

# DIALOGI MED »MIŠLJENJEM« IN »PESNIŠTVOM« IN TEORETSKO-LITERARNI HIBRID

---

Marko Juvan

Znanstvenoraziskovalni center SAZU, Ljubljana

UDK 82.0:1

*»Literatura« in »teorija« sta zgodovinsko določeni in soodvisni kulturni enoti. Povezali sta se že v zgodnji romantiki, še tesneje pa v modernizmu in postmodernizmu/poststrukturalizmu. Značilna oblika njune interakcije so teoretsko-literarni hibridi. V kontekstu postmoderne delegitimizacije in redistribucije vednosti ter disperzije besedilnosti se v njih kaže procesa literarizacije teorije in teoretizacije literature. Toda dialogi ali trenja med »mišljenjem« in »pesništvom« so od antike razvili še mnoge druge zvrsti. »Mišljenje« in »pesništvo« imata skupne poteze, a vendarle ostajata neukinljivo različna.*

Ključne besede: literatura, teorija, hibridizacija, romantika, postmodernizem, poststrukturalizem

## Dialog, trenje, različnost

Na splošno se pisatelji in filozofi že od nekdaj navdihujejo, si izmenjujejo ideje, strukture, eksemple in podobe. Literarna govorica je absorbirala celó diskurz znanosti, čeprav je ta veljal za njen antipod. Strniša je na primer svoje pesniško »vesolje« oblikoval po modelih moderne fizike Einsteina in Heisenberga ter razvil svojsko fraktalno poetiko (*Vesolje*), Calvino pa je v *Kozmokomičnih* kozmološke in evolucijske teorije prevedel v zgodbe, podobne bajkam, a prežete s sodobno senzibilnostjo in ironijo. Še več je primerov dialoga med literaturo in filozofijo, dveh domnevno sorodnejših govoric: Homer – Platon, Spinoza – Goethe, Schelling – Coleridge, Schopenhauer – Borges, Nietzsche – Dostojevski, Dostojevski – Bahtin, Artaud – Foucault ali Celan – Derrida,<sup>1</sup> na Slovenskem pa Pirjevec – Smole, Anaksimander – Dekleva, Cankar – Hribar ... Zgled za medsebojno navdihovanje med mišljenjem in pesništvom je Heideggerjevo prijateljstvo s Charom: prvi je svoje mišljenje razvijal ob branju Hölderlinove poezije,

sam pa je vplival na Chara, ki je s svojim pesniškim idiolektom končno zaznamoval cel cikel filozofovih poznih pesmi (prim. Worton).

Tudi ustvarjalci leposlovja in tisti, ki o njem kritično ali teoretsko pišejo, že dolgo sodelujejo ali vsaj sobivajo, saj v literarnem in medijskem sistemu ne morejo drug brez drugega. Literarni kritiki, zgodovinarji in teoretički so kovali oznake za umetniške smeri ali generacije in jih promovirali. Francoskega novega romana ne bi bilo brez teorije Tel Quela; tudi umetniške avantgarde so potrebovale teoretsko podporo v manifestih, raznih spremnih besedah (na primer OHO v 60. in 70. letih in NSK v 80. in 90. letih 20. stoletja; prim. Šuvaković). Teoretski koncept je namreč nastopal kot suplement, ki je nadomeščal tisto, kar je nekonvencionalni umetniški produkciji dozdevno manjkalo – smisel, relevantnost, kontekst ali referenco.

Toda kljub sodelovanju med umetnostjo in filozofijo se občasno skozi vso zgodovino (»od Platona naprej«) pojavlja nezaupanje med njima. Pojem dialog pač vsebuje tudi nepomirljive razlike in nepresegljivo konfliktnost stališč.

Zdi se mi, da je v zadnjih desetletjih prav na Slovenskem stopnja dialoške napetosti med teorijo in literaturo nekoliko višja kot drugod. Trenja med literarnimi nazori sodelavcev *Perspektiv* oziroma *Nove revije* (»heideggerjanci«) na eni strani in, na drugi, stališči o (slovenski) literaturi pri semiotičnih teoretikih (»markso-lakanovcih«) iz kroga revije *Problemi*, so v 70. in 80. letih 20. stoletja prispevala h kulturno-političnim delitvam, celo znotraj generacij, ki so v času komunistične vladavine uvajale modernistične in postmodernistične tokove.<sup>2</sup> Na »heideggerjanski« strani so pisatelji vztrajali v zavezništvu s filozofi in teoretiki (na čelu s Pirjecom, Kermaunerjem in Hribarjem). Bili so zvečine prepričani, da prek besedne umetnosti spregovarja bit, ki je metafizičnemu, tehničnemu in teoretskemu mišljenju nedostopna; kljub svoji kritiki usedlin romantičnega kulturnega nacionalizma so imeli književnost za steber nacionalne identitete, pot do osebne emancipacije in sredstvo političnega osvobajanja ter družbene kritike.<sup>3</sup> »Markso-lakanovska« stran – Žižek, Rotar, Močnik in drugi teoretiki, ki so se distancirali celó od raziskujočega pisanja pisateljskih vrstnikov iz *Problemov* – je domačo književnost kritizirala kot preživeto nacionalno institucijo, nanjo vezano kulturniško inteligenco kot izpostavo nazadnjaškega nacionalizma ali meščanskega elitizma, pisatelje in pesnike pa je imela za patološke jetnike imaginarnega.<sup>4</sup>

Ne glede na lokalne posebnosti je opisano rivalstvo pravzaprav pojavna oblika antagonizma med dvema tradicionalnima evropskima shemama razmerja umetnost – filozofija (prim. Badiou, *Mali priročnik o inestetiki* 9–26). Zdi se mi, da so teoretiki *Problemov* svoji moderni radikalnosti navkljub nasledli v platonistično »didaktično shemo«, ki je odmevala še v marksizmu. Umetnosti je odrekala samostojno spoznanje in izražanje resnice, češ da občinstvo zavaja z njenim *videzom*. Pravo spoznanje kajpada pritiče filozofiji in njeni dedinji teoriji. Slovenski »heideggerjanci« so potomci poznejše, »romantične sheme«, po kateri od zgodnjega 19. stoletja velja, da je resnica dostopna zgolj pesništvu, ne pa metafiziki in iz nje izpeljanim oblikam instrumentalnega, tehničnega, metodičnega in racionalnega spoznavanja, med katere sodi sleherna teorija.<sup>5</sup>

Badiou skuša preseči vse tri tradicionalne sheme, temelječe na razmerju umetnost – resnica; resnico so imele za eno samo, neodvisno od umetniškega dela. Badioujev predlog se vpisuje med postmoderne koncepcije, ki na sledi Wittgensteinovih »jezikovnih iger« uveljavljajo pluralnost, začasnost, dogovornost, relativnost, avtonomijo in (diskurzivno) proizvedenost resnic (prim. Lyotard 20–24, 65–72). Blizu je tudi tistim, ki vzroke za tekmovalnost literature in teorije iščejo v skupni podlagi umetnosti in filozofije: obe jezik uporabljata neutilitarno, za interpretiranje sveta kot nezaključene celote, ki se razpira prek človekove eksistence (prim. Rickman 28–31, Horn – Menke 12). Za Badiouja sta umetnost in pesem »mišljenje«, v katerem se vzpostavljajo njima lastne, vedno znova singularne resnice; te so »nezvedljive na druge resnice«, pa naj bodo znanstvene ali filozofske (*Mali priročnik* 18–19). »Resnica-umetnost« se razgrinja v zgodovinskih menjavah sistemov reprezentacije, ki jih Badiou opisuje po zgledu Kuhnovih znanstvenih paradigem. Prehodna resnica umetnosti je zanj »umetniška konfiguracija, ki jo je vpeljal nek dogodkovni prelom«, »generično mnoštvo«, »sekvenca«, »virtualno neskončen kompleks del«; posamezna umetnina »resnico te umetnosti«, katere »fragment« je, zgolj preiskuje in aktualizira (22–25). Primeri takšnih relativnih, od virtualnih potencialov zgodovinskih označevalnih sistemov odvisnih resnic so antične tragedije, novoveški romani od Cervantesa do Joycea ali abstraktno slikarstvo od Kandinskega naprej. Badioujevo razmišljanje o avtonomni in ireduktibilni resnici umetnosti se deloma prekriva s teorijami o možnih svetovih, dogovorno vzpostavljenih po sebi lastnih pravilih. Te so prav tako spodkopale binarno strukturo presojanja resničnosti trditev in vloge resnice v umetnosti (prim. Juvan, *Literarna veda v rekonstrukciji* 218–230).

Mislim, da Badiou navaja dobre razloge proti temu, da bi filozofija (teorija) in umetnost (literatura) še tekmovali, katera bolje spoznava in predstavlja resnico. Mislita in izrekata namreč medsebojno *različne* resnice. V teoretsko-literarnih hibridih se zato križajo različni režimi resnic in proizvajajo novo modaliteto spoznavanja, ki je drugo od seštevka teorije in literature.

## Postmoderna: hibridnost, identitete, mešanje področij

Topika hibridnosti je v diskurzu današnje humanistike in družboslovja omniprezentna, kar opozarja, da gre za problematiko, ki jo čutimo kot relevantno. V resnici je Hassan razglasil »hibridnost« za razpoznavni znak postmodernizma in postmoderne (»From Postmodernism to Postmodernity«). Hibridnost sodi med značilno postmoderne pojme, s katerimi je, v nasprotju z binarno logiko in metafizičnim esencializmom, mogoče misliti sobivanje različnih entitet v eni sami, *relacijsko* gibljivi, spremenljivi pojmovni enoti.

S prilastitvijo biološkega in jezikoslovnega izraza »hibrid« (v pomenu besede, zložene iz dveh jezikovno različnih morfemov) je Bahtin že sredi 30. let 20. stoletja opredelil »hibridizacijo« kot način literarnega pisanja, v katerem se v mejah ene izjave mešata dva sociolekta, dve jezikovni za-vesti, dva govoreča subjekta (*Teorija romana* 127–128), »hibridno kon-

strukcijo» pa kot izjavo, ki skladenjsko pripada enemu govorniku, v njej pa tičita dve izjavi, dva stila in dve obzorji, med katerima ni meje (81). Zaradi Bahtinovega vpliva na poststrukturalistično teorijo teksta<sup>6</sup> in kulture je pojem hibridnost – v obzorju postmoderne ekstaze komunikacije in razklapljanja tradicijskih kulturnih koherenc – prekoračil strokovna območja jezikoslovja, stilistike in poetike. Postal je skoraj neizogiben v razpravljanih o identiteti, ključnem problemu, ki v zadnjih desetletjih zaposluje družboslovje in humanistiko.

Postkolonialna teorija je s »hibridnostjo« zajela subjektive položaje vmesnosti (*in-between, interstice*), mejnosti (*border lives, liminality*) in razcepljenih, razseljenih ali preseljenih pripadnosti. V akademskih krogih je oslabil gospodstvo purističnega dojemanja etnične identitete: »subjektivnost sestavljajo raznoliki viri, različna gradiva, mnoge umestitve«, zato »hibridne identitete v sebi nikdar niso celovite in popolne [...], temveč ostajajo v stalnem gibanju« (prim. McLeod 216–221). Feministične in *queer* teorije, ki so spodkopavale biologistične opredelitve spolnih identitet, je izostrila Donna Haraway. Pri tem je v svojih spisih – zgledih teoretsko-literarnih hibridov – segla po kategoriji hibridnosti. V ironičnem »Kiborškem manifestu« je z blasfemično apologijo kiborga, tega »križanca med strojem in organizmom«, razkrila, kateri so za identitete žensk osvobajajoči in zasušnjujoči potenciali posthumanega sveta postmoderne, v katerem globalni kodi, kibernetika in biotehnologije razveljavljajo meje med naravo in družbo, telesom in strojem (Haraway 241–243, 264).

»Teoretsko-literarne hibride« vprašanje identitete zadeva predvsem na ravni besedil in vanje vpisanih žanrskih ali medijskih kodov, oblik vednosti in piščih subjektov. Križanci mišljenja in pesništva sodijo na široko področje žanrske hibridizacije (prim. Fowler 183 isl.). Mešanje raznorodnih besedilnih zvrsti je staro (na primer menipejska satira), vendar pa mu je ugled zrasel šele ob razpadu klasicističnega žanrskega sistema, morda najprej v romantičnih teorijah romana, fragmenta, arabeske in progresivne univerzalne poezije. Danes že na vsakem koraku naletimo na žanrske hibride, denimo na priljubljene mešanice faktov in fikcije (novi žurnalizem, resničnostni šovi ipd.). V postmoderini dobi so zvrstno hibridiziranje pospešile še spremembe v medijskem sistemu. Elektronska občila so besedila odtrgala od materialnih nosilcev, stvarnih referenc in umestitev ter jih prek medmrežja poslala v virtualne rizome kiberprostora, kjer so izgubili začetke in konce, mnoštvo medbesedilnih povezav pa jim je zabrisalo meje in zvrstne pripadnosti. V digitalnih tekstih so izginile še nekatere ločnice, ki so tradicionalno razvrščale vesolje diskurza (na primer stvarno – umišljeno).

Vzpon križancev med teorijo in literaturo je ne nazadnje spodbudilo postmoderno premeščanje ali izgubljanje mej med diskurzi. Napredek znanosti in tehnike, nadnarodni obtok kapitala, kriza metafizične filozofije in univerzitetnih ustanov so od 50. let 20. stoletja v postindustrijskih družbah omajali vero v spekulativne in emancipacijske »velike pripovedi«, ki so od razsvetljenstva upravičevale razne oblike znanj, torej tudi znanost, literaturo in umetnost (Lyotard 8–15, 56–82). Namesto pripovedovanja, da kopičenje znanja služi napredku in osvobajanju človeka (naroda, duha, človeštva),

in spekulativnega filozofiranja, ki je z »enciklopedijsko zasnovo« vsako znanost razporedila v totaliteto vednosti, se je od konca 19. stoletja čedalje bolj kazalo, da je znanje fragmentirano in kontingenčno: znanosti, teorije in umetnosti so se razkrile kot »vrste diskurzov«, raznorodne in avtonomne »jezikovne igre«, ki vsaka zase temelji zgolj na svojih lastnih pravilih in režimih verodostojnosti, določenih z arbitrarnimi konvencijami (Lyotard 10, 22–23, 69–70). Ker je postmoderni »razkroj velikih pripovedi« spodnesel skupno metafizično podlago znanj in razdril njihov enciklopedijski sistem, se je kot edino zunanje merilo, ki legitimira vednost, uveljavila moč: bodisi kot nadzor nad informacijami, ki omogočajo politično prednost in gospodstvo, bodisi kot akumulacija kapitala s trgovanjem znanja (80, 89). »Merkantilizacija vednosti« in njeno pozunanjenje (13–15) sta porušila ne samo stare humanistične ideale o izobrazbi, temveč sta močno zamajala tudi podedovane znanstvene in umetniške institucije ter razveljavljala imanenentne logike in koherentnost disciplin, v katere je bilo znanje organizirano:

[...]K]lasične razmejitve znanstvenih polj [so] podvržene delu dvoma: posamezne discipline izginjajo, meje posameznih znanosti prehajajo druga v drugo, od tod se porajajo nova področja. Speklativna hierarhija spoznanj prepusti svoje mesto imanentni in [...] »ploščati« mreži raziskovanj, katerih meje se nenehno premeščajo. (Lyotard 68)

Humanistika in filologija sta zato implodirali v polimorfne, eklektične panoge, kakršni sta tudi transdisciplinarna »teorija« in kulturni študiji. Obenem s humanističnimi institucijami je tla pod nogami izgubljala tudi avtonomija umetnosti in literature; umetnost so začeli proizvajati in dojemati v vse manj preglednih prepletih z drugimi znakovnimi praksami, mediji in javnim diskurzom (prim. Juvan, *Literarna veda* 11–19, 29–47). V literarnih besedilih zato pogosto naletimo na teoretski diskurz (ne samo v »profesorskih« romanih Lodgea, Schwanitza in Eca, ampak celo v Brownovi popularni fikciji), teoretska dela pa se izražajo z besednimi igrami, figurami, avtobiografskimi anekdotami, kolažem citatov, tako da dajejo vtis literarne fikcije in poljubnega *anything goes*. Kako torej dojemati in vrednotiti besedilno produkcijo, ki jo, zlasti v akademskem svetu, naplavlja naš čas? Ali naj sledimo metodološkemu hiazmu dekonstrukcije in beremo filozofijo (teorijo) kot literaturo, literaturo pa kot teorijo (prim. Horn – Menke 7, 10–11)?

