

**Responding to
Cosmopolitanism:
The New Identities of
Literary Theory**

**Odgovor na
kozmpolitstvo:
Nove identitete
literarne teorije**

ICLA Committee on Literary Theory International Colloquium

Mednarodni kolokvij Komiteja za literarno teorijo ICLA

Ljubljana, 5 – 7 June, 2008, Scientific Research Centre of the SASA

Ljubljana, 5. do 7. junij 2008, ZRC SAZU

CIP - Kataložni zapis o publikaciji
Narodna in univerzitetna knjižnica, Ljubljana

82.0"19/20"(063)
316.7(100)"19/20"(063)
821.09(063)

INTERNATIONAL Comparative Literature Association. Committee on Literary Theory.
International Colloquium (2008 ; Ljubljana)

Responding to cosmopolitanism : the new identities of literary theory : programme and
abstracts = Odgovor na kozmopolitanstvo :
nove identitete literarne teorije : program in povzetki / ICLA Committee on Literary
Theory International Colloquium, Ljubljana
5-7 June 2008 = Mednarodni kolokvij Komiteja za literarno teorijo ICLA, Ljubljana, 5. do
7. junij 2008 ; [edited by Marko Juvan]. -
Ljubljana : ZRC SAZU, 2008

ISBN 978-961-254-069-2
1. Gl. stv. nasl. 2. Vzp. stv. nasl. 3. Juvan, Marko, 1960-
239205376

ICLA / AILC Committee on Literary Theory
The Institute of Slovenian Literature and Literary Studies at the
Scientific Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and
Arts

ICLA/AILC (Mednarodna zveza za primerjalno književnost) – Komite
za literarno teorijo
Inštitut za slovensko literaturo in literarne vede ZRC SAZU

RESPONDING TO COSMOPOLITANISM: THE NEW
IDENTITIES OF LITERARY THEORY

ODGOVOR NA KOZMOPOLITSTVO: NOVE IDENTITETE
LITERARNE TEORIJE

Ljubljana, 5 – 7 June, 2008, premises of the Scientific Research Centre
of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts (ZRC SAZU), Novi trg

4

Ljubljana, 5. do 7. junij 2008, prostori ZRC SAZU, Novi trg 4

Organizing Committee / Organizacijski odbor:

Galin Tihanov (The University of Manchester – ICLA)
Marko Juvan (ZRC SAZU, Ljubljana)
Darko Dolinar (ZRC SAZU, Ljubljana)

PROGRAMME / PROGRAM

Wednesday, June 4th / Sreda, 4. junija

Arrival of the participants / Prihod udeležencev

Thursday, June 5th / Četrtek, 5. junija

09:15-09:30 Conference opening / Otvoritev konference

09:30-10:30 First panel / Prva sekcija

Galin Tihanov: *Genealogies of Cosmopolitanism*

John Neubauer: *Realities, Utopias, and Misconceptions Concerning the Globalization of Literary Studies*

Ulrike Kistner: *Cosmopolitan sensus communis: The Common of Singular Sense – Sense of the Singularly Common*

10:30-11:00 Discussion / Diskusija

11:00-11:20 Coffee break / Odmor za kavo

11:20-12:20 Second panel / Druga sekcija

Péter Hajdu: *The Status of Literature in an Age of Global Risks*

Vladimir Biti: *Theory and Trauma*

Marijan Dovič: *Literature and Censorship: From Plato's Ideal Polis to Cosmo-Polis*

12:20-12:50 Discussion / Diskusija

12:50-15:00 Lunch break (Pri Mraku) / Odmor za kosilo

15:00-16:00 Third panel / Tretja sekcija

Ziva Ben-Porat: *Cosmopolitanism, Globalization, Digital Culture and – Intertextuality*

Marko Juvan: *Influence, Intertextuality, and the (Literary) World System*

Angela Esterhammer: *Byron and Cosmopolitanism*

16:00-16:30 Diskusija / Discussion

17.00-19.30 Guided tour of Ljubljana /

Vodeni ogled Ljubljane (Luka Vidmar)

Friday, June 6th / Petek, 6. junija

09:30-10:30 First panel / Prva sekcija

Robert Stockhammer: *World Literature, Already Translated*

Sangjin Park: *Cosmopolitan Vernacular in Yi Kwang-Su's Bilingual Way of Writing*

Takayuki Yokota-Murakami: *The Future in the Margin: The Universal and the Particular in the Russian Emigre Poetry in the Far East*

10:30-11:00 Discussion / Diskusija

11:00-11:20 Coffee break / Odmor za kavo

11:20-12:20 Second panel / Druga sekcija

Calin Mihailescu: *Superbia, Suburbia*

Vanesa Matajc: *Globalization, Inter-literarity, and the Cosmopolitan Author*

Darja Pavlič: *The Role of Inclusive Logic in Comparative Literary Studies*

12:20-12:50 Discussion / Diskusija

12:50-15:00 Lunch break (Pri Mraku) / Odmor za kosilo

15:00-15:40 Third panel / Tretja sekcija

Jola Škulj: *Cosmopolitics through Literary Theory*

Walid Hamarneh: *A McWorld and McJihad Combo with Literature on the Side or The Beginning of the End of (National) Literature*

15.40-16.00 Discussion / Diskusija

16.00-16.20 Coffee break / Odmor za kavo

16.20-16.50 Conclusion / Sklep kolokvija

17:00-19.00 Committee business meeting / Zasedanje komiteja

20.00 Conference dinner in the Old Ljubljana /

Slavnostna večerja v stari Ljubljani (Špajza, Gornji trg)

Saturday, June 7th / Sobota, 7. junija

8.00-18.00

Excursion to Gorenjska (Bled, Bohinj, Slap Savica, Radovljica, Vrba) /

Izlet na Gorenjsko (Bled, Bohinj, Slap Savica, Radovljica, Vrba)

* Bus departure / Odhod avtobusa: Trg francoske revolucije

The Colloquium Outline

At the outset of the 21st century, the humanities are beginning to respond to a reality in which global restructuring and growing inequalities are fueling religious and ethnic conflicts and growing national anxieties, as well as movements for social justice, reconciliation, interconnection, and the development of inclusive perspectives.

The last few years have seen a veritable upsurge in interest in the discourses of cosmopolitanism. The work of well-known sociologists and political theorists, such as Ulrich Beck, Zygmunt Bauman, Arjun Appadurai and Antonio Negri, has had an impact on literary theory and comparative literature; it has confronted these fields with the challenge to rethink their place and tasks in a world marked by increasing complexity and interdependence.

In proposing to focus on the ways in which literary theory has embraced the various discourses of cosmopolitanism in the 20th century and at present, we wish to examine the foundations of the notion of 'world literature' and the disciplinary practices of literary theory in their relation to comparative literature, literary history, 'literature in translation' etc.

Our main goal is to work out responses to an important range of questions, including:

- How has literary theory conceptualised and responded to globalisation and cosmopolitanism? What are the differences between globalisation and cosmopolitanism?
- What are the theoretical and ideological stakes behind the notion of 'world literature'? How has 'otherness' been negotiated in notions and programmes of 'world literature'?
- What are the origins of modern cosmopolitanism as a discourse, from antiquity through the 18th century to the middle of the 20th century?
- How do literary theory and comparative literature participate in the shaping of educational and other cultural processes that set themselves the task of negotiating the effects of globalisation?

- Are the discourses of cosmopolitanism too elitist to play a serious role in modern consumerist societies?
- What is the significance of migration and exile in constructing cosmopolitanism as a body of discourse? How have migration and exile been inscribed historically in the identity of literary theory and comparative literature as disciplines?
- How does literary theory reflect upon the global media and transnational communication? To what extent do these phenomena alter the identity, the role, and the conceptualisations of literary theory at the beginning of the 21st century?
- How are feminism and gender studies inflected by the processes of globalisation, and by cosmopolitanism?

By proposing to hold its 2008 annual colloquium in Ljubljana, The ICLA Committee on Literary Theory acknowledges a long and fruitful collaboration with our colleagues in Slovenia, both at SAZU and at the University of Ljubljana.

Zasnutek kolokvija

Na začetku 21. stoletja se je humanistika začela odzivati na resničnost, v kateri so globalna prestrukturiranja in naraščajoče neenakosti podžigali verske in etnične konflikte, nacionalne tesnobe, a tudi prebujali gibanja za družbeno pravičnost, spravo in povezovanje. V zadnjih letih je oživel in se razmahnilo zanimanje za razpravljanje o svetovljanstvu, kozmopolitstvu. Znani sociologi in politologi (U. Beck, Z. Bauman, A. Appadurai in A. Negri) so vplivali tudi na literarno teorijo in primerjalno književnost. Spodbudili so ju k ponovnemu premisleku o svojem položaju in nalogah, posebej v kontekstu naraščajoče svetovne kompleksnosti in soodvisnosti.

Kolokvij se bo posvetil vprašanju, na kakšne načine je literarna teorija v 20. stoletju in na začetku 21. stoletja sprejemala različne diskurze o kozmopolitstvu; s tem bo preučil tako temelje pojma "svetovna književnost" kakor tudi disciplinarne prakse literarne teorije, predvsem v razmerju do primerjalne književnosti, literarne zgodovine, "literature v prevodu" itn.

Glavni cilj je kolokvija je izoblikovati odgovore na ključna družbena in aktualna strokovna vprašanja:

- Kako je literarna teorija konceptualizirala kozmopolitstvo in globalizacijo, kako se je nanju odzivala? V čem so razlike med kozmopolitsvom in globalizacijo?
- Katera so teoretsko-ideološka ozadja za znova aktualni pojem "svetovna književnost"? Kako programi poučevanja svetovne književnosti uveljavljajo "drugost"?
- Kateri so izvori modernega kozmopolitstva kot diskurza (od antike prek 18. stoletja do srede 20. stoletja)?
- Kako primerjalna literarna veda sodeluje pri oblikovanju izobraževalnih in kulturnih procesov, ki skušajo ublažiti ali premagati učinke globalizacije?
- Ali so diskurzi kozmopolitstva preveč elitistični, da bi lahko igrali vidno vlogo v modernih potrošniških družbah?

- Kakšne so vloge migracij in pregnanstva za oblikovanje diskurza svetovljanstva in za disciplinarno identiteto literarne teorije in primerjalne književnosti?
- Kako literarna teorija reflektira globalne medije in transnacionalno komuniciranje? Koliko ti pojavi danes spreminjajo identiteto, vlogo in pojmovnik literarne teorije?
- Kako kozmopolitstvo in procesi globalizacije modulirajo feminizem in študije spolov?

To da bo kolokvij, ki ga vsako leto prireja "The ICLA Committee on Literary Theory", junija 2008 potekal v Ljubljani, pomeni priznanje daljšega plodnega sodelovanja ICLA/AILC s slovenskimi kolegi na ZRC SAZU in Univerzi v Ljubljani.

ABSTRACTS /POVZETKI

Ziva Ben-Porat

Cosmopolitanism, Globalization, Digital Culture and – Intertextuality

This short contribution is bi-focal: on the one hand it situates 'Digital Culture' at the meeting point of Globalization and Cosmopolitanism and attempts to show how its uses of intertextuality paradoxically enhance and undermine the assumptions underlying both; and, on the other hand it deals with various aspects of the Digital Culture (such as the 'Internet' and its search engines, web2 – blogs in particular, web pages as hyper-texts, and computer games) and their challenge to the underlying assumptions of various theories of intertextuality. The paper however is not organized in two sections corresponding to its two themes, but is rather a 'ring composition': beginning with the assumptions surrounding all four concepts and the definitions they yield, the argument moves from the articulation of the problem to a description of intertextual uses characteristic of digital culture and ends with an articulation of the impact of those usages on the theoretical basis and evaluative aura of the sociological and literary concepts under discussion.

Whereas (evil) Globalization and (good) Cosmopolitanism have often been treated as either unrelated or opposing concepts, I join those who think that the two are inter-related. The new cosmopolitanism is no longer an intellectual elitist ideology, a benevolent, at times hospitable and nurturing but often patronizing and manipulative acceptance of others and otherness, but a fact of life. Migrants and refugees living outside their home cultures, mixed marriages, abundant travel experiences, visual popular representations of varying ways of life on the mass media, enhanced linguistic competence, and even commercial acculturation of folkloristic artifacts – all of these make constantly growing masses of people 'factual' if not 'ideological' cosmopolitans. Successful hybridity might bring about a sense of feeling at home in more than one culture; from there the road to seeing oneself as a citizen of the world is not a long one. Inasmuch as economic globalization is at least a partial cause of these processes it cannot be separated from cosmopolitanism.

And yet, cultural globalization is both a major constructive/constitutive element of the New Cosmopolitanism and a destructive force. The destructive function stems from the fact that cultural globalization is formed and informed by mass media in general and by digital forms of communication in particular, and that those tend to flatten cultural entities to the point of depletion. This is most conspicuously evident in specific uses of intertextuality in digital culture.

Whether we believe that intertextuality is the basic condition of language and communication and therefore meanings are constructed rather than decoded by users at the receiving end of messages, or that intertextual relations obtain between two distinct texts activated by specific textual devices which authors use, we cannot fail to see the challenges digital culture poses to intertextual theory of either kind. What is a blog reader supposed to do when a 13 years old Israeli blogger calls herself Lady Macbeth Assume that she would like to share some dark thoughts about glory? Murder? And what if it turns out (some, actually most bloggers like to receive comments and questions and respond to them) that she has neither read the play (not even a Lamb version of it) nor seen it performed in any format? What if she saw the name on another blog site and liked the sound of the name and the notion of 'Lady'? What are we to do with Hamlets or Little Princes? Can we assume that because of the hypothesized common source the name carries and wishes to convey the same associations in Tel Aviv, Papua, Delhi and St. Petersburg? What about a computer game the protagonists of which are two brothers, Dante and Virgil, and that is all most of the players know and will ever know about Dante and Virgil? Or, more problematic still, when players who happen to know *The Divine Comedy* gain nothing from activating it and must dismiss the actualized allusion as irrelevant; what do we do with Dante then?

While it seems possible to accommodate such instances within existing intertextual theories, claiming, for example, that they are simply extreme cases of traditional problems of interpretation, other types of "reading communities" and so forth, I'll try to articulate and substantiate the claim that the notion of intertextuality becomes problematic in itself; assumptions about a community of readers who share the same encyclopedia need to be reformulated; the very concept of global culture –in the sense of a reservoir of recognizable transferable entities (ideas, artifacts, beliefs)- may be only a mirage.

Svetovljanstvo, globalizacija, digitalna kultura in – intertekstualnost

Ta kratki prispevek ima dva poudarka: na eni strani postavi 'digitalno kulturo' na stičišče globalizacije in svetovljanstva ter poskuša pokazati, kako same njune rabe intertekstualnosti paradokсно stopnjujejo in spodkopavajo njune predpostavke; na drugi strani se ukvarja z raznimi vidiki digitalne kulture (npr. internetom in njegovimi iskalniki, *webom2* – še posebno z blogi, omrežnimi stranmi kot hiperteksti in računalniškimi igrami) in njihovimi izzivi temeljnim predpostavkam raznih teorij intertekstualnosti. Vendar razprava ni razdeljena na dva dela, ki bi se ujemala z njenima temama, ampak ima prej 'krožno kompozicijo': začenja se s predpostavkami, ki zajemajo vse štiri koncepte in definicije, ki jih prinašajo, nato se debata pomika od razčlenitve problema k opisu intertekstualnih rab, značilnih za digitalno kulturo, končuje pa se z razčlenitvijo vpliva teh rab na teoretsko osnovo in z evalvacijsko avro obravnavanih socioloških in literarnih konceptov.

Medtem ko so (zlobno) globalizacijo in (dobro) svetovljanstvo pogosto obravnavali, kot da nista povezana, pa se jaz pridružujem tistim, ki mislijo nasprotno. Novo svetovljanstvo ni več ideologija intelektualne elite, dobrohotno, sem ter tja prijazno in vzgojiteljsko, vendar pogosto pokroviteljsko in manipulatorsko sprejemanje drugega in drugačnosti, ampak je življenjsko dejstvo. Migranti in begunci, ki živijo zunaj svoje domače kulture, mešani zakoni, številne popotniške izkušnje, vizualne popularne predstavitve raznih življenjskih slogov v množičnih občilih, večje obvladovanje jezikov in celo komercialna akulturacija folklornih artefaktov – vse to stalno povečuje množico ljudi, ki so 'faktično', če že ne 'ideološko' svetovljani. Uspešno križanje lahko pripelje do tega, da se ljudje počutijo domače v več kot eni kulturi; in od tod pot do tega, da se vidiš kot državljan sveta, ni dolga. Kolikor je ekonomska globalizacija vsaj delni vzrok za te procese, je ne moremo ločevati od svetovljanstva.

