
**Slovenian Sociology of
Literature and Slovenian
National Poet:
France Prešeren
between the Partisans,
Dissidents and Theorists**

In the 1960s, Boris Zihlerl provided Slovenian sociology with its theoretical and institutional foundations—historical materialism and an academic department. After Zihlerl, however, the two foundations have only grown apart, so much so that two recent studies had to assume an anti-institutional perspective to reaffirm (Zihlerl's) historical materialism. Both these texts—Miklavž Komelj's book on Slovenian Partisan art and Rastko Močnik's book on Prešeren studies—intervene in Slovenian sociology of literature, which Zihlerl helped found as well. I will hence address the key field shared by Slovenian sociology and literary criticism: Prešeren studies. Zihlerl's view of Slovenian national poet France Prešeren was formed during and post WWII. His interwar Prešeren is an adversary of German Romanticism, and his post-war Prešeren is an ally of Hegel's anti-Romanticism. I will read the former with Komelj's Zihlerl, and the latter, with Močnik's.

SLOVENIAN SOCIOLOGY,
PREŠEREN STUDIES, BORIS ZIHERL,
RASTKO MOČNIK, MIKLAVŽ KOMELJ,
DUŠAN PIRJEVEC

В 1960-е гг. Борис Зихерл дал словенской социологии её теоретическое и институциональное основание: исторический материализм и университетскую кафедру. Но после Зихерла эти основания настолько разошлись, что две недавние реактуализации исторического материализма Зихерла не могли не быть анти-институциональными. Оба эти текста — книга Миклавжа Комеля об искусстве словенских партизан и книга Растко Мочника о прешерноведении — интервенируют в словенскую социологию литературы, пионером которой также является Зихерл. Эта статья посвящена прешерноведению как точке пересечения словенской социологии и литературоведения. Подход Зихерла к словенскому национальному поэту Прешерну формировался во время и после Второй мировой войны. Во время войны Зихерл считал Прешерна противником немецкого романтизма, а после войны сторонником антиромантизма Гегеля. В статье первый Прешерен читается на фоне Комеля — второй на фоне Мочника.

СЛОВЕНСКАЯ СОЦИОЛОГИЯ,
ПРЕШЕРНОВЕДЕНИЕ, БОРИС ЗИХЕРЛ,
РАСТКО МОЧНИК, МИКЛАВЖ
КОМЕЛЬ, ДУШАН ПИРЬВЕЦ

1 This paradoxical role of historical materialism as both foundation and lacuna of the Department of Sociology at the Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana is addressed in Rastko Močnik's recent study on historical materialism and sociology of culture in Slovenia (Močnik, 'Od historičnega materializma' 139). The study appeared in the volume dedicated to the fiftieth anniversary of the Department, which was also the occasion for which I wrote the Slovenian-language version of this article, which was published in a special section of essays on Slovenian sociology of culture that I co-edited, with Rastko Močnik, as issue 1 of volume 7 (2013) of *Arts & Humanitas*.

Two decades ago, marking the thirtieth anniversary of the Slovenian Sociological Association, Marko Kerševan (444–6) noted that Slovenian sociology, though being practised in important ways already in the early twentieth century by such researchers as Andrej Gosar, Aleš Ušeničnik and Janez Evangelist Krek, received its theoretical and institutional foundations only after World War II, when Boris Zihlerl provided it with its theoretical and institutional foundations: historical materialism and an academic department.

Today, in the fifty-second year of the Association's existence, it seems that after Zihlerl the two foundations—historical materialism and the academic department—have only been growing apart. This growing apart, however, has been not only temporal but, first and foremost, structural.¹ It has often taken the shape of institutional ignorance of Zihlerl's legacy. It is then no coincidence that this legacy was recently revitalised in view of historical materialism by a pair of texts that assume an anti-institutional perspective, namely Miklavž Komelj's book *Kako misliti partizansko umetnost?* (How to Think the Partisan Art?) and Rastko Močnik's book *Julija Primic v slovenski književni vedi* (Julija Primic in Slovenian Literary Studies). Both these texts intervene mostly in sociology of literature, a discipline whose Slovenian version was importantly developed by Zihlerl as well. Let us therefore take a look at the most important intersection of sociology and literary studies in Slovenia, namely Prešeren studies.

ZIHERL'S INTERWAR PREŠEREN

Zihlerl's approach to France Prešeren, the Slovenian national poet celebrated for his Romantic poetry and nation-building, is formed during and in the years after World War II. In what follows, Zihlerl's writings

on Prešeren will be read against the background of the two above-mentioned reactualisations of Zihelr: his interwar Prešeren will be read via Komelj's book, while his post-war Prešeren will be viewed through Močnik's.

