
World Literatures and Peripheries

Summary

THIS VOLUME IS A RESULT OF AN Institute of Slovenian Literature and Literary Studies (ZRC SAZU Research Center) project entitled “Slovenian” World Literature: Locating World Literature in a National Literary System, conceived by **Marko Juvan**. One of the main premises of the project is that world literature is always “glocalized.” Every national literature, every region, migration, and multicultural space has fashioned its own version of world literature. Consequently, many world literatures simultaneously exist within the single and unequal global literary system, “Slovenian” world literature being one of them. The project is mainly based on Casanova’s and Moretti’s theories of the world literary system/space and, using a transdisciplinary approach (comparative literature, polysystems theory, literary and cultural history, semiotics, book history, the notions of cultural transfer, and social networks), it explores the development of relationships between the world literary system and the Slovenian literary field. World literature—defined as the system of transnational literary interactions, a value concept, and a universal canon—has been establishing and reproducing itself from the nineteenth century onwards through particular nationally perceived literary systems (such as the Slovenian one) and their local perspectives and repertoires. Its structure has been influenced by asymmetrical relationships between systemic centers and the peripheries. The world periphery, including the “small” Slovenian literary system, can hardly be less creative than large cultural centers in principle, but it possesses neither comparable cultural, economic, and/or political power, nor equally developed institutional and media resources that would enhance broader and successful dissemination of its texts. A less-spoken language and internationally less-visible tradition are further hindrances on their path to global recognition. However, the periphery’s mere systemic position and its syncretic inventions are essential for the existence of the world literary system and the reproduction of its centers.

Because Slovenian literature is studied as an example of a weak, peripheral literary system, it is pertinent to compare it with other similar cases. This is the intention of this volume. The project group has invited foreign scholars (from the U.S., Spain, Luxembourg, Estonia, Croatia, and Georgia) and younger researchers from Slovenia to enhance theoretical tools and perspectives on the relations between the global literary system and its peripheral or central zones. The volume's contributions seek to answer the following questions: Are the literary world system and the modern capitalist world-system homologous, or does the latter determine the former? Is the act of writing literature through (cultural) otherness radically singular or is it preconditioned by its (stronger or weaker) position within the overall structure of (global) power and dependent on the forms imposed by this system? What are the roles of cultural transfer and the mobility of books in the cross-cultural circulation that established the global space of literature and/or encapsulated the world into single texts, artifacts, book series, and libraries? Can we speak of world literature in pre-modern periods, before the term *Weltliteratur* was invented? How and why were the world literature repertoires entered into texts, conventions, media, institutions, and practices of particular literary systems, especially emergent and peripheral ones (such as the Slovenian one)? From which cultural centers, through which mediators, and by which routes did peripheries adopt their models? What kind of models were selected and why? How were they met, transformed, and combined with local materials and perspectives? To what end? How were local variants of the global literary canon established and how did they evolve? How did the actors of the "small" national system perceive the world horizon and their position in it? Which transnational currents did they contribute to? How and which way could they enter into a transnational networking and circulation, which is essential to world literature? Did writers that transgressed domestic conventions and habits, through their cosmopolitan life trajectories, fashion idiocultures (singular cultural repertoires) that were able to expand the intellectual and aesthetic horizons of their homeland? How is the history of the idea of *Weltliteratur* reflected in a peripheral national literature? What are the possible special features of theorizing on world literature outside global metropolises of scholarship?

I

The first, predominantly theoretical, part of the volume offers two incommensurable understandings of world literature: the first stresses the intercultural existence of literature, the free play of semiotic exchange, the importance of border zones, and the singularity of each and every literary work. The second foregrounds material conditions of systemic inequality that determine global cultural flows on the entire planet. Various methods and concepts for exploring world literature are discussed, among them the notions of trajectory, idioculture, and cultural transfer. This last notion allows us to address material, media, institutional, and social factors that had an impact on the global traffic of literature from the Middle Ages to the present.