In vendar je globalizacija oboje: pomemben konstruktivni/konstitutivni element novega svetovljanstva in destruktivna sila. Destrukcija izhaja iz dejstva, da kulturno globalizacijo formirajo in informirajo množična občila na splošno, zlasti pa digitalne oblike komunikacije, in da te težijo k izravnavanju kulturnih entitet do

te mere, da jih osiromašijo. To se najjasneje vidi v posebnih rabah intertekstualnosti v digitalni kulturi.

Bodisi, da verjamemo, da je intertekstualnost prvi pogoj jezika in komunikacije in da zato ob koncu prenosa sporočil uporabniki pomene raje oblikujejo, kot pa razbirajo, bodisi, da nastanejo intertekstualne povezave, ki jih avtorji vzpostavijo med dvema različnima besediloma z rabo posebnih besedilnih orodij, ne moremo prezreti izzivov, ki jih digitalna kultura postavlja intertekstualni teoriji obeh vrst. Kaj naj stori bralec bloga, ko trinajstletni izraelski bloger sebe imenuje Lady Macbeth? Naj domneva, da bi ta oseba rada z njim delila kake mrakobne misli o slavi? Umor? In kaj, če se pokaže (nekateri, pravzaprav večina blogerjev želijo prejemati komentarje in vprašanja in nanje odgovarjati), da ni prebrala niti drame (niti njene Lambrove različice) niti videla nobene predstave v nobeni obliki? Kaj, če je videla ime na kaki drugi blogarski strani in ji je bil všec zvok imena in beseda 'Lady'? Kaj naj naredimo s Hamleti ali Malimi princji? Ali lahko domnevamo, da zaradi hipotetično splošnega vira ime nosi in želi zbuditi enake asociacije v Tel Avivu, Papui, Delhiju in Sankt Peterburgu? Kaj pa računalniške igre, katerih protagonista sta brata, Dante in Vergilij, in je to vse, kar večina igralcev ve in bo kadar koli vedela o Danteju in Vergiliju? Ali pa še bolj problematično: ko igralci, ki po naključju vedo za *Božansko komedijo*, po tistem, ko jo zaženejo, ne dobijo ničesar in morajo opustiti oživiljeno aluzijo kot nepomembno; kaj potem naredimo z Dantejem?

Medtem ko se zdi mogoče, da v okviru obstoječih teorij intertekstualnosti uskladimo take primere, pri čemer se, denimo, sklicujemo na to, da so to samo skrajni primeri tradicionalnih problemov interpretacije ali drugačne vrste »bralskih skupnosti« in tako naprej, pa bom sama poskušala razčleniti in utemeljiti trditve, da postaja sam pojem intertekstualnosti problematičen; domnevo o skupnosti bralecev, ki naj bi si delili isto enciklopedijo, je treba formulirati na novo; sam koncept globalne kulture – v pomenu rezervoarja prepoznavnih in prenosljivih entitet (idej, artefaktov, verovanj) – je lahko samo slepilo.

Vladimir Biti

Theory and Trauma

Literary theory is usually regarded to be the child of cosmopolitan spirit with all its well-known ambiguities. Not long ago Galin Tihanov (2004) put forth the provocative thesis that it was born in the nationally reawakened countries of East-Central Europe in the aftermath of the disintegrated Austro-Hungarian Empire. In such a transitional context it was, on the one hand, engaged in the process of constructing a new national and political identity of respective countries while, on the other, transcending local encapsulation by linguistic, cultural and methodological cosmopolitanism. As for the latter, the chief proponents of the Eastern and Central European literary theory lived the dislocated life of exiles and émigrés, travelers and strangers never completely adjusted. Being an embodiment of national, linguistic and cultural homelessness on the model of Lukács's novelistic hero, identifying completely neither with German nor Russian cultural and intellectual background, they enjoyed the expensive freedom of creative modification of both. Due to such traumatic in-between position, they were able to "estrangle" the naturalness of any given literature by refracting it through the prism of another one, i.e. to perform abstraction as the key operation of modern literary theory. Tihanov indicates that the same uneasy but productive cosmopolitan legacy, as a necessary presumption of theoretical abstraction, holds for those theorists from the Central and Eastern European countries who in the post-war decades moved to France contributing to the establishment and the enrichment of narratology, structuralism and poststructuralism.

It seems hence as if moving from the abandoned scraps of the former political and/or symbolic empire into its now separated center might be designated as a subversive operation that engendered modern literary theory. Through such an unexpected return, characteristic of every trauma, theory reminds both the former colonizer and the former colonized that, although their national terrains are politically divorced, their mutual ethical, cultural and intellectual dependency is still at work. If it is not going to be repeatedly and violently acted out in this divided constellation, it has to be patiently worked through on both sides. In this sense, modern literary theory can be interpreted as a consistent attempt to work through the trauma of colonized *hearts* and *minds* until their decolonization is reached. If nation is supposed to assert itself

against its oppressor, then not by excluding it as something external but recognizing it as something internal to it. The same goes for the oppressor whose national vocabulary is also summoned to take the cosmopolitan route of self-assertion. If decolonization is expected to really achieve a de-traumatizing effect, it must be relegated from the political into literary, cultural and intellectual terms where borders are not so sharp to divide national camps.

But even if we graft onto our national substance the irremovable “traces of the other”, as modern literary theory presses us to do in order to understand literature *per se* beyond its national derivations, the question remains whether the outcome of such othering surpasses the colonial relation as it was envisaged. Can trauma really be worked through after a nation makes its cosmopolitan detour in order to return to itself in a full consciousness of the other? Can one ever be fully conscious of the other or does the other stop being the other at the moment one becomes fully conscious of it? Since, if it ceases being the other, the colonial relation is not surpassed but reiterated and intensified. This line of thought casts certain doubts on the delineated cosmopolitan spirit of modern literary theory reminding of the colonial roots of this concept as it was envisaged by German and French enlighteners. How is something being colonially rooted expected to achieve decolonizing effects?

Teorija in travma

Na literarno teorijo se navadno gleda kot na otroka svetovljanskega duha z vsemi njegovimi dobro znanimi dvoumnostmi. Ni dolgo tega, kar je Galin Tihanov (2004) objavil izzivalno tezo, da se je ta duh rodil v narodno prebujajočih se deželah srednjevzhodne Evrope kot posledica razpadlega Avstro-ogrskega cesarstva. V takem tranzicijskem kontekstu je na eni strani sodeloval v procesu oblikovanja nove nacionalne in politične identitete posameznih držav, na drugi pa je z jezikovnim, kulturnim in metodološkim svetovljanstvom prestopal lokalni okvir. Glede slednjega: glavni predstavniki vzhodno in srednjeevropske literarne teorije so živeli odmaknjeno življenje izseljencev in izgnancev, nikoli popolnoma prilagojenih popotnikov in tujcev. Bili so utelešenje nacionalnega, jezikovnega in kulturnega brezdomstva – po vzoru Lukácsevega romaneknega junaka, ki se ni povsem poistovetil niti z nemškim niti z ruskim kulturnim in intelektualnim okoljem –, zato so uživali razkošno svobodo ustvarjalne modifikacije obeh. Zaradi takega travmatičnega vmesnega položaja so bili zmogli 'odtujiti' pristnost vsake dane literature tako, da so jo ulomili skozi prizmo druge: izpeljali so abstrakcijo kot ključno operacijo moderne literarne teorije. Tihanov navaja, da enaka neugodna, a ustvarjalna svetovljanska zapuščina – kot nujna predpostavka teoretske abstrakcije – velja za tiste teoretike iz srednje in vzhodnoevropskih dežel, ki so se v desetletjih po vojni preselili v Francijo in prispevali k uveljavitvi in obogatitvi naratologije, strukturalizma in poststrukturalizma.

Zato se zdi, da selitev iz zapuščenih ostankov nekdanjega političnega in/ali simbolnega cesarstva v njegovo zdaj ločeno središče, lahko označimo kot subverzivno operacijo, ki je ustvarila moderno literarno teorijo. S tako nepričakovano vrnitvijo, značilno za vsako travmo, teorija opominja nekdanjega kolonizatorja in nekdanjega koloniziranca: četudi sta njuni nacionalni ozemlji politično ločeni, pa njuna medsebojna, etična, kulturna in intelektualna odvisnost še deluje. Če se v tej ločeni konstelaciji odvisnost ne bo ponovno nasilno izrazila, jo bo treba na obeh straneh potrpežljivo predelati. V tem smislu lahko moderno literarno teorijo interpretiramo kot konsistenten poskus predelave travme koloniziranih *sv* in *umov* – vse dokler ni dosežena dekolonizacija. Če naj se narod brani pred svojim zatiralcem, naj tega ne

dela tako, da ga izključuje kot nekaj, kar je zunaj njega, ampak tako, da ga priznava kot nekaj znotraj njega. Enako velja za zatiralca; tudi njegov nacionalni besednjak naj gre po svetovljanski poti samouveljavitve. Če od dekolonizacije pričakujemo, da bo res razbremenila travme, jo je treba iz političnega govora usmeriti v literarnega, kulturnega in intelektualnega, saj meje tu niso tako ostre, da bi delile nacionalne tabore.

A tudi če na našo nacionalno substanco cepimo neodstranljive »sledove drugega«, k čemur nas sili moderna literarna teorija zato, da bi razumeli literaturo *per se* onkraj njenih nacionalnih izpeljav, ostane vprašanje, ali izid takega prepoznavanja drugega v sebi presega kolonialni odnos, o kakršnem je bil govor. Ali je travmo res mogoče predelati potem, ko narod opravi svoj svetovljanski ovinek zato, da se vrne k sebi in se popolnoma zave drugega? Ali se bomo sploh kdaj lahko zavedali drugega, ali drugi preneha biti drugi v trenutku, ko se ga v popolnosti zavedamo? Ker če preneha biti drugi, kolonialno razmerje ni preseženo, ampak se ponovi in stopnjuje. Tako razmišljanje meče nekaj dvoma na opisanega svetovljanskega duha moderne literarne teorije, saj opominja na kolonialne korenine tega koncepta, kot so si ga zamislili nemški in francoski razsvetljenci. Kako lahko od nečesa, kar korenini v kolonializmu, pričakujemo, da bo imelo dekolonizacijske učinke?

Marijan Dović

Literature and Censorship: From Plato's Ideal Polis to Cosmo-Polis

Censorship and literature have been closely connected for a very long time. Rulers and other influential interest groups have always tried to control the circulation of ideas in society and restrict the influence of those that were potentially harmful to their interests. In order to do so, a variety of procedures have been developed that can be described with the term *censorship*. This term covers all forms of regulation of the dissemination of ideas, ranging from brutal (i.e., the repressive apparatus of the judiciary, police, and even army) to softer, more sophisticated models (e.g., exclusions, lists of forbidden books or authors, and restricted access). In general, censorship can be approached from two different perspectives: one is *socio-political* (how a certain form of censorship functions in practice, and how it is institutionalized, hierarchically structured, etc.) and the other is *textual* (focusing on the relation between censored and censorial discourse, potential “displacements” in censorial discourse, etc.). At both levels, it seems productive to differentiate between more or less *explicit* and *implicit* censorial modes.

Even if censorship in history dealt with various kinds of (written or spoken) texts, it is literature that had an exposed, privileged position as the censors' target – a fact that legitimizes literary theory to deal with censorship. This is already obvious with Plato, who does not actually use the term censorship. However, in his dialogues (*The Republic*, *Ion* and *Phaedrus*) he presents and plays out a strikingly diverse set of censorial modalities. In general, Plato's censoring model suited for the “ideal polis” turns out to be highly transparent and explicit. In practices of later periods, a tendency towards increasingly *implicit* censoring is observable: censors disguise themselves (at the socio-political level) and censorial discourse seeks to suppress the actually contested content (at the textual level). This can be demonstrated by the fact that even 20th-century totalitarian regimes did not openly present themselves as violent supporters of enforced “unity”: a tendency to conceal interventions was characteristic both for Mussolini and for Russian or Yugoslav communists. Most oppressive regimes did not define boundaries clearly and explicitly: in this way, they kept potential opponents precarious (and self-censored). It is not surprising that in

such a tense atmosphere the notion of the special social relevance of literature was intensified, and that literature's presumed specific truth acquired subversive features.

However, censorship in the "global polis" remains a challenge to literary theory (both on sociological and discursive levels) in spite of the declared breakdown of the great totalitarianisms. Theoretical rethinking should incorporate new models adequate for the growing complexity of social systems, and follow what sometimes seems hardly followable: transformations of censorial practices that can remain local – but are at least in part already global. A general observation might be that "hard" models of censorship in democracies are absent to a degree that often questions the reasonability of using the term. The typical polarity represented by the opposition *censorial/censored* inside the explicit censorial model seems to be completely blurred. Nevertheless, serious problems exist, but often their "censorial" nature is contested.

I will analyze three important clusters: the first is connected to *legislation/law* (defamation processes against writers; tension between legislation and literary autonomy); the next is gathered around the concept of *political correctness* (demands to reintroduce some kind of censorship in the name of ethics, tolerance or emancipation of various marginal groups; also the notorious "Handke affair"); and the last one is generated by the global *economy*, where the problems concentrate around *corporate censorship*. In the case of the latter, literature seems to be losing significance. Nonetheless, is there also a chance that (only) literature escapes from these ties, from this deadly snare that the mass media can no longer escape from?

Although this might remain a question of *faith*, it is obvious that literary theory should not only focus on literary issues – especially if it wishes to ask how, in such an environment, truly subversive, "anti-systemic" attitudes are being disseminated and censored. Where does it take place: in literature, in theory, or elsewhere? Inasmuch as literary theory remains a legitimate part of the humanities and thus of the scholarly observation of the social world, it bears its share of *responsibility* to recognize and describe new forms of global censorship in society, closely linked by shared global risks. As Ulrich Beck has emphasized, these risks also entail the danger of enforcing various apparatuses of repression.

Marijan Dovič

Literatura in cenzura: od Platonovega idealnega polisa do kozmopolisa

Cenzura in literatura sta tesno povezani že od nekdaj. Oblastniki in drugi nosilci družbene moči so v vseh obdobjih skušali nadzirati pretok idej v družbi in omejiti vpliv tistih, ki so bile potencialno škodljive njihovim interesom. V ta namen so oblikovali različne postopke, ki jih je mogoče imenovati s skupnim izrazom *cenzura*. Ta zajema vse oblike regulacije obtoka idej – od grobih (represivni aparat: sodstvo, po potrebi policija ali celo vojska) do mehkih, subtilnejših variant (izključitve, katalogi nezaželenih avtorjev, omejevanje dostopa). Na splošno se je mogoče s cenzuro ukvarjati na dveh ravneh: *družbeno-politični* (kako določena oblika cenzure deluje v praksi, kako je institucionalizirana in hierarhično urejena) in *tekstualni* (odnos med cenzuriranim in cenzorskim diskurzom, morebitne »preместitve« ipd.). Na obeh ravneh je produktivno ločevati med bolj ali manj *eksplicitnimi* in *implicitnimi* oblikami cenzure.

Cenzura se je sicer v zgodovini sicer ukvarjala z različnimi teksti, vendar literatura kot tarča cenzorjev zavzema odlikovano mesto, s tem pa seveda literarna veda pridobiva legitimizacijo raziskovanja cenzure. Vse to se kaže že pri Platonu, ki v svojih dialogih (*Država*, *Ion* in *Fajdros*) predstavi in preigra osupljivo raznovrsten niz modalitet cenzuriranja. Pri tem se izkaže, da je platonski model cenzuriranja v »idealnem polisu« vendarle ekspliciten oziroma pregleden. Ko zasledujemo potek cenzurnih praks v poznejših obdobjih, je mogoče z večjimi ali manjšimi odkloni zaslediti težnjo k vse bolj *implicitnim* cenzorskim modelom. To je mogoče ponazoriti z dejstvom, da se v 20. stoletju niti totalitarne cenzure niso hotele jasno izpostaviti kot nasilne vzdrževalke enoumja: težnja po prikrivanju posegov je značilna tako za Mussolinija kot ruske ali jugoslovanske komuniste. Najbolj represivni režimi niso imeli jasno definiranih meja in eksplicitnih pravil igre: držali so potencialne oporečnike v napetosti, ti pa so iskali izvirne (literarne) rešitve in artikulacije nastalega položaja. Ni presenetljivo, da se je v takšni napetosti oblikoval občutek o posebnem družbenem pomenu literature in subverzivni moči njene specifične resnice.