The specificity of Zihelr's interwar Prešeren can best be demonstrated in relation to the two kinds of contemporaneous readings of Prešeren that resemble Zihelr's the most and which are documented and interpreted in Komelj's book as well. Both approaches to Prešeren register and then undo Prešeren's metaphoricity. In the first kind of interwar readings of Prešeren, this metaphoricity is undone in the sense that it is understood as realised in the ongoing People's Liberation Struggle; and in the second kind of readings, Prešeren's metaphoric language is simply read non-metaphorically. What Komelj does is to show that the truth of both interwar approaches to Prešeren lies in their respective negation. When the first approach, as it was practised, say, by Matej Bor, sees in Prešeren a Partisan *avant la lettre*, a Romantic poet who foresaw the liberation of the Slovenian national soul, it simultaneously romanticises the Partisans and thus effectively negates itself (Komelj 305). And the second approach to Prešeren is represented, say, by the following demand made by Josip Vidmar: 'Anything incomprehensible to the masses must go. ... Think of Pushkin! There is no metaphoricity there. Or think of Prešeren!'—a demand, that is, that is negated by Vidmar's own public defence of the "freedom of art" in the face of political decrees' (Komelj 218 n. 47).² So, when Bor reduces Prešeren's metaphoric language to a prophecy of the People's Liberation Struggle, he in fact reduces the Struggle itself to Romanticism; and when Vidmar refuses to even acknowledge the metaphorical dimension in Prešeren, he only reiterates *per negationem* the abstract character of his aestheticist defence of art against politics.

2
In Pushkin's case, this negation is demonstrated also by Močnik (*Spisi* 105-7), according to whom the metaphor-free pronoun poem *Ja vas ljubil ...* (*I Loved You Once ...*) is readable only from God's point of view.

3

In the same year of 1957, working in a similar strand of humanist Marxism, Theodor W. Adorno returned to Hegel himself from the perspective of this kind of turn:

A historical occasion like the 125th anniversary of Hegel's death could have elicited what we call an 'appreciation.' But that concept has become untenable, if indeed it ever had any value. It makes the impudent claim that because one has the dubious good fortune to live later, and because one has a professional interest in the person one is to talk about, one can sovereignly assign the dead person his place, thereby in some sense elevating oneself above him. This arrogance echoes in the loathsome question of what in Kant, and now Hegel as well, has any meaning for the present. . . . The converse question is not even raised: what the present means in the face of Hegel; whether perhaps the reason one imagines one has attained since Hegel's absolute reason has not in fact long since regressed behind the latter and accommodated to what merely exists, when Hegelian reason tried to set the burden of existence in motion through the reason that obtains even in what exists. (Adorno 1)

If we read these two kinds of interpretations of Prešeren together, as two kinds of undoing of his metaphoric language, we can begin to see the originality of Zihlerl's Prešeren. According to Zihlerl, an anti-fascist poem can reach the level of Prešeren's poetry even though—rather than insofar—it is metaphor-free: of concentration-camp sonnets he says that a '[m]eticulous critic and aesthete' might notice 'poor vocabulary and overrepetition, whereas we sense in these verses the spirit of Prešeren', which 'nevertheless was able to dictate to the author a beautiful sonnet' (quoted in Komelj 138 n. 10). As for Prešeren and the People's Liberation Struggle, Zihlerl sees in Prešeren not a prophet of the People's Liberation Struggle but a poet engaged in the struggle against Novalis's 'reactionary Romanticism' (quoted in Komelj 289 n. 5), a struggle that Prešeren is said to have fought in his own time and in his own, poetic field.

In other words, Bor's Prešeren is a proto-Partisan (which implies that the Partisans are merely Romantics in action), and Vidmar's a proto-socialist realist poet (which implies that socialist realism is only a Romanticism without metaphors). Zihlerl's Prešeren, on the other hand, is a 'revolutionary Romantic' (quoted in Komelj 289 n. 5) who joins Shelley and Byron in their struggle against the reactionary nature of Romantic poetry. And precisely insofar as Prešeren was a revolutionary in his own time and in his own field, the turn of Partisan poets to his poetry was 'healthy', according to Zihlerl (quoted in Komelj 467). Moreover, even when he comes closest to the so-called theory of reflection, Zihlerl remains at the level of poetry: in 1944, he demands tendentiousness of poets, but only because he dialectically inscribes in reality itself a tendency worthy of progressive poetry: 'Reality itself is full of tendentiousness. As soon as the tendency is depicted in a beautiful and faithful manner, it will itself begin to speak

for the proletariat. ... The tendency needs to be recognised as part of social processes itself, rather than following the old black-and-white model.' (Quoted in Komelj 356 n. 10) Whereas both the Proletkult of the interwar Vidmar and the *fin-de-siècle* aesthetic of the post-war Vidmar see in the subject a substance, Zihlerl presupposes, in a uniquely Hegelian gesture, that the substance itself is the subject, that reality itself is tendentious.