In his paper “Circulation in Pre-Modern World Literature: Historical Context, Agency and Physicality,” César Domínguez points out that recent discussions on world literature have stressed the importance of circulation as a criterion of worldliness, both in a literal and figurative sense. His paper focuses on how to correlate global circulation with pre-modern world literature. More specifically, he deals with medieval works either produced in or associated with *Outremer*, which enjoyed wide circulation within Western Europe (e.g., the Latin and translated versions of William of Tyre’s crusading chronicle *Historia rerum in partibus gestarum*, which is almost a library in itself because it includes materials from previous chronicles) in contrast to works that, despite not having enjoyed such wide circulation, encapsulate the world in their “book” physicality (e.g., the *Lindisfarne Gospels* with their combination of cultures from around the world). In the *Lindisfarne Gospels* during the mid-tenth century and in William of Tyre’s chronicle during the early thirteenth century, the “big world” of Latin communication was replaced by “local” vernaculars (English and French), but both works nevertheless enjoyed widespread circulation. Literary history proves that “cosmopolitanism” does not mean widespread circulation per se, and “vernacularism” does not mean restricted circulation per se. Because it is obvious that literary works do not travel by themselves, research on the history of the literary institution is imperative. However, in both cases the extension of audience and the limits of circulations also seemed to be dependent on literary issues (style, narrative techniques, topics, etc.).

Bala Venkat Mani is also aware of the need to explore the roles of literary institutions, media, physicality, and agency in the global circulation of (modern)

literature. In his paper “Bibliomigrancy: Book Series and the Making of World Literature,” Mani claims that the project of world literature is fraught with tensions between local formations and global transformations, national demarcations and transnational projections, individual differentiations, and universal configurations. World literature incorporates various institutions of literature, literary readings being just one of them. The act of reading is inherently connected with bibliomigrancy, the accessibility or inaccessibility to imaginative texts from elsewhere. The space of reading—the physical and metaphorical space of the library—demands an account of the agreed-upon and the contestable. World literature ceases to remain a space of infinitely accumulating time and consecutively arranged sites. It becomes a space of multiple sites with discontinuous temporalities, each one deriving its meaning through (to use Foucault’s terms) vectors of juxtaposition, dispersion, inversion, and contestation. Through this discontinuous and non-consecutive arrangement of time and space—*chronos* and *topos*—world literature acquires its cosmochronic and cosmotopic dimensions. Mani’s essay locates world literature at the intersection of libraries, translations, and the publishing industry. He argues that specific moments of global print cultural history contribute to the “making” of world literature. A plethora of socioeconomic, cultural, and political factors conditions the production, translation, distribution, circulation, and reception of a literary work beyond the point of its linguistic and national origin. Mani discusses three book series: Reclam’s Universal-Bibliothek, Heinemann’s African Writers Series, and the Modern Library.

Jernej Habjan goes to the core methodological problems that are arising in current debates on world literature as a global system of cultural flows. According to his paper “World Literature and World Market,” comparative literary studies has been preoccupied with a return to world literature for over a decade, sometimes with a return to an old Romantic theme by relying on old, multiculturalist notions (such as David Damrosch’s), but sometimes also by stressing new ways of returning to the old theme. These attempts—especially by Pascale Casanova and Franco Moretti—have in fact been returning to the Goethean and Marxian homology between world literature and the world market of commodities in a theoretically ambitious way. Critiques of Moretti, Casanova, and Damrosch often represented Damrosch as a realistic alternative to the exaggerations of Moretti and Casanova. This alternative can, however, already be proposed by a synoptic reading of Moretti and Casanova. Such

an approach has the advantage of remaining within their own horizon; that is, of solving their supposed deficiencies without having to dismiss the productive aspects of their theories and to resort to a third, compromise solution. Thus, it grasps the problematics shared by these two theories, continuing the project of conceptualizing Goethe's and Marx and Engels's initial intuitions. Read together, Moretti's theory of the literary world-system and Casanova's theory of the world republic of letters imply the irreducibility of cultural space to economy. According to Casanova, the most influential center of the world republic of letters has been Paris, even though France never became the core of the economic world-system as considered by Moretti. Moreover, this irreducibility is already implied in each of these two projects: for Casanova, literary capitals are not projections of economic capitals, but enjoy relative autonomy; so too, Moretti, far from projecting the world-systems model onto world literature, sees in world literature a world-system of its own with, again, France at its core. Hence, Casanova locates centers of world literature in geopolitical regions that were never centers of the global capitalist system, which Moretti studies as homologous, but not identical, to world literature. This is no coincidence because the main source of both models is Fernand Braudel's economic historiography, in which the great cultural capitals were already granted relative autonomy in relation to the economic ones.