## Mišljenje/pesništvo

Navkljub aktualnosti teh dilem pa interakcija med literarnim in teoretičnim ni novost, ampak moderna artikulacija razmerja med dvema tipoma govorice, ki živita druga poleg druge ali druga v drugi od antike. Nietzsche je postuliral enotnost poezije in filozofije ob zori grštva, za njim pa še mnogi, ki so že njun antični razvoj od Platona in Aristotela interpretirali kot postopno razločevanje in specializacijo (prim. Courtois – Séité 3). Heidegger je »prvobitnemu mišljenju« in »pesnjenju« pripisal isti izvir in poslanstvo

– prisluškovanje nagovoru biti skozi jezik (»hišo biti«) in razkrivanje njene resnice z »mislečevim rekanjem« in s »pesnikovo besedo« (97, 101, 144–145, 181, 260). Medtem ko je mišljenje s preoblikovanjem v metafiziko pri Platonu in Aristotelu doživelo »tehnično interpretacijo«, ki jo po Heideggerju označuje tudi izraz *theoría* (182), in s svojim iskanjem adekvatne »resnice spoznanja« (99) zakrivilo pozabo biti same – metafizično tradicijo naj bi premagalo šele Heideggerjevo lastno »mišljenje resnice biti« –, pa je pesništvo pristni stik z bitjo ohranilo. V umetniškem delu, ki »odpira neki svet«, v katerem bivamo, se namreč po filozofovem mnenju razkriva tudi resnica biti (260–283). Heidegger, ki je svoje filozofsko mišljenje preobražal tudi ob govorici Hölderlina in drugih umetnikov, je verjel, da je »mišljenje biti« znova našlo stik s »pesništvom«: oba varujeta bit prek besede, kljub temu pa sta »v svojem bistvu najbolj ločena«, tako da ne vemo ničesar »o dvogovoru pesnikov in mislecev, ki 'blizu prebivajo na najbolj ločenih vrhah'« (144–145).

Heideggerjevi filozofski spisi, s katerimi je razvijal mišljenje biti, so že sami na sebi primeri hibridiziranja filozofije z literaturo. Predvsem pa so vsebinsko razprli horizont, znotraj katerega se je nato v postmoderni prežemanje literature in teorije sploh lahko tako razmahnilo. Ko tukaj skušam pokazati, kako je sodobni »dvogovor pesnikov in mislecev« umeščen v dolgo evropsko tradicijo, uporabljam izraza »pesništvo« in »mišljenje« nekoliko drugače kot Heidegger. Z »mišljenjem« mislim tudi na vse različice metafizičnega, tehničnega, teoretskega mišljenja od antike naprej, s »pesništvom« pa vse zvrsti in oblike, ki jih danes dojemamo pod pojmom besedne umetnosti.

Po Heideggerju so v »mišljenju« in »pesništvu« še večkrat odkrivali skupno jedro, vendar so, paradokсно, tudi »pesništvo« razlagali kot »mišljenje« – čeprav mišljenje *sui generis*. V primerjavi z diskurzivno, pojmovno, logično-argumentativno in racionalno izoblikovanostjo filozofije ali teorije je v umetnini – tako Badiou – pri delu »mišljenje, ki ga ni mogoče misliti« oziroma »razločiti ali ločiti kot mišljenje« (tj., ne da se ga do dna zajeti s teoretsko mislijo), ker »v govorico zajame singularno prezenco čutnega«, s katero je povsem zraščeno (Badiou, *Mali priročnik* 32–33, 42, »La poésie« 72, 74).<sup>7</sup> Po Andrei Kern je »umetnost [...] filozofija v mediju izkustva, ki ga filozofija v mediju pojma ne more doseči«; filozofija »običajno izkustvo« premišljuje s pomočjo pojmovne analize, umetnost pa »v mediju izkustva samega« (58, 75–76). Umetnost namreč konkretnost eksistencialne izkušnje mimetično simulira. Podobno tudi Rickman trdi, da se v pesništvu udejanja »neposrednost individualiziranega gledanja« (31). Pesništvo po Badiouju preiskuje svojo resnico v pesmih, ki so tudi same na sebi enkratno dejstvo, medtem ko filozofija teži h konsistentnosti in izgrajevanju povezanih sistemov ali doktrin (*Mali priročnik* 42, Badiou – Ramond 72–74). Posebna, enkratna raba govorice daje pesništvu moč, da razstavlja in onesposablja »diskurzivno mišljenje«, tj. mišljenje, ki – v filozofiji, matematiki, teorijah – »povezuje in deduktivno sklepa« in katerega prehodi so urejeni s pravili; pesem je po Badiouju nasprotje takšne logike, je »pritrdjevanje, afirmacija in naslajanje, [...] propozicija brez zakona«



(*Mali priročnik* 30–31).<sup>8</sup> Razlika med pojmovno diskurzivnostjo, racionalno koherenco mišljenja in čutno nasičeno fragmentarnostjo, transgresivno nesistematičnostjo pesništva je odvisna tudi od disciplinarne členitve vednosti, ki jo je dojel že Platon.

V njegovem dialogu *Ion* se filozof Sokrat pogovarja z rapsodom Ionom, recitatorjem in razlagalcem Homerjevega pesništva. Ion je sprva prepričan, da je zmožen najboljše razlage prav vsega, o čemer je pisal Homer, pod težo Sokratove dialoške argumentacije pa prizna, da ne obvladuje nobene-ga od znanj, ki jih je véliki epik vtikal v pesniško prikazovanje (ne ve kaj dosti o veščinah medicine, morjeplovstva ali voznštva). Platon prikaže, da pesništvo obravnava mnoge stvari in »veščine«, ki jih ne poznavajo niti pesniki niti rapsodi, so pa predmet različnih strok. Te vednosti se praviloma nanašajo na posamezna predmetna področja, pesništvo pa jih zajema vase in poljubno prepleta. Pri njihovem prikazovanju obide običajne delitve strokovnih pristojnosti. Pesniška zmožnost vznika prav iz trenutka pesnikove popolne osebne nezmožnosti, iz *neobvladovanja* samega sebe in slehernega znanja; manko osebne, razumnega nadzora je nadomeščen z odpiranjem za zunanjo silo navdihnjenе govornice. Platonov Sokrat to razloži kot »božanski navdih«, nerazumno obsedenost in ekstazo. Pesniki izgubijo razum, »vstopijo v harmonijo in ritem, bakhovsko norijo in so obsedeni«; takšne navdihnjenosti so deležni tudi izvajalci in razlagalci njihovih del: »Kar je v tebi [govori Sokrat Ionu, op. M. J.] in zaradi česar dobro govoriš o Homerju, ni večšina [...], temveč božanska sila, ki te giblje, prav kot pri kamnu, ki ga je Evripid imenoval 'magnet' [...]« (Platon 961).

Filozof je torej tisti, ki se prvi zave deljenosti mišljenja na »veščine«, na razne strokovne kompetence. Pesnik za te pristojnosti oslepi, ko ga iz racionalnosti védenja zanese čutni, danes bi rekli *estetski* »ritem« ustvarjalne ekstaze in ga – če po svoje uporabim Platonovo prisposodobu – v neobvladljive vizije resnice ponese sila »magnetizma« same govornice, ki v pesniško delo vleče skupaj raznotere vednosti, da bi z njihovo presnovo mimetično predstavila izkušnjo sveta.<sup>9</sup>

Če povzamem, bi razlike med diskurzoma pesništva in mišljenja v teoretski abstrakciji opredelil nekako takole. Pesništvo črpa iz posameznikove eksistenčne in izkustvene navzočnosti v svetu. Njen medij je telo, tako pri dožemanju resničnosti kakor tudi pri jezikovnem upodabljanju sveta, ko se telesnost s svojimi gibi prepisuje v ritem, s svojimi zaznavami v pripovedne perspektive, z goni in čutnostjo pa v konotativnost, sinestezijske in pomen-ske nedoločljivosti. Pesništvo spregovarja prek individualnih perspektiv in enkratnega, »preiskujočega« besedilnega predstavljanja, kakršnega omogočajo zgodovinski sistemi umetniške reprezentacije (badioujevske »umetniške resnice«). V pesniškem pisanju se nizi jezikovnih znakov porajajo tudi iz drugih (predhodnih, vzporednih ali zalednih) jezikovnih sekvenc, iz platonovskega »magnetizma« njihovega pomena in ritma. Logika pesništva je torej avtopoetska, zato pomenljivost pesniškega dela ni togo pripeta na referencialna polja posameznih disciplin (»veščin«), ampak s prestopniškim prepletanjem raznoterih vednosti lahko gradi svojo, nevezano, fragmentirano in imaginarno podobo izkustva sveta. Mišljenje je, nasprotno,

refleksivna oddaljitev od osebnega izkustva. Od subjekta zahteva govor s položaja opazovalca, ki se oklepa razumske pojmovnosti. Mišljenje svojo spoznavno usmeritev k svetu izraža z abstrahiranjem konkretnosti (čutno zaznavne polnosti in zraščenosti) v deljena področja vednosti, znotraj katerih se izkustva otresejo sledi telesa in se preoblikujejo v obče modele. Mišljenje teži k vzpostavljanju sistemov za kopičenje in preverjanje znanj, ki presegajo enkratnost posamezne formulacije. Koherenca mišljenja je zato odvisna od ponovljivih metod sklepanja, struktura in pomenljivost besedil pa od pristojnosti posameznih disciplin, v katere se mišljenje vpisuje.

## Tipologija

Med takó opredeljenima mišljenjem in pesništvom so se od antike do danes razvile mnoge oblike dialoga, trenj in sodelovanja. V nekaterih se oba diskurza povsem prepleteta in zabrišeta meje. Oblike interakcije predstavlja tale zasilna razvrstitev:

1. *Mišljenje po pesništvu* (opisna poetika, filologija, hermenevtika, kritika, estetika, literarna zgodovina in literarna teorija ipd.) v svojih opisujočih metabesedilih singularnost pesniških del prevaja v obče modele in jih pojmovno razlaga, povezuje pa jih tudi s širšimi problemskimi konteksti, ki so v pristojnosti disciplinarne vednosti naštetih strok;

2. *Mišljenje pred pesništvom* (normativna poetika, literarni program, umetniški manifest, literarni načrt ipd.) v svojih predpisujočih, utopičnih, programskih besedilih razumno in performativno zarisuje možnosti ter meje sistema predstavljanja, po katerih naj se ravnaajo pesniška dela;

3. *Mišljenje v zaledju pesništva* (na primer v avantgardnem konceptualizmu, konkretni in vizualni poeziji) v svojih spremnih besedilih nakazuje umetniški koncept, neki fragment teorije, ki nastopa kot okvir besedilnega pomena pesniškega dela; brez takšnega mišljenja bi se umetniški izdelek zdel nesmiseln, nepomemben ali trivialen;

4. *Mišljenje v pesništvu* je prvi tip součinkovanja med obema diskurzoma znotraj enega besedila in ima mnogo oblik: trop, alegorija, simbol (vsi figurativno ponazarjajo, nakazujejo misli), eksemplifikacija (obče resnice in ideje so preizkušene prek individualnih zgodb ali likov), metaliterarnost (pesništvo misli samo sebe s svojimi lastnimi sredstvi), refleksivni vložki (filozofiranje v govoru nekaterih literarnih likov ali pripovedovalca, v posameznih citatih, epigrafi), končno tudi *hibridnost* 1 oziroma mišljenje na podlagi pesništva (razvijanje pojmovne govorice v pesništvu in po logiki pesništva: na primer filozofska lirika, esejistični roman in metafikcija);

5. *Pesniško v mišljenju* je drugi tip prepletanja obeh diskurzov v posameznih besedilih, to pot prvenstveno miselnih: mišljenje si prisvaja pesniška sredstva, na primer dialog (za perspektiviranje vednosti, mišljenjskih stilov in bivanjskih položajev), metaforiko, alegoriko, etimološke figure in besedne igre (vse za nadomestke diskurzivnega sklepanja in za pomenško premoščanje vrzeli nepojmljivega in razumsko neizrekljivega), avtobiografičnost, osebno doživljanje, pripovednost, žanrske modalnosti (vse



med drugim za stopnjevanje govorčeve in govorne prepričljivosti, odvisne bolj od etičnih kakor od logičnih in spoznavnih meril). Med tipi tovrstnih interakcij je *hibridnost 2* oziroma pesniško na podlagi mišljenja – gre za razvijanje pesniške govorice v mišljenju in po intencah, lastnih mišljenju: na primer platonski dialog, esej, romantični fragment, nietzschejevska »vesela znanost« in feministična postteorija.

Hibridnost prve in druge vrste sta po tej razvrstitvi samo dve od mnogih oblik dialoga med mišljenjem in pesništvom. Gre za besedila, ki razločno križajo zvrstno specifične elemente/strukture, povzete iz raznorodnih diskurzov – iz literarnega ustvarjanja in raznih disciplin razmišljanja. Tovrstno križanje je v besedilih postajalo zaznavno s postopnim uzaveščenjem različnosti diskurzov mišljenja in pesništva. To se je dogajalo že v antiki, s procesom izstopanja iz mitske zavesti in z oblikovanjem ločenih »veščin«, umetnosti (gr. *téchne*); proces ponazarja deveterica grško-rimskih muz, katerih genealogija je skupna, pristojnosti pa čedalje izraziteje deljene, specializirane.<sup>10</sup> Pojavnih oblik in zvrsti hibridiziranja mišljenja s pesništvom se je od Starih do danes nabralo ogromno. Naj jih naštejemo le nekaj: gnomika, maksime, fragmenti, filozofski dialogi, menipejska satira, pesniška poetika, pripovedna alegorija, filozofska parabola ali pripovedka, miselna poezija in pripovedna proza, esej, enciklopedični in esejistični roman, metapoezija, metadrama, metafikcija ...