ZIHERL'S POST-WAR PREŠEREN

It seems, then, that Zihlerl's interwar Prešeren is a poet and hence an adversary of German Romanticism. After WWII, however, Prešeren becomes for Zihlerl a thinker and as such an ally of the chief philosophical adversary of German Romanticism, namely Hegel. This shift occurs in Zihlerl's 1949 paper 'France Prešeren—pesnik in mislec' (France Prešeren—Poet and Thinker) and is recapitulated in his 1964 paper 'Hegel in Prešernov krog' (Hegel and the Prešeren Circle). Furthermore, Zihlerl speaks about Prešeren's 'humanist and democratic thought' (*Književnost* 259–60) also in his 1952 article 'Ob Prešernovem dnevu' (On the Prešeren Day), where he rejects the Zhdanovite as well as the Sartrean deviations in Slovenian literature of the time, introducing the article with the following dialectical turn of historicism: '[O]n this [Prešeren] day, we should not be speaking *only* about what Prešeren has given us. We should *also* be speaking about what exactly is our relation to Prešeren and to his spirit.' (Zihlerl, *Književnost* 257)³

Here, Zihlerl clearly portrays Prešeren as a thinker in order to intervene in the contemporary intellectual conjuncture. This agenda is, however, even more obvious in the other two post-war papers mentioned above.⁴ Of these two, the 1949 paper offers the best example

4
In the conclusion of the latter of the two papers, Zihlerl himself reflects on this, at least insofar as his reading of Prešeren as a progressive thinker is concerned:

When I took on the task of ... saying something about Hegel's influence on Slovenian poetry of the first half of the nineteenth century, I did not intend to provide philosophical analyses of individual poems. What I wanted was, first and foremost, to stress the fact that even in Slovenian history Hegel's dialectical thought ... produced revolutionary effects, providing the intellectual representatives of the most progressive strata of Slovenian society with a powerful tool in their search of productive solutions to the problems of their time. (Zihlerl, O humanizmu 194)

of Zihlerl's ungrounded transition from a discussion of Prešeren to a critique of his own contemporaries. In this particular case, Zihlerl dismisses the Leftism of Ivan Prijatelj, the central interwar literary and cultural historian in Slovenia, by supplementing a discussion of one of Prešeren's epigrams with the following footnote: 'The late Ivan Prijatelj was wrong to attempt to prove Prešeren's evolution from Hegelianism through Young Hegelianism to Feuerbachianism on the basis of the dialectic of this epigram... . As we know, one of the main inadequacies of Feuerbach's philosophy was to throw out Hegel's progressive dialectical method together with his idealist mysticism.' (Zihlerl, 'France Prešeren' 303, n. *****) It is clear that Prešeren serves Zihlerl here as a pre-text for a pressing Marxian epistemological debate; in other words, Prešeren is here an excuse for such a debate and at the same time a basis for it, a basis the dialectical character of which is obvious, according to Zihlerl, even to someone who, like Prijatelj, is blind to the flaws in the dialectics of Feuerbach's philosophy.

THE RECEPTION OF ZIHERL'S PREŠEREN IN PREŠEREN STUDIES

By 1969, this kind of mobilisation of Prešeren is given a label that institutional Prešeren studies will not be able to get rid off to this day (just as institutional ignorance of Zihlerl's legacy will not cease to separate that which he brought together, namely historical materialism and an academic department at Ljubljana). This label is the 'Prešernian structure'. In the essay 'Vprašanje o poeziji' (The Question Concerning Poetry), Dušan Pirjevec introduces the 'Prešernian structure' to name the instrumentalisation of literature for Slovenian nation-building. This instrumentalisation is said to structure the entire first century of interpretations of Prešeren, a conjuncture supplemented and tran-