For Katarina Molk ("A Glance at the Map of World Literature and the Comparison between the Concepts of *Habitus* and *Idioculture*"), one of the possible ways to study the system of world literature is a reconstruction of individual socio-literary paths or trajectories fashioned by literary artists and recipients of literature. This kind of "map" draws attention to the process in which an individual internalizes or overcomes cultural patterns, accumulates personal experiences, and upgrades his or her own cognitive schemata. The process is unique no matter which local or national literary subsystem this individual would traditionally belong to. If we consider the mutability and the potential of human *habitus*/*idioculture*, literary repertoire and the social circulation of literary works gain a cosmopolitan meaning. The question is whether it is even possible to describe an *idioculture* (that refers to a specific literary work) in such a way that the description would be valid in any historical place or time, and that the *idioculture* could be generalized as a culture belonging to a larger social group. On the other hand, the concept of *idioculture* (Attridge), used in this discussion as a link between the theory of the literary field (Bourdieu)

and theories of world literature (Casanova, Damrosch), proves that “world literature” was and is also local. In other words, if we introduce concepts such as global/local/individual reading, and distinguish between them, we can produce new possibilities in the evaluation of literary repertoire.

Jola Škulj proposes a different framework for studying global exchanges of literatures, one that subverts the systemic distinction between centers and peripheries. In her paper “A Critical Paradigm of the Intercultural Existence of Literature,” Škulj advocates a new critical paradigm of the intercultural existence of literature that seeks to analytically understand the factuality of cultural spaces and to hermeneutically read literary phenomena and their historical reality in the complexity of semiotic traces, in actual individualities of formal and textual deposits, and in interconnections of poetological influences. The literary facts seen in such intricate networks of intertextual phenomenology and re-accentuations attest to their character of mobility, evident instability, and constant inventive reformulation of verbal and literary matrices, which means that the identity of texts is also necessarily re-interpreted through the ever-new dissemination of literature. For this very reason, in this critical paradigm of the intercultural existence of literature, the concept of literary and cultural transfer has become topical. For the sake of methodological clarity, in further research on the “Slovenian” version of world literature it will be appropriate to preliminarily critically confront it with a selection of reinterpreted conceptions of comparative literature studies (Spivak, Moretti, Casanova, Weber, and Saussy), especially the perspectives that have derived new critical content from Even-Zohar’s polysystem theory, Lotman’s semiotics of culture, Mignolo’s border gnosis, or Bhabha’s concepts of “hybridity” and his standpoints on “nation and narration.” Škulj’s discussion is derived from Weber’s fundamental thesis that the humanities today demand new consideration of the singular, which means that in the complex network of cultural memory and cultural transfers it is necessary to keep records of exhaustive mapping of traces that continually re-establish the singular manifestation of literature in a certain cultural space and ensure its vitality.

2

The second section of the volume includes case studies discussing two complementary issues: first, what are the means and opportunities for authors from small or peripheral European literatures (from Luxembourgish through Esto-

nian and Croatian to Georgian) to circulate beyond their borders and languages and to enter the space of world literature; and, second, how are repertoires of world literature received, internalized, and perspectivized in such literatures? That is, what “world literatures” do they create? The section is introduced by a theoretical consideration of marginality characterizing not only certain “small” literatures, such as Croatian, but also literary studies itself.

In her paper “From the Margins: For a Performative Reading of Croatian Literature in the European Field of Cultural Production,” Morana Čale examines the question of how to study the texts of a “peripheral” and “belated” literature such as Croatian. This is connected to the growing marginalization of literary studies as well as to the decline of symbolic authority, autonomy, and sovereignty in the humanities, the university, and the nation-state, respectively. Each of these three institutional levels of framing literary studies is being assimilated to the dominant structures of the globalised economic liberalism, making up a hierarchy in which the least marketable institution is regarded as indebted and parasitic to its superior others. Because the humanities tend to promote sociology and economy in their epistemological metadisiplines, while obliterating the legacy of Kant’s Third Critique, a sort of methodological “realism” is being imposed on literary research. This epistemological framework, inconsistent with the very character of literature as a domain of “as if,” threatens to forsake literary scholarship for the currently influential cultural studies. On the other hand, literary studies (e.g., in Croatia) is also facing the opposite request by the state bureaucracy in charge of research financing to symbolically enhance the idea of national identity, which threatens to bring about an autarchic historicization of literature and an alternative local canonization of literary works. Keeping in mind that there is no sharp opposition between bordering entities, and thus neither between a thoroughly autonomous realm of the aesthetic and that of (political) economy, both being bound up in the parergonal structure of “economimesis” (Derrida), a contention is put forward according to which a marginal literature could not benefit from any of the aforementioned heteronomous critical approaches. Instead, a performative interpretation of singular literary texts able to measure up to the standards of the Western canon is pleaded for.