Toda cenzura v »globalnem polisu« kljub deklariranemu zlomu velikih totalitarizmov ostaja izziv za literarno teorijo tako na sociološki kot na diskurzivni ravni. Teoretski razmislek o cenzuri mora v rastoči

kompleksnosti socialnih sistemov slediti temu, kar je komaj sledljivo: »demokracičnim« transformacijam cenzorskih praks, ki lahko seveda ostajajo strogo lokalne, lahko pa se globalizirajo. Cenzura v teh transformacijah izgublja tipično polarnost, ki jo v eksplicitnem cenzurnem modelu ponazarja par *cenzor(sko)/cenzurirano*. Kljub temu obstajajo resni problemi, za katere pa pogosto ni mogoče doseči konsenza, ali sploh gre za cenzuro.

Obravnaval bom tri pomembne skupine takšnih problemov: prvi je povezan s *pravnim sistemom* (procesi zoper pisatelje zaradi obrekovanja, napetost med zakonodajo in literarno avtonomijo); naslednji s konceptom *politične korektnosti* (zahteve po vnovični uvedbi nekakšne cenzure v imenu etike, tolerance ipd; tudi »afera Handke«); zadnji pa zajema probleme, ki jih generira globalna *ekonomija* – tu se problemi zgoščajo okrog t.i. korporativne cenzure. V tem primeru literatura na videz izgublja pomen. Pa vendar se je mogoče vprašati, ali ni spet literatura tista, ki se lahko izogne smrtonosni zanki, v kateri so se očitno znašli množični mediji?

Če se odgovor na to vprašanje zdi predvsem stvar *vere*, literarni teoriji v teh okoliščinah vsekakor ne zadošča, da se osredotoči na literaturo – sploh če se hoče ukvarjati z vprašanjem, kako se v takšnem okolju razširjajo in po drugi strani cenzurirajo resnično subverzivna, recimo anti-sistemska stališča. Kje se to dogaja: v literaturi, teoriji ali kje drugje? Kolikor literarna teorija ostaja legitimen del humanistike in s tem znanstvenega opazovanja družbe, vsekakor nosi svoj delež *odgovornosti*, da prepozna in opiše nove oblike cenzure v družbi, ki jo tesno povezujejo globalna tveganja. Kot je poudaril Ulrich Beck, ta tveganja hkrati zbudajo skomine po utrjevanju različnih represivnih aparatov.

Angela Esterhammer

Byron and Cosmopolitanism

My primary concern in this paper is to think about how contemporary discourses on cosmopolitanism might contribute to recent studies of Byron as an expatriate and cosmopolitan poet, and, more generally, to a concept of Romantic cosmopolitanism.

T. S. Eliot, despite his famous skepticism about Byron and Romanticism, provides an intriguing approach to this topic in his 1937 essay "Byron." The essay is permeated by a dichotomy between native and foreign that reflects the anxieties of Eliot's own mid-twentieth-century historical moment. Describing Byron as anything but an English poet, Eliot famously discusses his "imperceptiveness to the English word" and concludes that he "added nothing to the [English] language." "I cannot think of any other poet of his distinction," Eliot writes, "who might so easily have been an accomplished foreigner writing English." He proposes from the outset to consider Byron primarily as a Scottish poet, mentions his adaptation of Italian verse-forms, highlights French criticism of Byron, and ascribes Byron's success in satirizing English society to his "alien" perspective.

Contemporary Byron scholarship has already related Eliot's critique of Byron's language to Byron's own treatment of languages and language acquisition, particularly in the highly international and cosmopolitan poem *Don Juan* (1818-24). I will pursue these themes with particular attention to the native/foreign axis in Eliot's essay and Byron's use of idioms, dialects, and codes that situate the speaker or writer differently in relation to different publics (an issue most recently taken up in Gary Dyer's work on Byron's use of criminal slang). A particular crux is cantos 2 to 4 of *Don Juan*, where the Spanish Juan has an affair with the Greek maiden Haidee. Although Juan's encounters with foreign languages, environments, food, dress, and behaviour will become comically routine later in the poem, this episode represents Juan's first sustained encounter with cultural otherness. As such, it pays unique attention to second-language acquisition and the evolution of an improvised "contact language," themes that are further complicated by the historical-cultural palimpsest of the Eastern Mediterranean where the episode is set. Writing *Don Juan* as a British expatriate in southern Europe, and addressing a readership in his repudiated and repudiating homeland, Byron both thematizes and enacts cosmopolitan identity-

construction in the context of multicultural encounters and asymmetrically intersecting communities.

Focusing on this episode as a nodal point for issues of (mis)communication, language, and identity, my paper will also draw on recent cosmopolitan theory, especially that of K. Anthony Appiah, in order to relate Romantic cosmopolitanism and the identity-construction of the nineteenth-century expatriate writer to present-day globalized identities.

Angela Esterhammer

Byron in svetovljanstvo

V tej razpravi bo glavna pozornost namenjena razmisleku o tem, kako bi lahko sodobni diskurzi o svetovljanstvu prispevali k novejšim študijam o Byronu kot izseljenskem in svetovljanskem pesniku in, splošneje, o konceptu romantičnega svetovljanstva.

T. S. Eliot je kljub svojim znanim pomislekom do Byrona in do romantike prispeval zanimiv pristop k tej tematiki v svojem eseju iz leta 1937 z naslovom »Byron«. Esej prežema dihotomija o domačem in tujem, kar izraža tesnobo Eliotovega lastnega zgodovinskega trenutka sredi 20. stoletja. Za Eliota je Byron vse kaj drugega kot angleški pesnik, govori o njegovi »neobčutljivosti za angleško besedo« in dodaja, da »ni ničesar prispeval k [angleškemu] jeziku«. »Ne morem si misliti nobenega drugega pesnika njegovega ugleda,« piše Eliot, »ki bi bil lahko nedvomno omikan tujec, ki piše v angleščini.« Že na začetku predlaga, naj vidimo v Byronu predvsem škotskega pesnika, omenja njegovo rabo italijanskih verzniških oblik, poudarja francoske ocene o Byronu in pripisuje njegov uspeh temu, da je s svojega »tujega« zornega kota satirično obravnaval angleško družbo.

Eliotovo kritiko Byronovega jezika je sodobni proučevalec pesnika že povezoval z Byronovo lastno obravnavo jezikov in usvajanja jezikov, zlasti v izrazito mednarodnem in svetovljanskem epu *Don Juan* (1818-1824). Te teme bom obravnavala s posebno pozornostjo do dvojice domače / tuje v Eliotovi razpravi in do Byronove rabe idiomov, narečij in kod, ki umeščajo govorca ali pisca različno, glede na različno občinstvo (problematike se je nedavno lotil Gary Dyer v delu o Byronovi rabi žargona kriminalcev). Posebno trd oreh so spevi od 2. do 4. epa *Don Juan*, v katerem ima španski Juan razmerje z grško deklico Haidee. Čeprav Juanova srečavanja s tujimi jeziki, okolji, hrano, obleko in vedenjem postanejo pozneje v epu komična rutina, predstavljajo te epizode Juanovo prvo nepretrgano srečanje s kulturno drugačnostjo. Pri tem veliko pozornost posveča privzemanju drugega jezika in razvoju improviziranega »kontaktnega jezika«; ti dve temi se nadalje zapleteta z zgodovinsko-kulturnim palimpsestom vzhodnega Sredozemlja, kamor je postavljeno dogajanje. Ko Byron piše *Don Juana* kot angleški izseljenec v južni Evropi in nagovarja bralstvo v svoji zavračani in zavračajoči domovini, hkrati tematizira in udejanja svetovljanski ustroj

identitete v kontekstu multikulturalnih srečanj in nesimetrično sekajočih se skupnosti.

Moja razprava se bo osredotočila na to dogajanje kot na vozlišče problematike (slabe) komunikacije, jezika in identitete, približala pa se bo tudi iz novejšim teorijam svetovljanstva, še posebno tisti, ki jo je obelodanil K. Anthony Appiah; s tem bi rada romantično svetovljanstvo in oblikovanje identitete izseljenskega pisatelja iz 19. stoletja povezal z dandanašnjimi globaliziranimi identitetami.

Péter Hajdu

The Status of Literature in an Age of Global Risks

Literature does not seem to have the prestige it used to. This change, of course, must have various causes, but one might try to interpret it in connection with the general transition from the system of nation states to globalisation, or from the cultural system of nation states to cosmopolitanism. Nationalism attaches strongly positive values to the national culture. A nationalist wants to be proud of the nation's cultural achievement, and since the concept of the nation is at least partly based on the concept of a shared culture, the importance of the cultural heritage, and especially the written part of it, is highly emphasised in national context. Nineteenth-century nation states tended to finance a literary scholarship that discovered, preserved, or even worshipped national literature. The establishment of the majority of departments for literary history in European universities might be connected with that purpose. Many countries promote and, to various degrees, finance literary production too, because they regard the continuous existence of national culture as of crucial importance. A cosmopolitan perspective can apparently provide neither a scholarly interpretative practice, which would be attractive or useful for nation states, nor deep emotional commitment on behalf of readers.

The sponsoring activity of nation states – sometimes even the formation of nation states – is part of the project of nation building, which is strongly connected with the economic elite's demands to enforce their interests. The second modernity experienced basic changes in the attitudes of the elites. The new global or cosmopolitan elite is not interested in nation building projects any longer, since even the residues of defensive national markets seem rather to restrict than to promote their economic activity. They need political fragmentation, weak quasi-states, and a “flexible” labour market, i.e., a defenceless one, which is completely deprived of any means of resistance. The new centres of power are much less interested in promoting culture than nation states used to be. And they are not interested in the promotion of a cosmopolitan elite culture, since the traditional erudition lost its importance for the new cosmopolitan elite even in creating group identity.

The immense popularity of fiction in the 19th century is partly attributed to the fact that after the break down of a single and generally

accepted worldview and value system, people turned toward literature to find some interpretations of the world and their life. On the one hand, there is a mass demand of unified worldviews even now, but good literature refuses to supply any. On the other hand, the post-modern mind can happily accept the impossibility of unified interpretations as a guarantee of freedom. But it is said only about the unity aspect of world interpretation, which does not exclude that literature could play a role of people's self-understanding. Another aspect of the change in the need of self-understanding in the recent age is that it ceased to be of narrative character; it is rather spiritual or discursive and tends to accept even the dominance of irrational elements.

The global risks of the present era developed a cosmopolitan and worldwide community of awareness. The question arises whether this global awareness of being threatened situates literature or high culture in general as a peripheral and childish game of the irresponsible past generations, or can create some kind of literature, i.e., a literary communication, which basically counts on the awareness of global threats. And this awareness should be present in every factor of the communication, i.e., texts, readers, critics. It is highly questionable that such a literature can exist, but the possibilities are worth examining.

Péter Hajdu

Položaj literature v času globalnih tveganj

Zdi se, da literatura nima veljave, kakršno je imela nekdaj. Seveda morajo biti za to spremembo razni vzroki, vendar bi lahko zadevo poskusili razložiti v povezavi s splošnim prehodom od sistema nacionalnih držav h globalizaciji, ali od kulturnega sistema nacionalnih držav k svetovljanstvu. Nacionalizem pripisuje nacionalni kulturi zelo pozitivne vrednote. Nacionalist hoče biti ponosen na nacionalne kulturne dosežke in glede na to, da koncept nacije vsaj deloma temelji na konceptu skupne kulture, je pomen kulturne dediščine, še posebno pa njenega pisnega dela v nacionalnem kontekstu zelo poudarjen. V 19. stoletju so bile nacionalne države pripravljene podpirati literarnega znanstvenika, ki je odkril, ohranil ali celo slavil nacionalno literaturo. Osebe večine oddelkov za literarno zgodovino na evropskih univerzah je nemara imelo take cilje. Številne države podpirajo in do različnih stopenj tudi financirajo literarno produkcijo, ker se jim zdi trajni obstoj nacionalne kulturne ključnega pomena. Svetovljanska perspektiva očitno ne more poskrbeti niti za znanstveno interpretativno prakso, ki bi bila vabljava ali koristna za nacionalne države, niti za globoko čustveno predanost bralcem na ljubo.

Pokroviteljska dejavnost nacionalnih držav – včasih celo nastanek nacionalnih držav – je del projekta izgradnje naroda, ki je tesno povezan z zahtevami ekonomske elite po uveljavljanju njenih interesov. V drugem obdobju modernosti se je vedenje elit bistveno spremenilo. Nova globalna ali svetovljanska elita se nič več ne zavzema za projekt izgradnje nacije, saj se zdi, da celo ostanki defenzivnih nacionalnih trgov prej omejujejo kot pospešujejo njeno ekonomsko dejavnost. Potrebuje politično razdrobljenost, šibke kvazi-države in »fleksibilen« trg delovne sile, se pravi nezaščiteni ljudi, ki se nimajo s čim upirati. Nove centre moči veliko manj kot nekdaj nacionalne države zanima podpiranje kulture. In ne zanima jih podpiranje svetovljanske elitne kulture, saj je za novo svetovljansko elito tradicionalna erudicija izgubila pomen, saj ji ni niti do oblikovanja skupinske identitete.

Veliko priljubljenost fikcije v 19. stoletju deloma pripisujejo dejstvu, da so se ljudje po propadu enotnega in splošno sprejetega svetovnega nazora in vrednostnega sistema obrnili k literaturi, da bi v njej našli razlago sveta in svojega življenja. Na eni strani poznamo celo danes množično povpraševanje po poenotnih svetovnih nazorih,

vendar dobra literatura noče ponuditi niti enega. Na drugi strani pa lahko postmoderni um kot zagotovilo svobode navdušeno sprejema nemožnost poenotениh interpretacij. A to velja samo za soglasni vidik interpretacije sveta, po kateri literaturi ni odvzeta vloga pri človekovem samorazumevanju. Drugi vidik spremembe, ki jo je v novejšem času doživela nuja po samorazumevanju, je, da to ni več pripovedne narave; njegova narava je prej spiritualna ali diskurzivna in je celo pripravljena sprejeti prevlado iracionalnih elementov.

Zaradi globalnih tveganj sedanjega časa so razvile svetovljansko in po vsem svetu razširjeno skupnost osveščenosti. Postavlja se vprašanje, ali ta globalna ozaveščenost glede ogroženosti literaturo ali višjo kulturo na splošno vidi kot nepomembno in otročjo igro neodgovornih preteklih rodov, ali pa lahko ustvari neke vrste literaturo, literarno komunikacijo, ki v bistvu računa prav na ozaveščenost glede globalne grožnje. In ta ozaveščenost bi morala biti navzoča v vsakem dejavniku komunikacije – v besedilih, pri bralcih in pri kritikih. Veliko vprašanje je, ali taka literatura lahko obstaja, vendar je vredno proučiti možnosti.

Walid Hamarneh

A McWorld and McJihad Combo with Literature on the Side

Is globalization theorizable? This question slaps us in the face and provokes a radical questioning of our theoretical paradigms and more importantly our conceptualizations and analytical tools. After posing the question, I will resort to the coward's strategy of not attempting to confront the question head on as much as to attack it elliptically.

Many discussions revolving around globalization in the cultural sphere have seen it as implicated (both positively and negatively, as a continuation or rupture) with the debates on post-modernity, post-coloniality, and to some extent cultural studies. As such, globalization theories inherited many of the dichotomies of these theories. Of the basic categories of culture (Gurevitch), globalization theories inherited and further perpetuated and developed an exaggerated emphasis on space as a way of avoiding the enigmas of time which mark the adoption of many new spatial metaphors like map and scale that were added to the many others that became our bread and butter since structuralism and its aftermaths. Implicated with this, and central to the field of literary studies, is the continuation of the neglect of the aesthetic that had been the Achilles' heel of many theories about culture and literature during the past few decades.