## Romantična in moderna matrica križancev literature in teorije

Teoretsko-literarni hibridi v *ožjem smislu* so začeli vznikat šele od 18. stoletja naprej, ko sta se tako literatura kot teorija postopno konstituirali kot samostojna, a soodvisna diskurza. »Literarno polje« (Bourdieu) je namreč v relativno avtonomno celoto komunikacijskih pojavov kognitivno organiziral tudi nanj vezani metajezik, iz tega pa je zrastle literarna teorija. Po drugi strani so literarna besedila za teorijo vse do zadnje tretjine 20. stoletja ostala referenčni temelj, brez katerega metajezik ne bi mogel kodirati pomenov in preverjati trditev.

Izraza »teorija« in »literatura« sta se uporabljala že v antični grščini in latinščini; v nekaterih evropskih jezikih, na primer v angleščini, je bila beseda »teorija« izpričana že od poznega 16. stoletja, in to v pomenih 'duhovnega, miselnega motrenja, kontemplacije', 'konceptije ali miselne sheme, principov, po kateri se ravna neka dejavnost' in zlasti 'sistema idej in trditev, ki razlagajo skupino dejstev ali pojavov'.<sup>11</sup> Toda današnja pojma (literarne) teorije in literature sta specifični kulturni enoti, ki sta se razvili šele v porazsvetljenem procesu pospešene družbene modernizacije in funkcijske diferenciacije. Podlaga njune interakcije je bila ideologija estetskega, ki je umetnosti znotraj kapitalističnega okolja skušala zagotoviti otoke neodvisnosti od trga in drugih družbenih determinizmov: literati so namerno ustvarjali besedila lepote, presežnosti, domišljije, teoretiki pa so z »intelektualnim zrenjem« kot »kategoričnim imperativom teorije« (Schlegel 25) razlagali, kako literatura to doseže in kakšen je smisel tega početja.

Lacoue-Labarthe in Nancy dokazujeta, da je bila vez literature in (literarne) teorije spletena na začetkih 19. stoletja, v jenski romantiki. Zgodnja dela bratov Schlegel, Schellinga, Novalisa, Tiecka, Schleiermacherja in drugih sta označila za »teoretsko romantiko«, »vpeljavo teoretskega projekta v literaturo« (9). Teoretska romantika je konceptualno vzpostavila literaturo kot absolutni žanr in avtonomno področje diskurza – uzavestila jo je kot umetnost, ki se po svojih lastnih načelih uresničuje v besedi (Lacoue-Labarthe – Nancy 11, 21): Friedrich Schlegel je »poezijo« značilno opredelil kot »govor, ki je svoj lastni zakon in svoj lastni namen« (Schlegel 13). Jenski romantiki so literaturi, tej nastajajoči kulturni enoti, oblikovali identiteto na eni strani s pomočjo kritike in »teorije« (ta izraz jim je bil pri srcu),<sup>12</sup> po drugi strani pa naj bi literatura s samorefleksijo še v sebi »proizvajala svojo lastno teorijo« (Lacoue-Labarthe – Nancy 22, 27). Literatura kot besedna umetnost in njena filozofska, estetska teorija sta se torej na začetkih nemške romantike vzpostavljali v interakciji in medsebojnih prepletih. Pisci so pričakovali, da se bo filozofija uresničila in dopolnila kot poezija (Lacoue-Labarthe – Nancy 51), v moderni poeziji pa so videli »nenehen komentar kratkega besedila filozofije« (Schlegel 18). F. Schlegel je v svojih fragmentih – ti so bili tudi strukturno med prvimi izstopajočimi teoretsko-literarnimi hibridi – izrecno pozival k interakciji ali združevanju obeh vrst govornice:

Vsa umetnost naj postane znanost in vsa znanost umetnost; poezija in filozofija naj se združita. (18) Romantična poezija je progresivna univerzalna poezija. Njena naloga ni le vnovič združiti vseh ločenih zvrsti poezije in poezijo spraviti v stik s filozofijo in z retoriko. [...] (27) *Bolj ko postaja poezija znanost, bolj postaja tudi umetnost.* Če želi poezija postati umetnost, če želi umetnik imeti znanost in temeljit uvid v svoja sredstva in svoje namene [...], potem mora pesnik o svoji umetnosti filozofirati [...] (38, poudaril M. J.)

Za Schlegla se torej pesništvo bliža bistvu umetnosti paradokso tako, da se obenem približuje idealu znanosti, torej diskurzu, ki se je prav tedaj vzpostavljal kot nasprotje umetnosti in svobodni igri domišljije. S seganjem v svoje nasprotje (»drugo«) se pesništvo pri formiranju svoje identitete nujno usmerja tudi k teoriji. Z njo si namreč ustvarjajoči subjekt uza-vešča izrazna sredstva in cilje pisanja. Način, na katerega pesnik o svoji umetnosti filozofira, je tudi samorefleksija, hibridno cepljena v pesništvo samo, se pravi avtoreferencialnost metapoezije – ta »zasnove za poetično teorijo pesništva« združuje »z umetniško refleksijo in lepim samozrcaljenjem«, zato je morala biti »obenem poezija in poezija poezije« (36).<sup>13</sup> Na pragu romantike se je umetniškost poezije potemtakem vzpostavljala ravno prek teorije o sebi (v ali ob sebi).

Takšna teoretičnost je primer racionalizacije, kakršne so bili – po Webrovih socioloških raziskavah – v procesu modernizacije in funkcijske diferenciacije kapitalističnih družbenih sistemov deležna tudi druga področja, od vsakdanjega življenja prek gospodarstva in tehnike do državne uprave, politike in znanosti. Racionalizacija je vrsta legitimizacije, ki se je otrsela tradicijske prevlade različnih transcendentnih (verskih, magičnih,

metafizičnih) upravičenj (prim. Weber 16–20, 64).<sup>14</sup> Je vodilo »odčaranega sveta«, ki je v 19. stoletju, sredi političnih, gospodarskih in industrijskih revolucij, pretrgal s tradicionalizmi, v katerih se je bilo vse vedno zdelo samoumevno in vnaprej dano (prim. Adam 210–214). V takšnem svetu je morala tudi literatura – še do 18. stoletja tradicionalno položena v naročja obredov, običajev, družabnosti in stanovsko ločenih kulturnih praks – iznajti jezike in poiskati zavezniške govorice, s katerimi je v javnosti in na kapitalističnem trgu utemljila smisel svojega avtonomnega obstoja in izostrila občutek za svojo posebnost.

Badiou je v romantiko postavil začetke »dobe pesnikov«, v kateri si je pesništvo začelo lastiti naloge filozofije, teorija umetnosti pa je silila v notranjost same umetnosti (Badiou – Ramond 67–71). Dobo pesnikov, ki traja vsaj še do Heideggerja, ima Badiou za sinonim modernosti; moderna pesem, na primer kakšna Mallarméjeva, se tudi »sama identificira kot mišljenje« (Badiou, *Mali priročnik* 33–34). Ker še vedno pripadamo dobi, katere nezavedno je romantika (Lacoue-Labarthe – Nancy 26), je razumljivo, da so se načela literarne samorefleksije, avtoreferencialnosti in hibridnega spajanja poezije s teorijo, ki jih je v svojih fragmentih postuliral Schlegel, še intenzivneje uveljavila v modernizmu 20. stoletja. Subjektova in umetniška samorefleksija, pri delu na primer v Poundovem pesemskem ciklu *Hugh Selwyn Mauberly* ali Joyceovem romanu *Umetnikov mladostni portret*, je med poglavitnimi lastnostmi modernizma. Tudi modernistična poezija in roman sta prevzela naloge filozofskega mišljenja (na primer Rilkejeve *Devinske elegije*, Eliotovi *Štirje kvarteti* ali Brochovi *Mesečniki*). V modernizmu so se po romantičnem zgledu okrepile tudi druge vezi med literaturo in teorijo. O tem pričajo naveze ruskega formalizma in futurizma, New Criticisma in imagizma ali strukturalizma in novega romana; teoretiki so se družili s pisatelji, z njimi sodelovali pri snovanju poetik posameznih gibanj ali pa so tudi sami nastopali kot pisatelji in pesniki (in narobe).

Ker se je literarna teorija dokončno izoblikovala v ruskem formalizmu in se institucionalizirala šele sredi 20. stoletja, torej najmanj poldrugo stoletje po uveljavitvi koncepcije umetniške literature, ne preseneča, da so se dela, v katerih so pisatelji ali teoretiki hibridizirali literaturo in (literarno) teorijo, začela kopičiti od sredine 60. let. Literarna teorija pa se je marsikje že kmalu začela oddaljevati od svojega prvotnega predmeta in se postopno preoblikovala v transdisciplinarno, samorefleksivno in kritično teorijo teksta, jezika, subjekta, kulture, zgodovine in družbe – navadno imenovano kar »Teorija«. Teorija se je proti koncu 20. stoletja lotevala širokih predmetnih področij in težila h kritični obravnavi temeljnih reči človeka in njegovega sveta. S tem si je prisvajala ozemlja filozofije. Sledi nekdanje vezanosti Teorije na obravnavo literature pa se še vedno kažejo v njenem izpostavljanju jezika. Teorija ima namreč jezikovnost in znakovnost za *clavis universalis*, medij, ki naj bi določal vse strukture sveta, od psihičnih do družbenih in političnih. S slovesom od literature kot predmetnega področja je opazen del takšne Teorije postajal literaren na drug način – zaradi lastnosti svojih lastnih besedilnih struktur in načina spoznavanja (prim. Culler). Po Nietzschejevemu zgledu je oponašal literarno govorico, njene trope in

figure, pripovednost, anekdotičnost, fragmentarnost, posamezne žanrske vzorce, izrazito perspektiviranost, predvsem pa modalno obarvano, zunaj-diskurzivno formuliranje resnice in prvenstvo retorike nad logiko (prim. Juvan, *Literarna veda* 29–44).

## Postmoderna literarizacija teorije in teoretizacija literature

Vzporedno s takšno »literarizacijo teorije« je zrcalno potekala »teoretizacija literature«. Na oba procesa je treba gledati v luči postmodernega stanja. Postmoderna je pojmovni dežnik, ki pokriva tudi poststrukturalizem v filozofiji/teoriji in postmodernizem v umetnosti (Hassan 1–5). Na literarizacijo teorije je vplival poststrukturalizem na področju mišljenja, na teoretizacijo literature pa postmodernizem na področju umetnosti.

Teoretsko-literarni hibridi na teoretski podlagi, katerih avtorji so praviloma teoretiki ali teoretičarke, so se v postmoderni razbohotili zaradi mnogih razlogov, o katerih sem uvodoma že razpravljal (relativizem, hibridnost identitet, razkroj velikih pripovedi in premeščanje vednosti čez meje tradicionalnih disciplin, premena besedilnosti v digitalnih medijih itn.). Za to, da je Teorija – ta je koncepte, metode in izrazje že tako ali tako eklektično pobirala iz raznorodnih disciplin – začela vneto posnemati še literarni diskurz, pa je verjetno glavni vzrok razpad velike pripovedi o racionalnosti in znanosti. Razpadu porazsvetljenskega prepričanja, da je spoznanja o posameznem predmetnem področju mogoče izraziti v zakonih ali empirično preverljivih univerzalnih modelih, neodvisnih od perspektiv posameznega raziskovalca, a umestljivih v enciklopedično shemo napredujoče vednosti, se dá zelo dobro slediti ob primeru prehoda strukturalistične teorije (literarnega) besedila v poststrukturalistično. Ta prehod najlepše ilustrirajo Barthesovi spisi od konca 60. do sredine 70. let 20. stoletja, posebej njegov enciklopedijski prispevek o teoriji teksta (Barthes, »Theory of the Text«; prim. Juvan, *Intertekstualnost* 95–100, 133–138).

Niti tradicionalna humanistika niti strukturalizem – ta je v svojem scientizmu humanistiko skušal izenačiti s strogo znanostjo – nista prevpraševala spoznavne avtoritete svojega lastnega jezika, ko sta besedno umetnino obravnavala kot predmet. Poststrukturalistična teorija teksta, ki jo je uvažal Barthes, pa je bila samorefleksivna, kritična tudi do diskurza znanosti. Barthes je v skladu z Lacanovo tezo, da v psihoanalitični interpretaciji ni metajezika, trdil, da si teorija teksta ne more lastiti statusa znanstvenega jezika, ki z metapozicije opazuje primarni jezik. Teorija je namreč prav tako kot njen predmet (literatura) zgolj »tekstualna praksa«. Oba diskurza sta s svojimi subjekti vred vprežena v delo jezika in na jeziku. Ker je vsako besedilo, literarno ali teoretsko, po Barthesu »fragment jezika, umeščen v perspektive drugih jezikov«, se ukinja epistemološka razdalja med predmetom in metodo. Barthes je tako – na valovni dolžini Derridajeve dekonstrukcije metafizike – spodkopaval gospostvo teoretskega metajezika nad resnico besedila. Zato teorija teksta po Barthesu izstopa iz okvirov ideografskih in nomotetičnih ved: ne mudi se niti pri partikularnih pojavih, kot

na primer zgodovina, niti pri formuliranju obćih zakonov, kot strukturalna lingvistika, ampak sledi neskonćnemu »toku postajanja« pomenov in zgodovinskega sveta, kakor ga je opredelil že Nietzsche (Barthes, »Theory« 45). Iz tega se ponuja sklep, da je poststrukturalizem v Barthesovi perspektivi spremenil razmerje med literaturo in teorijo iz hierarhićne metatekstualnosti v anarhićno intertekstualnost. Zato je teorija lahko prevzemala literarne prijeme (Barthes, »Theory« 35, 43–44).

V ideji, da metajezik ni mogoć, se potemtakem kaŹe resignacija nad veliko pripovedjo moderne racionalnosti. Nadomestil jo je uvid, da je sleherno znanje kontingenćno, vezano na telesno, socialno, politićno ali drugo perspektivo delujoćega posameznika, posameznice, na njeno/njegovo umestitev v druŹbeno-zgodovinsko konkretnost. Teoretsko-literarni hibridi na teoretski podlagi so ena od moŹnih poti za takšno samorefleksijo izjavne pozicije teoretika in za Źivljenjsko (tudi etićno in politićno) kontekstualizacijo spoznavne vrednosti njegovih izjav.

Tisti teoretsko-literarni hibridi, ki so v postmodernizmu nastajali na *literarni* podlagi, zvećine spod peres pisateljev, nadaljujejo in razvijajo mnoge simptome modernistićnega kriŹanja med mišljenjem in pesništvom: samorefleksivnost in avtoreferencialnost, filozofsko in znanstveno esejiziranje, abstraktno intelektualnost, montaŹo grobe materialne konkretnosti s ćisto mislijo ali konceptom, pa tudi matematićne principe strukturiranja besedil (serialnost, kombinacije in variacije). Toda »teoretizacije literature«, kakršno doŹivljamo nekako od konca 60. let 20. stoletja, bi ne bilo brez njej sodobne teorije. Barthes je s teorijo teksta kot odprte, intertekstualne in hibridne strukture poudaril nezakljućenost proizvajanja pomenov, transgresivno gibanje pisanja ćez meje besedil, zvrsti, diskurzov ali disciplin. S tem je racionaliziral in spodbudil tovrstno pisanje tudi v teoretski in literarni praksi. Znano je, da je Barthes vplival na Bartha, predstavnika ameriške metafikcije, in mu – skupaj z ostalimi francoskimi poststrukturalisti – za postmodernistićno citatno pisanje ponudil konceptualno podlago intertekstualnosti (razumevanje teksta kot mozaika citatov, povzetih iz heterogenih najdišč kulture);<sup>15</sup> nić manj ploden ni moral biti zanj tudi Barthesov teorem o izenaćevanju teksta in metateksta, saj se uresnićuje v Barthovem metafikcijskem zlivanju pisanja z opazovanjem tega pisanja.

