

književna smotra

Časopis za svjetsku književnost

ISSN 0455 – 0463

Godište LVIII/2026 broj 219 (1)

State of the Nation
and the Novel:
Jane Austen's
Persuasion

Pjesnički krug oko
Stefana Georgea s
očišta povijesti znanja
i obrazovanja

Prevoditeljska poetika
i praksa Voje Šindolića



AFTER CORNELIS VAN HAARLEM „THE FALL OF IXION“ (1588)

Časopis za svjetsku književnost
Godište LVIII / 2026
Broj 219 (1)

književna smotra

SADRŽAJ

Znanstvene rasprave na engleskom jeziku

- 3 Borislav Knežević
 State of the Nation and the Novel: Jane Austen's *Persuasion*
- 37 Marija Krivokapić
 Look at This Blue and the discontents of the Anthropocene
- 59 Ilir Breca
 "Or se' tu quel Virgilio..." (On the dedicatee of the elegy *An Autumn Flower*
 by Father Gjergj Fishta)

Pregledi i istraživanja

- 87 Christine Magerski
 Pjesnički krug oko Stefana Georgea s očista povijesti znanja i obrazovanja
- 105 Marijana Bijelić
 Elementi baladičnog u noveli *Duga* Dinka Šimunovića: između estetskog,
 intimnog i političkog
- 117 Tihomir Engler i Petra Žagar Šoštarić
 Schillerova drama *Wilhelm Tell* u svjetlu Kantove i Rousseauove misli
- 141 Damir Španić
 Prevoditeljska poetika i praksa Voje Šindolića
- 163 Etami Borjan
 Od književnosti do filma: dodirne točke između književnog i filmskog stvaralaštva
 u esejima Piera Paola Pasolinija

Savjet časopisa

Dalibor Blažina, Marijan Bobinac, Mislav Ježić, Maxim D. Shrayner (Boston College, Chestnut Hill), Josip Užarević, Andrea Zlatar

Uredništvo

Đurđica Čilić, Nikica Gilić, Maša Grdešić, Matija Ivačić, Maša Kolanović, Ivana Latković, Wolfgang Müller-Funk (Universität Wien, Beč), Nikita Dimitrov Nankov (Wenzhou-Kean University, Wenzhou, Zhejiang), Ivana Peruško, Vanja Polić, Jelena Šesnić, Evgenij Germanovič Vodolazkin (Institut ruskoj literatury Rossijskoj akademii nauk, Puškinskij dom, Moskva)

Izvršna urednica

Ivana Latković

Glavna i odgovorna urednica

Ivana Peruško

Grafička oprema

Ivan Picelj

Lektura

Jasmina Han i Andrea Cetinić

Naslovnica

Miron Milić, Skica prema slici Cornelisa van Haarlema, "Ixionov pad" iz 1588. godine, 2022. Za dozvolu objavljivanja zahvaljujemo autoru djela Mironu Miliću.

Priprema za tisak

Marina Ćorić

Cijena ovomu broju 7 eura

Godišnja pretplata (4 broja) 15 eura, za inozemstvo dvostruko

Žiro-račun

Zagrebačka banka

HR7423600001101551990

Hrvatsko filološko društvo – s naznakom "za Književnu smotru"

Narudžbe slati na

Filozofski fakultet u Zagrebu, I. Lučića 3, 10 000 Zagreb

Arhiv

e-mail: izivkovic@m.ffzg.hr

Izdavač

Hrvatsko filološko društvo

Adresa uredništva

Filozofski fakultet, I. Lučića 3, Zagreb

Uredništvo prima stranke utorkom od 13.00 do 14.00 (u sobi B-225)

Tel.: 01/4092 123, e-mail: knjizevna.smotra@gmail.com

Ovaj broj tiskan je uz novčanu pomoć Ministarstva znanosti i obrazovanja RH

Tisak: Denona, Zagreb

Online izdanje časopisa besplatno je dostupno na stranicama HFD-a

(www.hfiloloskod.hr/index.php/knjizevna-smotra),

te na portalu hrvatskih znanstvenih i stručnih časopisa Hrčak (hrcak.srce.hr/knjizevna-smotra)

Borislav KNEŽEVIĆ
University of Zagreb

Original scientific article
Accepted for publication: 12 April 2026

State of the Nation and the Novel: Jane Austen's *Persuasion*

Persuasion has often been regarded as something of a departure from Jane Austen's previous novels. Austen's world of the gentry seems more tired in this novel, and it is satirized with arguably greater intensity. Tony Tanner, for instance, suggests that the novel projects an image of English society caught between an old order in decline and a new one, "of as yet uncertain values, hierarchies and principles" (Tanner 1986: 249). The novel is indeed remarkable for its historicity, and for its own manner of social analysis. However, in my reading of the novel I will not place emphasis as much on its departure from some of the social certainties of Austen's previous fiction as on its continuous preoccupation with and judgement of the gentry world; if anything, it would be a profitable interpretative exercise to reread her entire opus for expressions of the tone and perspective of *Persuasion*. As an example, let us recall the often-quoted opening words of *Pride and Prejudice*: "It is a truth universally acknowledged, that a single man in possession of a good fortune, must be in want of a wife"; a tone of satire regarding the world of the gentry class is made clear already in the next sentence which posits a distance between the narrator and her world by describing this universality as "fixed in the minds of the surrounding families" (*P&P* 1996: 5). By mockingly bestowing on opinion in a small rural neighbourhood the status of universal truth, the narrator in fact brings into focus, in a gesture of both mockery and analysis, various cultural features of the social world of the gentry—its smallness in numbers, its connection to similar social enclaves elsewhere in the country, and its insularity of opinion which regards itself as a standard of universality, a national pattern. The insularity of the gentry society is coupled in *Pride and Prejudice* with a distinct mindfulness of instabilities attendant on the world of the gentry (including the issue of wealth featured in its opening sentence), and the existence, somewhere else outside that world, but still within the world of the nation, of new kinds of economies capable of producing respectable fortunes.

In *Persuasion* (1818) the opening setting is still that of a rural neighbourhood, with Kellynch-hall, occupied by the Elliots, at its centre. It is another small world, and some of its cast of characters are remarkably parochial in their opinion; indeed, the parochialism of Sir Walter Elliot, a baronet, stands out in the gallery of self-involvement in Austen's protagonist families. A one-dimensional character, he is wholly defined by his exaggerated class pride and exasperation over historical trends that degrade distinction as he sees it. His conceit and defensiveness about status come from an inflexible misjudgement of the changing social landscape. He is not meant as a representative of the whole class of the rural gentry; rather, he represents a tendency of self-absorption, a trait signalled already by the opening scene of his musing over the book of the Baronetage. He is also remarkably wasteful, and the story actually opens at the point of a serious erosion of his wealth; in order to address the financial problems he rents out Kellynch-hall and moves out of the area. On the other hand, Frederick Wentworth, the novel's male protagonist, belongs to the naval profession (as do a number of other male characters), rather than the landed classes. It thus appears that the novel turns its attention away from the patrician world to a different part of the nation; there is a long tradition of criticism making a great deal out of the role of the naval characters in the novel, whose professional life and domestic cordiality create a contrast to the staleness of the world of the rural gentry. From Nina Auerbach to Tony Tanner to Anne Frey, to name just a few critics, *Persuasion* has been read as a substantial shift in Austen's view of English society, or at least an indication of her readiness to attribute a new kind of social authority to the naval profession. While raising the question of a shift in Austen's social perspective is indisputably warranted by the importance bestowed on the naval profession in *Persuasion*, the novel doesn't quite seek to claim a considerable or transformative distinctiveness for the naval community in relation to the landed classes. As I will attempt to show, the emplacement of the naval community within the existing social order is rather customarily assumed in the novel. There is little evidence that the novel's views on English society either register or anticipate a considerable social shift, and there is little evidence that the novel questions the very principle of hierarchy shaping the existing order. The novel does insist on the importance of the navy in the uncertain times of the Napoleonic wars,¹ but extolling the achievements and virtues of the navy is largely the extent of its interest in the politics of the day. The text is more interesting if read not so much for its topical commentary, but for its implicit self-understanding as a

¹ The story is set in the period from the summer of 1814 through February 1815, which coincides with a period of peace during the Napoleonic wars. The final battle of the Napoleonic wars, Waterloo, was a land battle which took place after the story's conclusion, in June 1815. Claire Tomalin mentions that Austen finished writing the novel in July 1816, and then revised the last two chapters some time later (Tomalin 1999: 158-159). This timeline is interesting because the novel's references to the wars focus on characters serving in the navy.

discourse on the state of the nation and for claiming for the genre of the novel the cultural authority to act as purveyor of such discourse—at a time when the literary field was dominated by poetry, and novel-writing struggled to attain the same level of cultural capital.