scended by Janko Kos's 1966 book *Prešernov pesniški razvoj* (Prešeren's Poetic Development), the first systematic and non-contradictory study of Prešeren, according to Pirjevec (55–6). As an alternative to the Prešernian structure, due to which the works of Prešeren, but also of writers and essayists Fran Levstik and Cankar, had been read as representations of the spirit of the nation, Pirjevec senses in his own time the emergence of literature as an autonomous play free of any ideological demand. Or this is at least how Pirjevec's essay was understood in the by then more or less postmodern mainstream. This understanding of Pirjevec culminates in 1986, when sociologist and writer Dimitrij Rupel publishes the book *Sociologija kulture in umetnosti* (Sociology of Culture and Art). Pirjevec's rejection of Marxism on behalf of phenomenology is made explicit and even personified by Rupel, who discards Zihlerl in the name of Vidmar (Rupel 41–51) and even Pirjevec himself (97–104). Pirjevec rejects Marxism as a charismatic Heideggerian professor of Comparative Literature and as a former Partisan political commissar; Rupel, on the other hand, rejects Marxism as a conservative professor of Sociology and a soon-to-be foreign minister of the Republic of Slovenia. The former reproduces the Yugoslav nationalist cultural politics; the latter reproduces the Slovenian post-socialist identity politics.

In the 1969 essay, Pirjevec quotes in passing Vidmar's claim that Vladimir Nazor, Croatian writer and President of the State Anti-fascist Council for the National Liberation of Croatia (ZAVNOH), said the following as he was skimming through Prešeren's book of poetry: 'This one created the Slovenian nation.' (Pirjevec 56) Neither Vidmar nor Pirjevec valorise this statement. Even Rupel is silent on the matter, even though all he had to do was to apply a concept that was already produced.⁵ For in 1981, Rastko Močnik introduces in Prešeren studies the idea of the Slovenian as a presupposition of a text on a Slovenian

5 With some charity of interpretation, we could find a proto-concept already in Zihlerl's text. According to Zihlerl, Prešeren thought that the so-called Illyrian movement was an unrealisable project and that, if it were to be realised, ought to be stopped in the name of the construction of the national language (Zihlerl, 'France Prešeren' 314). In other words, that which is unrealisable has to be prevented if it is realised. Now, in structural anthropology the act of preventing the unrealisable has the status of the prohibition of the impossible, the paradigmatic case of which is incest taboo, the prohibition that interpellates its addressee precisely into the national language as a key social institution.

(Močnik, *Mesčevo zlato* 36–9). Thus, the materialism and the Hegelian dialectic that Zihlerl ascribes to Prešeren the thinker Močnik locates in Prešeren's text (ibid. 113). As a consequence, after Bor, Vidmar and Zihlerl himself, Prešeren's metaphoricity can now finally be interpreted. This metaphoricity is generated out of itself, according to Močnik, as the result of the work of linguistic oppositions themselves, which undo themselves by reappearing at higher levels of the text, where they lay bare the work they did at lower levels. This work is condensed in Prešeren's metaphors, which are elliptical and as such invite the addressee to supplement and saturate them with his or her own spontaneous knowledge, that is, the knowledge contained in the language that serves as the material of the text itself. (Močnik, *Mesčevo zlato* 103–6) The ideological moment lies no longer in the Prešernian structure, in the political appropriation of Prešeren, but, on the contrary, in the open, elliptical, non-saturated structure of Prešernian texts. The poetic polysemy that Pirjevec was said to regard as that which will succeed the Prešernian structure is reconnected, by Močnik, with Zihlerl's problematic of the relationship between poetry and ideology. Polysemy is no longer a projected alternative to ideology, but a key to it.

In his 2006 book *Julija Primic v slovenski književni vedi*, Močnik returns to this interpretation of Prešeren's texts, adding a defence of Zihlerl's Prešeren as well as a critique of the contemporary global disintegration of the national type of the social bond. He returns to what Rupel saw as an antagonism between Zihlerl and Vidmar, without, however, starting from the notion of the Prešernian structure. On the contrary, Močnik shows that Zihlerl intervened in Prešeren studies as a discipline, more precisely, in both the liberal and the clericalist readings of Prešeren's main text, *Krst pri Savici* (The Baptism on the Savica), readings that had been reproducing the national canon in

their very antagonism (Močnik, *Julija* 147–9). As an intervention in the pre-theoretical institution of the canon, Zihlerl's interpretation of *The Baptism* therefore could not have been pre-theoretical. At the same time, however, it had to be pre-theoretical; Zihlerl had to remain 'a prisoner of the old Marxism who, for instance, referred neither to Russian Formalists nor to their Marxist adversaries of the 1920s' (ibid. 162), insofar as he was left 'without an interlocutor' (ibid. 161), without a theoretical response that could force him into a dialogic refraction of his merely punctual, philosophical intervention.⁶