Preden pa s primeroma Barthesa in Bartha osvetlim postmoderne teoretsko-literarne hibride, moram opozoriti še na en odloćilen dejavnik, s katerim sta sodobna literarna teorija (in Teorija) moderirali theoretizacijo literature. Sociološke raziskave kaŹejo, da sta tako pisateljski poklic kakor zahtevnejša, netrivialna sodobna literatura v postmoderni kulturi odvisna od univerzitetnega okolja.<sup>16</sup> Toda univerza je obenem tudi sedeŹ teoretske kulture, in to gotovo velja še bolj kot za sodobno knjiŹevnost. Źe več kot desetletje poslušamo pritoŹbe, da je univerzitetni študij teorije Źe skoraj spodrinil nekdanje ukvarjanje s knjiŹevnostjo in da je poznavanje kano-na teoretikov postalo pomembnejše od razgledanosti po starih in modernih literarnih klasikih. Teorija je nedvomno postala prominenten diskurz. KnjiŹevnost ga lahko ignorira, kolikor pa se ćuti zavezana univerzitetni kulturi, se je nanjo Źe kar prisiljena odzivati.

Literarni ali teoretski hibridi, ki so od 60. let 20. stoletja nastajali v prej skiciranih dialogih modernistične in postmodernistične književnosti z moderno in postmoderno filozofijo/teorijo, so denimo *Roland Barthes o Rolandu Barthesu* (avtorefleksivni slovar Barthesovih idej in pogledov), *Meduzin smeh* Hélène Cixous (obravnavna, zagovor in obenem inscenacija politično izzivalne polimorfije ženskega pisanja), Calvinov roman *Če neke zimske noči popotnik* (v metafizijsko pripoved cepljena teorija branja in pripovednih žanrov), Quignardovo *Skrivno življenje* (v skoraj razblinjeno pripovedno strukturo ljubezenskega romana naseljeni fragmenti teorije erotičnega diskurza), na Slovenskem pa *Mesec dni z Ivanom Cankarjem*, *Martinom Kačurjem in Tarasom Kermaunerjem* (Kermaunerjev esejistični splet izpovedi, avtobiografije, strukturalnih interpretacij Cankarja in kritičnih teoremov o nacionalni ideji), Grafenauerjeve *Štukature* (metapoeitični soneti, ki zajemajo iz slovarja strukturalne poetike, fenomenologije in heideggrovske misli o umetnosti), v novejšem času pa posebej poezija Dekleve in Taje Kramberger, prepredena z referencami na umetnostne in teoretske topike postmoderne.

## Barthes/Barth

Strukturo postmodernih teoretsko-literarnih hibridov z literarno ali teoretsko dominantno si za konec oglejmo ob dveh prototipskih pisanjih, ob paru Barthes/Barth. V Barthesovih *Fragmentih ljubezenskega diskurza* – naslov obuja tradicijo romantičnega hibrida, tj. fragmenta – se teoretska in literarna govorica vseskozi vznemirljivo križata. Teoretično je v tem literarno očarljivem, inteligentnem in ganljivem besedilu predvsem analitično modeliranje erotizma, ki vsebuje neprestano klasificiranje ljubezenske psihologije ter tipiziranje zaljubljenega obnašanja in govorjenja. Barthesov hibrid prikazuje ljubezen deloma prek strukturalistično-semiotičnega koda: pisec kakor kakšen strukturalistični poetolog ali retorik razgrinja slovar značilnih »figur«<sup>1</sup> ljubezenskega »diskurza«<sup>2</sup> in jih v takšnem racionalnem, skoraj scientističnem metajeziku ponazarja z interpretativnimi komentarji in citati Goethejevega *Wertherja*, skrajno razčustvovanega romana. Teoretski subjekt teksta govori s položaja opazovalca, reduciranega na čisto racionalnost, svoje izjave pa utemeljuje v disciplinah psihoanalize, semiotike, naratologije itn. Toda s teorijo se v *Fragmentih* prepleta literarna govorica, ki prek avtobiografske prvoosebne ali tretjeosebne pripovedi (spominke anekdotičnosti) v izrekanje občnih modelov vpisuje avtorjevo osebno perspektivo, občutljivo čustveno-telesno izkušnjo. Barthes poleg tega dopušča, da mu argumentacijo z raznimi besednimi igrami in figurativnimi asociacijami strukturira (avto)poetska logika. Doživljajoči jaz literarne govorice se hibridno sublimira v lik teoretika, oba položaja pa sta opazovana še z gledišča, ki oscilira v njunem precepu.

Na Barthesovo *poststrukturalistično* teorijo teksta je svojo *postmodernistično* metafikcijo oprl John Barth. Njegova kratka zgodba *Naslov* je nedokončan fragment in prototip hibrida na prevladujoči literarni podlagi.



Barthova metafikcija je dedič bogate tradicije metaliterature, njena teoretska plast pa se – po obnovljenih načelih romantične ironije – dogaja na način samoopazovanja procesa pisanja, tudi s pomočjo osnovnih teoretskih terminov (»tematika«, »konflikt«, »glagolski pridevnik«, »dialog«, »monolog«, »roman«, »pripovedovalec« itn.). Barthesov hibrid, katerega strukturna dominanta je teoretska, je navsezadnje spoznavno usmerjen, gre mu za razumevanje – sicer nedosegljive, fantazmatske – resnice medčloveških odnosov. V realnost teh razmerij je avtor ne le intelektualno, ampak tudi telesno in doživljajsko vpleten. Drugače je z Barthovim hibridom, katerega strukturna dominanta je literarna. Tu teoretska samorefleksija služi ustvarjanju napetosti, graditvi zapleta in razpleta dobre zgodbe, torej oblikovalnemu interesu, ki se usmerja v imaginarno, v možni svet fikcije. V igro avtoreferencialnosti besed in stavkov in v samoopazujoči se proces pisanja, opisovan s teoretsko govorico, se vseskozi mešajo sledi psihodinamike in čustveno nabitega dialoga sprtih ljubezenskih partnerjev. Lahko bi rekli, da je »fragment ljubezenskega diskurza« v Barthovem *Naslovu* čustveno nabita zgodba, ki se razvija prek dramatičnih dialogov literarno kultiviranih parov in neprestano posega v literarni postopek pripovedi (z njim se zgodba sproti izgrajuje), meša pa se tudi z metajezikovnimi, kritiško-teoretskimi samoopisi naracije.

Iz teh dveh zrcalnih primerov bi se dalo sklepati, da se teoretsko-literarni hibridi precej razlikujejo, če so jih napisali pisatelji ali teoretiki. Ali teoretiki kljub literariziranju ne morejo zatajiti svoje racionalnosti, spoznavnega interesa? In ali pisatelji – četudi še tako teoretizirajo – ne morejo izstopiti iz ekstaze »pesništva«? Je torej treba vendarle pritrditi Heideggerju, ki za pisatelje in mislece pravi, da »blizu prebivajo na najbolj ločenih vrhah«?

## OPOMBE

<sup>1</sup> O tem prim. tudi Rickman 16, 23–25, 114–153; Courtois – Séité 9; Ancet 19.

<sup>2</sup> Sicer pregledni in natančni literarnozgodovinski prikaz »Literarnih revij in programov« (Štuhec) za obdobje 1945–2000 tega konflikta ne opisuje.

<sup>3</sup> V 60. in 70. letih je takšna stališča zvečine vpeljal in zagovarjal Pirjevec, zlasti v razpravah, zbranih v knjigah *Vprašanje o poeziji*. *Vprašanje naroda* ter *Filozofija in umetnost in drugi spisi*.

<sup>4</sup> Značilen in zgodnji primer takšnega razmišljanje je nepodpisani manifestativni spis »Umetnost, družba/tekst« iz leta 1975.

<sup>5</sup> Badiou opisuje še vmesno, »klasično shemo« (z začetkom pri Aristotelu): umetnost posreduje samo mimetični videz resnice, vendar njen namen ni prikaz resnice, ampak etični učinek »katarze«. V 20. stoletju je marksizem didaktičen, psihoanaliza klasična, heideggerjevska hermenevtika pa romantična (*Mali priročnik* 11–13).

<sup>6</sup> O zvezi poststrukturalistične teorije teksta in teoretsko-literarnih hibridov več v nadaljevanju.

<sup>7</sup> Podobno razmišlja o zlitosti čutno-telesne in razumsko-duhovne razsežnosti v mišljenju umetnosti estetska tradicija, od klasikov Kanta in Hegla do sodobnih koncepcij Kristeve (10–103; Kristeva v družbeno pogojenih jezikovnih kodih »simbolnega«, ki se udejanjajo v literarnem tekstu, odkriva sledi predjezikovnega, na telesnost oprtega označevanja, tj. »semiotičnega«; razsežnost semiotičnega se kaže

zlasti v ritmu) in pojmovanj mnogih drugih: Ancet denimo piše o »pesniškem pisanju«, v katerem deluje »telesna energija« oziroma »telesni naboj«, tako da mu je poezija »gibanje telesa v govorico« (21–24), Meschonnic pa meni, da je »pesem pokazatelj prehoda med telesom in govorico« (Meschonnic – Courtois 78). Več o razlikah med literarnim in teoretskim mišljenjem v nadaljevanju.

<sup>8</sup> S temi pogledi se ujemata tudi Ancet in Bordes. Prvi v pesniškem pisanju vidi telesno energijo, »ki prečka vse zvrsti«, v »pesniški misli« pa silo, ki – v nasprotju s povezujočo logiko filozofije – teži k »razvezovanju«, diskontinuiteti in fragmentarnosti (Ancet 21, 23). Tudi za Bordesa je pesniška beseda fragmentarna in kaotična kot razvalina (36).

<sup>9</sup> Platon je, na začetkih metafizike, zaradi zmožnosti tega uvida filozofom pripisoval tudi ekskluzivno pristojnost za spoznanje resnice, Badiou – kot postmetafizični mislec – pa je filozofskemu spoznanju o različnosti veščin, na katere se členi vednost, prisodil skromnejši položaj: »Filozofija ali bolje določena filozofija je vedno predelava neke kategorije resnice. Sama ne proizvaja nobene dejanske resnice. Zapopade resnice, jih pokaže, izpostavi, naznani, da so.« (*Mali priročnik* 25). Za digresijo: Prešeren, pesnik badioujevske »romantične sheme«, je pristojnosti strokovnih znanj (estetske kritike in jezikoslovja) pri presojanju *estetske* celote umetnine z *vidika pesništva* strnil v znani sentenci »Le čevlje sodi naj Kopitar!« (satirični sonet »Apel in čevljar«).

<sup>10</sup> Pri Heziodu, ki jih je verjetno prvi poimenoval, njihove vloge še niso razdeljene (*Teogonija* v. 1–115).

<sup>11</sup> Pomene in zgodovino besede *theory* povzemam po spletnem *Oxford English Dictionary* ([www.oed.com](http://www.oed.com)).

<sup>12</sup> Gospa de Staël je leta 1813 v svoji knjigi *O Nemčiji* komentirala veliko navezanost nemške literature in umetnosti na filozofske ideje; pri tem je tudi ona uporabila izraze »teorija«, »teorija o literaturi«, »literarna teorija« (*théorie littéraire* – Staël 470–472).

<sup>13</sup> O avtoreferencialni metapoeziji v romantiki na primeru Puškina in Prešerna sem obširneje pisal na drugem mestu (Juvan, »Prešernova in Puškinova poezija o poeziji«).

<sup>14</sup> Racionalizacijo razumemo tako v splošnem pomenu 'naknadnega utemeljevanja in upravičevanja nekega dejanja, dejavnosti', katerih smisel ni dan že kar *a priori*, kakor tudi v posebni Webrovi razlagi – kot prepričanje, da si subjekt lahko samostojno zastavlja cilje, načrtuje, kako jih bo dosegel, in preračunava dobičke in stroške.

<sup>15</sup> O tem med drugimi poročata Aleš Debeljak in Manfred Pfister (gl. Juvan, *Intertekstualnost* 104–106).

<sup>16</sup> Pisatelji so zaposleni kot profesorji literature in drugih humanističnih ali družboslovnih predmetov oziroma na univerzah poučujejo pisateljstvo, študenti in učitelji pa sodobno netrivialno literaturo berejo pretežno za potrebe univerzitetnih predavanj in seminarjev; če jo že kdo spremlja tudi v prostem času in zunaj šolskega in akademskega sistema, mora biti dobro izobražen, da lahko razume njene strukture in mnogovrstne reference.

## LITERATURA

- Adam, Frane. »K Webrovi Protestantski etiki in duhu kapitalizma.« Weber, Max. *Protestantska etika in duh kapitalizma*. Prev. Pavel Gantar – Štefan Vevar. Ljubljana: ŠKUC, Filozofska fakulteta, 1988. 209–224.
- [Anonim.] »Umetnost, družba/tekst: Nekaj pripomb o sedanjih razmerjih razrednega boja na področju književne produkcije in njenih ideologij.« *Problemi – Razprave* 13.3-5 [147-149] (1975): 1–10.
- Ancet, Jacques. »La voix de la mer.« *Europe* (Paris) 78.849-850 (2000): 19–31.
- Badiou, Alain. *Mali priročnik o inestetiki*. Prev. Suzana Koncut. Ljubljana: Društvo Apokalipsa, 2004.
- Badiou, Alain – Charles Ramond. »La poésie en condition de la philosophie. Entretien avec A. Badiou.« *Europe* (Paris) 78.849-850 (2000): 65–75.
- Bahtin, Mihail. *Teorija romana*. Ur. Aleksander Skaza, prev. Drago Bajt. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba, 1982.
- Barth, John. »Naslov.« Prev. Andrej Jereb. *Ameriška metafikcija*. Ur. Aleš Debeljak. Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga, 1988. 56–65.
- Barthes, Roland. "Theory of the Text." *Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader*. Ur. Robert Young. London: Routledge, 1981. 31–47.
- . *Fragmenti ljubezenskega diskurza*. Prev. Zoja Skušek. Ljubljana: Založba /\*cf., 2002.
- . »Roland Barthes o Rolandu Barthesu.« Izbor in prev. Taja Kramberger – Drago B. Rotar. *Monitor ISH* 4.1-4 (2002): 153–175.
- Bordes, Xavier. »Quand le poète montre la lune ...« *Europe* (Paris) 78.849-850 (2000): 32–40.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*. Prev. Susan Emanuel. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1996.
- Calvino, Italo. *Če neke zimske noči popotnik*. Prev. Jaša Zlobec. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba, 1993.
- . *Kozmokomične*. Prev. Irena Trenc-Frelj. Radovljica: Didakta, 2001.
- Cixous, Hélène. »Smeh Meduze.« Prev. Barbara Pogačnik. *Smeh Meduze in druga besedila*. Ljubljana: Društvo Apokalipsa, 2005. 5–48.
- Courtois, Jean-Patrice – Yannick Séité. »Littérature – philosophie.« *Europe* (Paris) 78.849-850 (2000): 3–10.
- Culler, Jonathan. "The Literary in Theory." *What's Left of Theory: New Work on the Politics of Literary Theory*. Ur. Judith Butler idr. London – New York: Routledge, 2000. 273–290.
- Fowler, Alastair. *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes*. Oxford: Clarendon press, 1982.
- Grafenauer, Niko. *Štukature*. Ljubljana: DZS, 1975.
- Haraway, Donna J. »Kiborški manifest: Znanost, tehnologija in socialistični feminizem v poznem dvajsetem stoletju.« *Opice, kiborgi in ženske: Reinvencija narave*. Prev. Tina Potrato. Ljubljana: Študentska založba, 1999. 241–292.
- Hassan, Ihab H. "From Postmodernism to Postmodernity: The Local/Global Context." *Philosophy and Literature* 25.1 (2001): 1–13.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Izbrane razprave*. Ur. Boris Majer, prev. Ivan Urbančič. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba, 1967.
- Heziod. *Teogonija. Dela in dnevi*. Prev. Kajetan Gantar. Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga, 1974.
- Horn, Eva, Bettine Menke in Cristoph Menke, ur. *Literatur als Philosophie – Philosophie als Literatur*. München: W. Fink, 2006.
- Juvan, Marko. *Intertekstualnost*. Ljubljana: DZS, 2000.