A familiar but important observation about the character of Austen's social vision needs to be attached here: while her narratives are invariably set within the social world of the gentry, they don't convey a panoramic survey of the functioning of the whole of that world and of its place within the national space. Rather, her novels largely focus on the domestic space of that social world, and especially the situation of women within it, marked by their very limited control over the cultural, legal and material conditions of their lives. Women born into the gentry class face a restricted scope of agency, often with uncertain prospects of retaining their class status with or without marriage. Interestingly, that which is socially the most radical aspect of Austen's writing—announcing the emergence of a new female subjectivity—seems to be dramatized within a perception of stability of the social order and the place of the gentry within it (albeit a stability that accommodates a degree of change). As her novels are highly focalized, mainly projecting a narrative canvas from the viewpoint of the protagonist, they even might be taken to imply that this new subjectivity emerges only within the confines of that social world and possibly no other. Other social spheres are occasionally and cursorily referenced, but it is the domesticity of the landed classes, with its material affluence, its leisure time, its walks and talks, its opportunities for cultivation of the mind and social sensibility, that creates the stage for Austen's novels to dramatize expressions of a new subjectivity of women.

Persuasion may appear a relatively easy novel to read, but it is rather difficult to parse thoroughly. Some of this difficulty comes from the high level of focalization, which means that much of the information, opinion, sensation, feeling comes from the characters themselves, and mostly, though not exclusively, Anne Elliot. This requires a reading meticulously attentive to differentiating and separating out narratorial commentary from free indirect discourse of the characters. As importantly, the third-person extradiegetic narrator assumes the stance of familiarity with the protagonist, some other characters and the narrated world in general, but doesn't practice omniscience to fill in the gaps regarding the entirety of the employment. In fact, a good deal of the information needed for understanding the whole of the story is unavailable because the narrative, after the early flashback to the act of persuasion which separated Anne Elliot and Frederick Wentworth, mostly proceeds by following the characters around, and mostly Anne, and sometimes it does that in the technique of free indirect style. The elliptical appearance of the plot created by focalization is occasionally mitigated by dialogue or by focalization itself; namely, some key pieces of information on the characters are not missing, but can be found strewn about the text, in conversations and in thoughts of characters. This is especially true regarding the careers of the naval officers: in particular, the recon-

struction of Captain Wentworth's career is rendered somewhat difficult, but not wholly impossible. Difficulty of this reconstruction is narratively motivated—in the sense that it makes narrative sense—because the women characters, again in particular Anne whose point of view is the main point of focalization, do have only a limited access to this kind of information. The emplotment is thus turned into something of a puzzle, and when the missing pieces do turn up, the information may still be skewed (as in Wentworth's conversational references to his career) with a touch of indirection, so that more vagueness may be produced. There is generally a good deal of ambiguity generated in the novel regarding the stories of individual characters (and also regarding its view of the social and historical circumstances it addresses). The effect of all this is that the act of interpretation itself is foregrounded: the novel could also and fittingly have been entitled *Making Sense*, both for a principal activity that Anne is engaged in—which is understanding the various communities, including the naval one, with which she comes in contact, and for the actual work of the novel as a discourse about society, i.e., for its ambition to assert its authority as a form of social knowledge in its own right.²

Rather than approaching the text as a substantial shift in Austen's views on the genteel rural world, I think it more productive to highlight its awareness of the limitation of its focus on that world, as well as its ambition to establish itself as an authoritative discourse on English society. The historicity of the novel, as we are reminded throughout it, is framed by the narrowness of its narrative lens. In fact, narrowness of vision is an important theme on its own in the novel. The narcissistic status obsession of Sir Walter Elliot, Elizabeth's indifference to the condition of contemporary society, Lady Russell's active persuasion of Anne not to marry Wentworth which is effectively in alignment with the species of class pride represented by the baronet, Mary's inability to let go of rank prejudice in her marriage to a Musgrove, but also the limited cultivation of the otherwise cordial Musgroves, Benwick's melancholic immersion in poetry, Mr. Elliot's obsession with money; all these elements of the story speak of narrowness of view associated with class position and cultural disposition. Importantly, because of the constitutive narrowness of narrative lens inherent to the practice of focalization and determined by the domestic scope to which the woman protagonist is bound, a wide social lens is not really a narrative possibility. This is not to say that the wider, public world remains unreferenced; it seeps into the narrative through exchanges among characters in the domestic sphere as well as in those public places where men and women congre-

² It is interesting to note in regard to the novel's title that the thematically most important act of persuasion, Lady Russell's influence in Anne's rejection of Wentworth, takes place before the timeframe of the novel's plot; the acts of persuasion that take place within the plot, such as for instance getting Sir Walter to rent out Kellynch, or even Lady Russell's talking to Anne about marriage to Mr. Elliot, which makes Anne only briefly think of the possibility of making Kellynch "her home again, her home forever" (*Persuasion* 1998: 143), are actually of lesser significance.

gate (in Lyme and Bath). Nature too is sometimes featured as a part of the domestic space, as Daniel P. Gunn observes regarding the episode that takes a group of characters walking to Winthrop: "It is a social occasion, in which the countryside has become an extension of the ballroom or the drawing room" (Gunn 1987: 405-6). While the domestic sphere is somewhat geographically mobile and its boundaries are somewhat fluid, it remains the vantage point on the narrative world.

The theme of narrowness of vision has a significant counterpoint in the cultural distinctiveness of Anne's broad-minded sensibility. She presents an implicit challenge to parochialism by her insistence that social interactions should be measured by breadth of knowledge and a conversational disposition: "My idea of good company [...] is the company of clever, well-informed people, who have a great deal of conversation" (*Persuasion* 1998: 134). In this regard, Anne's association with the naval community seems to alleviate some of the narrowness of the domestic perspective as well as the exclusiveness of class pride exercised by her father. Naval wives engage in more than the conventional degree of geographical mobility, as evidenced by Mrs. Croft, who lived with her husband on five ships, and "ha[s] crossed the Atlantic four times, and ha[s] been once to the East Indies, and back again; and only once, besides being in different places about home—Cork, and Lisbon, and Gibraltar" (*ibid.*: 63). However, this kind of mobility is not represented in the narrative directly, but only within the domestic space as a conversational topic, a kind of outlying challenge to established conventionalities.³ More generally, the novel's focus on the naval profession means that it raises the question of broadening the narrative lens beyond domesticity, just as it finds itself addressing the question of the navy's significance in the national context. In this regard, it should be remembered that the naval officers in their professional work operate on the borders of the national space, and far beyond them; their work conjures the space of international and global relations better than the internal space of the nation. In time of peace, naval officers come ashore to non-professional lives, which is what happens in the novel. So, how does the novel's concern with the naval profession affect its view of the existing social order on land? In my reading, while the novel does raise the question of the character of the existing social order, it remains somewhat cautious and conservative in its social views, and careful not to exaggerate its own narrative focus on the naval profession; in raising the question of the current condition of the social order, it is primarily concerned with foregrounding its own authority in addressing it.

³ This is from a conversation in which her brother Frederick declares he feels it impossible "to make the accommodation on board, such as women ought to have," and that he "hate[s] to hear of women on board, or to see them on board" (*P* 1998: 62). Mrs. Croft disagrees: "But I hate to hear you talking so, like a fine gentleman, and as if women were all fine ladies, instead of rational creatures" (*ibid.*: 63). Class conventionalities stand in the way of affirming the new female subjectivity; the conversation is indicative of flaws in Wentworth's social views, which the story works to eventually remedy.

In *The Country and the City* (1973), Raymond Williams quips that “[i]t is a truth universally acknowledged, that Jane Austen chose to ignore the decisive historical events of her time.” In recent times this view of Austen’s writing has not been widely entertained; Williams himself was not persuaded by it, and he was quick to point out the error in this supposedly universal truth insofar as Austen’s social imagination was concerned with “the social history of the landed families” (Williams 1975: 113), who wielded a substantial power in English society at that time. (This is not a world of the high echelons of aristocratic privilege and power, but the world of the gentry.) Williams underscores the adaptability of this world in Austen’s novels; it is not a stable social order engaged merely in its own conservative maintenance. Other forms of economic capital are featured on the margins of that small world, making alliances with the landed classes and sometimes blending into them over generations. It is an order relatively stable as well as relatively fluid, at once hierarchical and open to a degree of modification. Williams regards Austen’s novels as a literary discourse in which this world of the rural gentry reaches a kind of moral self-awareness: “An openly acquisitive society, which is concerned also with the transmission of wealth, is trying to judge itself at once by an inherited code and by the morality of improvement” (*ibid.*: 115). It does not suffice, Williams argues, to regard Austen’s narratives as being mostly about personal relationships, for her novels are chiefly concerned with problematizing in a moral and social sense the concept of personal conduct within that small social world. This “moral pretension is taken so seriously, that it becomes a critique” (*ibid.*: 116)—Austen’s novels amount to an elaborate social commentary on the social world they attempt to represent.

