

# Literatura v kontekstu »evropskih« religij (predgovor)

Alen Širca

To tematsko številko so napisali sodelavci, ki prihajajo iz sorodnih panog oziroma raziskovalnih področij – predvsem filozofije, religiologije in literarne vede. Prispevki, ki so tu zbrani, skušajo podati nekatere poglavitne vodilne niti za sodobno raziskovanje tako na področju religiologije kot literarne vede, pri tem pa izhajajo iz zgodovinskega prikaza različnih presekov med literaturo in religijo v evropski kulturi.

Interdisciplinarno področje literarnega in religioznega oziroma duhovnega je znano po svoji težavnosti, da bi se ga mislilo stvari primerno, kolikor imamo opraviti z bližino dveh singularnosti. Religija je lahko na eni strani razumljena kot izvor tega, kar je bilo na Zahodu poimenovano kot literatura, vendar je na drugi strani težko spregledati dejstvo, da je v sodobnem evropskem prostoru religiozna vera (pa tudi duhovnost na splošno) dojeta kot neke vrste aberacija znotraj okvira človeške racionalnosti. Kakorkoli že, že sama ta ambivalenca je lahko poglavitna motivacija za temeljito in poglobljeno raziskovanje. Poleg tega menimo, da v slovenskem akademskem prostoru tej tematiki ni bilo namenjeno dovolj prostora.

Naš namen ni, da bi poskušali podati posebno opredelitev duhovnosti, vendar je uvodoma vendarle dobro poskušati razložiti, na kaj merimo s samim izrazom »duhovno«. Rečeno zelo na kratko, duhovno je skoraj sinonimno z »religioznim«, čeprav ga lahko mislimo kot instanco, ki presega stabilne kulturne in religijske meje. Zato duhovno ni nujno isto kot denominacijsko, konfesionalno, ali včasih celo ne kot religiozno *per se*. Rečeno zelo na splošno, duhovnost nima ničesar opraviti z ezoteričnim, hermetičnim, z vdorom čudežnega, nenavadnega. Še najboljše se zdi, da jo mislimo kot odprtost za vse razsežnosti človeškega bivanja in kot tako večinoma skladno s podedovanim védenjem, modrostjo, ki se je sedimentirala v t. i. duhovnih izročilih.

To nas privede do naslednjega pomembnega vprašanja, namreč kaj je (duhovno/religiozno) izročilo. Najprej lahko pojem izročila razumemo v »horizontalnem« smislu, ki je v skladu s historicistično koncepcijo zgodovine kot sukcesivnega napredka časa, epoh, obdobj. Druga možnost pa je, da izročilo razumemo »vertikalno«, kar pomeni

v navezavi na dogodek, ki presega vsakršno človeško anticipacijo in je kot tak transcendentalni pogoj zgodovine, se pravi, da konstituira samo predstavljalnost in misljivost linearnosti časa. Ta vidik bi lahko označili kot zgodovinskost (nekega izročila), ki tlakuje pot k specifičnemu razumevanju duhovne izkušnje. V jedru takšne izkušnje (ki je včasih imenovana tudi mistična) je vselej moment heterogenosti, ki si ga psihološka sfera človeške subjektivnosti ne more prilastiti, saj presega meje predstavljalnega, čiste imanence opisljivosti in se na ravni literarnih besedil manifestira kot erozija lingvističnih konstant. Duhovna izkušnja – ali prizadevanje zanjo – je bistvena odprtost za Drugega, zmožnost za transcendenco. V okviru religiologije je takšen pojem »povsem Drugega« (*das Ganz Andere*) vselej negativno opredeljen. Klasično formulacijo najdemo v delu *Sveto* (Vroclav 1917) izpod peresa Rudolfa Otta:

Sie [die Mystik] nennt es schließlich »das Nichts« selbst. Sie meint mit dem Nichts nicht nur das was durch nichts besagbar ist sondern das schlechthin und wesentlich Andere und Gegensätzliche zu allem was ist und gedacht werden kann. (34–35)

Nazadnje ga [mistika] imenuje čisti »nič«. S tem ničem ne misli samo tega, kar je povsem neizrekljivo, ampak tisto, kar je absolutno in bistveno drug(ačn)o in nasprotno vsemu, kar je in kar je mogoče misliti. (43)<sup>1</sup>

Čeprav nam najbrž ni uspelo podati celovite podobe evropskih duhovnih izročil, kot so se manifestirala v literaturi (to bi bilo preambiciozno), smo si skušali prizadevati za kar najbolj pluralno podobo zgodovinskega konteksta evropske duhovnosti. Poleg krščanstva smo vključili tudi vpliv judovske in islamske mistike na evropsko literaturo.