Jüri Talvet, in his study “The Lingering Journey of Poetry from ‘Peripheries’ to ‘Centres’: The Estonian Case of F. R. Kreutzwald’s Epic *Kalevipoeg*

(1861) and Juhan Liiv's (1864–1913) *Lyrical Work*," meditates about the difficult relationship between "centers" and "peripheries" in the historical intercultural process of exchanging books and manuscripts across national and linguistic borders as well as establishing what is known as "world literature" and "Western literature." He continues by examining the factors that have favored or hindered the emergence of two key literary works in Estonia: Friedrich Reinhold's epic *Kalevipoeg* (1861) and Juhan Liiv's (1864–1913) lyrical-philosophical poetry. Despite contradictions in the interpretation of *Kalevipoeg*, the work has emerged as a "national epic," and as such it has almost been detached from its author Kreutzwald. (Even in the English translation by Jüri Kurman, published in the United States in 1982, Kreutzwald is mentioned as a mere "compiler" of the work.) Juhan Liiv, who spent his life in poverty and after 1893 suffered mental illness, did not manage to publish any book. His greatness as a lyrical poet was revealed by the early modernist-symbolist movement of Young Estonia (1905–1915), especially by Gustav Suits and Friedebert Tuglas. The posthumous editions of Liiv's poetry by Tuglas, published on the basis of manuscripts, in parallel with his volumes on the life and work of Liiv established Liiv's canon in Estonian literature. Even though the French translation of *Kalevipoeg* was published in 2004 by Gallimard, Kreutzwald's epic still seems to function in the canon of world literature as a potentiality rather than actuality. On the other hand, Liiv was completely unknown outside Estonia at least until 2007, when a first bilingual (Estonian-English) selection of his poetry was published in Tartu.

Jeanne Glesener reflects on a similar position of Luxembourg in the world literary system. In her "Small Literatures and Their Problematic Location in World Literature: The Case of Luxembourgish Literature," she addresses the question of whether the chances of small literatures being represented in world literature have improved since the revisionary thrust of redefining world literature and developing new methodologies for its analysis. In the past, the concept of world literature was often criticized for its predominant focus on Western literatures, and it has since been revised and opened up in order to include the literatures of the world; however, it is still worthwhile to launch a debate on the fate of "small" European literatures—those that by definition have very little visibility on the international literary scene; that is, in the canon of world literature. By focusing on the setup of the literary field of a small literature, the article argues that this setup may greatly contribute to the (in)vis-

ibility of a small literature in world literature. These questions are treated by taking as their field of analysis the case of Luxembourgish literature.

In her article “The Role of German Literature in the Estonian Canon of World Literature,” Liina Lukas outlines the historical importance of German literature in Estonian translation. She also examines the new literature curriculum of Estonian schools, applied in 2011, and analyses the share of world literature and the position of German literature in it. Considering the role of German literature in the Estonian literary canon, it has to be taken into account that, for centuries, German was the language of power, education, culture, and even communication in Estonia. Estonian literature was born in the lap of German-language culture, based on the model of German-language literature; moreover, it was even created by German-speaking authors. The leading position of German literature was shaken only by the Soviet regime, which pushed Russian literature into the forefront to replace German literature. It was only during the Soviet period that German literature became a translated literature. The story of the role of German literature in the Estonian canon of world literature is one of the disappearance of a cultural dominant; it is a postcolonial story. Today, Estonian culture is looking for new approaches to German literature. Although many works by German authors have been translated into Estonian in recent years—Grass’s novels one by one, Musil, von Doderer, Canetti, Elfriede Jelinek, Broch, Sebald, Karsten Dümmler, Herta Müller, and so on—German literature has become an exclusive field translated by the experts for the experts.

The paper “Georgian Literature of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries and the World Literary Process,” by Irma Ratiani, attempts to outline the development of post-eighteenth-century Georgian literature in a broad cultural and literary perspective, within the context of the world literary process and its conceptual contradictions. During the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Georgian literature developed against the background of diverse historical stages and mentalities, alongside with different ideological/political and religious/cultural conflicts (e.g., the relations towards the Russian state hegemony and Orthodox religion as opposed to efforts at westernization). The article illustrates the influence of political, religious, and social factors on new Georgian literature, and displays the diversity of relations between world literature as a system of literary interactions and interferences that shape international

literary processes on the one hand, and, on the other, the new Georgian literature as a specific national literary model.