A more detailed explication of Williams’s (cursory but perceptive) reading of Austen’s fiction in *The Country and the City* would require a closer look at the themes of conduct (and personal and social improvement). Suffice it to note here that across Austen’s fiction there obtains the assumption of a difference between the notion of conduct in a moral sense and the notion of manners in the sense of social etiquette, as well as the assumption of the moral superiority of rural society over urban society, which assumptions are explicitly articulated in *Mansfield Park* by Edmund Bertram.⁴ While Edmund Bertram is given the role of emphasizing the importance of the concept of conduct, in Austen’s novels, including *Mansfield Park*, the shaping of the right kind of conduct is primarily dramatized in the story

⁴ Mary Crawford tries to dissuade Edmund from pursuing the profession of clergyman, and suggests that clergymen don’t have the social importance that he attributes to them (in providing moral and religious guidance). He responds: “*You are speaking of London. I am speaking of the nation at large [...] We do not look in great cities for our best morality*” (MP 1996: 78). Austen’s novels generally assume that the countryside is the proper stage for dramatizing the making of proper conduct.

of the heroine (who often exerts an influence on the shaping of the conduct of the male protagonist as well). Conduct in Austen's texts is usually featured not as a set of principles wholly defined from the start of the narrative, but rather as a matter of constant search for the appropriate grounds of moral judgement and action under variable social conditions, an objective to be approximated by steady improvement in the departments of both sense and sensibility. Cultivating one's exercise of reason is essential in forming an understanding of the situation and role of the landed family in its immediate environment and the national context. Conduct also involves cultivating a feeling of social duty to marital partners, relatives, and neighbours with the same or similar social status, along with maintaining and managing social contacts with the gentry from other parts of the nation (all of which provides the fabric of the plot). The Austenian notion of conduct also includes a feeling of social duty to tenant farmers and the rural poor (which is regarded in Austen's novels as a required element of the social responsibility of the landed gentry, though not often directly dramatized in the plot). In addition to the moral cultivation of individuality, there is in Austen's world another sense of improvement: the question of economic improvement in the situation of a landed family, which is occasionally referenced in her narratives, but seldom extensively featured (due to the domestic perspective of the emplotment). In the quest for personal cultivation, which is the primary focus of Austen's novels, male and female situations are different, which ensues from the social structure of the hierarchical and relatively conservative social order of the landed classes; Austen's novels construct stories of (different versions of) advances in the social authority of women protagonists, in which their personal cultivation is also implicitly represented as incremental change, for the better, in the social authority of women in general.

The theme of personal formation or making of the self raises the question of the historical place of Austen's narratives in and beyond their immediate context. The self in Austen's narratives is forged in the sphere of domesticity, a sphere with a particular social and political significance; in an influential study, *Desire and Domestic Fiction*, Nancy Armstrong writes of "the rise of the domestic woman as a major event in political history" (Armstrong 1989: 3). She ascribes to authors of the 18th century an important shift in the cultural imagination of the self:

In place of the intricate status system that had long dominated British thinking, these authors began to represent an individual's value in terms of his, but more often in terms of *her*, essential qualities of mind. Literature devoted to producing the domestic woman thus appeared to ignore the political world run by men. Of the female alone did it presume to say that neither birth nor the accoutrements of title and status accurately represented the individual; only the more subtle nuances of behaviour indicated what one was really worth. In this way, writing for and about the female introduced a whole new vocabulary for social relations, terms that attached precise moral values to certain qualities of the mind. (*ibid.*: 4)

While Armstrong's foregrounding of domestic fiction and the rise of the domestic woman in the history of modern subjectivity is a matter for a more complex discussion, it is useful for purposes of this analysis to assume that Austen's fiction uses the domestic stage to explore changing ideas of self and society. Armstrong's assessment that domestic fiction made possible a narrative focus on qualities of mind rather than birth and status is of course true of Austen's novels to a great degree.⁵ It is a particularly salient aspect of her fiction that it simultaneously projects a sense of a relatively stable social order of the gentry, as well as a sense that the protagonists of her novels belong to a time in which a new notion of self is emerging and in which an interrogative attitude to aspects of that social order can begin to be dramatized. It is worth stressing again that the world which Austen's women characters have to navigate is remarkably, and indeed harshly, shaped by situations of disadvantage and uncertainty, produced by a general social, political and cultural subordination of women, as well as by specific effects of practices such as primogeniture and entail. Austen's novels don't really attempt to imagine that individual moral cultivation is possible without the proper material conditions; the right qualities of mind may begin to fashion themselves in relative deprivation, but they need a sufficient material basis to flourish. Yet the fact that Austen's protagonists are women, and that they are excluded from political and economic societies, also affects the way in which her novels evoke issues of social transformation, especially as regards the world of the landed classes. The personal cultivation of women protagonists, their pursuit of that seriously entertained idea of conduct that shapes the plots of Austen's novels, necessarily brings into question the boundaries and fixities of that social order. Austen's stories start with situations of disadvantage as a fundamental predicament of her gentlewomen within the genteel world: for instance, the Dashwood sisters find themselves in diminished circumstances after their father's passing; the entail arrangement troubles the lives of the Bennet sisters; Fanny Price is a poor relation of the Bertrams, dependent on them for her education and social status. The fashioning of self that Austen's women protagonists take up eclipses anything comparable in the construction of male protagonists, who do not have to contend with similar issues. The common situation of Austen's female protagonists is fragile and precarious, manageable only but not conclusively by their pursuit of a proper conduct, a set of attitudes that emerges as superior to the social constraints they are placed under.

Dealing with this uncertainty in Austen's genteel world necessarily involves the question of maintaining class status. Anne Elliot faces the prospect of diminished class prestige, the same predicament as for instance Elizabeth and Jane Bennet face in *Pride and Prejudice*, since making a socially acceptable match is ham-

⁵ Among Austen's novels, Armstrong discusses primarily *Emma*, while *Persuasion* is not discussed in the book.

pered by inheritance arrangements, and, in *Persuasion*, mismanagement. Before the point at which the story of *Persuasion* opens (the crisis caused by years of Sir Walter Elliot's incompetent management of his expenses), Anne's marriage to Wentworth was prevented by an act of persuasion undertaken by Lady Russell. She conveyed her assessment to Anne that Wentworth "had nothing but himself to recommend him, and no hopes of attaining affluence, but in the chances of a most uncertain profession, and no connexions to secure even his farther rise in the profession" (P 1998: 24).⁶ Eventually, Anne "was persuaded to believe the engagement a wrong thing—indiscreet, improper, hardly capable of success, and not deserving it" (*ibid.*: 25). Her father, "without actually withholding his consent," projected a coldness about the match for reasons of status: "He thought it a very degrading alliance" (*ibid.*: 24), but active opposition to it was Lady Russell's; she appeared an overzealous enforcer of Sir Walter's class condescension. The novel's plot underscores the folly of both Sir Walter and Lady Russell's views by opening with the baronet's mismanagement of his income, which has significantly damaged both the economic situation of the family as well as the social capital of the two unmarried daughters, Elizabeth and Anne, and their chances of making good alliances.

Anne had to be persuaded against the match with Wentworth on the grounds of inequality (but her father also never had high expectations that she would make a marriage suitable in terms of rank). Anne's moral stature is established early in the novel, at the same time as her father's and Elizabeth's inability to appreciate it: "[...] Anne, with an elegance of mind and sweetness of character, which must have placed her high with any people of real understanding, was nobody with either father or sister: her word had no weight; her convenience was always to give way;—she was only Anne." The youngest daughter Mary is already married before the story opens; her marriage to Charles Musgrove illustrates one of the options for women of her background, that of marrying slightly below.⁷ Her social attitudes are nevertheless shaped by an obsession with status that she shares with her father, which makes her squabble over precedence with Mrs. Musgrove. For Sir Walter at the beginning of the story, "[a]ll equality of alliance must rest with Elizabeth" (*ibid.*: 7), and Elizabeth's regard for status and precedence is more haughtily exer-

⁶ These words reflect Lady Russell's opinion of Wentworth; she suggests to Anne that he lacks access to such patronage as would make possible his further promotion. Wentworth and Anne first meet in 1806, when he has already been made commander. Later, the narrative suggests that Lady Russell misjudged his subsequent chances of affluence.

⁷ Slightly but perceptibly: "Charles Musgrove was the eldest son of a man, whose landed property and general importance were second, in that country, only to Sir Walter's" (P 1998: 26). On a different occasion, the narrator says that "the Musgroves were in the first class of society in the country" (*ibid.*: 67); of course, the Elliots too belong to that landed class, and enjoy slightly higher status. Country in these passages means neighbourhood.

cised than Mary's. But as in all of Austen's novels, the stories of the three daughters in *Persuasion* are to an extent shaped by the social parameters of the space that women of the gentry class inhabit, and the novel is about exploring that precarious space with its fragilities and vulnerabilities. Elizabeth and Mary, although painted with different brushes, both illustrate the taxing consequences on personal formation that come with deference to the principle of rank. On the other hand, Anne's conduct functions in the novel to gesture towards a reimagination both of the position of gentry women and the national culture of class; her conduct is designed as an advertisement for a new kind of subjectivity with broader social resonance. One of the Musgroves, complaining about Mary's frequent tiffs with Mrs. Musgrove, appeals to Anne, in effect foregrounding her role of social arbiter and practitioner of a different set of principles: "I have no scruple of observing to *you*, how nonsensical some persons are about their place, because all the world knows how easy and indifferent you are about it" (*ibid.*: 41).