- — —. »Prešernova in Puškinova poezija o poeziji.« *F. Prešeren – A. S. Puškin: Ob 200-letnici njunega rojstva*. Ur. Miha Javornik. Ljubljana: ZIFF, 2001. 43–71.
- — —. *Literarna veda v rekonstrukciji: Uvod v sodobni študij literature*. Ljubljana: LUD Literatura, 2006.
- Kermauner, Taras. *Mesec dni z Ivanom Cankarjem, Martinom Kačurjem in Tarasom Kermaunerjem ali O različnih dobrodejnih, še bolj pa o neblagih plateh slovenstva, o naši spodbudni tragikomediji*. Ljubljana: [samozaložba], 1976.
- Kern, Andrea. »Zwei Seiten des Verstehens. Die philosophische Bedeutung von Kunstwerken.« *Literatur als Philosophie – Philosophie als Literatur*. Ur. Eva Horn idr. München: W. Fink, 2006. 57–79.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Revolucija pesniškega jezika: Razprave*. Prev. Matej Leskovar. Piran: Obalne galerije, 2005.
- Littérature – Philosophie. *Europe* (Paris) 78.849-850 (2000): 3–310.
- Lacoue-Labarthe, Philippe – Jean-Luc Nancy. *L'Absolu littéraire: Théorie de la littérature du romantisme allemand*. Paris: Ed. du Seuil, 1978.
- Lytard, Jean-François. *Postmoderno stanje: Poročilo o vednosti*. Prev. Simona P. Grilc. Ljubljana: Analecta, 2002.
- McLeod John. *Beginning Postcolonialism*. Manchester – New York: Manchester UP, 2000.
- Meschonnic, Henri – Jean-Patrice Courtois. »Poétique du poème et de la pensée. Entretien avec H. Meschonnic.« *Europe* (Paris) 78.849-850 (2000): 76–82.
- Pirjevec, Dušan. *Filozofija in umetnost in drugi spisi*. Ur. Igor Zabel. Ljubljana: Aleph, 1991.
- — —. *Vprašanje o poeziji. Vprašanje naroda*. Ur. Rudi Šeligo. Maribor: Obzorja, 1978.
- Platon. »Ion«. *Zbrana dela* 1. Prev. Gorazd Kocijančič. Celje: Mohorjeva družba, 2004. 955–967.
- Quignard, Pascal. *Skrivno življenje*. Prev. Suzana Koncut. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba, 2002.
- Rickman, Hans Peter. *Philosophy in Literature*. Madison itn.: Farleigh Dickinson UP – Associated UP, 1996.
- Schlegel, Friedrich. *Spisi o literaturi*. Prev. Tomo Virk. Ljubljana: LUD Literatura, 1998.
- Staël, Madame de. *O Nemčiji*. Prev. Jelka Kernev Štrajn. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba, 2003.
- Strniša, Gregor. *Vesolje*. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba, 1983.
- Štuhec, Miran. »Literarne revije in programi.« Pogačnik, Jože idr. *Slovenska književnost III*. Ljubljana: DZS, 2001. 469–508.
- Šuvaković, Miško. *Anatomija angelov: Razprave o umetnosti in teoriji v Sloveniji po letu 1960*. Prev. Vlasta Vičič. Ljubljana: Znanstveno in publicistično središče, 2001.
- Weber, Max. *Protestantska etika in duh kapitalizma*. Prev. Pavel Gantar – Štefan Vevar. Ljubljana: ŠKUC, Filozofska fakulteta, 1988.
- Worton, Michael. "Between Poetry and Philosophy: René Char and Martin Heidegger." *Reconceptions: Reading Modern French Poetry*. Ur. Russell King – Bernard McGuirk. Nottingham: University of Nottingham Monographs in the Humanities, 1996. 137–157.

# DIALOGUES BETWEEN “THINKING” AND “POETRY” AND THEORETICAL-LITERARY HYBRIDS

---

Marko Juvan

Scientific Research Center of the Slovene Academy of Sciences and Arts,  
Ljubljana

UDK 82.0:1

*“Literature” and “theory” are historically determined and interdependent cultural entities. They were already linked in early romanticism, and became even more so in modernism and postmodernism/post-structuralism. The characteristic form of their interaction is theoretical-literary hybrids. In the context of the postmodern delegitimization and redistribution of knowledge, and the dispersion of textuality, the processes of the literarization of theory and the theorization of literature are evident in these hybrids. However, the dialogues between “thinking” and “poetry” have, since antiquity, developed many other forms and genres. Although “thinking” and “poetry” have common attributes, they still remain irreducibly different.*

Keywords: literature, theory, hybridization, romanticism, postmodernism, post-structuralism

## Dialogue, Friction, Difference

In general, writers and philosophers have inspired each other since early times and exchanged ideas, structures, exempla, and images. Literary language has managed to absorb even the discourse of science, although this was regarded as its antipode. Strniša, for example, formed his poetic “universe” according to the models of the modern physics of Einstein and Heisenberg and developed its own particular fractal poetic (*Vesolje*). In his *Cosmicomics*, Calvino translated cosmological and evolutionary theories into stories much like fables but imbued with a contemporary sensibility and irony. There are even more examples of dialogue between literature and philosophy, two supposedly more closely related discourses: Homer – Plato, Spinoza – Goethe, Schelling – Coleridge, Schopenhauer – Borges, Nietzsche – Dostoevsky, Dostoevsky – Bakhtin, Artaud – Foucault or Celan – Derrida;<sup>1</sup> in the Slovene sphere: Pirjevec – Smole, Anaximander – Dekleva,

Cankar – Hribar, and others. A telling example of the reciprocal inspiration between thought and literary art is Heidegger's friendship with Char: first Heidegger developed his thinking through reading Hölderlin's poetry, then Heidegger himself influenced Char, and with his own poetic idiolect Char finally marked an entire cycle of Heidegger's late poems (cf. Worton).

For a long time, creators of literature and those who write critically or theoretically about their work have also cooperated, or at least cohabitated, as one cannot exist without the other in the literary and media system. Literary critics, historians, and theoreticians have forged terms (or designations) for artistic movements or generations and often promoted them. The French *nouveau roman* would not exist without the theory of Tel Quel; the artistic avant-garde needed theoretical support in manifestos, in various accompanying texts (e.g., the group OHO in the 1960s and 1970s, and NSK in the 1980s and 1990s; cf. Šuvaković). The theoretical concept appeared there as a supplement, taking the place of that which unconventional artistic productions apparently lacked – sense, relevance, context, or reference.

However, in spite of the cooperation between art and philosophy, occasionally throughout history ("ever since Plato") a certain mistrust has reappeared between them. This testifies to the fact that the notion of dialogue also contains irreconcilable differences and an insurmountable clash of positions.

It seems to me that in the last few decades the level of tension in the dialogue between theory and literature has, in fact, been somewhat higher in Slovenia than elsewhere. The friction between the literary viewpoints of collaborators in the journals *Perspektive* or *Nova revija* (the "Heideggerians") on the one side and, on the other side, the positions about (Slovene) literature held by semiotic theoreticians ("Marxist-Lacanian") from the circle of the journal *Problemi* contributed to a cultural-political division in the 1970s and 1980s even within the very generation that had introduced modernist and postmodernist streams of thought in the time of communist rule.<sup>2</sup> On the "Heideggerian" side, writers maintained an alliance with philosophers and theoreticians (most notably with Pirjevec, Kermauner, and Hribar). They were largely convinced that Being, which was otherwise inaccessible to metaphysical, technical and theoretical thought, spoke through literary art; notwithstanding their criticisms of the sediments of romantic cultural nationalism, they understood literature as a pillar of national identity, a path to personal emancipation, and a means for political liberation and social criticism.<sup>3</sup> The "Marxist-Lacanian" side – Žižek, Rotar, Močnik, and other theorists who distanced themselves even from the experimental writing of their coevals of *Problemi* – criticized domestic literature as an anachronistic national institution, to which the cultural intelligentsia was connected as a branch of reactionary nationalism or bourgeois elitism, and understood writers as pathological prisoners of the imaginary.<sup>4</sup>

Irrespective of the local specificities, the rivalry described above is actually a manifestation of the antagonism between two traditional European schemata of the knotting together of art and philosophy (cf. Badiou, *Handbook of Inaesthetics* 1–15). It seems to me that the theoreticians of



*Problemi* have, in spite of their modern radicalism, been stranded in a Platonist "didactic schema," which still echoed in Marxism. It denied art an independent recognition and expression of the truth, claiming that it seduces the audience with mere "imitation of the effect of truth," with "the charm of a semblance of truth" (Badiou, *Handbook* 2). Genuine recognition, of course, pertains to philosophy and its heir, theory. The Slovene "Heideggerians," however, are descendants of the later "romantic schema," according to which since the early 19th century it has been held that truth is accessible only to literary art, not to metaphysics and the forms of instrumental, technical, methodological, and rational understanding derived from it, among which each and every theory is counted (3).<sup>5</sup>

Badiou attempts to surpass didacticism, romanticism, and classicism. All of the three traditional "schemata of the link between art and philosophy" (5) were based on art's relation to the truth; they understood truth as one only, independent of the artwork (8–10). Badiou's proposition places itself among postmodern conceptions that, in the footsteps of Wittgenstein's "language games," implement pluralism, temporariness, assent, relativity, autonomy, and the (discursive) production of truths (cf. Lyotard 9–11, 37–41). It is also close to those conceptions that seek the reasons for the competitiveness of literature and theory in the common basis of art and philosophy: both employ language in a non-utilitarian way, for interpreting the world as an open-ended whole that reveals (uncovers) itself to human existence (cf. Rickman 28–31, Horn et al. 12). For Badiou, art and the poem are "thinking," in which their immanent singular truths are established again and again; these are "irreducible to other truths," whether scientific or philosophical (*Handbook* 9). "Art *itself* is a truth procedure" (9); as "an art-truth" it unfolds in the historical change of systems of representation. Badiou describes this following the example of Kuhn's idea of scientific paradigms. For him, the transitional truth of art is "an artistic configuration initiated by an event," "a generic multiple," or "an identifiable sequence ..., comprising a virtually infinite complex of works" (12–13); the individual artwork "is a situated inquiry about the truth that it locally actualizes or of which it is a finite fragment" (12). Examples of such relational truths that are dependent on the virtual potential of historical systems of signification are ancient tragedy, the novel from Cervantes to Joyce, or abstract painting from Kandinsky onwards. Badiou's considerations about the autonomous and irreducible truth of art partly overlap theories of possible worlds, i.e., worlds established by convention and according to their own intrinsic laws. Possible-world theories have as well undermined the binary structure of judging the truthfulness of assertions and the role of truth in art (cf. Juvan, *Literarna veda v rekonstrukciji* 218–230).

I believe that Badiou puts forward good reasons against philosophy (theory) and art (literature) continuing to compete as to which better recognizes and presents truth; they think and express mutually *different* truths. Thus in theoretical-literary hybrids different regimes of truths cross and produce new modalities of understanding that are different from the sum of theory and literature.

## Postmodernity: Hybridity, Identities, the Mixing of Fields

The topic of hybridity is virtually omnipresent in the discourse of current humanities and social sciences; its wide circulation indicates problematics that we perceive as relevant and distinguishing of our time. In actual fact, Hassan declared “hybridity” to be a distinguishing feature of postmodernism and postmodernity (“From Postmodern to Postmodernity”). Hybridity is one of those characteristically postmodern concepts with which it is possible, in contrast to binary logic and metaphysical essentialism, to conceive of the cohabitation of various entities in the one, *relationally* mobile, changeable conceptual unit.

With the appropriation of the biological and linguistic expression “hybrid” (meaning ‘a word compounded from two linguistically different morphemes’) in the mid 1930s, Bakhtin defined “hybridization” as “an artistic device” or, in the general perspective, “one of the most important modes in the historical life and evolution of all languages” by which, within the limits of a single utterance, two sociolects, two language consciousnesses, and two speaking subjects mix (“Discourse in the Novel” 358–360). He also characterized a “hybrid construction” as “an utterance that belongs, by its grammatical (syntactic) and compositional markers, to a single speaker, but that actually contains mixed within it two utterances, two speech manners, two styles ... and belief systems” (“Discourse in the Novel” 304–305). Thanks to Bakhtin’s seminal influence on the post-structuralist theory of the text<sup>6</sup> and culture, the notion of hybridity – within the scope of the postmodern ecstasy of communication and the disbandment of traditional cultural coherence – overstepped the original domains of linguistics, stylistics, and poetics. It became almost unavoidable in discussions about identity, one of the key problems with which social sciences and the humanities have been occupied over the last decades.

With “hybridity,” postcolonial theory captured the subjective positions of the in-between (interstice), border lives (liminality), and split, displaced, or migrated affiliations. In academic circles it thus weakened the dominance of the purist conception of ethnic identity: “subjectivity is deemed to be composed from variable sources, different materials, many locations”; this is why “hybrid identities are never total and complete in themselves ..., instead, they remain perpetually in motion” (cf. McLeod 216–221). Feminist and queer theories, which undermined the biological determination of sexual identity, were honed by Donna Haraway, who employed the category of hybridity in her writings – incidentally, brilliant examples of theoretical-literary hybrids. In her ironic “A Cyborg Manifesto,” with its blasphemous apology for the cyborg (“a hybrid of machine and organism”), she exposed the liberating and enslaving potentials of the posthuman world of postmodernism for the identity of women. She stressed that in such a world global codes, cybernetics, and biotechnology invalidate the boundaries between nature and society, between the body and the machine (Haraway 149–155, 163–173).

The question of identity concerns “theoretical-literary hybrids” primarily at the level of the textual inscription of genre or media codes, forms of

knowledge, and the writing subjects. Crossbreeds of thinking and poetry fall within the broader area of genre hybrids (cf. Fowler 183 ff.). The mixing of heterogeneous textual kinds is quite old (for example, Menippean satire), but its reputation has only grown since the decline of the classical genre system, perhaps first in romantic theories of the novel, the fragment, the arabesque, and progressive universal poetry. Today everywhere we look we come across genre hybrids; for instance, in the popular mixtures of fact and fiction (new journalism, reality shows, etc.). In the postmodern era, the hybridization of genres was also accelerated by changes in the media system. Electronic media severed the text from material bearers, real references, and placement, and through the Internet sent them to the virtual rhizome of cyberspace, where they lost beginnings and endings, while the multiple intertextual links erased their boundaries and genre affiliations. In digital texts other traditional demarcations that had traditionally arranged the universe of discourse also disappeared (for example, real vs. imaginary).