ZIHERL WITHOUT AN INTERLOCUTOR

Thus, the reception of Zihlerl's Prešeren can be delimited by referring to two extremes: Močnik's 2006 book on the treatment of Prešeren's muse and unrequited love, *Julija Primic*, in Slovenian literary studies, on the one hand, and Slovenian literary studies itself, on the other; that is, a book on Slovenian literary studies, at one extreme, and Slovenian literary studies, at the other. In other words, the reception of Zihlerl's Prešeren varies between positive and negative readings of Zihlerl. Furthermore, both predicates, the 'positive' and the 'negative', apply both at the level of the enunciated (*énoncé*) and the level of enunciation (*énonciation*). Močnik's reception of Zihlerl is a positive one both at the level of enunciation, the level at which he actually acknowledges Zihlerl's reading of Prešeren, and at the level of the enunciated, where he generally agrees with this reading. And vice versa, the reception of Zihlerl's reading of Prešeren in Slovenian literary studies is a negative one at the level of enunciation, where it refuses to acknowledge this reading, and, consequently, at the level of the enunciated, where there

6 Moreover, even when the historical materialist interpretation of Prešeren developed by Močnik in 1981 replaces the humanist problematic with a theoretical conceptualisation of ideological interpellation, Prešeren studies (as represented by Marko Juvan's articles on the modernity of *The Baptism*: see Juvan 'The Nation' 389 and Juvan, 'Modernost' 357–8) registers this conceptualisation only indirectly, by referring only to a punctual, philosophical intervention in the problematic of interpellation in *The Baptism* (as outlined by Slavoj Žižek: Žižek 34–9).

7

With the exception, that is, of reviews of Močnik's book by Jelka Kernev-Štrajn, Matej Krajnc and Maša Ogrizek (see Kernev-Štrajn, Krajnc and Ogrizek respectively), and references to the book in Maja Čakarič's interview with Juvan ('Figura') and in Marijan Dovič's article on the so-called Slovenian cultural syndrome (Dovič 207). Outside Slovenian literary studies, an epistemological commentary of Močnik's book is provided by Primož Krašovec (Krašovec).

simply is nothing enunciated about Zihlerl's Prešeren in Slovenian literary studies.

This opposition between Močnik's book on Julija Primic in Slovenian literary studies and Slovenian literary studies itself—the opposition between, at one extreme, enunciating and enunciated acceptance of Zihlerl and, at the other, enunciating and enunciated rejection of Zihlerl—is also what overdetermines the mutual reception of Močnik's book and Slovenian literary studies. Here, too, there is the opposition between a positive and a negative reception, but there is no more unity of enunciation and the enunciated. For Močnik's reception of Slovenian literary studies is a positive one only in its enunciation, where it actually acknowledges Slovenian literary studies post Zihlerl, while being a negative one at the level of the enunciated, where it treats Slovenian literary studies as an epistemological obstacle. The reception of Močnik's book in Slovenian literary studies, on the other hand, is a negative one both at the level of enunciation, where the book remains unacknowledged, and at the level of the enunciated, where, as a consequence, there is nothing enunciated about the book.⁷

So, for Močnik, Zihlerl's Prešeren is productive, whereas Slovenian literary studies after Zihlerl is ignorant of Zihlerl and as such unproductive. Which implies that for Močnik, Slovenian literary studies is also ignorant of him (which in turn implies that Miklavž Komelj's engagement with Močnik's reading of the Partisan art, as published in this volume, is truly unique). Thus, Močnik's about-quoted proposition about 'Zihlerl without an interlocutor' is an implicit proposition about, as it were, *Močnik without an interlocutor*. Now, this claim puts us in the position of someone who merely makes a clearly implied proposition explicit. In general, such a position is, of course, redundant, if not tautological. But in our case the position is one of explicitly stat-

ing precisely that Močnik is without an interlocutor, that is, without anyone who would be able to acknowledge his implication and then reject as redundant or even tautological the position of making this implication explicit. So, what is made explicit here is that the text that is being made explicit is unable to presuppose an interlocutor and yet addresses a kind of addressee. Which, of course, is a pragmatic paradox. But we can resolve the paradox if we distinguish between empirical interlocutors and structural addressees, and then locate the text that we just made explicit in the empirically existing Prešeren studies, thereby calling on to Prešeren studies to assume the position of the addressee of the text that we have made explicit. So, by making Močnik's implication about his non-existent interlocutors explicit, we try to make Slovenian literary studies acknowledge the implication and thus become the interlocutor of Močnik's and, by extension, Zihel's Prešeren.