3

Against the theoretical and comparative background provided by the articles from the previous sections, the third part of this volume focuses on the Slovenian version of world literature, which is understood as another example of relations between a peripheral, relatively young literary system and the broader literary space. On the one hand, the collected case studies explore in historical detail what, between the sixteenth-century Reformation and twentieth-century Postmodernism, were the modes and functions of reception, translation, cultural transfer (including the migrancy of books and setting up of libraries), canonization, or intertextual rewriting of literary and cultural repertoires from the globally more established, powerful, and richer traditions. The authors attempt to show that Slovenian ethnic territory quite early developed an awareness of broader (predominantly European) cultural space and, although mostly peripheral, strove to be an integral part of transnational intellectual and artistic currents and controversies—not least because of adopting, from the late 1820s onwards, several practices of Goethean *Weltliteratur* along with the term itself. On the other hand, it is emphasized how difficult it was even for the Slovenian avant-garde authors—who, like their nineteenth-century predecessors, wrote in Slovenian and lacked urban metropolises in their country—to actively participate in transnational networking. Especially for the avant-gardists, networking was among the necessary conditions to become globally known. Interestingly, in older periods when Latin, German, or Italian was also used among the educated classes that otherwise promoted and cultivated Slovenian letters, it was much more natural for authors from Slovenian ethnic territory to act as recognized and even prominent members of the European *respublica litterarum*; for example, Trubar and other Lutheran reformers. It seems, then, that the nineteenth-century nation-building process, by stressing the purity of the native language and the individual authenticity of literature, in many ways diminished the power of transnational networking, which was and remains crucial for a small literature to participate actively in the “world republic of letters.”

Alen Širca's article “Renaissance Humanism in Slovenian Literature during the Reformation and Baroque” discusses the influence of Renais-

sance humanism on Slovenian literature from the perspective of the history of ideas. Renaissance humanism is a complex phenomenon that needs to be discussed in the plural; however, due to the predominantly religious character of literary texts during the Slovenian Reformation and Baroque, the emphasis is on studying the branch of humanism known as Christian humanism. The discussion seeks to determine how Slovenian literature was actually included in the broader European space of the humanities. For Trubar, there is an emphasis especially on his direct, personal contact with Italian humanistically oriented reformers (Bonomo, Ochino, Sozzini), Zwinglianism (Bullinger), and indirectly, through texts, with Erasmus of Rotterdam. Trubar may be considered the most cosmopolitan Slovenian of his time, whose work succeeded in integrating certain important elements of Renaissance humanism such as humanistic pedagogical and philological consciousness. Another conspicuous humanist among the Slovenian reformers was Adam Bohorič; the German humanist reformer Melancthon probably most influenced his Slovenian grammar, which was the first ever written and was also advanced for its time. The discussion of hitherto understudied humanist elements in Slovenian literature is limited to Slovenian preaching activity by two major Capuchins: Janez Svetokriški (Tobia Lionelli) and Rogerij Ljubljanski (Mihael Krammer). Although they were the first in Slovenian literature to feature the broader reception of passages from the works of Renaissance humanists (Petrarch, Ficino, Abravanel, Poliziano, and Pontano), here one is also not dealing with “real” humanism because the elements of humanism (e.g., the conceptualization of love, quoting Ancient writers, and Renaissance hermetics) are allegorized to serve the needs of homiletic didactics and exhortations. Such a phenomenon of “allegorized” (Christian) humanism was generally widespread in the religious Baroque in Europe. Therefore the two Slovenian preachers mentioned here do not lag behind from their other European contemporaries.

Matija Ogrin (“Connections to European Literary Horizons in Slovenian Baroque Literature”) determines, like Širca, that Slovenian Baroque literature arose through the direct influence of two dominant cultural backgrounds: from the literature of Catholic reform efforts of the late Middle Ages and early Modern Age, and from Ancient, especially Latin, classical literature and rhetorical culture. Awareness of both heritages from which the genesis of Slovenian literature flows is shown, among other things, in a shift from pastoral-dogmatic literature to meditative, rhetorical literature. At this fundamental level, awareness of the European literary context can especially be observed

as a transformation or formation of (semi-)literary genres—including, among others, meditative prose (ascetics) and rhetorical prose (sermons). The transition from non-literary theological genres (e.g., a catechism) to (semi-)literary genres (various forms of prose) is one of the fundamental phenomena of reflecting European literary horizons in seventeenth-century Slovenian literature. This context also provides true relevance to special research on the origins and nature of quotations and references in Slovenian Baroque literature. The contribution points out only a few such passages in Adam Skalar, Janez Svetokriški (Tobia Lionelli), and Rogerij Ljubljanski (Mihael Krammer). The manner in which these writers used or made reference to Ancient (semi-)literary texts reveals various modalities, from rejection of content and polemics to express affirmation. In the majority of cases, quotations from Ancient writers are counterposed by some sort of statement from Christian heritage and, when an affirmative relationship appears between them, the Ancient image and the further Christian explanation are connected into a rich Baroque allegory or symbolic image, such as Krammer's image of Jupiter's gold chain as a metaphor for Christ's divine mercy. Slovenian Baroque literature contains countless such fragments of Ancient Latin literature, used in Slovenian texts for various interpretative and symbolic representations.