Resorting to some concrete examples and discussions within the Arab and Islamic World, this paper will attempt to address two issues that are deemed central to the discussions of globalization and literary theories. The first issue is that of aesthetic transfer, a concept borrowed from studies of the economics of technology. But this borrowing, as much as it may force us to think analogically about the two phenomena, yet it mainly wants through such an analogy to emphasize the differences through their foregrounding. Not only is it important to make reference to the discussions revolving around how value free (or not) technology is (and by extension we see the glaring difference with the aesthetic), but also through radicalizing the problematic of technological transfer we can also problematize transfer within the cultural spheres, especially differentiating between transfer for cultural consumption and transfer that reconstitutes the aesthetic as such. Following a model that connects the processes of the constitution and reconstitution of the aesthetic as embodied in the complexities and

tensions within the processes of the institutionalization of the literary field, two issues will be highlighted. The first is that of language and, by extension, translation. The second is the inter- and intra-generic “struggle” within the literary institution. Both these issues can no longer be explained through the model of the paradigm (even the sociological or externalistic revisions thereof). With reference to works by some Arab novel writers who have been translated into English (Nawal Sa`dawi from Egypt, Layla Abu Zayd from Morocco, Ilyas Khuri from Lebanon, and Ghada al-Samman from Syria) the paper addresses their shifting positioning within the institutions of contemporary Arabic literature relating these shifts to both the institutions themselves as well as to their positions globally.

McSvet in McDžihad plošča z literaturo povrhu

Je o globalizaciji mogoče teoretizirati? Vprašanje trešči v nas in zaradi njega se začnemo spraševati o naših teoretskih paradigmah in, kar je še pomembneje, o naših pojmovanjih in analitičnih orodjih. Vprašanje sem postavil, zdaj pa se bom zatekel k strategiji strahopetca in se z njim ne bom poskušal spopasti neposredno, ampak se ga bom lotil po ovinkih.

O globalizaciji v kulturni sferi premišljujejo številne razprave, ki jo vidijo povezano (bodisi pozitivno ali negativno, kot nadaljevanje ali kot prelom) z debatami o postmoderni, postkolonializmu in do neke mere s kulturnimi študijami; in kot take so teorije globalizacije podedovale mnogo dihotomij, navzočih v teh teorijah. Od temeljnih kategorij kulture (Gurevich) so teorije globalizacije podedovale, ohranjale in razvijale pretirano poudarjanje prostora kot načina izogibanja ugankam časa; to se pokaže v rabi številnih novih prostorskih metafor, kot sta zemljevid in obseg, ki so jih dodali številnim drugim, in so postale s strukturalizmom in po njem naša vsakdanja hrana. S tem je povezano – in za polje literarnih študij bistveno – nadaljnje omalovaževanje estetike, kar je bilo Ahilova peta številnih teorij o kulturi in literaturi zadnjih nekaj desetletij.

Ta razprava, ki bo uporabila nekatere konkretne primere in diskusije v okviru arabskega in islamskega sveta, se bo poskušala usmeriti k dvema temeljnima vprašanjema, o katerih menijo, da sta osrednji pri razpravljanju o globalizaciji in literarnih teorijah. Prvo je vprašanje estetskega transferja – koncept je sposojen pri študijah o ekonomiji tehnologij. Vendar želi to sposojanje – toliko, kolikor nas nemara sili k enakemu razmišljanju o dveh pojavih – ob pomoči te analogije v glavnem poudariti razlike, tako da jih postavlja v ospredje. Ni se pomembno sklicevati le na diskusije, ki premišljujejo o tem, kako je (ali ni) tehnologija nepristranska (torej vidimo očitno razliko z estetiko), ampak lahko tudi skozi radikalizacijo problematike tehnološkega transfera problematiziramo tudi transfer znotraj kulturnih sfer, zlasti tako, da razlikujemo med transferjem za kulturno potrošnjo in tistim, ki vzpostavi estetiko kot tako. V skladu z modelom, ki povezuje procese osnovanja in vzpostavljanja estetskega, kot je vključeno v kompleksnostih in napetostih znotraj procesov institucionalizacije literarnega polja, bomo osvetlili dva glavna

problema. Prvi je problem jezika in posledično prevoda. Drugi je inter- in intragenerični »spopad« znotraj institucije literature. Teh problemov ne moremo več razlagati s pomočjo paradigatskega modela (niti njunih socioloških ali objektivnih revizij). Razprava se sklicuje na dela nekaterih arabskih romanopiscev, prevedenih v angleščino (Nawal Sa'dawi iz Egipta, Layla Abu Zayd iz Maroka, Ilyas Khuri iz Libanona in Ghada al-Sammam iz Sirije), in poudarja njihov spremenljivi položaj znotraj institucij sodobne arabske literature; te spremembe povezuje tako s samimi institucijami kakor tudi z njihovim položajem na splošno.

Marko Juvan

Influence, Intertextuality, and the World (Literary) System

Theories of intertextuality fundamentally reshaped the understanding of influence in comparative literature. Shattering its positivist framework, along with the “methodological nationalism” (Beck) that regarded nations (nation states) as basic units of comparison, theories of intertextuality showed that supposedly primary sources are themselves but intertextual transformations dependent on the transnational cultural encyclopedia (Eco). They further helped to develop a refined terminology of forms and functions of foreign literatures' creative reception, while respecting the linguistic and cultural otherness that underlies intercultural transfers (Đurišin, Even-Zohar, and others). They deconstructed the postulates of influence, such as the “romantic” understanding of the author, and criticized those who saw temporal priority and innovation as aesthetic values *per se*, explained influences by a simple cause-and-effect logic, or identified state-like boundaries between texts, identities, nations, and national literatures. For these reasons intertextuality in literary scholarship provokes the appearance of polycentric, pluralistic, and cosmopolitan models of influence based on dialogic notions of cultural identity (e. g., Zima). Once freed from the framework of “methodological nationalism” in which it had been used since the 19th century, and often modeled on inter-state politics, influence turned to being more interactive and dialogical, and to constantly undoing the opposition of the self and the other. On the other hand, however, intertextual theories since Bloom have revealed influence's psychological and socio-political power – of hierarchy, colonialism, and hegemony – as well as its ambivalent, oppressive, and stimulating role in identity formation. In this regard, I propose that influence be understood as a discursive force that, coming from the symbolic order, acts as a kind of imaginary performative (“Be like me!” or “Try to be different/better than me!”). As such, and in its quality of otherness, influence is unavoidably involved in the ongoing process of identity formation/reconstruction of every individual or cultural community during its entire lifetime. It cannot be denied that influence has caused many individual or “collective” anxieties, but it is ubiquitous and thus nothing to be either ashamed or proud of.

In my present attempt to position the notions of influence and intertextuality vis-à-vis world literature (understood here as the world

literary system, according to Wallerstein, Even-Zohar, Moretti, and Casanova) I propose that we discriminate between the two in the following way. I regard influence as a psychosocial force that imbues cultural products and emerges not only from the achievement of creative labor, but also from asymmetrical distribution of cultural capital in the world literary system, as well as from the conjunctures, trends, and demands of inter-literary and cultural exchange. Several social actors, practices, institutions, and discursive regimes are involved in empowering texts, series of texts, matrixes, and elements, and making them influential: from literary canons and cultural memory to salons, journals, theaters, reviews, criticism, and translation policies and marketing strategies of publishing houses. This network of influences may thus be seen as a key factor in the world literary system's cohesion, dynamics, evolutionary self-regulation, and internal tensions. Intertextuality, on the other hand, is not just an imprint of psychosocial forces of influence at the level of writing. The textual subject also strategically uses intertextuality to take its imaginary position in the universe of discourse: intertextual references and derivations locate the subject both in the traditions and present state of the "native" cultural space and in the selected or desired zones of world literature. Goethe, who invented the term "world literature," was also among the first to practice its cosmopolitan interactions and cultural trade; one of the most prominent forms of practicing world literature is citing, transforming, and alluding to its vast, plural, and multilingual resources. Whereas in Romanticism, cosmopolitan intertextuality is often the counterpart of cultural nationalism (e.g., in Prešeren), the prototypical modernist poet, such as Pound, seems to use "world" intertextual references from a nomadic point of view – as a *citoyen du monde* whose homeland is global modernism.

Vpliv, medbesedilnost in svetovni (literarni) sistem

Teorije medbesedilnosti so temeljito preoblikovale razumevanje vpliva v primerjalni književnosti. Omajale so tako njegov pozitivistični okvir kakor tudi »metodološki nacionalizem« (Beck), ki je kot temeljne enote za primerjanje obravnaval narode oziroma nacionalne države; s tem so teorije medbesedilnosti pokazale, da so domnevno prvotni viri že sami medbesedilne transformacije, odvisne od nadnarodne kulturne enciklopedije (Eco). Medbesedilni pristop je pomagal razviti pretanjeno izrazje za oblike in vloge ustvarjalnega sprejemanja tuje književnosti, pojmovnik, ki je upošteval jezikovno in kulturno drugačnost, delujočo v ozadju medkulturnih prenosov (Đurišin, Even-Zohar idr.). Medbesedilne teorije so dekonstruirale vodilne predpostavke vpliva: »romantično« razumevanje avtorja, razglašanje časovnega prvenstva in inovacije za estetski vrednosti *per se*, poenostavljeno razlaganje vpliva z logiko vzroka in učinka, pa tudi vzpostavljanje državi podobnih meja med besedili, identitetami, narodi in nacionalnimi literaturami. Zaradi navedenih razlogov medbesedilnost v literarni vedi v zadnjem času spodbuja policentrične, pluralne in kozmopolitske modele vpliva, ki temeljijo na dialoških pojmovanjih kulturne identitete (prim. Zima). Ko se je vpliv otrešel okvirov »metodološkega nacionalizma«, v katerih so ga uporabljali od 19. stoletja naprej (pogosto po vzoru teorij mednarodne politike), je vpliv pokazal svoj interakcijski, dialoški značaj, ki neprestano razstavlja nasprotje med jazom in drugim. Toda po drugi strani so medbesedilne teorije od Blooma naprej razkrivale tudi psihološko in družbeno-politično moč vpliva (njegovo hierarhičnost, kolonializem, hegemonijo), in to skupaj z njegovo ambivalentno vlogo pri oblikovanju identitet. V tem kontekstu predlagam, da vpliv razumemo kot diskurzivno silo, ki prihaja s področja simbolnega in deluje prek besedil kot nekakšen imaginarni performativ (»Posnemaj me!« ali »Poskusi biti drugačen/boljši od mene!«). Na ta način je vpliv kot instanca drugosti neizogibno vmešan v vseskozi potekajoči proces oblikovanja in redefiniranja identitet pri slehernem posamezniku ali kulturni skupnosti. Vpliv je gotovo povzročal mnoge »tesnobe« posameznikov in skupnosti, vendar pa je zaradi svoje vseprisotnosti dejstvo, ki se ga ni treba niti sramovati niti se z njim ponašati.

V pričujočem poskusu, kako umestiti pojma vpliv in medbesedilnost v razmerje do svetovne književnosti (v duhu Wallersteina, Even-Zoharja, Morettija in Pascale Casanove razumljene kot svetovni literarni sistem), predlagam, da ju razlikujemo takole. *Vpliv* razumem kot psihično in družbeno silo, ki prežema kulturne proizvode ne samo po zaslugi uspešnosti ustvarjalnega dela, temveč tudi zaradi asimetrične razporeditve kulturnega kapitala v svetovnem literarnem sistemu in zaradi konjunktur, trendov in povpraševanj na področju medliterarne in kulturne menjave. V vzpostavljanje vplivne moči, ki jo dobijo določena besedila, njihovi nizi, matrice ali elementi, so vpleteni mnogi družbeni akterji, prakse, ustanove in diskurzivni režimi: od literarnih kánonov in kulturnega spomina prek salonov, časopisov, gledališč, kritike do politik prevajanja in prodajnih strategij založb. Takšno omrežje vplivov imamo torej lahko za ključni dejavnik pri vzpostavljanju koherentnosti svetovnega literarnega sistema, pa tudi njegove dinamike, razvojnega samouravnavanja in notranjih napetosti. Po drugi strani *medbesedilnost* ni zgolj odtis psiho-socialnih silnic vpliva na raven pisanja. Besedilni subjekt namreč medbesedilnost tudi strateško uporablja za svojo imaginarno umestitev v vesolje razpravljanja: medbesedilni sklici in izpeljave umeščajo subjekt v »domači« kulturni prostor (tako v njegovo tradicijo kakor tudi v aktualno stanje) in v izbrane ali zaželene cone svetovne književnosti. Goethe, ki je izumil pojem »svetovna književnost«, je bil med prvimi, ki so kozmopolitske interakcije in kulturne menjave tudi udejanjali. Ena izmed izstopajočih oblik udejanjanja svetovne književnosti je citiranje in preoblikovanje njenih obsežnih, pluralnih in večjezičnih virov. Medtem ko je bila kozmopolitska medbesedilnost v romantiki pogosto soigralka kulturnega nacionalizma (npr. pri Prešernu), pa je videti, da je prototipski modernistični pesnik, kakršen je bil Pound, uporabljal »svetovne« medbesedilne navezave z vidika kulturnega nomadstva – kot *citoyen du monde*, katerega domovina je globalni modernizem.

Cosmopolitan *sensus communis*: The Common of Singular Sense - Sense of the Singularly Common

‘*Sensus communis*’, defined as the presupposition of a sense common to all, features prominently in Kant’s writings in two significant places: as an aspect of aesthetic judgement in the *Critique of Judgement* (1790), and as a matter of the distinct status of cosmopolitan right in the essay on *Perpetual Peace* (1795). The link between aesthetic judgement and cosmopolitan right is established with the *sensus communis* mobilised by the imagination and the judgement of taste, that Kant calls “enlarged thought” (“*erweiterte Denkungsart*”), “extended” or “universal communicability” (“*erweiterte*”, “*allgemeine Mitteilbarkeit*”). Their common link to the judgement of taste has not ceased to baffle Kant’s commentators and critics. The judgement of taste, probably the most radically idiosyncratic, internal, and private of the senses seems, at first glance, a paradoxical foundation for a sense presupposed to be common to all. Kant himself deepened this paradox by elaborating it in terms of the antinomy peculiar to the judgement of taste: taste, as an internal sense, is highly particular and subjective, and yet has to be thought of as objectively purposeful, and under the presumption of what is societally agreeable. Kant, it seems, wants to make the point that even highly subjective forms of an aesthetic sensorium presuppose sociality – not as an object of thought, but as one of its analogically construed conditions.

In this paper, I would like to extend the explanatory and critical reach of this paradox. I will initially be looking at some older definitions and localisations of ‘*sensus communis*’ in anatomical, topographical, and optical models in the traditions of Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas, and Leonardo da Vinci. Before attaining the notion of the ‘sense of the common’, it turns out, ‘*sensus communis*’ was thought of as the ‘common’ of ‘sense’, co-ordinating the perceptions received from the external senses. It is described by Thomas Aquinas as an ‘inner sense’, along with imagination and *vis cogitativa*. In Leonardo da Vinci’s diagrammatic drawing illustrating how sight works, sensory information travels to the *sensus communis*, located alongside the imagination, the intellect, and the soul in a specific ventricle of the brain.

In a second step, I will explore how Kant refunctionalises these older accounts of ‘*sensus communis*’, to critical effect. If Kant can

gleefully revel in the paradox posed by antinomy of the judgement of taste to the point of risking the cogency of his argument – his critics have accused him of circularity -, it is because he had elsewhere explored and articulated the relationship between internal and external senses, between the individual, contingent, particular, on the one hand, and sociality on the other, with regard to the “powers that move the human heart“ - negatively, in his polemic against Immanuel Swedenborg, published in 1765 under the title *Dreams of a Spirit-Seer*, and simultaneously, and positively, in his first explorations of the analytic of the sublime, in ‘The Beautiful and the Sublime’ (1764), and subsequently in the *Critique of Judgement*. The location of the *focus imaginarius* in his optical model allows him to account for both the manifold of sensation, and its combination in the imagination, for both the apperception of an external reality, and of an internal sensation. The relative location of the *focus imaginarius* becomes decisive in the distinction between ethical sociality and bondage (the latter evinced in “*Schwärmerei*”, fascination, suggestibility).

Thus, while Kant’s theory of aesthetic judgement retains the elements juxtaposed in the older accounts and localisations of ‘*sensus communis*’ – especially the *vis cogitativa* and the imagination, as well as the synthetic capacities of the imagination -, he sets them in dynamic and contradictory relations with each other so as to make them critically condition, inflect, and limit each other in a way that prefigures Freud’s concern, one hundred and fifty years later, to raise the ethical standing and standards of groups. I hope to show, finally, how Kant’s theory of judgement – and of the judgement of taste in particular - and his localisations of the *focus imaginarius* offer perspectives for a critical cosmopolitics.