Elizabeth Elliot complains at one point that Lady Russell has given her "a tiresome book" to read: "I really cannot be plaguing myself for ever with all the new poems and states of the nation that come out. Lady Russell quite bores one with her new publications" (*ibid.*: 190). What this passage does, other than reinforce the contrast between Elizabeth's indifference to reading and the very readerly disposition of Anne's, is remind us that the large public issues of the day, social, political and economic, admitted into the represented world of this novel largely in a peripheral way, are brought up in this case through the mediating experience of texts. Elizabeth does not entertain those issues at all, but interestingly enough, her words casually foreground a specific feature of the public sphere in which writing on the "states of the nation" is produced—the simple fact that there is no agreement on what the state of the nation is, but rather a presumably prolific range of public discourse presenting a plurality of views. This outside world—the world outside of Elizabeth's very selective perspective (which selectivity replicates much of her father's habit of social condescension)—is in fact a world that brings in some degree of instability; in this way, the novel projects an awareness of change, as well as a sense that the question of the state of the nation is a question that needs to be raised. Incidentally, Lady Russell's unsuccessful attempt to persuade Elizabeth to cultivate literary and political opinions casts her in a somewhat more favourable light than her successful attempt at persuasion (of Anne, against the match with Wentworth); giving Elizabeth "a tiresome book to read" signifies Lady Russell's recognition of the need to actively understand the world, as opposed to Elizabeth's mixture of haughtiness and indifference.

Anne on the other hand, whose mind is active and discerning, has a propensity for social observation, a resolve to actively study the world. When after the

renting out of Kellynch-hall she spends some time with the Musgroves, the family Mary married into, Anne determines to adapt to an environment which she finds to be somewhat unlike Kellynch: "She acknowledged it to be very fitting, that every little social commonwealth should dictate its own matters of discourse; and hoped, ere long, to become a not unworthy member of the one she was now transplanted into" (*ibid.*: 38-39). Anne appears in a variety of roles here: she is of course thinking about how to blend in socially in this new situation, but she is also a sort of ethnologist, describing the peculiarities of a micro-society not completely like (nor indeed completely unlike) her own.⁸ She is in some sense a political scientist too, implying that there are other such small commonwealths, and that the society that is England is composed of such little social units, a network of socially privileged, landed families. Mary's marriage to a Musgrove, and Anne's visiting with the Musgroves, delineate a local segment of this national network. This of course brings to mind Raymond Williams's remark: "Neighbours in Jane Austen are not the people actually living nearby; they are the people living a little less nearby who, in social recognition, can be visited. What she sees across the land is a network of propertied houses and families [...]" (Williams 1975: 166). The local social world experienced by the Elliots is rather limited, and living in such "a scanty neighbourhood" is felt acutely by Elizabeth, the eldest daughter whose social precedence has not resulted in marriage. But the Elliots of Kellynch-hall are also a part of a national social network, a network of neighbourhoods as it were; also, Elizabeth accompanies her father annually to the "great world" (*P* 1998: 8) of London, and the family's taking lodgings in Bath brings them to another hub of the national network. Similarly, Sir Walter's reading of the Baronetage serves to evoke a small national community defined by a specific status; his pride in his family's long membership, admiration for "the limited remnant of the earliest patents," and disapproval of "the almost endless creations of the last century" (*ibid.*: 5) immediately cast him as a snobbish social conservative, who finds the increase in the numbers of baronets detestable. The names of the Elliot daughters, Elizabeth, Anne and Mary, all royal names, project a strong identification with the monarchy as a symbol of the English state. The national community that the Elliots belong to is in effect an archipelagic world in which small insular hubs of privilege and power socialize and communicate with each other even over considerable distances. Of course, within the hierarchical world of Austen's landed communities, being a neighbour, as Williams

⁸ Anne Frey similarly notes that Anne observes the ways of Uppercross "with an almost anthropological awareness" (Frey 2005: 217). However, Frey states that the Uppercross episode serves to suggest an insularity of communities like Uppercross: "Communities founded on location prove insular and unable to connect even to proximate outsiders, much less to feel the concerns of a social whole" (*ibid.*: 218). In my reading, communities such as Uppercross, detached as they may be from one another, are still rendered as a part of a national network of such communities, as is the case in all of Austen's novels.

notes, implies possession of a certain level of social status. One might say that those without it, which really means the majority of the people living nearby, are not regarded as citizens, figuratively speaking, either of these little archipelagic commonwealths, or of the larger network of the nation made up by this archipelago. This restricted idea of community looms large over Anne's use of the term commonwealth: the equation of the small world of a landed family with the concept of the commonwealth makes obvious the exclusive (and necessarily paradoxical) class connotation the word common in commonwealth may hold for Anne (or for the gentry in general).

Elizabeth is not interested in publications on the states of the nation; while there was a time when she fondly perused the Baronetage, the "book of books," at twenty-nine, as the novel's story opens, she "would have rejoiced to be certain of being properly solicited by baronet-blood within the next twelvemonth or two. Then might she again take up the book of books with as much enjoyment as in her early youth" (*ibid.*: 8). At this point she is troubled by the book because it records Mary's marriage while reminding her that her marriage to be recorded in it has not happened. Like her father, Elizabeth is trapped by the rigid (and farcical) exercise of an ideology of distinction that in effect isolates her; her indifference to other kinds of reading is coupled with her larger incapacity to comprehend the world with competence and adaptability. Lady Russell's attempts to get Elizabeth to read may imply, as I suggested, a more noble cause of persuasion on Lady Russell's part, possibly motivated by a concern for Elizabeth's ability to effectively cope with her situation. Yet the novel offers little direct information about what kind of reader Lady Russell herself is, and on balance we are asked to imagine her as one whose scope in reading is not profitably matched by her social discernment (at the end of the novel the narrator suggests she needs to work on her judgement: "[t]here was nothing less for Lady Russell to do, than to admit that she had been pretty completely wrong, and to take up a new set of opinions and of hopes"; *ibid.*: 219).⁹

Elizabeth is unenthused about reading, and reading is not an activity associated with Mary; in fact, Mary and her husband make fun of Captain Benwick's immersion in books. Unlike her sisters, Anne is a well-informed reader, and reading is implied in the story to play a large part in the making of her personality, taste, moral authority and conduct. A resource for a new perspective on subjectivity, her reading is in itself a departure from the practices of class and gender roles to which her family adhere. References to her reading interests occur on a number of occasions through focalization; Anne also ventures into a public discussion of literature in the episode featuring Benwick's constant poring over poetry occasioned by the passing of his fiancé. In the conversation with Benwick, "evidently a young man

⁹ Lady Russell is painted as well-meaning, but as regards "a nicety in discernment of character" the narrator states that "she had been less gifted" than Anne (*P* 1996: 219).

of considerable taste in reading, though principally in poetry,” Anne seeks to give the grieving naval officer some advice: “she had the hope of being of real use to him in some suggestions as to the duty and benefit of struggling against affliction” (*ibid.*: 90). Certain of her “seniority of mind” over him and concerned over his excessive and melancholy consumption of poetry, Anne “ventured to recommend a larger allowance of prose in his daily study; and on being requested to particularize, mentioned such works of our best moralists, such collections of the finest letters, such memoirs of characters of worth and suffering, as occurred to her at the moment as calculated to rouse and fortify the mind by the highest precepts, and the strongest examples of moral and religious endurances” (*ibid.*: 90-91). Shortly after the conversation, however, she fears “that, like many other great moralists and preachers, she had been eloquent on a point in which her own conduct would ill bear examination” (*ibid.*: 91). The implication here may be twofold: on the one hand, Anne may be alluding to the fact that she herself has been affected by the appeal of contemporary poetry (whose cultural stature is referred to in the context of their conversation as “the richness of the present age”; *ibid.*: 90); on the other hand, she may be having doubts about her superior judgment, a moment of self-reflection that suggests that her literary cultivation (and personal formation) is a work in progress. Not to mention that Anne doesn’t recommend any texts in the genre of the novel (unless “memoirs of characters of worth and suffering” are a possible, veiled reference to novels too, and not, say, spiritual biographies). In fact, the word ‘novel’ is not featured in *Persuasion*, in sharp contrast to *Northanger Abbey*, whose protagonist Catherine Morland is an avid reader of novels.¹⁰