Not least, the rise of crossbreeds between theory and literature was stimulated by the postmodern displacement or erasure of delimitations between discursive fields. In the postindustrial society after 1950, the progress of science and technology, the supranational flow of capital, and the crisis of metaphysical philosophy and academic institutions seriously shook the faith in the speculative and emancipative "grand Narratives," which had legitimated different forms of knowledge, including science, literature, and art since the enlightenment (Lyotard xxiii–xxv, 3–6, 31–47). In place of the narrative claiming that the accumulation of knowledge serves the advancement and liberation of man (the nation, the Spirit, mankind), and instead of the speculative philosophy distributing, according to an "encyclopedic net" (39), each science within the totality of knowledge, at the end of the 19th century it became ever clearer that knowledge is fragmentary and contingent: sciences, theories, and arts proved to be but "kinds of discourse" or autonomous "language games" of diverse origins, each based on its own rules and arbitrary regimes of validity (Lyotard 3, 10–11, 39–40). After the postmodern "breaking up of the grand Narratives" had shaken the general metaphysical grounds of knowledge and ruined its encyclopedic system, it was power that installed itself as the only external measure that could legitimate knowledge: whether through political advantage and dominance enabled by the control of information, or through the accumulation of capital on the knowledge market (46–47, 51). The exteriorization and "merchandization of knowledge" (5) not only demolished the old humanistic ideal about education, but also violently unsettled traditional scientific and artistic institutions, annulling the immanent logics and coherence of the disciplines in which knowledge had been organized:

The classical dividing lines between the various fields of science are thus called into question – disciplines disappear, overlappings occur at the borders between sciences, and from these new territories are born. The speculative hierarchy of learning gives way to an immanent and, as it were, "flat" network of areas of inquiry, the respective frontiers of which are in constant flux. (39)

The humanities and philology thus imploded into polymorphic, eclectic domains, such as transdisciplinary “theory” and cultural studies. Along with humanistic institutions, the autonomy of art and literature also lost their solid ground; art began to be produced and understood in ever less transparent interlacements with other signifying practices, as well as with media and public discourse (cf. Juvan, *Literarna veda* 11–19, 29–47). Consequently, in literary texts we often come across theoretical discourse (not just in the “professorial” novels of Lodge, Schwanitz, and Eco, but even in Brown’s popular fiction), whereas theoretical works express themselves with word games, figures, autobiographical anecdotes, and collages of citations, in such a way as to give an impression of literary fiction and the capricious “anything goes.” How then are we to understand and assess the production of texts that, especially in the academic world, have flooded our time? Should we follow the methodological chiasmus of deconstruction and read philosophy (theory) as literature, and literature as theory (cf. Horn et al. 1, 10–11)?

## Thinking/Poetry

Notwithstanding the currency of these dilemmas, the interaction between the literary and the theoretical is nothing new; it is simply a modern articulation of the relation between two types of discourse that have coexisted alongside or inside each other since antiquity. Nietzsche postulated the unity of poetry and philosophy at the dawn of the Greek age, and was followed by many who interpreted their ancient development since Plato and Aristotle as a gradual differentiation and specialization (cf. Courtois and Séité 3). Heidegger attributed the same origin and mission to both “thinking” and “poetry.” Their original capacity was to hearken to Being, which bespeaks *Dasein* (i.e., human existence) through language:

Language is the house of Being. In its home man dwells. Those who think and those who create with words are guardians of this home. Their guardianship accomplishes the manifestation of Being insofar as they bring the manifestation to language and maintain it in language through their speech. (“Letter on Humanism,” *Basic Writings* 217)

Listening to the voice of Being is, for Heidegger, the earliest and most authentic source of both “the thinker’s saying” (*das Sagen des Denkers*) and “the poet’s naming” (*das Nennen des Dichters*); poetry and thinking are initially equal in their care for the Word of Being (*Was ist Metaphysik* 50–51).<sup>7</sup> Poetry has retained its authentic bond with Being, whereas primordial thinking (*das anfängliche Denken*), transformed into metaphysics by Plato and Aristotle, underwent a fatal “‘technical’ interpretation,” also characterized by the expression *theōría* (“Letter on Humanism,” *BW* 218). In methodically seeking the essence of things, metaphysics forgot about their being and lost the miraculous truth of Being from its sight.<sup>8</sup> According to Heidegger, the truth of Being can not be attained by technical or theo-

retical reasoning, but discloses itself (as *aletheia* 'unconcealment') primarily through the work of art. "The work as work sets up a world" of our existence; it is the place where "the truth of beings has set itself to work" ("The Origin of the Work of Art," *BW* 161–182, esp. 162, 170). Inspired by Hölderlin and other artists, Heidegger turned (*die Kehre*) his existential and phenomenological philosophy into more poetic "thought of Being" (*das Denken des Seins*), which he believed was able to surpass metaphysics<sup>9</sup> and regain the primordial contact with "poetry."

Heidegger's philosophical writings that developed the thought of Being are themselves examples of the hybridization of philosophy and literature. Above all they conceptually extended the horizon within which the post-modern permeation of literature and theory could then actually flourish. Trying to demonstrate here how the contemporary dialogue of the poet and the thinker is embedded in a long European tradition, I use the expressions "poetry" and "thinking" somewhat differently than Heidegger. By "thinking" I also mean all of the variants of metaphysical, technical, theoretical reflection from antiquity onwards, and by "poetry" I refer to all of the genres and forms that we understand today under the notion of literature as verbal art.

After Heidegger, a common nucleus was often found in "thinking" and "poetry," but paradoxically "poetry" was explained as "thinking" – albeit thinking *sui generis*. In comparison to the discursive, notional, logico-argumentative, and rational formation of philosophy and theory, in artworks – according to Badiou – "thought that cannot be discerned or separated as a thought ... a thought that is not even thinkable" is at work (*Handbook* 19). The poetic thought cannot be exhausted by conceptual thinking (i.e., theory) because "it is inseparable from the sensible" (*ibid.*) and it attempts "to capture in discourse the singularity of presence of the sensible" ("La poésie" 72).<sup>10</sup> Likewise, Andrea Kern maintains that "art is ... philosophy in the medium of experience which philosophy in the medium of the concept cannot achieve;" philosophy considers "normal experience" with the aid of conceptual analysis, whereas art does so "in the medium of experience itself" (58, 75–76) by mimetically simulating its existential concreteness. This is why poetry is able to enact "the immediacy of individualized vision" (Rickman 31). According to Badiou, poetry explores its own singular truth through poems, which are themselves unique facts, whereas philosophy strives for consistency and the construction of connected systems or doctrines (*Handbook* 24, Badiou and Ramond 72–74). The particular, unique use of language gives poetry the power to forbid "discursive thought, *dianoia*;" that is, "the thought that traverses, the thought that links and deduces." Contrary to the discursiveness of philosophy, mathematics, and theories that link arguments obeying logical and other rules, the poem itself "is affirmation and delectation, ... a lawless proposition" (Badiou, *Handbook* 17).<sup>11</sup> The difference between conceptual discursiveness, the rational coherence of thinking, and the sensually saturated fragmentariness, the transgressive non-systematism of poetry is also dependent on the disciplined dissection of knowledge – something that was already understood by Plato.

In Plato's dialogue *Ion*, the philosopher Socrates speaks with the rhapsodist Ion, performer and explicator of Homer's poetry. At first, Ion is convinced that he is capable of providing the best explanation of everything about which Homer has written, but under the weight of Socrates' dialogic argumentation he has to admit that he has not mastered any of the knowledge that the great epic weaves into its poetic account (he does not know enough about the skills of medicine or seamanship). Plato demonstrates that poetry deals with many matters and skills ("arts") that neither the poet nor the rhapsodist know about, but are rather the objects of various specialist fields. These competences as a rule belong to individual domains of reference, but poetry appropriates them for itself and weaves them together at its own will. In his account, the poet circumvents the usual division of specialized competences. Poetic ability is evident from the very moment of the poet's complete personal inability, from the *non-mastery* of himself and each and every area of knowledge; the lack of personal, intellectual command is compensated for with the opening to the outside force of inspired discourse. Plato's Socrates explains this as "divine inspiration," irrational obsession, and ecstasy: "When falling under the power of music and rhythm they [poets] are inspired and possessed ... they are under the influence of Dionysus." Performers and explicators of their works also partake in this inspiration: "The gift which you [Socrates speaking to Ion] possess of speaking excellently about Homer is not an art, but ... an inspiration; there is a divinity moving you, like that contained in the stone which Euripides calls a magnet ..." (Plato, "Ion" 533d–534d)

Thus it is the philosopher who first realizes the division of thinking into skills, into various specialized competences. The poet blinds himself to these competences in the moment when he is carried away from the rationality of knowing by the sensual – today we would say *esthetic* – "rhythm" of creative ecstasy and – to redirect Plato's allegory – is conveyed by the linguistic "magnetism" of discourse to an ungovernable vision of the truth, which in the poet's work draws together diverse fields of knowledge and merges them in a mimetic presentation of human existence.<sup>12</sup>

To summarize, the differences between the discourse of poetry and that of thinking could, in a theoretical abstraction, be somehow defined as follows. Poetry draws from the individual's existence and experiential presence in the world. Its medium is the body, both in comprehending reality and in the linguistic presentation of the world, by which corporeality with its movements is transcribed in rhythm, with its perceptions in the narrative perspectives, with its drives and sensuality in connotation, synesthesia, and semantic indeterminacy. Poetry speaks through individual perspectives and through a unique, "inquiring" textual presentation, which is enabled by a historical system of artistic representation (Badiou's "art-truth"). In poetry the strings of linguistic signs are also generated from other (previous, parallel, or backing) language sequences, from the Platonic "magnetism" of their meaning and rhythm. Thus the logic of poetry is autopoietic, and therefore the significance of the poetic work is not rigidly locked into the referential fields of individual disciplines ("arts"), but rather with the



transgressive interweaving of diverse domains of knowledge it can build its own, unconnected, fragmentary, and imaginary image of the experiential world. Thinking, on the other hand, is the reflexive distancing from personal experience. It demands that the subject speak from the position of an observer that clings to rational conceptuality. Thinking expresses its cognitive orientation to the world with the abstraction of concreteness (meaning 'sensually perceived fullness' and 'what is grown together') in the divided fields of knowledge, within which experience removes the bodily traces and transforms itself into general models. Thinking strives towards the establishment of systems for the accumulation and verification of knowledge that exceed the singularity of the individual formulation. Thus the coherence of thinking is dependent on repeatable methods of inference, whereas the structure and the significance of texts rely on the competencies of individual disciplines, in which thinking inscribes itself.

## Typology

Between thinking and poetry, defined in this way, from antiquity to today, many forms of dialogue, friction, and cooperation have developed. In some of these, the two modes of discourse have become completely entwined and their borders erased. The forms of interaction are presented in the following provisional classification:

1. *Thinking after poetry* (descriptive poetics, philology, hermeneutics, criticism, esthetics, literary history and literary theory, etc.), in its descriptive metatexts translates the singularity of poetic works into general models and explains them conceptually, also connecting them with broader problematics and contexts that pertain to the disciplinary competences of the fields mentioned above;

2. *Thinking before poetry* (normative poetics, the literary program, the artistic manifesto, the literary plan, etc.) in its prescriptive, utopian, programmatic texts rationally and performatively delineates the possibilities and borders of the system of representation according to which poetic works should behave;

3. *Thinking behind poetry* (e.g., in avant-garde conceptualism, in concrete and visual poetry) in its accompanying texts demonstrates the artistic concept; that is, a fragment of theory that acts as a framework of the textual significance of the poet's work; without such thinking the artistic product would seem meaningless, unimportant, or trivial;

4. *Thinking in poetry* is the first type of interaction between the two modes of discourse within one text, and has many forms: the trope, the allegory, the symbol (all of which figuratively illustrate and indicate the thought), exemplification (common truths and ideas are tested through individual stories or characters), meta-literariness (poetry thinks itself with its own means), reflexive inserts (philosophizing in the speech of certain literary characters or a narrator, in individual citations, in epigraphs), and finally *hybridity 1*, or thinking on the basis of poetry (the development of

conceptual discourse in poetry and according to the logic of poetry: e.g., the philosophical lyric, the essayist novel, and metafiction);

5. *Poetry in thinking* is the second type of interweaving of the two modes of discourse in individual texts, in this case primarily thinking discourse: thinking appropriates poetic means; for example, the dialogue (for the perspectivization of knowledge, cognitive styles, and existential positions), metaphor, allegory, etymological figure, and word game (all supplanting discursive reasoning or semantically bridging the gaps of the unintelligible and the rationally unsayable), autobiography, personal experience, narrativity, genre modality (all for the intensification of the textual and speaker's persuasiveness, dependent more on ethical than on logical and gnoseological criteria). Among the types of this kind of interaction is *hybridity 2*, or poetry on the basis of thinking – this is the development of poetic discourse in thinking and through intentionality particular to thinking: for example, the Platonic dialogue, the essay, the romantic fragment, Nietzsche's "gay science," and feminist post-theory.

Hybridity of the first and second types according to this classification are only two of many possible forms of dialogue between thinking and poetry. It concerns texts that clearly cross genre-specific elements/structures derived from heterogeneous discourses – from literary creation and various disciplines of reflection. This kind of crossbreed becomes perceptible in texts only with the gradual realization of the difference between the two modes of discourse and their varieties. This occurred in antiquity with the process of departure from a mystical consciousness and with the formation of discrete skills, or arts (Greek *tékhnē*); the process is illustrated by the nine Greco-Roman Muses, who share a common genealogy but whose dominions are ever more clearly divided and specialized.<sup>13</sup> Since the Ancients, there have been a great many manifestations and types of hybridization of thinking with poetry; to name just a few: gnomes, maxims, fragments, philosophical dialogues, Menippean satire, poetics in verse, narrative allegory, philosophical parable or fable, reflexive poetry and narrative prose, the essay, the encyclopedic and essayist novel, metapoetry, metadrama, and metafiction.

## **The Romantic and Modern Matrix of Crossbreeds of Literature and Theory**

Theoretical-literary hybrids in *the narrow sense* began to surface from the 18th century onwards, when both literature and theory gradually established themselves as autonomous but interdependent discourses. Namely, the "literary field" (Bourdieu) was cognitively organized into a relatively autonomous whole of communicative phenomena, also thanks to the metalanguage referring to literary texts; literary theory grew from the traditions of this post-processing. On the other hand, at least until the last third of the 20th century, literary texts remained the referential basis without which metalanguage would have been unable to codify meaning and verify assertions.