Svetovljanski *sensus communis*: občost singularnega občutka – občutek singularno občega

Sensus communis, definiran kot predpostavka občutka, skupnega vsem, se pri Kantu jasno pokaže na dveh pomembnih mestih: kot vidik estetske sodbe v *Kritiki razsodne moči* (1790) in kot tema posebnega statusa svetovljanske pravice v razpravi *Večni mir* (1795). Zvezo med estetsko sodbo in svetovljansko pravico vzpostavlja *sensus communis*, ki ga spodbujata domišljija in razsojanje o okusu; to Kant imenuje »razširjena miselnost« (erweiterte Denkungsart), »razširjena« ali »univerzalna komunikativnost« (erweiterte, allgemeine Mittelbarkeit). Njihova splošna povezanost z razsojanjem o okusu je stalno begala Kantove komentatorje in kritike. Razsojanje o okusu, o nemara najbolj radikalnem, značilnem, notranjem in zasebnem občutju, se zdi na prvi pogled paradoksen temelj občutka, ki naj bi bil skupen vsem. Sam Kant je ta paradoks poglobil tako, da ga je razvil kot antinomijo, tipično za razsojanje o okusu: okus kot notranji občutek je zelo specifičen in subjektiven, pa vendar ga je treba misliti, kot da je objektivno pomemben, in s predpostavko o tem, kaj je družbeno sprejemljivo. Kant hoče menda poudariti, da celo zelo subjektivne oblike estetskega zaznavanja predpostavljajo družbenost – ne kot objekt misli, ampak kot enega izmed njenih podobno sestavljenih pogojev.

V tej razpravi bi rada razširila pojasnjevalni in kritični doseg tega paradoksa. Najprej bom pregledala nekaj starejših definicij in umestitev *sensus communis* v anatomskih, topografskih in optičnih modelih pri Aristotelu, Tomažu Akvinskem in Leonardu da Vinciju. Preden je besedna zveza *sensus communis* dobila pomen »občutek za občec«, je pomenila, kot se je pokazalo, »občost občutka«, koordinacijo zaznav, prejetih od zunanjih čutov. Tomaž Akvinski to opisuje kot »notranji čut«, skupaj z imaginacijo in *vis cogitativa*. V Leonardovih diagramskih risbah, ki ilustrirajo delovanje vida, čutne informacije potujejo k *sensus communis*, ki ima ob imaginaciji, intelektu in duši prostor v posebnem prekatu možganov.

Nato bom raziskala, kako Kant usposobi te starejše poglede na *sensus communis*, da postane njihov učinek kritičen. Če se Kant veselo predaja paradoksu, ki ga postavlja antinomija razsojanja o okusu do te mere, da tvega prepričljivost svojega argumenta – kritiki so ga obdolžili samoreferenčnosti –, je to zato, ker je drugje raziskal in izrazil razmerje

med notranjimi in zunanji čuti, med individualnim, kontingentnim in partikularnim na eni strani in socialnostjo na drugi; pri tem se je oziral na »sile, ki vzgibavajo človekovo srce« – v polemiki proti Immanuelu Swedenborgu, objavljeni leta 1765 pod naslovom *Sanje vidca dubov*, odklonilno, v istem času pa naklonjeno v svojih prvih raziskavah o analitiki sublimnega v spisu »Lepo in sublimno« (1764) ter pozneje v *Kritiki razsodne moči*. Umestitev *focus imaginarius* v njegovem optičnem modelu mu omogoča, da razloži mnogovrstnost občutkov in njihovo prepletanje v imaginaciji, zaznavanje zunanje realnosti in notranjih občutkov. Ustrezna umestitev *focus imaginarius* postane odločilna pri razlikovanju med etično socialnostjo in odvisnostjo (slednje se je razkrilo v *Schwärmerei*, fascinaciji, sugestibilnosti).

Medtem ko torej Kantova teorija estetskega razsojanja ohranja elemente, ki jih je vzporejal v starejših razlagah in umestitvah *sensus communis* – zlasti *vis cogitativa* in imaginacijo, pa tudi sposobnost imaginacije, da zadeve sintetizira – jih nato postavi v medsebojna dinamična in protislovna razmerja zato, da kritično pogojuje, modulirajo in omejujejo drug drugega na način, ki napoveduje Freudovo prizadevanje, da bi – sto petdeset let pozneje – povzdignil etični položaj in merila množic. Upam, da bom nazadnje dokazala, da Kantova teorija estetske sodbe – in razsojanja o okusu še posebej – ter njegova umestitev *focus imaginarius* ponujata obet za kritično svetovljanstvo.

Globalisation, Interliterariness, and the Cosmopolitan “Author”

When literary studies were separated from the disciplines of classical philology and national philologies, the thesis of the aesthetic autonomy of literature had been used as an argument for this separation. Expanding research of the so called “world literature” was provided exactly by this thesis. Postmodern epistemology has revealed this thesis, as well as the concept of “world literature”, to be a problematic historical apriorism, which tries to unify world literature from the point of view of Western literary studies. Revealing this, postmodern epistemology uses new strategies of unification: one of them can be the multiculturalism of cultural studies, which reveals mechanisms of power and of hegemony in former constructions of (pro-Western) knowledge. (In spite of the fact that multiculturalism critically conceives contemporary globalising tensions, which annihilate the differences in knowledge, this multicultural knowledge paradoxically implies a tension of an absolute unification: a concept based on fusing different cultural periods and places to – once again – a “self-evident” “here-and-now”.) Another paradox can be, for example, the concept of plurality of methods in literary studies. If comparative literary studies accept a co-existence of absolutely different interpretations of their subject, they should at the same time accept a concept of many co-existing literary studies. This can annihilate the comparability of their subject (literature), as well as annihilate the capacity of comparing, which should be inherent to its function in the humanities. In this way, literary studies can once again form a partial, discursive grid – as a negative matrix of the former conditions; this time as a plurality of co-existing negative matrixes. These matrixes transform literature to a kind of somehow universal cultural discourse of different contents.

Is it possible to attempt to find a concept of unity implying differences? A concept, which could substitute annihilation with an exceeding of this position? Exceeding in a sense of a concrete dialogical openness to the Other?

Cosmopolitanism maybe can serve exactly as such an alternative concept: as an opposition of globalisation and nationalisms of different kinds it implies dialogic structure (Bakhtin, Hutcheon). Cosmopolitanism can identify and admit otherness, not to annihilate peculiarity. This peculiarity can, first, be modified by a newly recovered otherness

according to the specific individual criteria of this peculiarity; and secondly, this peculiarity can reflect its own dialogical position as a meta-principle of literary studies (Culler).

Interliterariness could be a method, by which this cosmopolitan dialogism could have been realised in a cogent way: it implies a reflected inherent dialogism of the literary subjects (texts, traditions, and their meta-literary texts). The result, achieved by this dialogism is probably eminently represented by a literary studies' central subject, i.e., by a literary text. In spite of its mimetic dimension it is not completely directed to any concrete and single historical reality, to its cultural-historical context, or to the historical mechanisms of its construction (or: creation). Literary text is autoreferential and polysemic in its structure and effect (otherwise it couldn't open a dialog with its recipients, who are always somehow determined by their historical contexts). Its dialogism derives from its individual structure, which provides it to serve as an agent between "grounds" of different kinds.

What a position could serve as a compromise between the intertextual "death of the author" (Barthes) and contemporary notion of the so called "ressurrection of the author" (Nehamas)?

Such a compromise should preserve a literary text from an absolute ethical and cognitive freedom of interpretation, i.e., from allowing of absolutely monological interpretations. (Are they possible at all? Obviously yes; in cases when interpretation ignores the poetic structure of a literary text, as well as the fact that its rhetoric is formed by its poetic structure.) Such a compromise should also provide the Otherness of a literary text to be taken into account. However, such a compromise should at the same time provide an interpretation by which the literary text can dialogically open to the Otherness of its recipient. Such a compromise could be probably derived from Wayne C. Booth's concept of "implied author": of a literary-textual (or: rhetorical) strategy of interpreting a narration. A global feeling that the agents of ethical, religious, economical, etc. conflicts can't be conceived as to be separated, has strengthen ethical and cognitive dimension, inherent to the concept of "implied author". However, this dimension is produced literary: it is an inherently dialogical attitude of a literary text, provided by the openness of its polysemical structure.

According to this, it is probably not too ambitious to expect from a *literary* researcher (interpreter) to be acceptable of the Otherness of a literary text, of its (meta-)literary tradition, and of the interpreter's own historical conditions and personal values.

Interpreter's acceptability of the literary Otherness can be conceived as an ethical and cognitive gesture. Creating such a dialogical interpretation of a literary text can also transpose this gesture to the textual strategy of "implied author". It may be conceived as a model, protecting literary studies from the globalising culturological unification of discursive practices, as well as from the tension to split comparative literature to an absolute methodological pluralism, in conditions, in which every potential reading of literature and of literary texts should be acceptable, even if the literary (autoreferential and polysemical) structure or effect of the object wouldn't be taken into account.

"Implied author" – perhaps it should better be named "implied interpreter"? – can also be conceived as a symbolical legitimacy of contemporary dialogical ethics, practiced, for example, by the concept of interliterariness. Agency of interliterary perspective and of its "implied interpreter" can be described with a motif of "the old man from the mountain" and its different comprehensions in different genres, cultures, and literary traditions (Persian historiography, Marco Polo's *Il Milione*, Vladimir Bartol's novel *Alamut*, some novels of Umberto Eco).

Globalizacija, medliterarnost in kozmopolitski »avtor«

Ko se je literarna veda ločila od klasične in nacionalnih filologij, je za argument svoje avtonomije uporabila tezo o estetski avtonomiji literature. S tem je lahko razširila svoje raziskovalno območje na predmet svetovna literatura. Oboje je postmoderna epistemologija razkrila kot problematični historični apriori poskusa, da se svetovna literatura poenoti z vidika zahodne literarne vede. V tem razkrivanju pa postmoderna epistemologija sama uporablja nove strategije poenotenja: ena od njih je lahko multikulturalizem kulturnih študij, ki razkrivajo mehanizme moči in hegemonije v predhodnih oblikovanih (pro-zahodne) vednosti. (Kljub dejstvu, da multikulturalizem kritično dojema sodobne globalizacijske težnje, ki zanikajo raznolikost vednosti, ta vednost paradoksalno implicira težnjo po absolutnem poenotenju, koncept, ki temelji na zlitju kulturnih časov in prostorov v vnovič »samoumevni« »tu-in-zdaj«.) Drugi paradoks je lahko npr. koncept metodološkega pluralizma v literarni vedi. Če primerjalna literarna veda sprejme soobstoj absolutno različnih interpretacij svojega predmeta, obenem sprejme množstvo soobstoječih literarnih ved: s tem lahko zanika primerljivost svojega predmeta (literature) in s tem tudi sposobnost primerjanja, ki naj bi bila inherentna funkciji literarnih študij v humanistiki. S tem ponovno vzpostavi parcialno, diskurzivno rešetko – kot negativna matrica prejšnjega stanja, le da tokrat v množstvu soobstoječih negativnih matric. Te pa literaturo spreminjajo v na nek način univerzalni kulturni diskurz raznolikih vsebin.

Ali je možen poskus najti enotnost v raznolikosti? Koncept, ki bi namesto zanikanja impliciral preseganje danega položaja? Preseganje v smislu dejanske dialoške odprtosti za Drugega?

Alternativa utegne biti prav kozmopolitizem: v nasprotju z globalizacijo in tudi nacionalizmi različnih vrst implicira dialoškost (Bahtin, Hutcheon). Kozmopolitizem lahko prepozna – in pripozna - drugost, ne da bi zanikal svojskost. Obenem lahko to svojskost, prvič, po lastnih kriterijih modificira z na novo odkrito drugostjo; in drugič, reflektira lastno dialoško držo kot meta-princip literarne vede (Culler).

Metodološko to kozmopolitsko dialoškost v literarni vedi morda učinkovito uveljavlja koncept interliterarnosti: implicira

uzaveščeno dialoškost literarnih objektov (tekstov, tradicij ter njihovih metaliterarnih tekstov). Rezultat te dialoškosti pa verjetno eminentno reprezentira prav objekt literarne vede, literarni tekst. Ta kljub svoji mimesis ni popolnoma izpeljiv na nobeno zgodovinsko konkretno realnost, na svoj kulturnozgodovinski kontekst ali na historične mehanizme njegovega konstruiranja. Literarni tekst je samonanašalen, strukturno in učinkovno polisemičen (drugače ne bi mogel »dialogizirati« z recipienti, ki jih opredeljujejo tudi njihovi historični konteksti). Ta dialoškost pa izhaja iz njegove individualne strukture, ki mu omogoča posredništvo med raznolikimi »temelji«.

Kakšen položaj bi dopuščal kompromis med medbesedilno »smrtjo avtorja« (Barthes) in sodobnimi opozorili na »vstajenje avtorja« (Nehamas)? Tak kompromis bi moral zavarovati literarni tekst pred tem, da bi bralcom omogočal popolno spoznavno-etično svobodo (poljubnost) interpretacije, torej absolutno monološke interpretacije.

So sploh mogoče? Očitno so, v primeru da interpretacija ignorira poetično strukturo literarnega teksta, kakor tudi dejstvo, da njegovo retoriko oblikuje poetična struktura.) Tak kompromis bi moral torej upoštevati Drugost literarnega teksta. Hkrati bi moral tak kompromis dopustiti interpretacijo, s katero se literarni tekst dialoško odpira Drugosti recipienta. Tak kompromis bi bilo morda mogoče izpeljati iz Boothovega koncepta »implicitnega avtorja«: literarno-tekstne (ali retorične) strategije pri interpretaciji pripovedi. V globalnem občutju, da so nosilci etičnih, religioznih, ekonomskih, idr. konfliktov sopevezani, se je okrepila spoznavno-etična implikacija, posebej poudarjena v konceptu »implicitnega avtorja«. Ta pa je dana literarno: kot dejansko inherentna dialoška drža literarnega teksta, ki jo omogoča odprtost njegove polisemične strukture.

S tega vidika morda ni preambiciozno pričakovati, da bo *literarni znanstvenik* (interpret) dovzeten za Drugost literarnega teksta, Drugost (meta)literarne tradicije literarnega teksta in za svoje lastne historične pogoje in osebne vrednote. Interpretovo dovzetnost za literarno Drugost lahko razumemo kot spoznavno-etično gesto. Ustvarjanje takšne dialoške interpretacije literarnega teksta lahko to gesto preobrazi v tekstno strategijo »implicitnega avtorja«. V literarni vedi lahko deluje kot model zoper globalizacijsko kulturološko enotenje diskurzivnih praks in tudi zoper težnjo po razcepitvi primerjalne literarne vede v absolutni metodološki pluralizem, v katerem bi bilo sprejemljivo vsako branje literature in literarnih tekstov, celo tisto, ki ne upošteva njihove literarne (samonanašalne in polisemične) strukture ali

učinka. Implicitnega avtorja – ali naj ga raje imenujemo »implicitni interpret«? lahko torej razumemo kot simbolno legitimizacijo sodobne dialoške etike, ki jo udejanja npr. interliterarno dojetje literature. Delovanje interliterarne perspektive in njenega »implicitnega interpreta« je mogoče opisati ob motivu »starca z gore« in ob različnih obravnavah tega motiva v različnih žanrih, kulturah in literarnih tradicijah (perzijska historiografija, Marco Polo, Bartol, Eco).

Superbia, Suburbia

As the humanities are cornered by the toxins of our age, literature is left to dribble on the slopes: the slopes of the ever-ascending mountains of visual cultures, of the proof-finding sciences, and of the very overproduction of print and hypertext. And as the defense of literature is made trickier and trickier by the habit and rising legitimacy of images, numbers and numbers, the self-justifying metaphors of the humanities won't fence off the reflexes of the truth-tough-proof of statistics, branding, impact, or market value. In this new geology of the social imaginary, the relief resulted from the serial *Entbergungen* of literature's competitors has had verbal creative imagination left as a maid in the valleys, to float on the lakes of tears it shed. These rising mountains fathom a new world image, as Heidegger would have it; or, rather, as a set of subworlds whose drive to light and fame fuels the social dynamic of change and survival. So as not to be beleaguered by the overlapping echoes coming back from the mountains, theory's answer to the contemporary condition ought to be sharp.

This sharpness will first be tried by the dissection of suburbia for, as cities are taken over by their suburbs, so is the world overwhelmed by its subworlds. The symmetry between city and world is neither new nor merely analogical. It is, though, constitutive to our age, even if, like other globalizing impulses, it comes out of North America. Along lines of similarity and measurable difference, the "world" turned from the Roman *urbis orbis* to the neo-Roman *suburbis suburbis*.