THEORY WITHOUT THE UNIVERSITY

By calling on to Slovenian literary studies in this way, however, we merely reiterate the strategy of performative interpellation of an addressee to the position of knowledge. Močnik himself has analysed this strategy in his various lectures by referring to the way in which Karl Marx and Frederick Engels address in *The German Ideology* a not yet fully formed proletariat in order to contribute to its formation by precisely addressing it as it had already been formed; according to Močnik, *The German Ideology* addresses the proletariat as a political subject irreducible to the existing working class and thereby, in the address itself, creates the space needed for the inscription of this subject. More importantly, Močnik not only analyses but also prac-

tices this strategy, most notably perhaps in his recent critique of the so-called Bologna Process and its neoliberal reform of the European academia. This critique, as he himself comments, ‘has found no reader at the university—just as the author has found no interlocutor there’ (Močnik, *Spisi* 535). The pragmatic paradox therefore seems to reappear here, insofar as Močnik’s critique of the Bologna reform addresses the academia with the theoretical proposition that the academia is unable to acknowledge theoretical propositions.

Močnik reflects on the contemporary academia in relation to the Bologna reform. The argument is threefold: first, the subordination of higher education to the market pursued by the Bologna reform is already an accomplished fact; second, the reform cannot guarantee further subordination of higher education to the market; and third, there is no need to subordinate higher education to the market because the market is increasingly determined by knowledge itself (Močnik, *Spisi* 418–9). Now, this argument seems to follow the symptomatic structure of the Freudian borrowed kettle. ‘The story of the borrowed kettle which had a hole in it when it was given back’, writes Freud, ‘is an excellent example of the purely comic effect of giving free play to the unconscious mode of thought. It will be recalled that the borrower, when he was questioned, replied firstly that he had not borrowed a kettle at all, secondly that it had had a hole in it already when he borrowed it, and thirdly that he had given it back undamaged and without a hole.’ (Freud 254) Nevertheless, the symptomatic character of Močnik’s argument against the Bologna reform can be given some legitimacy if the symptom is ascribed to the very reference of the argument, that is, if the argument about the Bologna reform is viewed as the negative of the reform itself: the reform itself symptomatically pursues something that, first, is an accomplished fact, second, unachievable

by the reform, and third, needs not be achieved at all. In this respect, Močnik's argument is a negative model of the Bologna reform, a model that Močnik later on supplements with a positive proposition that what the reform does achieve is, first and foremost, to reject the pursuit of theory, to sacrifice theoretical production to a symptomatic pursuit of something that is already achieved, out of the reform's reach and obsolete. The negative model is then, to use Freud's terms, an 'example of the purely comic effect of giving free play to the unconscious mode of thought', an effect that triggers a positive proposition.

But precisely insofar as a positive theoretical elaboration of the initial argumentation dispels the symptom at the level of the enunciated, the symptom reappears at the level of enunciation. For insofar as the elaboration brings the three points together by claiming that the reformed university rejects theory, it is clear that the claim is addressed at the university as a kind of addressee that, precisely from the perspective of this theoretical elaboration, is unable to take up theoretical elaborations (or, for that matter, the comical structure of the borrowed kettle). At the level of enunciation, the chapter on the Bologna reform presupposes an addressee whose inability to understand the chapter itself is conceptually demonstrated at the level of the enunciated.

Thus, the symptom at the level of the enunciated is dispelled only to the extent that it reappears at the level of enunciation: it disappears by way of reappearing on the next level; in a word, it is *aufgehoben*, sublated in the sense given to this Hegelian category by Lacan's return to Freud (Lacan 710). Yet the level of enunciation is also where the symptom is nevertheless reflected upon. For the author of the chapter on the Bologna reform has already reflected upon the political implications of a theoretically grounded address to a non-existent Other as he,

as mentioned above, referred to the case of *The German Ideology*. Hence, just as *The German Ideology* creates a space, a position for proletarian addressees endowed with class consciousness, so too the chapter on the Bologna Process creates a position for academic addressees equipped with theory—and thereby calls on academics to assume that position. ♡