As I already hinted, *Persuasion* doesn’t recommend Anne’s taste unequivocally; Anne certainly is not given the role of Austen’s surrogate in the story. Interestingly, earlier in the novel an obvious distance is already created between Anne’s literary taste and the novel’s implied views on literature, in the episode in which Anne joins the Musgroves for a walk in the countryside:

¹⁰ Speaking in defence of novelists, the narrator of *Northanger Abbey* deplores the lack of cultural prestige of the genre: “Although our productions have afforded more extensive and unaffected pleasure than those of any other literary corporation in the world, no species of composition has been so much decried” (NA 1985: 58). The novel, published posthumously with *Persuasion*, contains a range of references to specific novels, novel-reading and the cultural status of the genre at the turn of the century. In a 2001 article, Claudia L. Johnson offered an interesting short analysis of Austen’s views on the 18th century novel in *Northanger Abbey*, pointing out that Austen highlights novels by women writers. Johnson’s article primarily focuses on a contemporary attempt to consolidate the prestige of the genre, Anna Barbauld’s edition of *The British Novelists* (1810), “the first novelistic canon” (Johnson 2001: 166). Barbauld’s series included a number of women novelists, but not Austen, who had not published yet; it was soon followed by Sir Walter Scott’s *Ballantyne’s Novelists’s Library* (1821-24). Both series may be seen as attempts to enhance the cultural standing of the genre of the novel, but they created very different versions of the canon “of the twenty-two novelists Barbauld includes, fourteen are men and eight are women. By contrast, in Scott’s *Ballantyne’s Novelist’s Library* [...] of the fourteen novelists Scott includes, twelve are men and two are women” (*ibid.*: 170).

Her *pleasure* in the walk must arise from the exercise and the day, from the view of the last smiles of the year upon the tawny leaves and withered hedges, and from repeating to herself some few of the thousand poetical descriptions extant of autumn, that season of peculiar and inexhaustible influence on the mind of taste and tenderness, that season which had drawn from every poet, worthy of being read, some attempt at description, or some lines of feeling. (*ibid.*: 75-76)

Poetry, and nature poetry in particular, is here presented as a prolific form of literary production and a fashionable cultural force (whose appreciation is indicative of possession of taste), but it is also almost pronounced to be a clichéd species of literature, in theme and tone. It is not clear to what extent the passage is an expression of Anne's own aesthetic judgment; it is more convincingly read as the narrator's musing on Anne's participation in popular cultural fashions. This walk in the countryside takes the characters "through large enclosures, where the ploughs at work, and the fresh made path spoke the farmer, counteracting the sweets of poetical despondence, and meaning to have spring again" (*ibid.*: 77). On a second reading, especially in the light of Anne's attitude to poetry later in her conversation with Benwick, it is not entirely implausible to argue that there is focalization in the passage, containing a hint of Anne's self-deprecating humour in the phrasing; but again, since at this point Anne is still rather conventionally immersed in poetical clichés, the passage is better read as the narrator's creation of distance from the poetical fashion of the day. The narrator presents an encounter of two views of nature: the popular poetical musings on autumn contrasted by the practical work of farmers and the very different experience of season and time that such work requires. The mention of enclosures in turn brings up questions of social and political power, at a time when such land policies in England were still commonly enforced to the advantage of the landed classes. This is one of the very few places in the text that alludes to the economic basis of the landed classes (possession of land and tenant farming); in combination with the casual allusion to the political practices of enclosure this short passage represents a peculiar moment of eruption of economic and political realities in the text (which were at that time conventionally regarded as being outside the purview of women).

The walks and the sightseeing, a common leisure activity of the comfortable classes, are given a further limelight in the Lyme episode, with its picturesque natural scenery and a historical importance as a harbour. Going to Lyme out of season means that the party that sets out from Uppercross miss "any amusement or variety which Lyme, as a public place, might offer," such as "bathing machines and company." But in November the town and its surroundings are still worth visiting, one of the attractions being the Cobb, the harbour wall, which evokes an economic history of the town not actually mentioned in the novel.¹¹ Then, there's the nature to

¹¹ That the town has an economic life in the present other than tourism, is suggested only by the mention of "the boatmen and workmen about the Cobb" (P 1998: 100), who happen to be around at the time of Louisa's accident.

enjoy: "The scenes in its neighbourhood, Charmouth, with its high grounds and extensive sweeps of country, and still more its sweet, retired bay, backed by dark cliffs, where fragments of low rock among the sands, make it the happiest spot for watching the flow of the tide, for sitting in unwearied contemplation"; more than a hint of the romantic sublime is in evidence here. The most attractive sight is "Pinny, with its green chasms between romantic rocks, where the scattered forest trees and orchards of luxuriant growth, declare that many a generation must have passed away since the first partial falling of the cliff prepared the ground for such a state, where a scene so wonderful and so lovely is exhibited [...]" (*ibid.*: 86). Here, the picturesque appeal of the scenery comes not only from natural features, but also from the orchards which speak of human work. It should be observed that the passage doesn't present the activities of admiration and contemplation of nature as the exclusive province of the poet, but rather associates them with the leisurely visitor with cultured sensibilities. The visit that the characters make to Lyme is not an occasion for contemplation of nature as a heightened form of experiencing and understanding the world as in Romantic poetry; yet as a resource of enjoyment and relaxation affordable to the leisure classes it is also a badge of the right kind of cultivation (to achieve which having a literary taste is a conventional requirement).

Anne's readerly habitus is at first manifested primarily in her appreciation of nature poetry (with a possible burgeoning awareness of conventionalities and clichés); in the conversation with Benwick her attitude to the reading of poetry becomes more discerning and establishes the authority of her literary judgement. But her most striking pronouncements on literature happen in the conversation with Harville about constancy in women and men, in which Anne presents a specific critical approach to literary history, pointing to a historical bias in the writing on that subject:¹² "[...] if you please, no reference to examples in books. Men have had every advantage of us in telling their own story. Education has been theirs in so much higher a degree; the pen has been in their hands" (*ibid.*: 206).¹³ The world of books is thus given a double significance in the novel: for Anne it is the medium

¹² What occasions Anne's words is the statement by Harville: "But let me observe that all histories are against you, all stories, prose and verse. If I had such a memory as Benwick, I could bring you fifty quotations in a moment on my side the argument, and I do not think I ever opened a book in my life which had not something to say upon woman's inconstancy. Songs and proverbs, all talk of woman's fickleness. But perhaps you will say, these were all written by men" (*P* 1998: 206).

¹³ Interestingly enough, this conversation, which takes place in Bath, bears a resemblance to the Prologue of the Wife of Bath's Tale from Geoffrey Chaucer's *The Canterbury Tales*. The Wife of Bath's fifth husband, the scholar Jankin, reads daily a misogynist compilation of texts about women, mostly by male authors (Harville's words to Anne about women, that "all histories are against you," convey a similar tone as Jankin's book). The Wife of Bath points out that "scholars" have a biased way of writing about women, and raises the question of what kind of depiction women would have made of men "had women written histories/Like cloistered scholars" (Chaucer 1998: 236).

through which women can achieve a form of contact with the (dominantly male) spheres of public history and literature from which they are excluded, but in talking to Harville she points out, resoundingly, that written culture has historically been a record of lopsided views, formed under conditions of inequality between men and women. Anne's resolute act of bringing into focus such momentous issues is a key juncture of social commentary in the text; an unstated but obvious enough implication of her words is that there should be more writing by women, and that this would require addressing the social inequalities between men and women which work against women telling their story. In comparison to Anne, both Elizabeth's resistance to reading and Lady Russell's presumably ample yet ineffective reading appear emphatically problematic, with Anne acting as the voice and instrument of a social space not yet realized, a space which is also as yet sparsely written—an inequality which the text in which she is the protagonist foregrounds and seeks to redress.