The North American suburbia (in which lives and pullulates the majority of this continent's population) is different from the European, Asian or African metoc, banlieue, or bidonville. Whatever else it may be, the suburbia grows out of the North American city's lack of history. Ontologically, in added time, the city roots itself in the ground, as if to stay close to its spatial essence. In this conquest of its essential place, the city slowly squeezes out its underground, which comes exposed on its edges as a sheer expression of this geo-ontological architecture. The growth of the suburbia surrounding the city beyond the horizon line marks the twentieth century, as does the American model's world domination. To the postmodern subject, the lateral outgrowth of the suburbia originates in this evisceration of the

underground: the under-, sub-, or hypo- comes out on the horizontal plane to surround and defend the city. While the banlieue threatens the European, etc. city with its “impurities,” the other type of outskirt – the North American suburbia – defends the city unknowingly, unwillingly perhaps. As the suburbs grow into city walls, the city itself becomes its own temple: possible as an object of desire, yet real as a state of exception. The suburbia is the greatest repository of cosmopolitan sameness on this continent: of the ideology of comfort naturalized. In that, suburbia is real.

These two opposites do not figure in classical nomenclatures: there is no *urbia* in Latin and no *hypopolis* in Greek. *Hypopolis*: does this monster hide and ride under such a funny name? The Greek polis was the exception made to the countryside: its structure of understanding did not mediate in the understanding of nature (Aristotle’s definition of man as a *zoon politikon*, for one, parachutes the unqualified life form – *zōē*, as opposed to the qualified *bios* – directly from nature into the sheltering city). On the contrary, nature (*phusis*) mediated every understanding of the polis, or at least this what we can glimpse from the statute of the “Greek subject” – *hypokeimenon*. *Hypopolis* would have been as monstrous to the Greeks as *urbia* would be to us – and this, not only rhetorically.

We will thus inquire into the ways in which suburbia disguises the monstrosity of the *hypopolis* which generated it. We ask: what *theoria* for the suburbia? What can be witnessed and “brought back” from the visitation of those large patches of land, geographical and mental? For now, two things can be said: that the suburbia takes shape and shapes the “world” in the age of the neutralization unto rearrangement of Protestant moral (double) standards. As all sponsors are “proud sponsors,” the vice of pride and the virtue of charity join forces to remake the circle of sacred broken by Luther and his followers into the ethical and aesthetic hemispheres. This patchwork of the selflessness of *caritas* and the narcissism of *superbia* (pride) looms large over the set of subworlds inspired by suburbia. The theoretical understanding of this “superb suburb” can be but aesthetic, empirical, and not underwritten or sponsored by any agency like those that were sanctioning the Greek *theoria*. The corpus dealt with in this discussion extends from *Babbitt* to *Desperate Housewives* and from Aristotle to Heidegger.

Superbia, suburbia

Ker so strupi današnjega časa humanistične vede potisnili v kot, preostane literaturi preigravanje na strmini: na strmini vedno višjih gora vizualnih kultur, tistih znanosti, ki ponujajo dokaze, in čezmerne proizvodnje tiska in hiperteksta. In ker je zaradi navad in naraščajočega pomena podob obramba literature vedno bolj težavna, samoutemeljuječe se metafore humanističnih ved ne bodo mogle odbiti samodejnih odzivov na dokaze o točnosti statistike, označb, vplivov ali tržne vrednosti. V tej novi geologiji družbenega imaginarija je olajšanje, ki je bilo posledica periodičnega *Entbergerunga* literarnih tekmecev, besedno ustvarjalno imaginacijo pustilo za služkinjo v dolini, da pluje po jezerih pretočenih solza. Te vzpenjajoče se gore merijo globino nove podobe sveta, kot bi rekel Heidegger; pravzaprav je to niz podsvetov, katerih siljenje na svetlo in k slavi podžiga družbeno dinamiko menjave in preživetja. Odgovor teorije na današnje razmere mora biti oster, da je ne bi nadlegovali zapovrstni odmevi, ki se vračajo z gora.

Ostrino bomo najprej preizkusili na analizi predmestij, saj mesta zavzemajo njihova predmestja, tako da je svet preplavljen z njihovimi podsvetovi. Simetrija med mestom in svetom ni niti nova, niti ne gre samo za podobnost; vendar je sestavina našega časa, četudi prihaja, tako kot druge globalizacijske spodbude, iz Severne Amerike. V »svetu« ne opažamo samo podobnosti in izmerljivih razlik, »svet« se je iz rimskega *urbis orbis* spremenil v novorimski *suburbis suburbis*.

Severnoameriška predmestja (v katerih živi in se bohota večina celinskega prebivalstva) so drugačna od evropskih, azijskih ali afriških satelitskih naselij, primestij ali barakarskih naselij. Ščasoma se mesto, ontološko, samo ukorenini v tla, kot bi hotelo ostati blizu svojega prostorskega bistva. V tem osvajanju pomembnega prostora mesto počasi iztisne svoje podzemlje in to se razkriva na njegovih robovih kot pravi *izraz* te geo-ontološke arhitekture. Razraščanje predmestij, ki obdajajo mesto še prek obzorja, zaznamuje 20. stoletje, tako kot ga zaznamuje prevlada ameriškega modela. Postmoderni subjekt je prepričan, da stransko izraščanje predmestij izvira prav iz tega izpraznjenega podzemlja: tisto, kar je pod-, sub- ali hipo- pride na dan na horizontalni ravni, da obkroži in varuje mesto. Medtem ko evropska in druga mesta predmestja ogrožajo s svojo »nesnago«, pa druga vrsta periferije, to so severnoameriška predmestja, mesto nevede ali nehoti

varuje. Ker se predmestja razvijajo v mestna obzidja, postaja mesto svoje lastno svetišče: možno kot objekt želje, a stvarno kot status izjeme. Predmestje je največji vir svetovljanske enakosti na tej celini: je naturalizirana ideologija udobja. V tem pogledu je predmestje stvarno.

Teh dveh nasprotij v klasičnem izrazju ne najdemo: latinščina ne pozna *urbia*, grščina ne *hypopolis*. *Hypopolis*: ali se ta pošast skriva in jezdi pod tako smešnim imenom? Grški polis je bil izjema, izmišljena za podeželje: njegova struktura razumevanja ne posreduje razumevanja narave (Aristotelova definicija človeka kot *zoon politikon*, na primer, odvrže neprimerno življenjsko obliko – *zoe* kot nasprotje primerne *bios* – iz narave naravnost v zavetno mesto). Nasprotno pa narava (*physis*) posreduje razumevanje polisa, ali vsaj tisto, kar lahko bežno zaznamo v statusu »grškega subjekta« – *hypokeimenon*. *Hypopolis* bi bil za Grke prav tako pošasten kot bi bili *urbia* za nas – in to ne samo teoretično.

Raziskovali bomo torej to, kako predmestja prikrivajo pošastnost *hypopolis*, ki so jih ustvarila. Sprašujem: kakšna *theoria* je primerna za predmestja? O čem lahko priča in kaj lahko »obudi« obisk teh obširnih zaplat zemlje – geografsko in miselno? Za zdaj lahko rečemo dvoje: da v času od nevtralizacije do preureditve protestantskih (dvojnih) meril, predmestja dobijo obliko »sveta« in hkrati »svet« oblikujejo. Ker so vsi pokrovitelji »ponosni pokrovitelji«, pregreha ponosa in vrlina milosti združita sile, da bi obnovili krog svetega, ki so ga Luter in njegovi privrženci prelomili na etično in estetsko polovico. Ta sestavljenka iz nesebičnosti *caritas* in narcizma *superbie* (napuha) se grozeče dviga nad nizom podsvetov, ki so jih navdihnili predmestja. Teoretsko razumevanje tega »superb suburb« je lahko samo estetsko, empirično, ne more ga podpisati ali sponzorirati nobena agencija – kot tiste, ki jih je potrdila grška *theoria*. Korpus, s katerim se bom ukvarjal v tej razpravi, sega od *Babbitta* do *Obupanib gospodinj* in od Aristotela do Heidegggra.

John Neubauer

Realities, Utopias, and Misconceptions Concerning the Globalization of Literary Studies

Using Arjun Appadurai's article "Grassroots Globalization and the Research Imagination" (2001), I wish to consider several (mis)conceptions concerning the theorization and practical globalization of literary studies.

Appadurai envisages a "globalization from below," for which he discusses three aspects: 1) "the peculiar optical challenge posed by the global," 2) area studies, and 3) research itself. The first refers to the need to perceive apparently stable objects as objects moving in spaces that are in constant flux. The most recalcitrant object to a refocusing is also the one that is apparently most stable: the nation-state, which, as Appadurai says, "is today frequently characterized by floating populations, transnational politics within national borders, and mobile configurations of technology and expertise" (5). The second aspect, area studies, refers to a similar need to reinterpret the term as a referent to something unstable and flowing: "the capability to imagine regions and worlds is now itself a globalized phenomenon," which means that area terms, such as the Pacific Rim (or, I would add, Eastern Europe), are constantly redefined and their definition depends very much on the position of the observer (8). Finally, perhaps the most important of the three terms, research, also requires rethinking in a globalized world. For Appadurai, this means "a deparochialization of the research ethic," which, in turn, raises a fundamental question about the objectivist and disinterested Western research tradition: "Can we retain the methodological rigor of modern social science while restoring some of the prestige and energy of earlier visions of scholarship in which moral and political concerns were central" (15).

Although Appadurai talks here, and elsewhere, about challenges to the social sciences, we can use his terms and questions, with appropriate modifications, to tackle the issue at hand, namely in what ways literary theory has (or has not) responded to the challenges of globalization. Since this is a matter of research, I shall focus primarily on Appadurai's third point. The shifting and perspectival definitions of nations and regions is, of course, highly relevant also, but I have dealt with those questions elsewhere, notably in the *History of Literary Cultures*

of *East-Central Europe*, which opens with a reflection on the alternative terms *Mitteleuropa*, *Eastern Europe*, *East-Central Europe* etc.

We note with surprise that Appadurai's reflections on research, ignore a factor that is crucial for us and should be of great importance in the social sciences as well: I mean, of course, *language*. How are we to imagine his "grassroots globalization" if that globalization from below does not allow, or severely limits, the use of vernacular language? Not even the most abstract paper can get away with mere statistics. It is here that I see the greatest obstacle (not "challenge") to globalized literary studies: How are we to respect the local, the "grassroots" if in our field (as in all others) global communication must use English or, at best, some other post-imperial language? I am dissatisfied with Gayatri Spivak's answer to this.

If we go beyond the insolvable language question, we may distinguish between three possible modes of globalizing literary studies: an encyclopedic one, a historical one, and a genre-theoretical one. Encyclopedias of world literature exist in various languages and scopes. They are useful as data banks but of little help for comprehensive theoretical approaches. The second mode, historical, aims at histories of world literature. Next to some older examples, I wish to discuss here Pascale Casanova's *La république mondiale des lettres* (1999) and Gunilla Lindberg-Wada's 4-vols. collaborative *Literary History: Towards a Global Perspective* (2006). Finally, under genre-theoretical approaches I wish to take a critical look at Franco Moretti's work, especially his global (or world-system) approach to the novel, which seems to me both organicist and eurocentric. Earl Miner's essay *Comparative Poetics* (1990) seems to me a more promising beginning.

John Neubauer

Dejstva, utopije in napačne predstave o globalizaciji literarnih študij

Rad bi proučil različne (napačne) predstave o teoriji in dejanski globalizaciji literarnih študij, pri čemer se bom oprl na članek Arjuna Appadurajja »Grassroots Globalization and the Research Imagination« (2001).

Appadurai se loteva »globalizacije od spodaj«, zato razpravlja o treh vidikih: 1) »posebnem izzivu, ki ga postavlja globalna optika«, 2) področnih študijah in 3) samem raziskovanju. Prvi se nanaša na potrebo, da navidezno stabilne objekte zaznavamo kot objekte, ki se premikajo po nenehno spreminjajočih se prostorih. Najbolj uporen objekt, na katerega se je treba znova osredotočiti, je tisti, ki je navidezno najtrdnjši: to je nacionalna država, za katero so, kot pravi Appadurai, »danes pogosto značilni nestalno prebivalstvo, transnacionalna politika znotraj nacionalnih meja ter mobilne oblike tehnološkega in strokovnega znanja« (5). Drugi vidik, področne študije, se nanaša na podobno nujno po ponovnem interpretiranju pojma kot nekaj nestalnega in valujočega: »zmožnost predstavljati si regije in svetove je danes že sama globalni pojav« – to pomeni, da področne pojme, kot je Tihomorski obroč (ali, bi dodal, Vzhodna Evropa), nenehno opredeljujejo na novo in je njihova opredelitev zelo odvisna od položaja opazovalca (8). In nazadnje, raziskovanje, nemara najpomembnejši izmed treh pojmov, v globaliziranem svetu prav tako zahteva ponovni razmislek Za Appadurajja to pomeni »deprovincializacijo raziskovalne etike«, kar načenja temeljno vprašanje o objektivistični in nepristranski raziskovalni tradiciji Zahoda: »Ali lahko ohranimo metodološko strogost moderne znanosti o družbi, medtem ko zgodnejšim pogledom znanstvenega razpravljanja, pri katerem so imele osrednje mesto moralne in politične zadeve, vračamo nekaj ugleda in energije« (15).

Četudi Appadurai v tem članku in drugje govori o izzivih družbenim vedam, se lahko s primernimi prilagoditvami teh pojmov in vprašanj lotimo tudi našega problema – namreč, kako je (ali ni) literarna teorija odgovorila na izzive globalizacije. Glede na to, da je to predmet raziskave, se bom osredotočil predvsem na Appadurajjevo tretjo točko. Seveda so definicije narodov in regij, ki se spreminjajo in so podane z določenega zornega kota, tudi zelo pomembne, vendar sem se s temi vprašanji ukvarjal drugje, namreč v delu *History of Literary Cultures of*

East-Central Europe, ki se začena z razmišljanjem o alternativnih pojmih: *Mittleuropa*, Vzhodna Evropa, Srednjevhodna Evropa itn.

S presenečenjem opažamo, da v Appadurajevem premišljevanju o raziskovanju ne najdemo dejavnika, ki je za nas bistvenega pomena in bi moral biti pomemben tudi v družbenih vedah: seveda imam v mislih *jezik*. Kako naj si predstavljamo to »temeljno globalizacijo«, če ta globalizacija od spodaj ne dopušča ali strogo omejuje rabo ljudskega jezika? Niti najbolj abstraktna razprava se ne more izmuzniti zgolj s statistiko. Prav tu vidim največjo oviro (ne »izziv«) za globalne literarne študije: Kako naj spoštujemo lokalno, »ljudsko«, če mora na našem polju (kot tudi na vseh drugih) globalna komunikacija uporabljati angleščino ali, v najboljšem primeru, kak drug postimperialistični jezik? Z odgovorom na ta problem, ki ga je ponudila Gayatri Spivak, nisem zadovoljen.

Če gremo prek nerešljivega jezikovnega problema, lahko razločujemo med tremi možnimi oblikami globalnih literarnih študij: enciklopedični, zgodovinski in zvrstnoteoretski. Enciklopedije svetovne književnosti obstajajo v raznih jezikih in obsegih. Koristne so kot baze podatkov, malo pa pomagajo pri splošnih teoretskih pristopih. Drugi način, zgodovinski, si prizadeva za zgodovine svetovne književnosti; ob nekaj starejših primerkih bi tu želel razpravljati o dveh delih: Pascale Casanova, *La république mondiale des lettres* (1999) in o kolektivnem delu *Literary History: Towards a Global Perspective* (2006), katerega urednica je Gunilla Lindberg-Wada. Nazadnje bom med zvrstnoteoretskimi pristopi vzel v kritični pretres delo Franca Morettija, zlasti njegov globalni (ali svetovnometodološki) pristop k romanu, ki se mi zdi tako organicističen kot evrocentričen. Po mojem mnenju je bolj obetaven začetek delo *Comparative Poetics* (1990), ki ga je napisal Earl Miner.

Sangjin Park

Cosmopolitan Vernacular in Yi Kwang-Su's Bilingual Way of Writing

The collision between plural national languages may cause an exclusive nationalism. However, if we can hypothesize that the resistance of a national language is not directed to the (language of) outside but rather to all kinds of homogenized (language) space, we can consider that the national language inheres the power of resistance to that self-homogenized space which is based on self-nation-centeredness. This kind of resistance, which can also be named self-negation, is primarily related to the capacity to allow the Other in itself and to make itself the Other. This is the process in which the particularity formed through its resistance to a universality forms another universality: namely, the process of appropriating universalities.