Book history and bibliomigrancy, which are treated in the articles by Domínguez, Mani, and Koron, are also at the center of Luka Vidmar's study "The Forbidden Books in Carniola from the Index of Paul IV (1559) to the Index of Pius VI (1786): Libri Prohibiti in the Seminary Library." Its topic is the Carniolan reception of books banned from the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries by the Roman *Index librorum prohibitorum* and the Viennese *Catalogus librorum prohibitorum*. The research is based particularly on the large collection of prohibited books of various origins in the Seminary Library in Ljubljana, the former capital city of the Duchy of Carniola. In the second half of the sixteenth century, the Carniolans (either Catholic or Protestant) were mainly interested in controversial religious books published in the Protestant north. Their distribution was facilitated by the balance of power between the Catholic prince and Protestant states that postponed the introduction of the Roman Index. Its power culminated only in 1600 and 1601, when a special state commission re-established Catholicism in cities and towns and therefore occasionally burned the indexed controversial theological books (e.g., by Luther, Melanchthon, and Spangenberg). Even then, however, many Protestant biblical translations

and commentaries (e.g., by Pellican, d'Étaples, and Dalmatin) and scholarly works (e.g., by Sleidanus, Hotman, and Wildenberg) and literary works (e.g., by Erasmus, Frischlin, and Hess) were spared. Thereupon, all the libraries (especially that of the Ljubljana Jesuits and the bishop's library in Gornji Grad) started collecting banned books. After the second half of the seventeenth century, the influence of the Index weakened. The influx of prohibited books increased after the Thirty Years' War and the political and religious stabilization of Europe. They were coming from the great printing and bookselling centers of Catholic Europe (Venice, Lyon, and Paris) and Protestant Europe (Frankfurt, Cologne, Amsterdam, and Basel). Many were written by Gallican writers (Maimbourg, de Thou, and Roussel). The share of authors that were controversial either politically (Machiavelli, Boccalini, and Sarpi) or morally (Boccaccio, Pallavicino, Descartes, and Folengo) was growing. The members of the social and intellectual elites around 1700, including the founders of the scholarly Academia Operosorum in Ljubljana, could buy or acquire prohibited books rather easily, usually on the Italian (rarely French) black market and in the Holy Roman Empire during their study (of theology, law, or medicine) or official duties (visitations, diplomacy, librarianship); acquisitions were also made in Carniola (in the countryside and from converts). The buyers and readers were mostly senior Church officials, including Ljubljana's bishops (Herberstein) and canons (Dolničar). They consulted forbidden books to improve their knowledge, but also enjoyed them for their personal amusement. Whereas in the church libraries of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (e.g., the Seminary Library) these works were kept under lock and key and read only with special permission from Rome, they were always easily accessible in private libraries, such as that of the provost Janez Krstnik Prešeren.

The article "Slovenian Romanticism, World Literature, and Comparative Literature" reaches back into the period when the reception of the concept of *Weltliteratur* was also beginning in Slovenia. Among the determinants of Romanticism in the sense of the history of ideas, the study's author, Darko Dolinar, classifies the constitution of the autonomous individual personality as the bearer of experience, as well as the emergence of historical and national elements as general categories of thought. This also introduces a series of innovations into the general perspective on literature. Among other things, the relationship is changed between national literatures and world literature, and between developed and less-developed literatures. The typical course of less-

developed literatures, including Slovenian, was traditionally explained through the concepts of lag and rebirth; these are categories of national history, but they also have a clear comparative dimension because they measure the course of less-developed literatures according to criteria borrowed from those that are more developed. In the mid-twentieth century, during the predominance of “internal approaches” in literary studies, there was decreased interest in this dimension; recently, however, it has come to the fore again in a changed form, as the relationship between central and peripheral literature within world literature. This leads to the question of what kind of relationship Slovenian Romanticism had toward world literature and comparative literature. Individual areas of Slovenian Romanticism were unequally developed; the most developed were art poetry and philological and aesthetic thought, and there was considerably less principled consideration in collecting and adapting folk songs, whereas artistic prose and drama were not yet even recognized at this time. An overview of the viewpoints on the most developed areas of Romantic thought indicates that the leading writers were dealing with certain issues that turned out to be a component part of the conceptual determinant of world literature. Likewise, they developed the procedures and findings of comparative literature to a rather high level, but the explicit concept of world literature, as well as the name of comparative literature as a profession, was still unknown.