While Raymond Williams emphasizes the historicity of Austen's novels, he maintains that for "all intricacy of her social description," her chief focus on the landed families was a limitation: "[...] where only one class is seen, no classes are seen" (Williams 1975: 117). This is almost true of Austen's world, but not quite. Its narrative lens is indeed not a wide one; it features little outside the scope focalized by the protagonists. Yet it would be slightly misleading to think of this scope as bringing into view one class only, because Austen's narratives, while mainly taking the perspective of looking inwards at the small world of a specific class, are also well-aware of the complex social space within which the landed class exists; this space, carefully stratified, is the backdrop to all of Austen's novels. In *Persuasion*, there is a good amount of talk of rank, precedence and consequence which separate different segments of the landed class into finely graded levels of hierarchy, and around that small world in the novel there extends, perhaps a sporadically dramatized, but still a customary and comprehensive sense that the entire social edifice is ordered hierarchically. While massive parts of the population are barely referenced in Austen's fiction, what her novels see is not just the internal world of one class, but a hierarchical organization of the body politic, in which the gentry regard themselves as an important part (and often as the moral centre of national life).¹⁴

¹⁴ In *The Rise and Fall of Class in Britain* (1999) David Cannadine examines rhetorical uses of three models of class description in England since the 18th century: hierarchical, dichotomous (such as upper and lower) and triadic (such as upper, middle and lower). The broad question of theorizing the notion of class—whether it is an expression of social structures and processes, or a rhetorical and political attempt to define them, or both—is too complex to address here. Suffice it to observe, along with a

Persuasion, like Austen's fiction in general, arises out of a society in which the capital of rank or social prestige is still a powerful force. That aspiring for status continues to be a strong motivation in this world is discreetly suggested in the story of the Crofts: "Admiral Croft was a native of Somersetshire, who having acquired a very handsome fortune, was wishing to settle in his own country" (*P* 1998: 20)—the narrative doesn't explicitly depict the Crofts as looking to move up in social rank, but renting a place in the countryside, from a baronet, necessarily raises their social prestige. On the other hand, capital in the form of money is claiming an ever more prominent and undeniable role for its own financial importance. For William Walter Elliot, a relative of the Elliots of Kellynch-hall, money is at one point everything, and more important than status. Mrs. Smith, who knows the circumstances of his youth and marriage, reveals to Anne that "[h]e was determined to make [his fortune] by marriage" (*P* 1998: 177), and that "[m]oney, money, was all that he wanted." Although heir presumptive to Kellynch-hall, he wasn't content with the possible inheritance but wanted money immediately, and valued it more than the social prestige of Kellynch to be had in the future (an uncertain prospect anyway, if Sir Walter were to marry again). Mrs. Smith "often heard him declare, that if baronetcies were saleable, anybody should have his for fifty pounds, arms and motto, name and livery included" (*ibid.*: 178). It is not merely that his marriage for money (to a woman seen as having an inferior class status) is considered by some characters as reprehensible in the department of conduct; Mr. Elliot evokes a world in which social relations in general are increasingly being defined, valued and reshaped by money.¹⁵

Money may cause deviation from conventional taste, morals or class ideology of the gentry, but monetary wealth is a thing to be reckoned with. For instance, Captain Wentworth "had no fortune" when he first met Anne in 1806, since what he made in his profession, he "spen[t] freely" (*ibid.*: 25); but by 1814 he comes out

good deal of historiography, that the persistence of hierarchical imagination of class over the course of the 19th century is demonstrable, in spite of new social landscapes created by industrialization which also facilitated new versions of binary and triadic class description. Austen's class imagination and language are hierarchical, and her fiction is not very eloquent on the national geographies, economies and class relations without a direct relationship to land. The working population in particular gets a feeble acknowledgment; yet it would be interesting to examine at greater length her characters, in a number of novels, who are associated with nonlanded wealth. This kind of analysis would have to determine whether Austen does imagine in some way the existence of a middle class in a triadic system of class, or rather sees wealth coming from trade and professions as occupying specific places in a hierarchical image of society. The only express triadic reference in her fiction I could find is from *Mansfield Park*, when Edmund Bertram on one occasion prefers to speak of his social position not as rich or poor, but as belonging to "the middle state of worldly circumstances" (*MP* 1996: 178); but, of course, he very much benefits from his family's status and wealth.

¹⁵ After becoming a widower, Mr. Elliot rediscovers the attraction of rank, and Mrs. Smith reports him watchful about the baronet and Mrs. Clay, i.e. the possibility of a marriage that could deprive him of the baronetcy. The novel highlights in this way the continued social currency of status.

of the Napoleonic wars with significant wealth. This was, the novel suggests, relatively common at the time: “Many a noble fortune has been made during the war” (*ibid.*: 15), says Shepherd the lawyer generally apropos the profession of naval officer. When Captain Wentworth is introduced at Uppercross, Charles Musgrove is reported to estimate that he has “not made less than twenty thousand pounds by the war [...] besides which, there would be the chance of what might be done in any future war,” and that he would be “a capital match for either of his sisters” (*ibid.*: 68)—use of the word capital here cannot be an artless choice of idiom. (It even occurs to Mary that Wentworth’s career in the navy might eventually bring him the reward of a baronetcy.) The conversion of money into status is a regular matter in Austen’s world, and the Musgroves understand and embrace this social dynamic. It is of course important that the novel opens with a financial matter, the crisis experienced by the Elliots, which throws into sharp relief the fact that money is one of the fundamental underpinnings of the maintenance of the social order that Austen’s protagonists inhabit. Sir Walter has been utterly incapable of prudently managing his income: “While Lady Elliot lived, there had been method, moderation, and economy, which had just kept him within his income; but with her had died all such right-mindedness, and from that period he had been constantly exceeding it” (*ibid.*: 10). The problem is not in the profitability of the estate, but in the baronet’s excesses of consumption. The text provides no detail on his income from the estate, even though Austen’s novels, generally speaking, tend to get very specific when it comes to income. As Raymond Williams observes, Austen is on the whole “more exact about income, which is disposable, than about acres, which have to be worked” (Williams 1975: 115). Thomas Piketty examined specific references to income in Austen’s novels, and estimated that Austen’s landed characters needed “twenty to thirty times” the average income at the time to support their status; “[t]he characters in her novels consider themselves free from need only if they dispose of incomes of 500 to 1,000 pounds a year” (Piketty 2014: 105-106). But in *Persuasion* there are, uncharacteristically, no particulars on the size of the Elliots’ income from rent or the scale of Sir Walter’s mismanagement. However, there is a sense of the relative cost of the mismanagement, beginning with the fact that letting Kellynch-hall is a necessity. Also, at the end of the story Anne’s dowry, it is suggested, falls short of what it should have been, for her father “had not had principle or sense enough to maintain himself in the situation in which Providence had placed him, and [...] could give his daughter at present but a small part of the share of ten thousand pounds which must be hers hereafter” (*P* 1998: 218). The baronet’s wastefulness looms large in the narrative; more emphatically than any other gentry character in Austen’s novels, he embodies a practice of consumption that threatens to overwhelm the economic basis of his class in land rent. A broadly farcical character, he may even appear to stand for a social order that is becoming spent (were it not for the Musgroves, who provide some vigour to that order). But at the same time, there is no clear indication in the narrative of what a different

social order might look like. So how does the novel construct its view of the historical moment it inhabits, and what is a sense of social change in this construction?

One answer is that the novel really doesn't imagine the emergence of anything radically different. It may be more about improvement than social transformation, let alone a radical one. The role of the Crofts in the narrative is interesting in this regard. Anne notices that Kellynch-hall is far better managed by the Crofts as renters: "she had in fact so high an opinion of the Crofts, and considered her father so very fortunate in his tenants, felt the parish to be so sure of a good example, and the poor of the best attention and relief, that however sorry and ashamed for the necessity of the removal, she could not but in conscience feel that they were gone who deserved not to stay, and that Kellynch-hall had passed into better hands than its owners" (*ibid.*: 113). The Crofts make some small improvements to the house and keep it in good order, and, more importantly, Anne feels that they discharge the role of an exemplary paternalist authority of social cohesion in the parish much better than their father.¹⁶ The story of the Crofts is not epilogued; they have decided to settle in the countryside, but the narrative doesn't show them actually buying a property. The Admiral is "of a gentleman's family" (*ibid.*: 21), an argument Shepherd uses to get the baronet to consider letting to the Crofts. Later, the Crofts also go to Bath, announcing their claim on participation in that social hub of the classes with nationally prestigious status. So, while the novel doesn't tell us, the Crofts may be easily imagined as eventually getting integrated into the landed gentry, the latest arrivals in a long history of such incorporations. If the story of their absorption into the landed elite might also be read as a story of social improvement—the Crofts excelling in their good sense and paternalist exercise of privilege where Sir Walter failed—they are not exactly parvenus to begin with and their social integration is still presented in a way that doesn't essentially redefine the character of the social order. The change is gradual and conservative, without affecting greatly the established social structures and the principle of hierarchy itself.

