soviet publishers and editors were not inferior to the harmfulness of censorship. An unauthorized intervention in the text and sometimes complete disregard of the piece of work were frequent during publication of the classics. The editor-in-chief of the publishing-house “Sabchota Sakartvelo” (Soviet Georgia) Alio Adamia did not consider the poet-academician I. Grishashvili the author of such level who would be worthy of academic edition. That is why the ten-volume of academic edition prepared at the Department of Textology of the Institute of Georgian Literature turned into only five-volume collection of works (1980-1985).

In 1980, VI volume of Mikheil Javakhishvili’s collection came out. It was abruptly reduced due to the publication limit and around 900 pages were reduced to 280 pages. Naturally, this occurred at the expense of taking off a number of M. Javakhishvili’s publicist letters. The “affected” letters along with Javakhishvili’s complete publication were published later as a separate book in 2001 (Javakhishvili 2001).

Pavle Ingorokva’s relation to the texts can be considered as a subjective attitude to the work. P. Ingorokva as a publisher often to beautify the rhythm and avoid tautology changed the author’s words at his own discretion. Such amendments were done by him in the texts of “Vepkhistaosani” (The Knight in the Panther’s Skin), Nikoloz Baratashvili and Ilia Chavchavadze. This is totally unacceptable for establishment of the text and this is disregard of the author’s will. Besides this, such intrusions hinder the study of not only author’s but generally grammatical and literary changes of the language in a concrete epoch, its evolution. It is textological work and academic edition that must prepare the material for linguists and literary critics to investigate the epochal or author’s norms. It is impossible to do this without taking into consideration author’s will –“The fullness and accuracy of all texts is an indispensable ingredient of any academic edition” (Kusrashvili 1997:114).

Academic editions imply chronological display of the author’s complete creative works. This or that work may be less valuable from literary or creative viewpoints but the publisher of a complete collection should familiarize the reader with the classic writer, his laboratory. Academic edition is intended for the circle of readers who represent scholars and researchers who need to be supplied

with the works of classics at a proper, textological level in order to conduct the research into the writer's creative works on correct scientific base. Therefore any religious, social, political or subjective views should not hinder complete display of the writer's creative works. This would mean that the author's will is taken into consideration, inviolability of the text created by him.

REFERENCES

Arveladze 2005: Arveladze M. Akaki Tsereteli's poem "Patara Kakhi" (textological analysis). Tb., "Tsodna", 2005.

Grishashvili 1992: Grishashvili I., The Lost Verses, Tb., "Nobati", 1992.

Kusrashvili 1976: Kusrashvili R. Textological Observations on I. Grishashvili's poetic creativity. Issues of textology, V, Tb., 1976.

Kusrashvili 1976: Kusrashvili R. The author's will is impregnable. journal "Tsiskari", 1997, #8.

Tabidze 1966 a: Tabidze G. Collective works in 12 volumes. vol. I, Tb., "Sabchota Sakartvelo", 1966.

Tabidze 1966 b: Tabidze G. Collective works in 12 volumes. vol. II, Tb., "Sabchota Sakartvelo", 1966.

Tsitsishvili 2010: Tsitsishvili T. Critical reception of Ioseb Grishashvili's "erotic lyrics" as an indicator of socio-cultural processes of that time. The III International Symposium, Modern Problems of Literary Criticism (Materials), Tb. 2010.

Tsereteli 2011: Tsereteli A. Complete set of collective works in 20 volumes. vol. II, Tb.: "Publishing-house of the Institute of Georgian Literature", 2011.

Tsereteli 2012: Tsereteli A. Complete set of collective works in 20 volumes. vol. III, Tb.: "Publishing-house of the Institute of Georgian Literature", 2012.

Tsereteli 2014 a: Tsereteli A. Complete set of collective works in 20 volumes. vol. IV, Tb.: "Sakartvelos Matsne", 2014.

Tsereteli 2014 b: Tsereteli A. Complete set of collective works in 20 volumes. vol. IV, Tb.: "Sakartvelos Matsne", 2014.

Chavchavadze 1961: Chavchavadze I. Collective works. vol. X, Tb.:1961

Chavchavadze 1989: Chavchavadze I. Set of Collective works in 20 volumes. Vol. X, Paris: “Qartuli Wigni“(Georgian book), 1989.

Javakhishvili 2001: Javakhishvili M. Letters, Tb., 2001.