Marko Juvan, in his paper “Slovenizing World Literature from Čop to Ocvirk,” also considers Slovenian romanticism as the starting point in the history of the idea of *Weltliteratur* as reflected in a European periphery. From 1828 to 1835, when Goethe was introducing his idea to the European public, in Slovenia Matija Čop and France Prešeren were carrying out the complex process of culturally transferring the Schlegel brothers’ romantic cosmopolitanism. In this way they sought to substantiate the emerging and peripheral Slovenian literature, which was embedded in the national movement, with the universality of esthetic humanism and, through references to the repertoires of European literary traditions from Antiquity to Romanticism, to establish it as a modern classic at the global level. Čop and Prešeren carried out Goethe’s idea of world literature without using this concept. However, it is likely that Čop also became acquainted with Goethe’s first remarks on *Weltliteratur* from the 1827 and 1828 volumes of *Kunst und Alterum*. The term *Weltliteratur* was first mentioned in Slovenian periodicals only in 1866 (in German) and 1884, respectively (in Slovenian as *svetovna književnost*), but it was implied and dis-

cussed in Josip Stritar's critical essays of the 1860s and 1870s. Stritar dealt with the following issues: the evaluation of Slovenian literary and artistic achievements in the light of the world literary canon, the classical tradition, and universalist notions of humanism, aestheticism, and "the world culture" (key to Stritar was to demonstrate that the role of Prešeren as the Slovenian national poet was equal to other world classics); the proper proportion between original and translated literature with regard to national identity; the unequal historical position of different national literatures in the development of European culture; and the international circulation and success of contemporary authors or literary trends. The majority of mentions of the term *svetovna književnost* around 1900 presupposed the normative and canonic understanding of the concept. It was used with reference to prominent authors of foreign literatures; the newly established book series devoted to translations of world classics; the role of translations of world literature in the development of Slovenian language and literature; the underrepresentation of Slovenian authors in recent foreign surveys of world literature; and the problem of the Slovenian passive, dependent relationship to more renowned literatures and the resultant lagging behind their development. The comparative view that enabled Slovenian intellectuals to recognize that, despite adopting the highest standards of world literature (Prešeren), Slovenian literature was in fact globally peripheral, like many other non-Western European literatures, marked Anton Ocvirk's conceptual and institutional transfer of (French) comparative literature into his homeland's academe, where national literary history prevailed. In the 1930s, Ocvirk provided the first in-depth comparative, historical, and theoretical description of the concept of world literature from a Slovenian perspective.

Marijan Dović focuses on the role of the cosmopolitan network in the transfer of literary artifacts from their original literature into world literary space. In his article "The Slovenian Historical Avant-Garde between Cosmopolitanism and Peripherality," he seeks to show the development of two avant-garde waves in Slovenian art or culture in the 1920s from the perspective of their relationship to the cosmopolitan network of contemporary European avant-garde movements. From such a perspective, the first wave, connected with the magazine *Trije labodje* (Three Swans), is shown as autarchic and, in the international sense, unambitious, whereas the second wave around the magazine *Tank*—relying mostly on the already existing network of Zenithism—sought to place Slovenian avant-gardism on the international stage as its equal creative

component. Despite the emphasized internationalism and some visible artistic achievements in this regard, the second wave was also unsuccessful; the reasons for this lie both in the internal characteristics of Slovenian avant-gardism (too little continuity and penetration) and in external factors connected with the dynamics of the relations between cultural centers and peripheries.