Zgradba tematske številke ni torej niti naključna niti izčrpna. Razprava Matica Kocijančiča se ukvarja s Sofoklesovo *Antigono* in tematizira najvplivnejše razlage vprašanja dvojnega pokopa, in sicer v psiholoških, teoloških in narativnih razsežnostih. Poleg tega pa obravnava tudi odločilno pomembnost tega vprašanja za sodobno misel o mestu realnosti v grški dramati. Borut Škodlar in Jan Ciglencečki se osredinjata na patristično in bizantinsko dediščino, in sicer ob branju Dionizija Areopagita in Janeza Klimaka, katerih dela označita za kenotično književnost. Izraz »kenotična« je treba misliti kot izpraznjenje sebstva in ta proces razumeti kot postopno opuščanje navezanosti na posebne dele narativnega jaza, ki učinkujejo kot motnje v obliki misli, idej, čustev, želj, skušnjav in strahov.

---

<sup>1</sup> Rudolf Otto. *Sveto. O iracionalnem v ideji božjega in njegovem razmerju do racionalnega*. Prevedel Tomo Virk. Ljubljana: Nova revija, 1993.

Potem se pomaknemo k srednjemu veku. Nena Bobovnik se ukvarja z mistično teologijo Nikolaja Kempfa, ki je deloval v kartuzijah Pleterje in Jurklošter na predvečer reformacije. Pri tem skuša pokazati, da je bilo njegovo delo povezano s t. i. rensko-flamsko mistiko in da je bil pomembna figura v okviru poznosrednjeveške mistike. Prispevek Neže Zajc se dotika vzhodnega krščanstva, in sicer podaja pregled teologije in duhovnost Maksima Greka in ima njegovo uporabo verzov iz izročila bizantinske himnografije za »veljaven uvod v izvirno slovansko poezijo v evropski renesansi«. Al-Daghistani v svojem prispevku o islamski mistiki raziskuje vpliv Hafiza na Goetheja. Poleg tega meni, da je predvsem estetska razsežnost *Korana* bila tista, ki je pomembno prispevala k ustvarjalnosti največjega nemškega pesnika.

Razprava Blaža Zabela nas opomni na t. i. mistiko narave, razumljeno kot izkušnja izvorne enosti z Naravo. Kot dokazuje avtor, so bralne prakse Homerja vplivale na romantično dojetje antike kot dobe, ko je bila primordialna enost z Naravo še možna. Milosav Gudović posega po primerjalnem branju dveh velikih literatov 19. stoletja: Hölderlina in Dostojevskega. Njegov pristop k besedilni analizi se napaja iz fenomenološko-hermenevtične tradicije. V svojem poglobljenem branju ključnih podob in metafor obeh piscev vzpostavlja pogoje možnost za »kenotično« interpretacijo literarnega.

Čeprav se je judovska mistika odvijala na robovih evropske kulturne zgodovine, je to vendarle pomembna tema pri nekaterih sodobnih piscih. Vid Snoj v svojem eseju o Celanu, ki v sodobni literarni vedi velja za enega izmed najprominentnejših literatorov po drugi svetovni vojni, ugotavlja, da se je Celan v svojem »Psalmu«, ko imenuje Boga Nihče, morda opiral na kabalo. Martin Uranič se osredotoča na razlago slovitega romana *Neznosna lahkost bivanja*. Pri tem se navezuje na Nietzscheja in ugotavlja, da nas »dihotomija med lahkostjo in težino vabi k temu, da na novo premislimo evropsko duhovno izročilo, ki se, kolikor izhaja iz starogrških korenin, giblje znotraj Platonove *chorismós* med umskim svetom zunajzaznavnih idej in votlinskega sveta zaznavnega izkustva«.

V sklepnem eseju nas Dejan Kos sooči z refleksijo o izvorih poezije, kot jih najdemo v evropski misli. Kos se zavzema za tisto razumevanje izvorov, ki presega logiko kavzalnosti in ontologije in zaključí z uvidom: »Evropska poezija je vseskozi ohranila elementarno povezavo s svojim duhovnim izvorom. To pa se ne razodeva samo na ezoteričnih robovih literarnih izročil, ampak v vseh njenih plateh in še zlasti v njenih vrhovih.«



# Literature in the Context of “European” Religions (An Introduction)

Alen Širca

This thematic issue has been written by colleagues in related areas or research fields – especially philosophy, religious studies, and literary criticism. Elaborating on historical account of various cross-sections of literature and religion in European culture, the contributions seek to give some significant guidelines for contemporary investigation both in religious studies and literary criticism.

The interdisciplinary field of literary and religious or spiritual is known for difficulty to be thought of adequately, to the extent that we are dealing with the proximity of two singularities. Religion could be, on the one hand, thought of as the source of what in the West became to be signified as literature, yet on the other hand it is hard to ignore the fact that in contemporary European culture religious beliefs (and spirituality in general) are treated as a sort of aberration within the framework of human rationality. Yet this ambivalence can itself be seen as primary motivation for a thorough and deepened survey. Furthermore, we believe that not enough attention has been given to the topic in Slovene academia.