For Tony Tanner, the change announced by the novel is more substantial, potentially: as mentioned before, he suggests that the novel projects an image of English society caught between an old order in decline and a new one, "of as yet uncertain values, hierarchies and principles" (Tanner 1986: 249). Some of this sense of transition is in his reading associated with the naval profession, which acquired a new sense of social importance in the course of the Napoleonic wars, and which in the novel is taken to project "a wholly different scheme of values, and a potentially new model of alternative society or community, [...] a new community which,

¹⁶ By renting the house to the Crofts and absenting himself from Kellynch-hall, on the other hand, the baronet, who may be assumed to still receive rent from tenant farmers on the estate, is also dislocated from the local social order.

among other things, accepted wives as equals” (*ibid.*: 228). In *Persuasion* Tanner sees Austen’s “transfer of allegiance and emotional investment from the English ruling classes [...] to the navy (which not only appealed to her patriotism but also embodied new and welcome alternative values” (*ibid.*: 229). The social interactions of the naval cast of characters are shaped by informality and cordiality that are in sharp contrast with the stale formalities of the landed classes. Mrs. Croft, the Admiral’s wife is in Tanner’s reading “a new kind of woman in Jane Austen’s world”; she leads an active life as her husband’s companion but is also “strongly independent” (*ibid.*: 232).¹⁷ More recently Anne Frey has argued that the novel projects a sense of admiration for the naval profession and bestows on it a new way of imagining the national community; Frey regards the navy as one of the “administrative” or “bureaucratic agencies” whose importance grew during this period when “[t]he war with France and the growth of the East India Company placed more men in service” (*ibid.*: 214). *Persuasion* rejects “aristocratic and organic models of nation” (*ibid.*: 216); and “[i]n transferring power from the gentry to the navy, Austen critiques the Burkean model of a nation as a community defined through landed inheritance” (*ibid.*: 217). An example of the decline of the organic notion of nation based on the authority of the landed classes Frey finds in the Musgroves who are “self-absorbed,” and more generally she states that the novel regards the communities of the landed classes as “insular” (*ibid.*: 218) and unable to relate to the entirety of society.¹⁸ Nevertheless, Frey also acknowledges that the assumed new moral significance of the naval community is rendered in the novel in a way that is contiguous with the old order: “But although Austen’s Britain liberally opens its governing structures to a wider group of people, she defines morality in terms still recognizable from aristocratic *noblesse oblige*” (Frey 2005: 230). A similar observation was made by Daniel P. Gunn, who stated that in “matters of conduct [Austen] superimposes an older way of seeing onto the new.” In Gunn’s reading, there is a “contradiction [...] between the moral language of *Persuasion*, which presupposes a static social order, and the novel’s basic way of imagining the world, which implies very strongly that such an order no longer exists” (Gunn 1987: 414).

The relationship between the old and the new is certainly dealt with in the novel with some equivocation. Sir Walter is rigidly conservative about rank, but even he eventually accommodates a degree of change, granting Wentworth some acknowledgment: “Captain Wentworth, with five-and-twenty thousand pounds,

¹⁷ Mrs. Croft is possessed of a good business sense. Speaking of the Crofts inquiring about renting Kellynch, Shepherd the lawyer observes that she “asked more questions about the house, and terms, and taxes, than the Admiral himself, and seemed more conversant with business” (*P* 1998: 22).

¹⁸ The Musgroves may be parochial, but their modernization and exercise of customs similar to those of other such small “commonwealths,” manifest their taking part in a culture connecting the nation-wide archipelago of landed classes.

and as high in his profession as merit and activity could place him, was no longer nobody. He was now esteemed quite worthy to address the daughter of a foolish, spendthrift baronet" (*P* 1998: 218). Sir Walter's approval of Wentworth is no longer an issue, but his class arrogance doesn't carry much weight anyway, as he is from the very beginning of the narrative cast as someone given to a misperception of social processes (unlike Mr. Shepherd who advises him). In the world of the story it is always clear that the naval profession is not without prestige, and that there would be nothing unusual in an alliance between Anne and a Captain in the navy; it is only unusual to the baronet (and Lady Russell). However, the deflation of Sir Walter's stature doesn't mean that the stature of the landed classes is deflated as well, and the novel is careful not to suggest that the old order with its mooring in land possession has been in a decisive decline or that it has been swept away. For instance, while there is a parochialism to the Musgroves, they also project a sense of sociability and improvement: "The Musgroves, like their houses, were in a state of alteration, perhaps of improvement. The father and mother were in the old English style, and the young people in the new. Mr. and Mrs. Musgrove were a very good sort of people; friendly and hospitable, not much educated, and not at all elegant. Their children had more modern minds and manners" (*ibid.*: 36). The Musgroves may be taken to signify a revitalizing of the old order by replenishment from the ranks rising from immediately below. They are less conceited and arrogant than Sir Walter, Elizabeth and Mary,¹⁹ which also means they are much more sociable.²⁰ In addition to their cordiality they are also implied to possess a drive to improve their economic circumstances which has withered away with Sir Walter Elliot. Yet, while their place in the narrative is not entirely marginal, the Musgroves are also given no central role in it. Anne finds Charles Musgrove, heir to Uppercross, "civil and agreeable; in sense and temper he was undoubtedly superior to his wife [...] a more equal match might have greatly improved him." Anne doesn't provide details, but it is possible to assume he doesn't show much promise in re-

¹⁹ Upon arriving at Uppercross, Anne too shows some condescension, albeit in her thoughts: "Anne always contemplated them as some of the happiest creatures of her acquaintance; but still, saved as we all are by some comfortable feeling of superiority from wishing for the possibility of exchange, she would not have given up her own more elegant and cultivated mind for all their enjoyments; and envied them nothing but that seemingly perfect good understanding and agreement together, that good-humoured mutual affection, of which she had known so little herself with either of her sisters" (*P* 1998: 36). This is Austen's way of hinting that no character in the novel, and not even Anne, embodies completely the tone of its vantage point.

²⁰ The Musgroves contribute some vigour to the landed order by their sociability: "The neighbourhood was not large, but the Musgroves were visited by everybody, and had more dinner parties, and more callers, more visitors by invitation and by chance, than any other family. They were more completely popular" (*P* 1998: 42). Generally speaking, in Austen's gentry world the visitors to landed families are not just people from other landed families, but also people in their social orbit (such as Anglican clergy, and navy and army officers) as well as people like Bingley in *Pride and Prejudice* (whose family wealth comes from trade), who are appreciative of the social prestige of the gentry.

finement of conduct or possibly even in economic responsibility: "As it was, he did nothing with much zeal, but sport; and his time was otherwise trifled away, without benefit from books or anything else" (*ibid.*: 39). Having heard that Benwick and Louisa Musgrove are about to marry, Anne imagines Louisa to develop an enthusiasm for poetry, and reflects (not without a touch of condescension): "The idea of Louisa Musgrove turned into a person of literary taste, and sentimental reflection, was amusing" (*ibid.*: 149). On the whole, the personal cultivation of the new generation of the Musgroves is not given an air of moral or social substance. The Musgroves are an improvement on the Elliots, but a superficial one; they can hardly be seen as the novel's harbingers of a substantially different order of things.

In interpreting the novel as a gesture towards a new social order (one which is without a clear definition as yet), Tanner stresses the significance of the depiction of the naval profession for its different practices of communication, both more informal and more respectful than the stale and superficial civilities of the landed classes; he also emphasizes the fact that Wentworth's money and status (like Admiral Croft's too) are not rooted in land, but in a profession unassociated with land. Before Tanner, Nina Auerbach saw the significance of the shift from the land to the sea in even stronger terms than Tanner later would, and regarded the novel as suggesting "Austen's new utopianism" in its depiction of the naval community, and Wentworth's role in particular: "Wentworth has been called the first of Jane Austen's heroes who is a self-made man, and he is also the first hero to represent the world of the future rather than the past. As Anne's lover, Wentworth can initiate her into the brave new world that is so radically transforming the structure of the old. The warmth and generosity that were chilled by the old society can flourish in the new" (Auerbach 1972: 120). While describing the significance of the naval community in the novel as "utopianism" and claiming that it ushers in "a brave new world" may appear extraordinarily hyperbolic claims, Auerbach's point is possibly to underscore the novel's tendency to idealize the significance of the navy (as opposed to landed classes). In that context, Auerbach also argues that the novel foregrounds "the new importance of productive labor as fulfillment in itself;" and that the sailors are, like farmers, in tune with the natural world: "[a]s the farmer works with the rhythm of the seasons, so the sailors work with the rhythm of the sea" (*ibid.*: 121). It may be a bit of a stretch to attribute to the novel a construction of close affinity between the labour of farmers and the labour of sailors (especially if we consider the fact that farming is featured in the novel far less than the naval profession), but Auerbach does have a point in emphasizing that both these groups engage in arduous work, a quality conspicuously absent from the baronet's life. It is not that in Austen's other novels, where male characters inherit land or money, idleness is tolerated or praised, but the emphasis on work as application in *Persuasion* seems new in degree and kind. The sailors in *Persuasion* are not born into abundant money or lofty status, but make their own fortunes by applying themselves in a difficult profession, which separates them for instance from someone

like Darcy in *Pride and Prejudice*, assiduous as he is in the exercise of his paternalist duties, or his friend Bingley, whose family wealth comes from trade and who doesn't seem to engage in any work himself.