Relations of Slovenian modernists to world literature are discussed from a different angle in Alenka Koron's paper "The Private Library of Lojze Kovačič and World Literature." Literary scholars have already expressed their interest in the private libraries of major representatives of Slovenian literary and cultural history, whereas the libraries of modern authors have been much less researched. The article deals with Lojze Kovačič, a key modernist writer of the second half of the twentieth century. Following Latour, Koron analyzes Kovačič's private library as a historically contextualized material object of cultural transfer and an intellectual milieu, through which we can obtain insight into the circulation of modern literature in Slovenia and its connection with global processes and systems. Kovačič never raised the topic of world literature in his essays, although from a distinctly individualistic and cosmopolitan standpoint he did touch upon its conceptual backgrounds and contexts. In this context, he always took a stand for freedom and universality of art, artistic autonomy, and the highest aesthetic standards—that is, for elite literature of aesthetically demanding readers or of the (bourgeois) intelligentsia. His library encompasses 654 items, most of which were published from the 1970s to the 1990s. The largest part consists of Slovenian, German, and Serbo-Croatian books of the Western canon. The relationship between translated works (in Slovenian and other languages) and originals shows that only 44.6% of the items are in their original language. Among the many fictional works, the narrative ones dominate; there is much less poetry and even fewer dramatic works. There are also many documentary, memorial, and autobiographical works, quite a few erotic texts, and texts of popular literature. Non-fiction books are mostly philosophical, literary-historical, and essayistic. The almost complete absence of Ancient, Medieval, Renaissance, and Enlightenment authors may not be surprising to those acquainted with Kovačič's writing. Books by romanticists and realists are negligible. The majority and the core of the corpus of books consist of modern world literature of the twentieth century, which remained at the heart of the author's interests in both original and translated editions.

Literary journals had been the most important forums for the global literary circulation ever since Goethe's announcements of world literature. A telling segment of recent Slovenian interactions with world literature in postmodernism constitutes the topic of the article "The Journal *Literatura* at a Crossroads of Americanisation, Globalisation and Postmodernist Metafiction." In it, **Andraž Jež** briefly presents the relation between globalization and Americanization, as seen from the cultural perspective. The article sketches a history of American influence on Slovenian literature since the 1960s to focus on the journal *Problemi – Literatura*, which became the main medium of literary Americanization. Jež delineates three main periods of this process: in the first period (roughly the 1970s and the early 1980s) the influences were sporadic, mostly from the literature of the beatniks, postbeat underground aesthetics, and the multimedia art of ultra-modernist concrete and visual poets. In the second period, the influence was more pronounced—coming from the metafiction of Pynchon, Barth, and others. They became models for a whole era of editors of and contributors to *Problemi – Literatura* in the second half of 1980s. Profound Americanization (as well as globalization and "postmodernization") can be noted through the naming of the journal sections (such as "The School of Writing," uncommon in communist Slovenia), translations, quotations, the use of language, and the original literary texts themselves. The third period, which coincides with the transition of Slovenia to capitalism, paradoxically shows the decline of Americanization. Despite major political turns, aesthetic collisions, and stylistic changes, *Problemi – Literatura* displays continuity in the reception of American cultural repertoires; almost all American authors and schools that inspired the modernist and postmodernist profile of the Slovenian journal were ideologically and aesthetically subversive, quite different from the prevailing image of the U.S. Not only the beatniks and underground poets, but also the concrete and visual poets and postmodernist writers scorned mainstream American culture and were critical of U.S. policies. In conclusion, the article reflects on the dynamism of American literary influences in the journal, as well as, more generally, the Slovenian literary scene at large.

Finally, similarly to Liina Lukas's paper on the Estonian curriculum of world literature, **Jožica Jožef Beg** demonstrates how crucial literary curricula in secondary schools are in shaping (nationally) localized variants of the world literature canon. Her paper entitled "World Literature in Secondary School Textbooks after 1945" starts from the conviction that the school has

an important impact on the formation of the literary canon. Whether a given author is canonized or not depends on both the classification of the author in the curriculum and the selection of texts for readers. The article presents the development of the school canon of world literature in Slovenia after 1945 and presents a list of canonized authors and texts formed based on an analysis of forty-six volumes of twelve readers for secondary schools after 1945. Despite the strong impact of politics in different periods (the decade after the Second World War, career-oriented education in the 1970s, and the period after the independence of Slovenia in 1991), the analysis of readers shows that most persistent didactic selection of world literature was already canonized in the 1960s. The canon was even taken into account by the editors of readers with the smallest share of world literature. The fundamental features of this canon are a strong domination of Western literature, the lack of more contemporary authors and comical genres, and the underrepresentation of women authors. However, the last decade has been marked by changes in the school national and world literature canon due to the team approach. The list of texts from world literature in the new curriculum (2008) includes women authors from different literary periods. The inclusion of authors from peripheral and non-European literatures aims to improve general knowledge, encourage cosmopolitanism, and stimulate intercultural awareness.