The literary language can be generated and maintained in the process of such de-homogenization. Literature, by means of excluding and deconstructing the oppression of a universality, receives the Other as a momentum for reconstructing another universality, thus building up a field where the plural universalities are contested. In modern Korean literature, I will discuss an example of the literature that built up such field beyond 'Korean' and 'modern' in the period of bilingual writing (1943-1945) with special reference to the writer Yi Kwang-Su.

Sangjin Park

Svetovljanski govorjeni jezik v dvojezičnem pisanju Yi Kwang-Suja

Navzkrižje med jeziki v večnacionalnih okoljih lahko pripelje do izključevalnega nacionalizma. Če pa lahko postavimo hipotezo, da odpor nacionalnega jezika ni usmerjen v (zunanji) jezik, ampak prej v vsakovrstne homogenizirane (jezikovne) prostore, si lahko mislimo, da je z nacionalnim jezikom neločljivo povezana moč odpora do tistega samopoenotnega prostora, ki temelji na osredotočenosti na svoj narod. Ta vrsta odpora, ki ga lahko imenujemo tudi samonegacija, je v prvi vrsti povezana z zmožnostjo dopustiti Drugega kot takega in iz sebe napraviti Drugega. To je proces, v katerem posebno, ki se oblikuje skozi svoj odpor do univerzalnega, oblikuje drugo univerzalnost: to je proces prilaščanja univerzalnosti.

Literarni jezik lahko nastane in se ohrani v procesu takega razbijanja istorodnosti. Literatura z izključevanjem in razgradnjo pritiska univerzalnega sprejme Drugega kot gonilno silo vzpostavljanja druge univerzalnosti, ter tako zgradi polje, na katerem tekmujejo številne univerzalnosti. V moderni korejski literaturi bom proučil primer literature, ki je v obdobju dvojezičnega pisanja (1943 – 1945) zgradila tako polje onkraj 'korejskega' in 'modernega'; posebno pozornost bom namenil pisatelju Yi Kwang-Suju.

Darja Pavlič

The Role of Inclusion in Comparative Literature and Literary Theory

The social sciences employ a number of concepts through which they seek to embrace the characteristics of modern society and ideas about how society is organized, such as globalization or globalism, multiculturalism, and cosmopolitanism. The differences between individual concepts are often indistinct; in addition, the term “cosmopolitanism” is very old and used by various authors in various ways, which is why it seems that every discussion about the concepts cited above should start with a terminological explanation. The author bases her discussion on Ulrich Beck, whose theoretical works on cosmopolitanism (such as *Cosmopolitan Vision* and *Cosmopolitan Europe*) sought not only to establish precise limits between these concepts, but also to define the difference between cosmopolitanism and universalism on the one hand, and internationalism on the other. According to Beck, multiculturalism, as opposed to cosmopolitanism, refers exclusively to collective differences; it deals with social groups within a nation state, whereas cosmopolitanism draws attention to the fact that ethnic boundaries are disappearing. Although both cosmopolitanism and internationalism envisage international cooperation, cosmopolitanism differs from internationalism because it opens and sets new limits on its own. Similar to cosmopolitanism, universalism emphasizes the equality of all people, but in contrast to cosmopolitanism it seeks to eliminate the differences between them. In general use, globalization or globalism is usually equated with economic globalization, whereas cosmopolitanization takes place at various levels and encompasses human rights, labor rights, environmental protection movements, and so on; according to Beck, cosmopolitanization at the institutional level is represented by the International Court of Justice and the UN. Beck distinguishes between cosmopolitanism (as a philosophical concept, which is frequently said to be a conscious decision and a matter of the elite) and the truly existing cosmopolitanization that takes place in everyday life. Beck provides the briefest definition of cosmopolitanism: “affirmation of the other as both different and the same” (*Cosmopolitan Vision* 58). The basic characteristic of cosmopolitanism (and cosmopolitanization) is transcending national boundaries and differences, which, however, does not involve the elimination of

nations. Cosmopolitanism demands a certain extent of nationalism because this “is the best way for institutional production and stabilization of collective differences” (*Cosmopolitan Vision* 62) and represents protection against cosmopolitanism degenerating into universalism. According to Beck, cosmopolitanism cannot be conceived of without nationalism; however, nationalism appropriately changes due to its connection with cosmopolitanism.

With respect to cosmopolitanism and sociology, Beck establishes that the principle of exclusion, typical of the “first modern age,” is outdated and should be replaced by the principle of inclusion. This means that differences should be treated in line with principle of “both/and” and no longer in line with the principle of “or/or.” The question of how to treat a difference is not merely the central question of the social order and social sciences, but can also be posed in relation to literary studies or, to be more precise, their subject and methods of research. In contrast to sociology – which has only recently become aware of the need to move beyond studying the new social reality from the national perspective and instead seeks to establish a “cosmopolitan perspective” – literary studies have had a considerably longer tradition of using this approach. When I began studying comparative literature in 1986, our professor offered us the following definition as a generally accepted definition of the discipline: “Comparative literature deals with a multinational area from a supranational perspective” (Evald Koren). Nearly twenty years later, when Beck talks about the period of cosmopolitan perspective, it seems reasonable to pose the question of what “supranational perspective” means and whether it could be replaced with “cosmopolitan perspective” as defined by Beck. In this case, following the principle of inclusion, the validity of Goethe’s statement that “national literature does not mean much these days” (31 January 1827, *Conversations with Eckermann*) also deserves reflection.

Darja Pavlič

Vloga inkluzivnosti na področju primerjalne književnosti in literarne teorije

Socialne vede uporabljajo vrsto pojmov, s katerimi skušajo zaobjeti značilnosti sodobne družbe in predstave o tem, kako naj bi bila družba organizirana, npr. globalizacija/globalizem, multikulturalnost, kozmopolitizem. Razlike med posameznimi koncepti so pogosto zabrisane, poleg tega je izraz kozmopolitizem zelo star in so ga različni avtorji uporabljali na različne načine, zato se zdi, da je potrebno vsako razpravo o omenjenih pojmih začeti s terminološkim pojasnjevanjem. Sama se bom pri tem oprla na Ulricha Becka, ki je skušal v svojih teoretskih delih o kozmopolitizmu (npr. v knjigah *Cosmopolitan Vision* in *Cosmopolitan Europe*) ne samo natančno razmejiti naštete pojme, ampak tudi opredeliti razliko med kozmopolitizmom in univerzalizmom ter internacionalizmom. Multikulturalnost se po njegovem mnenju v nasprotju s kozmopolitizmom nanaša izključno na kolektivne razlike; družbene skupine obravnava v okviru nacionalne države, medtem ko kozmopolitizem opozarja, da postajajo etnične meje zabrisane. Tudi od internacionalizma se kozmopolitizem razlikuje, čeprav oba predpostavljata mednarodno sodelovanje, kajti sam odpira in na novo postavlja meje. Univerzalizem podobno kot kozmopolitizem poudarja enakost vseh ljudi, vendar želi v nasprotju z njim odpraviti razlike med njimi. Globalizacija/globalizem je v splošni rabi po navadi izenačen/a z ekonomsko globalizacijo, medtem ko kozmopolitanizacija poteka na različnih ravneh, obsega npr. gibanja za priznavanje človekovih pravic, za pravico do dela, za zaščito okolja; na institucionalni ravni kozmopolitanizacijo po Becku predstavlja Mednarodno sodišče in OZN. Beck razlikuje kozmopolitizem (kot filozofski koncept, za katerega se pogosto trdi, da je zavestna odločitev in stvar elite) ter resnično obstoječo kozmopolitanizacijo, ki poteka v vsakdanjem življenju. Kozmopolitizem, kot ga najkrajše opredeli Beck, pomeni »priznavanje drugega kot drugačnega in hkrati enakega.« (*Cosmopolitan Vision* 58) Osnovna značilnost kozmopolitizma (in kozmopolitanizacije) je preseganje nacionalnih meja in razlik, pri čemer pa ne gre za odpravljanje narodov. Kozmopolitizem zahteva določeno mero nacionalizma, ker je ta »najboljši način za institucionalno ustvarjanje in ohranjanje kolektivnih razlik« (*Cosmopolitan Vision* 62) ter pomeni zaščito pred tem, da bi se kozmopolitizem izrodil v univerzalizem. Po Becku si

torej kozmopolitizma ni mogoče zamisliti brez nacionalizma, ki pa se zaradi povezave s kozmopolitizmom seveda ustrezno spremeni.

Beck v zvezi s kozmopolitizmom in sociologijo ugotavlja, da je princip izključevanja, ki je bil značilen za »prvo moderno«, preživeti, nadomestiti ga mora princip vključevanja. To pomeni, da je treba z razliko ravnati v skladu s principom »prav tako/in« (both/and) in ne več po načelu »ali/ali«. Vprašanje, kako ravnati z razliko, ni samo osrednje vprašanje družbene ureditve in družbenih ved, ampak si ga lahko zastavimo tudi v zvezi z literarno vedo, natančneje v zvezi z njenim predmetom in načini raziskovanja. V nasprotju s sociologijo, ki se šele v novejšem času zaveda potrebe, da nove družbene stvarnosti ne proučuje več z nacionalne perspektive, ampak skuša uveljaviti »kozmpolitsko perspektivo«, ima ta pristop na področju literarne vede precej dolgo tradicijo. Ko sem leta 1986 začela študirati primerjalno književnost, nam je profesor kot splošno sprejemljivo definicijo vede podal naslednjo: »Primerjalna književnost se ukvarja z mnogonarodnim področjem z nadnarodnega stališča.« (Koren) Skoraj dvajset let kasneje, ko Beck govori o dobi kozmopolitske perspektive, se zdi smiselno zastaviti vprašanje, kaj pomeni »nadnarodno stališče« in ali bi ga kazalo nadomestiti s »kozmpolitsko perspektivo«, kot jo definira Beck. V tem primeru bi morali v skladu z načelom inkluzivnosti razmisliti tudi o veljavnosti Goethejeve misli, da »nacionalna književnost ne pomeni več veliko« (31. 1. 1827, *Pogovori z Eckermannom*).

Robert Stockhammer

World Literature, Already Translated

'World Literature' means, ever since Goethe coined the phrase, not so much a set of canonical works but rather a type of literature that gains its efficacy through circulation, transgressing borders between different national literatures. In order to reduce the complexity of this circulation, most accounts of world literature presuppose distinctive and homogenous entities as points of reference. In linguistic terms, these accounts presuppose stable and pure source and target languages. David Damrosch, for example – in his recent book *What is World Literature?* that has inspired a lively discussion – defines: "I take world literature to encompass all literary works that circulate *beyond* their culture of *origin*, either in translation or in their *original* language [...] a work only has an effective life as world literature whenever, and wherever, it is actively present within a literary system *beyond* that of its *original* culture" (my emphasis).

What, however, if 'origin' and 'beyond' are not so easily to be located and distinguished? If a work to be translated, or if the 'original language' in which it is written, already contains elements of the target language? If the 'original culture' from which it stems has already been under the impact of the culture 'beyond'?

My paper argues that cases like these are not simply exceptions from the rule but rather characteristic features of circulation, cultural and otherwise, that, at least in our times of advanced globalization and worldwide migration, had begun long ago. I propose the working term of 'elements already translated' in order to cover a variety of phenomena that share the common denominator of challenging the notion of stable entities named 'culture' or 'language'.

Robert Stockhammer

Svetovna književnost, že prevedena

Odkar je Goethe skoval izraz 'svetovna književnost', ta v glavnem ne pomeni niza kanoniziranih del, ampak prej tisti tip književnosti, ki postane pomemben s širjenjem in prestopanjem meja med različnimi nacionalnimi književnostmi. Ker želi večina interpretacij zreducirati kompleksnost tega širjenja, predpostavlja kot merilo značilne in homogene entitete. Kar zadeva jezik te interpretacije, predvidevajo obstoj trdnega in čistega izhodiščnega ter ciljnega jezika. David Damrosch, na primer, ima v najnovejši knjigi *What is World Literature?*, ki je spodbudila živahne razprave, tole definicijo: »Svetovna književnost, kakor jo razumem, zajema vsa literarna dela, ki se širijo *onkraj* svoje *izvorne* kulture, bodisi v prevodu ali v svojem *izvornem* jeziku [...] literarno delo ima kot svetovna književnost uspešno življenje, kadar je in kjer je dejavno navzoče v literarnem sistemu *onkraj* tistega, ki je njegova *izvorna* kultura« (moji poudarki).

Kaj pa, če 'izvorna' in 'onkraj' ni tako zelo lahko locirati in razločevati? Če delo, ki naj bi bilo prevedeno, ali če 'izvorni jezik', v katerem je napisano, že vsebuje elemente ciljnega jezika? Če je bila 'izvorna kultura', iz katere izhaja, že pod vplivom kulture 'onkraj'?

Moja razprava kaže, da taki primeri niso le izjeme, ampak prej značilne poteze širjenja, bodisi kulturnega ali kakega drugačnega, ki se je, vsaj v današnjih časih pospešene globalizacije in svetovne migracije, začelo že davno prej. Predlagam delovno oznako 'že prevedeni elementi', da bi z njo zajel raznovrstne pojave, ki imajo skupni imenovalec –izpodbijanje predstave o trdnih entitetah, imenovanih 'kultura' in 'jezik'.

Jola Škulj

Cosmopolitics through Literary Theory: Dialogism and Semiosphere as Cosmopolitan Ideas

Opening the discussion on issues of world literatures in comparativist perspective today invites us to reconsider certain views. Reality of world literatures in the awareness of our planetary existence urges to envision fresh and more exhaustive ideas to grasp complex facts in literary studies. Could comparativistics discuss its literatures freed from national anchoring? The focal point of the paper is to revise certain judgments and thoughts about our cultural realities, to rethink the facts of cultural identities as well as views on national literary corpuses and literary canons, which have all changed in the last hundred and fifty years, as the idea of the nation has. Literature as the body of writings of a particular language - or just of a particular cultural territory - and as a specific textual activity, allocates in semiotic (and artistic) space manifold interpretative strategies. - Can cosmopolitan perspective through highly structured concepts provide more complex insights into cultural realities for scholarly interpretative practices?

Viewing any cultural identity as dialogism with several other cultures, cultural spaces of world literatures can be approached quite empirically. Bakhtin's idea of dialogue and Lotman's notion of semiosphere appear to be useful concepts to find planetary cultural achievements as *an open set*, as cultural life in the process of ongoing exchange, re-accentuation and renewal. Hence ever new individual drives in constituting the ways of art communication. To approach the multifaceted reality of world cultures and their differentiated literary legacies, our way of thinking must get used to more complex ideas and to those holistic concepts that can convey the reality principle, the challenging diversity of cultural histories and their intertwining coexistence.

Kozmopolitika skozi literarno teorijo: Dialogizem in semiosfera kot ideji kozmopolitanizma

Ko se v današnjem svetu lotevamo razpravljanj o problemih svetovne literature v primerjalni perspektivi, smo spodbujeni, da znova pretehtamo določena stališča. Stvarnost svetovne literature nas v zavedanju naše planetarne eksistence nagovarja, da v literarni vedi domislimo izčrpnije in kompleksnejše pojme za zajemanje njene zapletene dejanskosti. Ali bi primerjalna literarna veda sploh lahko obravnavala literature brez navezav na njihova nacionalna sidrišča? V žarišču obravnave bo revidiranje določenih presojanj in razmišljanj o kulturnih realnostih, premislek dejstev o kulturnih identitetah, pa tudi pogledov na nacionalne literarne korpuse in literarne kanone, ki so se spremenili v zadnjih stopetdesetih letih, kakor se je spremenila tudi ideja nacionalnega. Literatura kot korpus pisanja v nekem jeziku - ali zgolj v nekem kulturnem prostoru - in kot specifična tekstualna aktivnost, hrani v semioticskem (in umetniškem) zajetju mnogotere interpretativne strategije. - Ali lahko kozmopolitska perspektiva s svojimi zapletenimi pojmi daje na razpolago bolj celovite vpoglede v kulturne realnosti tudi za znanstvene interpretativne prakse?