The expressions "theory" and "literature" are used as early as in ancient Greek and Latin; in some European languages, for example English, the word "theory" was already evident in the late 16th century, in the sense of 'spiritual, conceptual observation, contemplation', 'conception or thought scheme, principles by which an activity behaves', and especially 'systems of ideas and assertions that explain a group of facts or phenomena.'<sup>14</sup> Today's notions of (literary) theory and literature, however, are specific cultural units, which developed only in the post-Enlightenment process of accelerated social modernization and functional differentiation. The basis of their interaction was the ideology of esthetics, which tried to ensure independent islands of art within the capitalist environment, the market, and other societal determinants: literati intentionally created texts of beauty, transcendence, and imagination, and theoreticians with their "intellectual point of view" as "the categorical imperative of any theory" (Schlegel, *Philosophical* 170; AF 76) explained how literature achieved this, and what the sense of this endeavor was.

Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy demonstrate that the bond of literature and (literary) theory was formed at the beginning of the 19th century, in Jena romanticism. The early works of the Schlegel brothers, Schelling, Novalis, Tieck, Schleiermacher, and others were labeled "theoretical romanticism," "the introduction of the theoretical project to literature" (9). Theoretical romanticism conceptually established literature as an absolute genre and an autonomous field of discourse – it created an awareness of literature as an art that was realized in words according to its own principles (Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy 11, 21): Friedrich Schlegel characteristically defined "poetry" as "a speech which is its own law and end unto itself" (Schlegel, *Philosophical* 150; KF 65). On the one hand, the Jena romantics shaped an identity for literature, this nascent cultural entity, with the help of criticism and "theory" (they were fond of this word),<sup>15</sup> whereas on the other hand, literature, with its self-reflection, was to "produce its own theory" within itself (Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy 22, 27). Thus literature, as verbal art, and its philosophical, esthetic theory, established themselves in interaction and mutual entanglement at the beginning of German romanticism. Writers expected philosophy to realize and complete itself as poetry (Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy 51), seeing in modern poetry "a running commentary on the following brief philosophical text" (Schlegel, *Philosophical* 157; KF 115). In his short fragments – which were structurally amongst the first prominent theoretical-literary hybrids to appear – Friedrich Schlegel specifically called for the interaction or joining of the two types of discourse:

... all art should become science and all science art; poetry and philosophy should be made one (KF 115; *Philosophical* 157). Romantic poetry is a progressive, universal poetry. Its aim isn't merely to reunite all the separate species of poetry and put poetry in touch with philosophy and rhetoric ... (AF 116; 175). The more poetry becomes science, the more it also becomes art. If poetry is to become art, if the artist is to have a thorough understanding and knowledge of his ends and means, his difficulties and his subjects, then the poet will have to philosophize about his art ... (AF 255; 199).<sup>16</sup>

For Schlegel, therefore, poetry's drawing near the essence of art is paradoxical, in that at the same time it approached the ideal of science, and thus discourse, which was at that very time establishing itself as the contrary of art and the free play of the imagination. By reaching for its opposite ("other"), poetry necessarily directed itself towards theory while forming its own identity. With theory, the writing subject becomes aware of his expressive means and the ends of writing. One of the possible ways for the writer to philosophize about his own art is also offered by self-reflection, grafted in a hybrid way within poetry itself – that is to say, by the self-reference of metapoetry. The latter unites "preliminaries of a theory of poetic creativity ... with artistic reflection and beautiful self-mirroring;" its task is to be "simultaneously poetry and the poetry of poetry" (Schlegel, *Philosophical* 195; AF 238).<sup>17</sup> It may be concluded that, on the threshold of romanticism, the artistic "essence" of poetry established itself precisely through its theory (within or next to poetry).

According to Weber's sociological research, such theorization is an example of the rationality that, during the process of modernization and functional differentiation of the capitalist social system, was also present in other fields, from everyday life, through economics and technology, to state administration, politics, and science. Rationalization is a type of legitimization that shook off the traditional dominance of various transcendental (religious, magical, metaphysical) justifications (cf. Weber xxxviii–xxxix, 30, 86, 95).<sup>18</sup> It became the guiding light of the "disenchanted world," which in the political, economic, and industrial revolutions of the 19th century was torn from a traditionalism in which everything had always seemed self-evident and given in advance (cf. Adam 210–214). In such a world, literature – until the 18th century placed in the lap of ceremony, conventions, sociability, and the *esprit de corps* of separated social states – had to invent languages and seek allied discourses on which it could base the sense of its autonomous existence in the capitalist marketplace and sharpen the feeling of its particularity in the eye of the general, anonymous public.

It is in romanticism that Badiou places the beginning of the "era of the poets," in which poetry started to lay claim to the role of philosophy, while the theory of art forced its way to the interior of art itself (Badiou and Ramond 67–71). The era of the poets, which lasts at least to Heidegger, is understood by Badiou as the synonym of modernity; the modern poem, for example a poem by Mallarmé, "identifies itself as a form of thought" (Badiou, *Handbook* 20). Because we still belong to an age that is unconsciously romantic (Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy 26), it is understandable that the principles of literary self-reflection, self-referentiality, and the hybrid joining of poetry and theory, as postulated by Schlegel in his fragments, were still intensively implemented in the modernism of the 20th century. The subject's artistic self-reflection, such as in Pound's cycle of poems *Hugh Selwyn Mauberly* and Joyce's novel *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, is one of the primary characteristics of modernism. Modernist poetry and the modernist novel also took up the role of philosophical thinking (for example, Rilke's *Duino Elegies*, Eliot's *Four Quartets*, or Broch's

*The Sleepwalkers*). Following the example of romanticism, other ties between literature and theory were also strengthened in modernism. This is witnessed by the connections between Russian formalism and futurism, New Criticism and imagism, or structuralism and the *nouveau roman*; theoreticians joined with writers and together collaborated in devising the poetics of individual movements, or they appeared themselves as writers and poets (and *vice versa*).

Because literary theory took its final shape in Russian formalism and only institutionalized itself in the mid 20th century – at least a century and a half after the introduction of the concept of artistic literature – it is of no surprise that works in which writers or theoreticians hybridized literature and (literary) theory began to accumulate from the mid 1960s. However, in many places, literary theory soon began to distance itself from its original subject and gradually transform into interdisciplinary, self-reflexive, and critical theory of the text, language, the subject, culture, history, and society – usually called simply “Theory.” Towards the end of the 20th century, Theory engaged with a broad range of subject areas and strove for the critical treatment of the fundamental issues of the human world. In so doing it usurped the territory of philosophy. Traces of the former ties of Theory to the treatment of literature are still evident in its exposure of language; Theory takes language and signs for the *clavis universalis*, the media that should determine all of the structures of the world, from the psychic to the social and political. With its departure from literature as a field of study, a noticeable part of such Theory became literary in a different way – because of characteristics of its own textual structures and manner of comprehension (cf. Culler). Following Nietzsche’s example, it imitated literary modes of discourse, its tropes and figures, its narrative, anecdotalism, fragmentariness, individual genre models, and perspectiveness, but above all its modal and non-discursive presentation of the truth and the precedence of rhetoric over logic (cf. Juvan, *Literarna veda* 29–44).

## **The Postmodern Literarization of Theory and Theorization of Literature**

Parallel to this “literarization of theory” there was a corresponding “theorization of literature.” It is necessary to view both processes in the light of the postmodern condition. Postmodernity is an umbrella term that also covers post-structuralism in philosophy/theory and postmodernism in art (Hassan 1–5). Post-structuralism influenced the literarization of theory in the field of thinking, whereas postmodernism influenced the theorization of literature in the field of art.

Theoretical-literary hybrids on a theoretical basis, whose authors were normally theoreticians, came to the fore in the postmodern for the many reasons I have already discussed in the introduction (relativism, the hybridity of identity, the breaking up of the grand Narratives, the transferal of knowledge across the borders of traditional disciplines, the modification

of textuality in digital media, etc.). The dissolution of the grand Narratives of rationality and science is most likely the main reason for the fact that Theory – already eclectically picking up concepts, methods, and expressions from disciplines of diverse origin – also began to copy *literary* discourse with considerable enthusiasm. The fall of the post-enlightenment belief that it is possible to express the understanding about individual fields of study in laws or empirically verifiable universal models, independent of the perspective of the individual researcher but able to be placed in the encyclopedic scheme of progressive knowledge, is easy to follow in the example of the passage of the structuralist theory of the (literary) text to the post-structural. This transition is best illustrated by Barthes' essays from the end of the 1960s to the mid 1970s, especially his encyclopedic contribution about the theory of the text (Barthes, "Theory of the Text", cf. Juvan, *Intertekstualnost* 95–100, 133–138).

Neither traditional humanities nor structuralism – the latter with its scientism tried to equate the humanities with strict science – questioned the scholarly and epistemic authority of their own language as they treated verbal artworks as objects. The post-structuralist theory of the text introduced by Barthes was, however, self-reflexive, and also critical towards the discourse of science. In line with Lacan's assertion that in psychoanalytical interpretation there is no metalanguage, Barthes claimed that the theory of the text cannot appropriate the status of a scientific language observing the primary language from a metaposition. Theory, just like its object (literature) is only a "textual praxis." Both modes of discourse are, along with their subjects, embroiled in the work of language and on language. Because each text, literary or theoretical, is, according to Barthes, "a fragment of language, itself placed in a perspective of languages," the epistemological distance between the object and the method is annulled. Thus, on the wavelength of Derrida's deconstruction of metaphysics, Barthes undermined the dominance of theoretical metalanguage over the truth of the text. Following Barthes, the theory of the text thus withdraws from the framework of ideographic and nomothetic sciences: it is not hindered by particular phenomena, as history is, nor by the formulation of common laws, as structural linguistics is, but follows the infinite "flow of becoming" of the historical world, as already circumscribed by Nietzsche (Barthes, "Theory" 45). From this it is possible to infer that the post-structuralism in Barthes' perspective changed the relation between literature and theory from hierarchic metatextuality to anarchic intertextuality. For this reason theory was able and justified to adopt literary techniques (Barthes, "Theory" 35, 43–44).

The idea of the impossibility of metalanguage thus shows the resignation over the grand narrative of modern rationality. This narrative was replaced by an insight that each and every form of knowledge is contingent, connected to the bodily, social, political, or other perspective of the acting individual ("agency"), to his/her placement in the socio-historical concreteness. Theoretical-literary hybrids with a theoretical basis enable theorists to self-reflect their discursive position and to contextualize the cognitive value of their assertions in their own living experience.



Theoretical-literary hybrids that came about in postmodernism on a *literary* basis, mainly under the pens of writers, continue and develop many symptoms of the modernist crossbreeding between thinking and poetry: self-reflexivity and self-reference, philosophical and scholarly essayism, abstract intellectualism, the montage of rough material concreteness with pure thought and concept, and also the mathematical principles of text structuration (seriality, combinations, and variations). However, the "theorization of literature," such as witnessed since the end of the 1960s, would not have come about without its contemporary theory. With the theory of text as open, intertextual, and hybrid structures, Barthes emphasized the open-endedness of meaning production, the transgressive circulation of writing over textual, generic, and disciplinary borders. He thus also rationalized and encouraged this kind of writing in theoretical and literary practice. It is well known that Barthes influenced Barth, a representative of American metafiction, and, along with the other French post-structuralists, supplied his postmodernist citatology with the conceptual basis of intertextuality (i.e., understanding the text as a mosaic of citations, transposed from heterogeneous sources);<sup>19</sup> Barthes' theorem about the equating of text and metatext cannot have been any less fertile for Barth, as it is realized in Barth's metafictional mingling of writing with the observation of this writing.

Before shedding light on postmodern theoretical-literary hybrids with the examples of Barthes and Barth, I must draw attention to one other decisive factor with which contemporary literary theory (and Theory) moderated the theorization of literature. Sociological research shows that in postmodern culture both the profession of writing and more demanding non-trivial contemporary literature are dependent on the university environment.<sup>20</sup> However, the university is also the seat of theoretical culture, and surely to a greater degree than of contemporary literature. For more than a decade we have heard the complaints that the university study of theory already almost supersedes the former occupation with literature, and that familiarity with the canon of theoreticians is more important than knowledge of ancient and modern literary classics. Theory has no doubt become the prominent discourse. Literature could ignore theory but, inasmuch as it feels connected to university culture, literature is actually forced to respond to theory.

Literary or theoretical hybrids, which have come about in the dialogues of modernist and postmodernist literature with modern and postmodern philosophy/theory since the 1960s, as sketched above, include works such as *Roland Barthes by Roland Barthes* (a self-reflexive dictionary of Barthes' ideas and viewpoints), *The Laugh of the Medusa* by Hélène Cixous (a treatment, advocacy, and at the same time staging of politically challenging polymorphic women's writing), Calvino's novel *If on a Winter's Night a Traveler* (the theory of reading and narrative genres grafted onto the meta-physical narrative), Quignard's *The Secret Life* (fragments of the theory of erotic discourse inhabiting an almost evaporated narrative structure of the love novel), and, in Slovenia, *Mesec dni z Ivanom Cankarjem, Martinom Kačurjem in Tarasom Kermaunerjem* (A Month with Ivan Cankar, Martin

Kačur, and Taras Kermauner – Kermauner's essayist weave of confession, autobiography, structural interpretations of Cankar and critical theories about national ideas), Grafenauer's *Štukature* (Stuccowork – metapoetic sonnets that draw from the dictionary of structural poetics, phenomenology, and Heidegger), and in recent times especially the poetry of Dekleva and Taja Kramberger, laced with references to the artistic and theoretical topics of postmodernism.

## Barthes/Barth

Finally, I examine the structure of postmodern theoretical-literary hybrids with a literary or theoretical dominant in two prototypical writings, in the pair Barthes/Barth. In Barthes' *A Lover's Discourse: Fragments* – the title evokes the tradition of a romantic hybrid; that is, the fragment – theoretical discourse and literary discourse restlessly cross each other throughout. That which one can find theoretical in this literary charming, intelligent, and moving text is above all the analytical modeling of eroticism, containing an incessant classification of love psychology and a typification of enamored behavior and discourse. Barthes' hybrid shows love partly through the structuralist-semiotic code: the writer behaves as kind of structuralist poetologist or rhetorician who presents the dictionary of the characteristic "figures" of love "discourse" and illustrates them in rational, almost scientific metalanguage, with interpretative commentary and citations from Goethe's *Werther*, an extremely emotionally charged novel. The theoretical subject of the text speaks from the point of view of an observer, reduced to pure rationality, his utterances grounded in the disciplines of psychoanalysis, semiotics, narratology, and so on. However, literary discourse is interwoven with theory in *Fragments*: the author's personal perspective, sensitivity, and sensually-bodily experience shines through the autobiographical first-person or third-person narrative (anecdotes of memories) and interferes in formulations of general models. As well as this, Barthes allows the argumentation, with a range of word games and figurative associations, to be structured along the (auto)poetic logic. The experiential I of the literary discourse is sublimated in a hybrid manner to the figure of the theoretician, whereas both positions are also observed from the point of view that oscillates in their fissure.

John Barth based his own *postmodernist* metafiction on Barthes' *post-structuralist* theory of the text. His short story *Title* is an open-ended fragment and prototype of the hybrid structure with a literary dominant. Barth's metafiction is an heir to the rich tradition of metaliterature, whereas its theoretical layer renovates principles of romantic irony in the manner of self-observation of the process of writing, which is described with some help of basic theoretical terminology ("plot and theme," "climax," "predicate adjective," "suspense," "literary genres," "dialogue," "monologue," "the novel," "the narrator," etc.). Barthes' hybrid, whose structural intention is theoretical, is oriented towards knowledge in the end, concerning itself with understanding – albeit unattainable, fantasmic – the truth of hu-

man relationships. The author is not just intellectually, but also bodily and experientially, caught up in the reality of these relationships. In contrast, the dominant of Barth's hybrid is literary. Here theoretical self-reflection serves the creation of tension, the building of intrigue and unfolding of a good story, thus serving the formation of interest that is directed to the imaginary, to the possible world of fiction.