We are not in any way attempting to impose a special definition of spirituality, but for the sake of this introduction, we must at least attempt to explain what we mean by the term “spiritual”. To put it shortly: spiritual has to be taken as almost synonymous to “religious”, albeit it can be reflected upon as transcending stable cultural and religious boundaries. Thus, spiritual is not necessarily denominational, or confessional, and sometimes not even religious per se. Broadly speaking, spirituality is essentially existential phenomenon, yet never being merely a subjective appropriation of religion. Moreover, spirituality has nothing to do with the esoteric, hermetic, the intrusion of marvelous, extraordinary. It can be safely thought of as an openness to all dimensions of human existence, and as such is chiefly in accordance with inherited knowledge, wisdom, that has sedimentated in the so-called spiritual traditions.

This brings us to another important question – what is (spiritual/religious) tradition? Firstly, there is something that we might call “hori-

zontal” notion of tradition that is attuned to the historicist conception of history as successive progression of time, epoch, and periods. The other option is to consider tradition “vertically” that is as linked to *event* that exceeds all human anticipation and as such functions as transcendental condition of history, i.e. renders the linearity of time representable and thinkable in the first place. This aspect may be designated as historicity (of tradition), and paves the way to a more determined understanding of spiritual experience. At the core of such experience (sometimes even called mystical) is a moment of heterogeneity that cannot be appropriated by psychological sphere of human subjectivity as it exceeds the boundaries of representational, the sheer immanence of describability, and is manifested as an erosion of linguistic constants at the level of literary texts. The spiritual experience – or the striving after such experience – is essentially an openness for the Other, a capacity for transcendence. Within the religious studies the notion of this *Ganz Andere* was defined negatively. Classic formulation is given by Rudolf Otto in *Das Heilige* (Breslau 1917):

Sie [die Mystik] nennt es schließlich “das Nichts” selbst. Sie meint mit dem Nichts nicht nur das was durch nichts besagbar ist sondern das schlechthin und wesentlich Andere und Gegensätzliche zu allem was ist und gedacht werden kann. (34–35)

While we may not have succeeded to give comprehensive picture of European spiritual traditions as they are manifested in literature (that would be too ambitious), yet to a various degree we have attempted to pluralize, as much it was possible, the historical context of European spirituality. Besides Christianity, we have been able to include the influence of Jewish and Muslim mysticism on European literature.

However, the structure of this issue is neither haphazard nor exhaustive. The first essay, by Matic Kocijančič, deals with Sophocles’s *Antigone* and discusses the most influential interpretations of the question of the double burial in its psychological, theological and narrative dimensions, and the decisive importance of this question for contemporary thought on the place of reality in Greek drama.

Next, Borut Škodlar and Jan Ciglencečki focus on the patristic and Byzantine spiritual heritages. They engage in special reading of Dionysius the Areopagite and John Climacus and define their works as kenotic literature. The term “kenotic” should be linked with emptying of oneself, and this process is characterized as gradual abandoning of the attachment to particular parts of narrative self, which func-

tion as disturbances in the form of thoughts, ideas, emotions, wishes, temptations and fears.

Then we move on to Middle Ages. Nena Bobovnik explores the mystical theology of Nikolaus Kempf which *flourished* in charterhouses of Pleterje and Jurklošter at the eve of the Reformation. She attempts to demonstrate that his work was also related to the Rhineland and Flemish mysticism and that Kempf was important figure in the mysticism of late medieval West. The essay of Zajc touches on Eastern Christianity. She provides an overview of the theology and spirituality of Maxim the Greek, and considers his use of the verses from the tradition of Byzantine hymnography as a “valid introduction to the original Slavonic spiritual poetry in the European Renaissance”. Islamic mysticism, which has been important for European culture in many ways, is explored by Raid al-Daghistani. In his essay he is suggesting that Goethe was influenced especially by the aesthetic dimension of *Quran*.

Next essay, by Blaž Zabel, reminds us of the so-called Nature mysticism, understood as primordial oneness with Nature. He demonstrates that reading practices of Homer influenced romantic understanding of antiquity as a period when primordial oneness with Nature was still possible. Milosav Gudović engages in comparative reading of the two great literary figures of the nineteenth century, Hölderlin and Dostoevsky. His approach to the textual analysis draws on phenomenological and hermeneutical tradition. In his detailed reading of key images and metaphors of both authors, he opens up the possibility of “kenotic” interpretation of the literary.

Although Jewish mysticism took place on the fringes of European culture and history, it is an important theme for some contemporary writers. In his essay on one of the most prominent modernist poets as proclaimed by the current scholarship, Paul Celan, Vid Snoj argues that Celan, especially in his “Psalm”, when God is addressed as No One, may pursue Kabbalah. Martin Uranič focuses on interpretation of Kundera’s famous novel *The Unbearable Lightness of Being*, while he draws on Nietzsche. As he writes: “The dichotomy of lightness and weight invites us to rethink the European spiritual tradition, which, stemming from its ancient Greek origins, moves within Plato’s *chorismos* between the intelligible world of extrasensory ideas and the cave world of sensory experience.”

In the final essay, Dejan Kos faces us with reflexion on the origin of poetry as has been expounded in European thought. He is opting for an understanding of origins that go beyond causality and ontology. Kos concludes with the insightful statement: “European poetry always

preserves elementary connection with its spiritual source. And this does not appear only on esoteric fringes of literary traditions, but in all their layers and especially in their summits.”