Če gledamo katerokoli kulturno identiteto kot dialog z mnogimi drugimi kulturami, je mogoče h kulturnemu prostoru svetovne literature dostopati povsem empirično. Bahtinova ideja dialoga in Lotmanov pojem semiosfere se nakazujeta kot uporabna koncepta za ugotavljanje planetarnih kulturnih uresničitvev kot *odprtega niza*, kot kulturnega življenja v procesu neodpravljevih menjav, premeščenih poudarkov in prenov. Iz tega sledijo tudi vedno nove individualne namere v vzpostavljanju načinov umetniške komunikacije. Ko pristopamo k mnogoteri realnosti svetovnih kultur in njihovih različnih literarnih izročil, se mora naše miselno uokvirjanje navaditi na bolj zapletene pojme in takšne holistične koncepcije, ki lahko posredujejo principe realnosti, izzivajoče raznolikosti kulturnih zgodovin in njihovih sprepletenih soobstajanj.

Genealogies of Cosmopolitanism

It is imperative to broaden the field of our theoretical enquiry and examine the origins of the modern discourses of cosmopolitanism in conjunction with the origins of global capitalism. Current theoretical work on cosmopolitanism has largely bracketed off its contradictory genealogy. While the present focus on the Enlightenment and Kant's ideas of perpetual peace is an expression of a specific trend that is anxious to endow cosmopolitanism with a 'positive' genealogy, it is also essential to reveal the 'negative' genealogy of cosmopolitanism in a body of ideas that rationalise the universality of human nature in terms that are not necessarily optimistic and ameliorative. The current consensus of understanding cosmopolitanism as a discourse that absorbs and 'rectifies' the unacceptable effects of globalisation is only one option in theorising cosmopolitanism. It would seem equally important to pose the question of the role played by actual conflicts and the idea of violence as potentiality in the construction of the discourse of cosmopolitanism. In other words, we need to ask: whether violence could be justifiable on humanitarian grounds; what are the limits of such justification; can war be the vehicle of growing cosmopolitan consciousness of the world; how do sociology and political theory, but also literature and cinema, relate to conflict as a complex form of exchange in the modern globalised world; are there universal human rights that are available in the exceptional state of conflict but not in the situation of normality and peace; is equality the unspoken pivotal value of cosmopolitanism, or is the recognition of a universal human nature entangled in the acceptance of not simply difference but also inequality? The embrace of the modern agenda of cosmopolitanism confronts us with the necessity to rethink the significance of class, gender, and race as conceptual tools. Rather than abandoning them (a trend that the prevalent strands of cosmopolitanism could easily encourage), we would need to lend them a new sophistication that considers their fruitfulness for cosmopolitanism.

In the context of a study of the genealogies of cosmopolitanism, one should also be concerned to carve out a discursive space that looks beyond 'methodological nationalism'. The rise of global modernity was manifested in the proliferation of exile and exilic experiences, and it seems to me important to dwell on these as

they relate to the discourses of cosmopolitanism. Three points seem essential here: a) exile as a trans-border global experience challenges substantially not only the premises of 'methodological nationalism', but also the predominantly Eurocentric picture of cosmopolitanism that obtains today, implying as it does that cosmopolitanism rests on tacitly adopted values that had been worked out in the course of a long European intellectual evolution ; b) exile as an *individual* experience (in writing, film-making, engaging in theoretical exploits etc.) questions the project of cosmopolitanism as implemented solely by supranational collective agents (NGOs; governments acting together; NATO as peace-keeper); c) the study of exile opens up the possibility of theorising cosmopolitanism not as a normative discourse (still the prevalent trend today, regardless of the political affiliations and sympathies of its exponents), but as an experiential perspective that describes one particular modus of relating to the world which is complemented by - and also competes with - other experiential modi. The question of 'enforced' cosmopolitanism becomes meaningful from this new perspective.

Genealogije svetovljanstva

Nujno moramo razširiti polje naše teoretske raziskave in proučiti začetke modernih razprav o svetovljanstvu skupaj z začetki globalnega kapitalizma. Sedanje teoretsko ukvarjanje s svetovljanstvom je velikopotezno izločilo njegovo protislovno genealogijo. Medtem ko je današnja osredotočenost na razsvetljenje in Kantove ideje o trajnem miru izraz posebnega toka, ki si prizadeva svetovljanstvu najti 'pozitivno' genealogijo, pa je pomembno tudi razkrivanje njegove 'negativne' genealogije v korpusu idej, ki upravičujejo univerzalnost človeške narave z izrazjem, ki ni nujno optimistično in olepševalno. Sedanje soglasje o razumevanju svetovljanstva kot diskurza, ki vsrka in 'spravi v red' nesprejemljive posledice globalizacije, je samo ena od možnosti teoretskega obravnavanja svetovljanstva. Prav tako pomembno bi se nam zdelo postaviti vprašanje o vlogi sedanjih spopadov in o ideji nasilja kot potencialu pri nastajanju diskurza o svetovljanstvu. Z drugimi besedami, vprašati se moramo: ali je mogoče nasilje upravičevati na humanitarni osnovi; kje so meje takega upravičevanja; ali je vojna lahko nosilec rastoče svetovljanske zavesti sveta; kakšen odnos vzpostavljata sociologija in politična teorija, pa tudi literatura in film, do spopada kot kompleksne oblike izmenjave v modernem globaliziranem svetu; ali obstajajo človekove pravice, ki so dostopne v izjemnem položaju spopada, ne pa tudi v normalnem položaju in v miru; ali je enakost neizrečena temeljna vrednota svetovljanstva, ali je priznavanje univerzalne človeške narave vpleteno v sprejemanje ne zgolj drugačnosti, marveč tudi neenakosti? Če sprejmemo moderni program svetovljanstva, moramo nujno ponovno razmisliti o pomenu razreda, spola in rase kot konceptualnih orodij. Namesto da bi jih opustili (tako težnjo bi prevladujoči tokovi svetovljanstva prav radi podprli), bi bilo bolje, če bi jim pomagali do nove prodornosti, s katero bi lahko oplodila svetovljanstvo.

V kontekstu proučevanja genealogij svetovljanstva bi se morali ukvarjati tudi z ustvarjanjem takega diskurzivnega prostora, ki bi videl prek 'metodološkega nacionalizma'. Vzpon globalne modernosti se je kazal v širjenju izseljenstva in izseljenskih izkušenj; to se mi zdi pomembno poudariti, saj je povezano z diskurzi o svetovljanstvu. Kaže, da je tu pomembno troje: a) izseljenstvo kot čezmejna globalna izkušnja odločno izziva ne le izhodišča 'metodološkega nacionalizma', marveč

tudi prevladujočo evrocentrično podobo, ki jo danes dobiva svetovljanstvo; ta namreč nakazuje, da se svetovljanstvo opira na molče sprejete vrednote, ki so jih oblikovali v teku dolgega evropskega intelektualnega razvoja; b) izseljenstvo kot *individualna* izkušnja (izražena v pisanju, filmanju, teoretskih prizadevanjih itn.) zbuja dvome v projekt svetovljanstva, ki ga implementirajo samo nadnacionalni kolektivni predstavniki (nevladne organizacije, sodelujoče vlade, NATO kot ohranjevalec miru); c) proučevanje izseljenstva odpira možnost za teoretsko obravnavo svetovljanstva ne kot normativnega diskurza (kar je danes še prevladujoča smer, kljub političnim povezavam in simpatijam njegovih zastopnikov), ampak kot izkušnjskega zornega kota, ki opisuje posebni modus povezanosti s svetom, ki ga dopolnjujejo – in tudi tekmujejo z njim – drugi izkušnjski modusi. S tega novega zornega kota postane vprašanje 'vsiljenega' svetovljanstva zelo pomembno.

Takayuki Yokota-Murakami

The Future in the Margin: The Universal and the Particular in the Russian Emigre Poetry in the Far East

This paper is an attempt at investigating the way how internationalism, nationalism and regionalism could function in interplay, by analyzing poetical/literary works of the Russian Far East in the last half of the nineteenth and the first half of the twentieth century. I will focus on the three generations of the poets from Vladivostok/Kharbin: Nikolai, Venedikt, and Ivan Matveevs.

Political/journalistic/literary discourses of the Far East Russia were strikingly marked by their cosmopolitan bend. Apparently, geographical and political distance from the cultural center was instrumental in creating such an atmosphere. A versatile intellectual, Nikolai, was representative, with his call for the study of East Asian cultures, including aboriginal, and with his cosmopolitan, idealistic program of establishing the community of the nations on the Pacific rim.

His spirit was bequeathed to his son, Venedikt Mart, futurist poet, active in Vladivostok, Kharbin, and, eventually, Kiev, where he was executed. Kharbin, one of the most important centers of the Russian emigration, was also a major base of the futuristic movement. We see here a queer connection of the cosmopolitan and the local. The idealist, international program of the futurism had to be all the more fervently approved and endorsed in the geographical/political/cultural marginality and exteriority in the Russian city in Manchuria. I will analyze the correlation of the two moments in the futurist discourse from Kharbin. The competition of the Bolshevik and Eurasianist ideologies within the poetics of the futurism in Russian China will be one of the major points of reference. I will also draw attention to the relationship between a role of a signifier and that of a signified in this competition, broadly hinting that nationalistic literature is generally inclined towards a meaning whereas the cosmopolitan tends to emphasize a sheer form. The futuristic rendition of *haiku* by Venedikt is significant in this respect. At this juncture, however, I will be making some theoretical contemplation as a gesture of reservation as to the problematic complicity of nationalism and internationalism (also, of particularism and universalism) and as to the no less problematic distinction between cosmopolitanism and internationalism.

In the last part of the paper, I will contrast the cosmopolitanism of Nikolai and Venedikt to a weirdly nationalistic political/literary stance of the grandson, Ivan Elagin. He was deported from Kiev to Berlin, eventually, emigrating to the United States. Tentatively, I will try to show, through the analysis of Elagin's works, that the deprivation of the mother tongue can be instrumental in recuperating nationalism as Elagin was acutely conscious about his being severed from the Russian literary tradition and the Russian language itself. I will also suggest that this problem has gender implication: nationalism may be reinforced by the erasure of maternity and by the valorization of the paternal. Once lost, one's motherland, i.e. one's *native* land, endorsed by one's *native* tongue, which one is born with, can be represented only as a lost Fatherland. For Elagin, the loss of the Russian literature and the Russian language was typically represented by the loss of his father, Venedikt. This gender problematic is all the more significant in the case of Ivan Elagin as it might also have signified the erasure of Jewishness (his maternal line), pointing to the inconsistency between the reality of diaspora and the ideology of the nation-state.

Prihodnost na obrobju: obče in posebno v ruski izseljenski poeziji na Daljnem vzhodu

Razprava poskuša raziskati, kako bi internacionalizem, nacionalizem in regionalizem lahko medsebojno delovali; zato analizira pesniška/literarna dela ruskega Daljnega vzhoda iz druge polovice 19. in prve polovice 20. stoletja. Osredotočil se bom na tri rodove pesnikov iz Vladivostoka/Karbina: Nikolajja, Venedikta in Ivana Matveevsa.

Politične, novinarske in literarne razprave o daljnovzhodni Rusiji je močno zaznamovala njihova svetovljanska usmerjenost. Očitno je zemljepisna in politična oddaljenost od kulturnega središča koristila pri ustvarjanju takega vzdušja. Mnogostranski intelektualec Nikolai je bil tipičen predstavnik: s svojim pozivom k raziskovanju vzhodnoazijskih kultur, vključno s prvobitno, in s svojim svetovljanskim, idealističnim programom za vzpostavitev skupnosti narodov na robu Tihega oceana.

Njegovega duha je podedoval sin Venedikt Mart, futuristični pesnik, ki je deloval v Vladivostoku, Karbinu in nazadnje v Kijevu, kjer so ga usmrtili. Kaharbin, eno najpomembnejših središč ruske emigracije, je bil tudi glavni sedež futurističnega gibanja. Tu smo priča nenavadni povezavi med svetovljanskim in lokalnim. Z idealističnim mednarodnim futurističnim programom so se še toliko bolj navdušeno strinjali in ga potrdili na zemljepisnem/političnem/kulturnem obrobju in zamejstvu, v ruskem mestu v Mandžuriji. Analiziral bom soodnosnost dveh momentov v futurističnem diskurzu iz Karbina. Tekmovanje med boljševistično in evrazijsko ideologijo v okvirih futurističnega pesnikovanja v ruski Kitajski bo ena mojih najpomembnejših referenčnih točk. Opozoril bom tudi na razmerje med vlogo označevalca in označenca v tem tekmovanju, ko bom okvirno nakazal, da je nacionalistična literatura v splošnem naklonjena pomenu, medtem ko teži svetovljanska k poudarjanju čiste forme. V tem pogledu je značilno Venediktovo futuristično tolmačenje *haikujja*. Ob tem stiku pa bom navedel nekaj teoretskih premislekov, s katerimi bom izrazil zadržanost do problematične vpletenosti nacionalizma in internacionalizma (pa tudi partikularizma in univerzalizma) in do nič manj problematičnega razlikovanja med kozmopolitizmom in internacionalizmom.

V zadnjem delu razprave bom primerjal Nikolaijevo in Venediktovo svetovljanstvo ter nenavadno nacionalistično politično in literarno držo vnuka Ivana Elagina. Iz Kijeva so ga pregnali v Berlin, nazadnje pa se je izselil v Združene države. Skozi analizo Elaginih del bom poskušal pokazati, da je prikrajšanost za materni jezik koristna za krepitev nacionalizma, saj je Elagin globoko občutil ločenost od ruske literarne tradicije in ruskega jezika samega. Povedal bom tudi, da je to imelo posledice: nacionalizem je mogoče okrepiti z izbrisom materinskega in povečevanjem vrednosti očetovskega. Ko nekdo izgubi domovino, se pravi *rojstno* deželo, ki jo potrjuje njegov *rojstni* jezik, s katerim se rodi, je to domovino mogoče predstaviti samo kot izgubljeno Očetnjavo. Za Elagina je izgubo ruske literature in ruskega jezika simbolično predstavljala izguba očeta Venedikta. Ta s spolom povezana problematika je v primeru Ivana Elagina še toliko bolj pomembna, ker bi lahko pomenila tudi izbris judovstva (po materini strani), kar usmerja pozornost na protislovje med realnostjo diaspore in ideologijo nacionalne države.

Notes on the Participants / Podatki o udeležencih

Ziva Ben-Porat, The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics, Tel-Aviv University, Israel, Honorary President of the ICLA Committee on Literary Theory

Vladimir Biti, University of Zagreb, Croatia, Honorary President of the Committee

Marijan Dovič, Scientific Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts (ZRC SAZU), Ljubljana, Slovenia

Angela Esterhammer, University of Zurich, Switzerland

Péter Hajdu, HAS Institute of Literary Studies, Hungary

Walid Hamarneh, Swarthmore College, USA

Marko Juvan, ZRC SAZU and University of Ljubljana, Slovenia

Ulrike Kistner, University of South Africa, Secretary of the Committee

Vanesa Matajc, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia

Călin-Andrei Mihăilescu, University of Western Ontario, Canada

John Neubauer, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Sangjin Park, Pusan University of Foreign Studies, South Korea

Darja Pavlič, University of Maribor, Slovenia

Robert Stockhammer, Free University of Berlin, Germany

Jola Škulj, ZRC SAZU, Ljubljana, Slovenia

Galin Tihanov, The University of Manchester, UK, President of the Committee

Takayuki Yokota-Murakami, Osaka University, Japan

RESPONDING TO COSMOPOLITANISM: THE NEW
IDENTITIES OF LITERARY THEORY
Programme and Abstracts

ODGOVOR NA KOZMOPOLITSTVO: NOVE IDENTITETE
LITERARNE TEORIJE
Program in povzetki

Ljubljana, 5 – 7 June, 2008 / Ljubljana, 5. do 7. junij 2008

Edited by / Uredil
Marko JUVAN

Organizacija kolokvija / Organizers of the Colloquium
Galin TIHANOV, The ICLA Committee on Literary Theory
Marko JUVAN, ZRC SAZU
Darko DOLINAR, ZRC SAZU

Prevodi povzetkov v slovenščino / Abstracts translated into Slovene by
Vera TROHA

Layout / Prelom
Marijan DOVIĆ

Print / Tisk
Megacop, Ljubljana

Publisher / Založnik in izdajatelj
ZRC SAZU, Inštitut za slovensko literaturo in literarne vede, Ljubljana
/ Scientific Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and
Arts, The Institute of Slovenian Literature and Literary Studies,
Ljubljana, 2008

Financial support / Finančna podpora
The Slovenian Research Agency (ARRS); ZRC SAZU; The Research
Institute for Cosmopolitan Cultures at The University of Manchester