In the play of the self-referentiality of words and sentences, and in the self-observing process of writing described with theoretical discourse, the traces of psychodynamics and sensually charged dialogue of the bickering lovers mix throughout. We could say that the "fragment of a lover's discourse," in the case of Barth's *Title*, is an emotional story that develops through the dramatic dialogues of a literary cultivated couple and unceasingly fiercely interferes in the narration through which this very story is being presented and, simultaneously, coolly self-described.

From these two mirroring examples it would be possible to infer that theoretical-literary hybrids are rather different from each other depending on whether they are written by a writer or a theoretician. Are theoreticians, in spite of their efforts at literarization, unable to hide their rationality, their knowledge-oriented interest? And are writers – although still theorizing – unable to depart from the ecstasy of "poetry"? Is it therefore necessary all the same to confirm Heidegger when he says of the writer and the thinker that "they dwell close on most distant mountains" (*nahe wohnen auf getrenntesten Bergen; Was ist Metaphysik* 51)?

Translated by Neville Hall

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> About this, cf. also Rickman 16, 23–25, 114–153; Courtois and Séité 9; Ancet 19.

<sup>2</sup> The otherwise clear and exact literary-historical survey »Literarne revije in programi« (Štuhec) for the period 1945–2000 does not describe this conflict.

<sup>3</sup> In the 1960s and 1970s, such viewpoints were largely introduced and supported by Pirjevec, especially in the essays collected in the books *Vprašanje o poeziji. Vprašanje naroda* and *Filozofija in umetnost in drugi spisi*.

<sup>4</sup> A characteristic and early example of this position is the unsigned manifesto essay "Umetnost, družba/tekst" from 1975.

<sup>5</sup> To these two schemata Badiou adds a third, intermediate one – the "classical schema" (with its beginnings in Aristotle): art mediates only a mimetic view of the truth, but its purpose is not a presentation of the truth but the ethical effect called "catharsis." In the 20th century, "Marxism is didactic, psychoanalysis classical, and Heideggerian hermeneutics romantic" (*Handbook* 5).

<sup>6</sup> On the connection between the post-structuralist text theory and theoretical-literary hybrids, see more below.

<sup>7</sup> »Aus der langbehüteten Sprachlosigkeit und aus der sorgfältigen Klärung des in ihr gelichteten Bereiches kommt das Sagen des Denkers. Von gleicher Herkunft ist das Nennen des Dichters ... das Dichten und das Denken aber am reinsten sich gleichen in der Sorgsamkeit des Wortes ...« (Heidegger, *Was ist Metaphysik* 50–51).

<sup>8</sup> »Inzwischen bleibt der Metaphysik während ihrer Geschichte von Anaximander bis zu Nietzsche die Wahrheit des Seins verborgen.« – »Einzig der Mensch unter allem Seienden erfährt, angerufen von der Stimme des Seins, das Wunder aller Wunder: *Daß Seiendes ist.*« (*Was ist Metaphysik* 11, 46–47)

<sup>9</sup> »Die Metaphysik ist im Denken an die Wahrheit des Seins überwunden.« (*Was ist Metaphysik* 9)

<sup>10</sup> The esthetic tradition, from the classics of Kant and Hegel to the contemporary concerns of Kristeva, also stresses the amalgamation of the emotional-bodily and the rational-spiritual in the esthetic event. To wit, in the socially determined language codes of the “symbolic,” which are actualized in the literary text, Kristeva discovers traces of the primordial, pre-linguistic signification open to the body; that is, “the semiotic;” the semiotic could be felt especially in rhythm (“Revolution in Poetic Language” 90–98). Similar statements can be found throughout: Ancet, for instance, thinks that “poetic writing” is imbued with “almost corporeal energy” or “a bodily charge;” for him, poetry is “the movement of the body in speech” (21–24); Likewise, Meschonnic holds that “the poem is an indicator of the passage between the body and speech” (Meschonnic and Courtois 78). More about the differences between literary and theoretical thinking below.

<sup>11</sup> Ancet and Bordes agree with this view. The former sees bodily energy in poetic writing, “which crosses all genres,” whereas in “poetic thought” a force that – in contrast to the connecting logic of philosophy – strives to discontinuity and fragmentariness (Ancet 21, 23). Also for Bordes, the poet’s word is fragmentary and chaotic, like ruins (36).

<sup>12</sup> Plato, at the beginnings of metaphysics, due to the capability of this awareness, assigned philosophers exclusive dominion over comprehending the truth; Badiou – as a post-metaphysical thinker – judged philosophical thought about the diversification of knowledge into disciplinary competences to have a more modest position: “Philosophy, or rather *a* philosophy, is always the elaboration of a category of truth. Philosophy does not itself produce any effective truth. It seizes truths, shows them, exposes them, announces that they exist” (*Handbook* 14).

<sup>13</sup> In Hesiod, who was probably the first to name them, their roles are not defined (*The Theogony* v. 1–103).

<sup>14</sup> The meaning and history of the word *theory* is taken from the online *Oxford English Dictionary* ([www.oed.com](http://www.oed.com)).

<sup>15</sup> In the 9th chapter of third part of her book of 1813, *De l’Allemagne* (II, 159–164), Mme de Staël commented on the fact that German literature and art were exceptionally attracted to philosophical ideas; in so doing she also used the expressions “theory,” “theory of literature,” and “literary theory” (*théorie littéraire*).

<sup>16</sup> »Alle Kunst soll Wissenschaft, und alle Wissenschaft soll Kunst werden; Poesie und Philosophie sollen vereinigt sein« (KF 115; *Kritische Schriften* 1, 249). »Die romantische Poesie ist eine progressive Universalpoesie. Ihre Bestimmung ist nicht bloß, alle getrennte Gattungen der Poesie wieder zu vereinigen, und die Poesie mit der Philosophie und Rhetorik in Berührung zu setzen ...« (AF116; KS 2, 114). »Je mehr die Poesie Wissenschaft wird, je mehr wird sie auch Kunst. Soll die Poesie Kunst werden, soll der Künstler von seinen Mitteln und seinen Zwecken, (ihren Hindernissen und ihren Gegenständen gründliche Einsicht und Wissenschaft haben,) so muß der Dichter über seine Kunst philosophieren ...« (AF 255; KS 2, 129)

<sup>17</sup> I have written extensively elsewhere about self-referential metapoetry in romanticism, for example that of Pushkin and Prešeren (Juvan, »Prešernova in Puškinova poezija o poeziji«).

<sup>18</sup> We understand rationalization both in the general meaning ‘the subsequent grounding and justifying of some event or fact’ whose sense is not given *a priori*, and

in Weber's specific explanation – as a belief that the subject can independently determine goals, decide how to achieve these goals, and calculate the profits and costs.

<sup>19</sup> About this report, among others, Aleš Debeljak and Manfred Pfister (see Juvan, *Intertekstualnost* 104–106).

<sup>20</sup> Writers are employed as professors of literature, or other humanistic or sociological subjects, or teach creative writing at universities; students and teachers read non-trivial contemporary literature predominantly for the needs of university lectures and seminars; if someone also follows such literature in their free time and outside the school and university system, he/she must be well-educated in order to understand its structures and multifarious references.

## WORKS CITED

- Adam, Frane. »K Webrovi Protestantski etiki in duhu kapitalizma« [On Weber's Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism]. Weber, Max. *Protestantska etika in duh kapitalizma*. Trans. Pavel Gantar and Štefan Vevar. Ljubljana: ŠKUC, Filozofska fakulteta, 1988. 209–224.
- [Anonim.] »Umetnost, družba/tekst: Nekaj pripomb o sedanjih razmerjih razrednega boja na področju književne produkcije in njenih ideologij« [Art, Society/Text: Some Remarks on the Present Situation of the Class Struggle in the Domains of Literary Production and Its Ideologies]. *Problemi – Razprave* 13.3–5 [147–149] (1975): 1–10.
- Ancet, Jacques. "La voix de la mer." *Europe* (Paris) 78.849–850 (2000): 19–31.
- Badiou, Alain. *Handbook of Inaesthetics*. Trans. Alberto Toscano. Stanford, CA: Stanford UP, 2005.
- Badiou, Alain and Charles Ramond. "La poésie en condition de la philosophie. Entretien avec A. Badiou." *Europe* (Paris) 78.849–850 (2000): 65–75.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Discourse in the Novel." *The Dialogic Imagination*. Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981. 259–422.
- Barth, John. "Title." *Lost in the Funhouse: Fiction for Print, Tape, Live Voice*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co., 1968. 105–113.
- Barthes, Roland. *Roland Barthes*. Trans. Richard Howard. New York: Hill and Wang, 1977.
- . *A Lover's Discourse: Fragments*. Trans. Richard Howard. New York: Hill and Wang, 1978.
- . "Theory of the Text." *Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader*. Ed. Robert Young. London: Routledge, 1981. 31–47.
- Bordes, Xavier. "Quand le poète montre la lune ...". *Europe* (Paris) 78.849–850 (2000): 32–40.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*. Trans. Susan Emanuel. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1996.
- Calvino, Italo. *Cosmicomics*. Trans. William Weaver. New York: Harcourt Brace & Co., 1968.
- . *If on a Winter's Night a Traveler*. Trans. William Weaver. New York: Harcourt Brace & Co., 1981.
- Cixous, Hélène. "The Laugh of the Medusa." *Feminism: An Anthology of Literary Theory and Criticism*. Revised ed. Eds. Robyn R. Warhol and Diane Price Herndl. Houndmills etc.: Macmillan Press, 1997. 347–362.
- Courtois, Jean-Patrice and Yannick Séité. "Littérature – philosophie." *Europe* (Paris) 78.849–850 (2000): 3–10.

- Culler, Jonathan. "The Literary in Theory." *What's Left of Theory: New Work on the Politics of Literary Theory*. Eds. Judith Butler et al. London and New York: Routledge, 2000. 273–290.
- Fowler, Alastair. *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
- Grafenauer, Niko. *Štukature* [Stuccowork]. Ljubljana: DZS, 1975.
- Haraway, Donna J. "A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and Socialist-Feminism in the Late Twentieth Century." *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. New York: Routledge, 1991. 149–181.
- Hassan, Ihab H. "From Postmodernism to Postmodernity: The Local/Global Context." *Philosophy and Literature* 25.1 (2001): 1–13.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Was ist Metaphysik?* 8th ed. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1960.
- . *Basic Writings*. Revised and expanded ed. Ed. and trans. David Farrell Krell. London and New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Hesiod. *Theogony*. Trans. Richard S. Caldwell. Cambridge, MA: Focus information Group, 1987.
- Horn, Eva, Bettine Menke, and Cristoph Menke, eds. *Literatur als Philosophie – Philosophie als Literatur*. Munich: W. Fink, 2006.
- Juvan, Marko. *Intertekstualnost* [Intertextuality]. Ljubljana: DZS, 2000.
- . »Prešernova in Puškinova poezija o poeziji« [Prešeren's and Pushkin's Poetry on Poetry]. *F. Prešeren – A. S. Puškin: Ob 200-letnici njunega rojstva*. Ed. Miha Javornik. Ljubljana: ZIFF, 2001. 43–71.
- . *Literarna veda v rekonstrukciji: Uvod v sodobni študij literature* [Literary Studies in Reconstruction: An Introduction to the Modern Study of Literature]. Ljubljana: LUD Literatura, 2006.
- Kermauner, Taras. *Mesec dni z Ivanom Cankarjem, Martinom Kačurjem in Tarasom Kermaunerjem ali O različnih dobrodejnih, še bolj pa o neblagih plateh slovenstva, o naši spodbudni tragikomediji* [A Month with Ivan Cankar, Martin Kačur, and Taras Kermauner ...]. Ljubljana, 1976.
- Kern, Andrea. »Zwei Seiten des Verstehens. Die philosophische Bedeutung von Kunstwerken.« *Literatur als Philosophie – Philosophie als Literatur*. Eds. Eva Horn et al. Munich: W. Fink, 2006. 57–79.
- Kristeva, Julia. "Revolution in Poetic Language." Trans. Margaret Waller. *The Kristeva Reader*. Ed. Toril Moi. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002. [1986]
- Littérature – Philosophie. *Europe* (Paris) 78.849–850 (2000): 3–310.
- Lacoue-Labarthe, Philippe and Jean-Luc Nancy. *L'Absolu littéraire: Théorie de la littérature du romantisme allemand*. Paris: Ed. du Seuil, 1978.
- Liotard, Jean-François. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Trans. Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.
- McLeod John. *Beginning Postcolonialism*. Manchester and New York: Manchester UP, 2000.
- Meschonnic, Henri and Jean-Patrice Courtois. "Poétique du poème et de la pensée. Entretien avec H. Meschonnic." *Europe* (Paris) 78.849–850 (2000): 76–82.
- Pirjevec, Dušan. *Vprašanje o poeziji. Vprašanje naroda* [The Question of Poetry. The Question of a Nation]. Ed. Rudi Šeligo. Maribor: Obzorja, 1978.
- . *Filozofija in umetnost in drugi spisi* [Philosophy and Art and Other Essays]. Ed. Igor Zabel. Ljubljana: Aleph, 1991.
- Plato. "Ion." Trans. Benjamin Jowett. *The Internet Classics Archive*. Ed. Daniel C. Stevenson. Web Atomics, 1994–2000. <http://classics.mit.edu/Plato/ion.1b.txt> [21 August 2006]



- Quignard, Pascal. *Vie secrète*. Paris: Gallimard, 1999.
- Rickman, Hans Peter. *Philosophy in Literature*. Madison, WI: Farleigh Dickinson UP, 1996.
- Schlegel, Friedrich. *Philosophical Fragments*. Trans. Peter Firchow. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1971.
- — —. *Kritische Schriften und Fragmente*. Studienausgabe. Vol. 1 [1794–1797]; Vol. 2 [1798–1801]. Eds. Ernst Behler and Hans Eichner. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1988.
- Staël, Madame de. *De l'Allemagne*. 2 vols. Paris: Garnier-Flammarion, 1997–98.
- Strniša, Gregor. *Vesolje* [The Universe]. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba, 1983.
- Štuhec, Miran. »Literarne revije in programi« [Literary Journals and Programs]. Pogačnik, Jože et al. *Slovenska književnost* III. Ljubljana: DZS, 2001. 469–508.
- Šuvaković, Miško. *Anatomija angelov: Razprave o umetnosti in teoriji v Sloveniji po letu 1960* [The Anatomy of Angels: Discussions on Art and Theory in Slovenia after 1960]. Trans. Vlasta Vičič. Ljubljana: Znanstveno in publicistično središče, 2001.
- Weber, Max. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Trans. Talcott Parsons. London and New York: Routledge, <sup>2</sup>2001. [<sup>1</sup>1992]
- Worton, Michael. "Between Poetry and Philosophy: René Char and Martin Heidegger." *Reconceptions: Reading Modern French Poetry*. Ed. Russell King and Bernard McGuirk. Nottingham: University of Nottingham Monographs in the Humanities, 1996. 137–157.