References

- ADORNO, THEODOR W., 1993: *Hegel: Three Studies*. Trans. Shierry Weber Nicholsen. Cambridge (MA): The MIT Press.
- DOVIĆ, MARIJAN, 2007: Early Literary Representations of National History and the 'Slovene Cultural Syndrome'. *Primerjalna književnost* 30, Special Issue. 191–207.
- FREUD, SIGMUND, 1989: *Jokes and Their Relation to the Unconscious: The Standard Edition*. Ed. and trans. James Strachey. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.
- JUVAN, MARKO, 2002: Modernost Krsta pri Savici? In: *Romantična pesnitev: Ob 200. obletnici rojstva Franceta Prešerna*. Ed. Marko Juvan. Ljubljana: Center za slovenščino kot drugi/tuji jezik pri Oddelku za slovanske jezike in književnosti Filozofske fakultete. 347–60.
- , 2007: Figura, ki povezuje Ljubljancane (vsaj) na trgu. *Delo* 49, no. 44. 6.
- , 2015: The Nation Between the Epic and the Novel: France Prešeren's *The Baptism on the Savica* As a Compromise 'World Text'. Trans. Mojca Šorli and Neville Hall. *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature* 42, no. 4. 382–95.
- KERNEV-ŠTRAJN, JELKA, 2007: Julija kot vezivo: Rastko Močnik, *Julija Primic v slovenski književni vedi*. *Delo* 49, no. 216. 19.
- KERŠEVAN, MARKO, 1995: Slovenska sociologija med socialnim okoljem in znanstveno skupnostjo. *Teorija in praksa* 32, no. 5–6. 444–52.
- KOMELJ, MIKLAVŽ, 2009: *Kako misliti partizansko umetnost?* Ljubljana: Založba /*cf.

- KRAJNC, MATEJ, 2007: Rastko Močnik, *Julija Primic v slovenski književni vedi*, Sophia, 2006. *Mentor* 28, no. 3. 76–77.
- KRAŠOVEC, PRIMOŽ, 2009: Rastko Močnik: O muzah, Engelsih in jezikovni politiki. *Družboslovne razprave* 60. 111–3.
- LACAN, JACQUES, 2006: Position of the Unconscious. In: Jacques Lacan, *Écrits: The First Complete Edition in English*. Trans. Bruce Fink in collaboration with Héloïse Fink and Russell Grigg. New York: W. W. Norton & Co. 703–21.
- MOČNIK, RASTKO, 1981: *Mesčevo zlato: Prešeren v označevalcu*. Ljubljana: DDU Univerzum.
- , 2006: *Julija Primic v slovenski književni vedi*. Ljubljana: Sophia, 2006.
- , 2009: *Spisi iz humanistike*. Ljubljana: Založba /*cf.
- , 2010: Od historičnega materializma k sociologiji kulture: digresija, deviacija, dubitacija? In: *Včeraj in danes: jubilejni zbornik socioloških razprav ob 50-letnici Oddelka za sociologijo*. Ed. Ksenija Vidmar Horvat and Avgust Lešnik. Ljubljana: Znanstvena založba Filozofske fakultete. 137–59.
- OGRIZEK, MAŠA, 2007: *Julija Primic v slovenski književni vedi*. *Bukla* 3, no. 17. 14.
- PIRJEVEC, DUŠAN, 1978: Vprašanje o poeziji. In: Dušan Pirjevec, *Vprašanje o poeziji; Vprašanje naroda*. Maribor: Obzorja. 5–86.
- RUPEL, DIMITRIJ, 1986: *Sociologija kulture in umetnosti*. Ljubljana: Državna založba Slovenije.
- ZIHERL, BORIS, 1957: *Književnost in družba*. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba.
- , 1965: *O humanizmu in socializmu*. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba.

- , 1986: France Prešeren—pesnik in mislec. In: Boris Ziherl, *Zbrana dela. Tretja knjiga*. Ed. Neda Pagon-Brglez. Ljubljana: Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti. 294–320.
- ŽIŽEK, SLAVOJ, 1987: *Jezik, ideologija, Slovenci*. Ljubljana: Delavska enotnost.

