Lolita at 50 — what it taught us about art and morali

Intry years ago unto week une first copies of a two-volume paperback novel in a plain green cover began appearing in French bookstores. The Englishlanguage book had to be published abroad because the author had been advised that if he tried to do so in America, where he lived and the book is set, the obscenity laws would surely have landed both him and his publisher in jail.

The author was an obscure refugee from both Bolshevism and Nazism named Vladimir Nabokov. The novel was Lolita.

When the book did find its way to America, people called Lolita pornographic. Most only knew its basic plot, a middle-aged man's obsession with a 12-year-old girl — and they didn't like it. Vigilance in the laudable goal of protecting children from predatory adults obscured the difference between pornography and art — and with it Nabokov's credentials as a literary colossus. It hardly mattered that

"It is not my sense of the immorality of the Humbert Humbert-Lolita relationship that is strong," Nabokov told an interviewer, "it is Humbert's sense. He cares, I do not."

When Nabokov once said that

he didn't "give a damn for public lumorals, in America or elsewhere," he was not proclaiming his own immorality. He was insisting on the necessity of the artist rising above the fray. The tagoal, in his words, of "aesthetic bliss" was otherwise unattain.

He himself objected to pornography not because it was obscene, but because it was trite.

Great art doesn't seek mere

JOHN YEWELL

light, but they are always a

The revelation that led to Lotta was not of some prurient desire on the part of the author to bed pre-pubescent girls—Nabokov himself seemed old-tashioned about such matters—but rather was inspired by a newspaper article he read in Paris before the war about an ape that had been coaxed by scientists to make a charcoal drawing. The ape's choice of subjects?

And that's what Lolita is about. Humbert Humbert, the wretch, describing in the calculating terms of the practiced madman the prison of his unspeakable desires, and the methodical, maniacal strides he takes in pacing his cage — all told in luxurious, even mannered prose.

In a world overrun by "poshlost," a Russian word meaning "self-satisfied inferiority" and one of Nabokov's favorites, *Lolita*'s complex imagery, expressed in dazzling, magical language, stands out.

Today Nabokov would have no trouble publishing his book in this country although it's less certain it would be recognized as the work of genius it is. The obscenity laws may be gone, but their absence has opened the floodgates to so much tawdry tripe that one wishes banality laws had taken their place.

In raising the bar on pornography — thanks, if that's the right word, to the Internet and cable — we have also given rise

It hardly mattered that Nabokov viewed his own creation, the depraved character of Humbert Humbert, as a "vain and cruel wretch." Most of Nabokov's characters are lost or demented in some fashion, but that isn't the point. What he steadfastly resisted was the urge to ascribe moral conclusions to works of art, because doing so was the surest way to poison the well of rigorously honest creation.

Philistines and sexual hyporecrites. Ask any big-city hotel armager, who will tell you that you usage of pay-per-view porn pochannels spikes whenever a here.

religious convention is in town.
Instead of a Nabokovian
yawn over this avalanche of
poshlust, if you will, the reaction
has been a moral revanche. Last

whether we fight an unwinnable
y war against the technologically
superior forces of modern pornography, which Nabokov called
the "copulation of clichés." What

matters is whether we are fostering our highest forms of expression, not our lowest, and whether we understand how art's refuge, not its refuse, can confer a kind of immortality on its creations.

John Yewell is the city editor for the Free Lance in Hollister, Calif., where this column first appeared. He previously wrote columns for The Salt Lake Tri-