Povzetek

V šestdesetih letih prejšnjega stoletja je Boris Ziherl slovenski sociologiji zagotovil teoretsko in institucionalno podlago: historični materializem in univerzitetni oddelek. Toda po Ziherlu se je med tema podlagama začel odpirati prepad, in sicer pogosto prav zaradi institucionalne pozabe Ziherlove dediščine. In obratno, nedavni študiji, ki to dediščino reafirmita v okviru historičnega materializma, dosledno zavzemata anti-institucionalno gledišče. Ti študiji – knjiga Miklavža Komelja o slovenski partizanski umetnosti in knjiga Rastka Močnika o prešernoslovju – posegata v slovensko sociologijo literature, ki jo je prav tako utemeljeval Ziherl. Tukajšnji članek se zato posveča osrednji disciplini, relevantni tako za slovensko sociologijo kakor za slovensko literarno vedo, namreč prešernoslovju. Ziherlov pristop k slovenskemu nacionalnemu pesniku Francetu Prešernu se formira med 2. svetovno vojno in v letih po njej. Ziherlov Prešeren obeh obdobjih je v članku obravnavan na ozadju omenjene nedavne dvojice reaktualizacij Ziherla: medvojni Prešeren na Komeljevem ozadju, povojni pa na Močnikovem.

Med vojno Ziherl v nasprotju z večino drugih partizanskih kulturnih delavcev poudarja, da je Prešernovo pesniško govorico mogoče brati ne kot aluzijo na antifašistični boj, temveč kot orožje v boju proti Novalisovi reakcionarni romantiki. Šele kot takšna, tj. kot orožje v boju, bojevanem v Prešernovem lastnem času in v njegovem lastnem, pesniškem polju, lahko Prešernova pesniška govorica po Ziherlu navdihuje partizansko poezijo. Ziherlov medvojni Prešeren je torej pesnik in s tem nasprotnik nemške romantike. Kot pozitivni protipol te negativne opredelitve pa je Ziherlov povojni Prešeren mislec in s tem Heglov zaveznik v boju z romantiko.

Konec šestdesetih let je tovrstna politična mobilizacija Prešerna zavrtnjena kot nacionalistična instrumentalizacija, ki bi se morala umakniti domnevno prihajajoči literaturi svobodne jezikovne igre onkraj ideologije. Leta 1969 namreč Dušan Pirjevec, nekdanji partizanski politični komisar, sproži to kritiko kot heideggrovski profesor komparativistike; leta 1986 pa Dimitrij Rupel to kritiko uporabi kot profesor sociologije, ki želi jugoslovansko nacionalistično kulturno politiko zamenjati s slovensko post-socialistično identitetno politiko, politiko, ki jo bo Rupel manj kot desetletje pozneje reproduciral kot zunanji minister Republike Slovenije.

Ne Pirjevec ne Rupel ne konceptualizirata Prešernove vloge v nacionalističnem projektu, za katerega naj bi bil Prešeren žrtvovan. A že leta 1981 to opravi Rastko Močnik. Dialektiko, ki jo je Ziherl pripisal Prešernu kot mislecu, Močnik locira v sam Prešernov tekst, s tem pa nazadnje omogoči dejansko analizo Prešernove pesniške govornice in njene vloge v nacionalističnem projektu. Ideološki moment zdaj ni več v tem, v čemer Pirjevec in Rupel vidita Ziherlovo instrumentalizacijo pesništva, pač pa v interpelirajoči strukturi pesniškega teksta samega. Močnik tedaj pesniško polisemijo, ki jo Pirjevec in Rupel branita pred Ziherlom, analizira v samem okviru Ziherlove problematike ideologije. V zadnjem desetletju pa mu to omogoča, da v omenjeni institucionalni pozabi Ziherlove dediščine prepozna primer slovenske neoliberalne identitetne politike in da na tej podlagi refleksivno totalizira prešernoslovje s kritično študijo tako Prešernove govornice kakor samega prešernoslovja.

Jernej Habjan

Jernej Habjan is Research Fellow at the Institute of Slovenian Literature and Literary Studies at the Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts. He has also held postdoctoral positions at the University of Munich and at the International Research Centre for Cultural Studies (IFK) in Vienna. In Ljubljana, he is a member of the editorial boards of academic publishing houses Sophia and Studia humanitatis. Besides authoring two Slovenian-language books of literary theory, he has guest-edited a 2015 special issue of the Canadian Review of Comparative Literature titled Novel beyond Nation as well as co-edited Globalizing Literary Genres (Routledge, 2016), Academic Labour, Unemployment and Global Higher Education (Palgrave Macmillan, 2016) and (Mis)readings of Marx in Continental Philosophy (Palgrave Macmillan, 2014). His articles have appeared in (a): The Journal of Culture and the Unconscious, CLCWeb, Filozofski vestnik, Neohelicon, Primerjalna književnost, Problemi, South Atlantic Quarterly and Slavistična revija. With Rastko Močnik, he has guest-edited a 2013 issue of Arts & Humanitas devoted to Slovenian sociology of culture.