Nevertheless, it should be observed that within the world of the novel the naval profession is not really imagined as bringing about a redrawing of the basic contours of the existing social order. The Crofts, after all, seem to retire as country gentlefolk, imitating, at least to an extent, the lifestyle of the rural gentry. So maybe, as with the Musgroves, the Crofts and potentially even Anne and Wentworth are merely taking part in a superficial tweak to the old order. Anne Frey claims that "in insisting that Wentworth's rise was not based on patronage, Austen portrays a navy open to middle-class men" (Frey 2005: 219). Significance of merit in Wentworth's career is certainly indicated in the text, as he was "made commander in consequence of the action off St. Domingo" (*P* 1998: 24). Over the years he acquired a large fortune in service, by seizing enemy ships,²¹ and it appears that advancement in his career (which also made possible his accumulation of wealth in it) had a great deal to do with his actions in service. But it is still likely that patronage was involved in getting Wentworth his first rank in the Royal Navy (before being made commander, a part of his career which is not really illumined by the narrative), and it is likely that patronage played a part later in his career too. Austen's vague but careful construction of Wentworth's story suggests his background to be relatively humble but still having some association with the genteel orders. His older brother was a curate at Monkford, a low-level position within Anglican hierarchy, but still a position which implies some social status just as it offers chances of further appointment. On one occasion, Sir Walter disagrees with his lawyer's characterization of Mr. Wentworth, the curate, as a gentleman: "You misled me by the term *gentleman*. I thought you were speaking of some man of property: Mr. Wentworth was nobody, I remember; quite unconnected" (*P* 1998: 22). Unconnected for the baronet means unrelated to holders of landed property; but were the Wentworths really without access to patronage? Captain Wentworth is the curate's and Mrs. Croft's brother; whether Mrs. Croft's husband had something to do with Frederick's joining the navy is not stated, but her very marriage to Croft is another indication that the Wentworths were not without some social capital. One instance of patronage in Wentworth's career is in fact referenced, with some indication. Wentworth's first command was the *Asp*, a sloop about which he complains

²¹ Paul Johnson writes that "[u]nder the Cruisers Act (1708), renewed at the beginning of each war, Crown rights to the value of captured vessels were divided into eights: three-eighths went to the captain of the ship which took the prize, one-eighth to the commander in chief of the fleet or squadron, one-eighth to the officers, one-eighth to the warrant officers, and two-eighths to the crew." Seizing ships was not a regular occurrence, though, and at the end of the Napoleonic wars, "[a]s the Royal Navy cleared the seas, the chances of prize money fell, and with the peace, it virtually ceased. [...] In the first years of peace, the navy was not an attractive career for ambitious men" (Johnson 1992: 336-37).

as being “[h]ardly fit for service then.” Admiral Croft begs to differ, “Never was a better sloop than the *Asp* in her day. [...] Lucky fellow to get her!—He knows there must have been twenty better men than himself applying for her at the same time. Lucky fellow to get anything so soon, with no more interest than his” (*P* 1998: 58-59). The Admiral’s rejoinder implies that there were more deserving candidates for the post, and that just about enough patronage (interest) may have been involved in Wentworth’s favour for him to get it.

A further step in Wentworth’s career is his getting posted to the frigate *Laconia*, which turned out to be quite financially lucrative: “How fast I made money in her” (*ibid.*: 60). After Anne was persuaded to reject marriage to Wentworth, she perused navy lists and newspapers and concluded that he “must now, by successive captures, have made a handsome fortune” (*ibid.*: 27). It should be remembered that early in the story the baronet expresses his dislike of the naval profession for being a vehicle of social mobility, “the means of bringing persons of obscure birth into undue distinction, and raising men to honours which their fathers and grandfathers never dreamt of” (*ibid.*: 19).²² Sir Walter is aware of the mobility in contemporary society and doesn’t approve of it, but mobility in the world of this novel doesn’t so much challenge hierarchy as function rather routinely within it; on the whole, the narrative clearly places Wentworth within the available and structured forms of mobility which reconfigure the established hierarchy somewhat, but do not get rid of the principle and the mechanisms of it.

Fortunes are sometimes made in the naval profession in times of war, and Wentworth’s considerable wealth largely comes from prize money (made by seizing enemy ships); how this wealth is going to be made use of in the future remains undecided. What is known is that his career in the navy continues, with Anne understanding very well and fearing the dangerous character of it. Neither the narrator nor Anne engage in speculations about his future status in the navy, let alone about possibilities of further enrichment or a different occupation. What the social roles for members of the naval profession might be in peacetime is something the novel barely touches upon, other than in the story of the Crofts who might be moving towards some manner of integration into the landed classes. At any rate, the focus on the naval profession in *Persuasion* doesn’t really either register or propose a radical break with the gradual pace and conservative character of social processes in England (the chief traits of the social world of Austen’s novels in general). If there is an element of novelty to social vision in *Persuasion* which didn’t yet feature in the previous novels, it has to do with the fact that a profession (the naval one) is placed in the narrative limelight, the first such occurrence in her novels. Almost automatically by virtue of that focus, and in spite of its association with

²² As an example of social mobility, Sir Walter complains about “Lord St. Ives, whose father we all know to have been a country curate, without bread to eat” (*P* 1998: 19).

the social world of the landed class and the armature of the patrician state, the naval profession seems invested with the role of making visible a potential of social forces and views not deriving from possession of land. A related novelty is the fact that the male protagonist makes a fortune through his career, an unprecedented plot in Austen's novels. Wentworth's fortune of "five-and-twenty thousand pounds" is not insignificant; it is also the only precisely quantified fortune in the novel. The naval profession may be thus said to allow the narrative to acknowledge the growing social significance of wealth generated in forms other than land rent; yet it is better regarded as a convenient and familiar example than a paradigmatic and new one. By focusing on a different kind of wealth, made within a single career or a single generation, the novel also necessarily casts a particular light on Austen's previous texts, in which male protagonists as a rule inherit wealth but in which there are strong hints of the expanding status of money that doesn't come from land. In *Pride and Prejudice*, for instance, in addition to Bingley, there is Mrs. Bennet's brother: Mr. Gardiner, "a sensible, gentlemanlike man, greatly superior to his sister as well by nature as education," is "a man who lived by trade, and within view of his own warehouses" (*P&P* 1996: 118); certainly, there is not nearly as much focus on Mr. Gardiner and his business, as there is on the naval officers in *Persuasion* (albeit, in their private capacity mostly).²³

It is in the wording of the novel's ending that the importance of the naval profession seems to receive a strong endorsement. The ending also delivers a resounding statement on the importance of the union of Anne and Wentworth. Once, both characters were regarded as nobodies: Anne initially "was nobody with either father or sister" (*P* 1998: 7), and Wentworth was not considered socially acceptable by the baronet and Lady Russell. The story has worked to equip Anne and Wentworth with a kind of significance unmatched by other characters, and the concluding passage of the novel highlights both the value of the union and the value of the profession (while also acknowledging its hazards):

Anne was tenderness itself, and she had the full worth of it in Captain Wentworth's affection. His profession was all that could ever make her friends wish that tenderness less; the dread of a future war all that could dim her sunshine. She gloried in being a sailor's wife, but she must pay the tax of quick alarm for belonging to that profession which is, if possible, more distinguished in its domestic virtues than in its national importance. (*ibid.*: 221)²⁴

²³ A more direct approach to representation of a business enterprise is featured in the unfinished manuscript of *Sanditon*, in the story of Mr. Parker, a small property holder who is trying, with great enthusiasm, to turn the coastal village of Sanditon into a tourist attraction; this novel, had it been completed, may have turned out to signify an additional direction in Austen's writing, her social satire extending outside the landed setting into the sphere of entrepreneurship (even though Mr. Parker's story seems still to inhabit the outskirts of the genteel rural world).

²⁴ In *Victorious Century*, David Cannadine describes a series of celebrations in London in 1814, one of which included a structure named "'Temple of Concord'" on whose "walls were a series of allegorical

Revisiting a number of themes explored earlier in the novel, the ending emphasizes the mutuality of affection as the foundation of the couple's marriage; Anne and Frederick join the Crofts as new standards of domestic virtue. The ending is thus also a comment on that crisis of domesticity with which the narrative opens. The first character introduced in the novel is the baronet, whose habit of narcissistic looking at the Baronetage helps him deal with "any unwelcome sensations, arising from domestic affairs" (*ibid.*: 5); it is soon made clear that the sensations are related to his mismanagement of his income as well as to the unresolved question of Elizabeth's marrying into proper status. But early on the narrative focus shifts away from Sir Walter's domestic problems, and the novel's ending affirms the superior quality of domesticity exemplified in the union of Anne and Frederick, where the superiority derives from greater economic prudence, more cordial forms of sociality, and the anchoring of marriage in affection. Once hampered by the increasingly dysfunctional sense of social distinction embodied in the baronet and Lady Russell, Anne and Frederick are no longer nobodies, and their version of domesticity is now being promoted as a new exemplar (with a nod to the service of the naval profession to the nation at large). But at the same time, the ending references a sense of uncertainty attendant on the naval profession itself, the danger of possible war. There is an interesting dynamic of shifting perspectives in the closing passage, rendered in resonant language; the primary business of the naval profession, a hazardous affair, is praised for its "national importance;" on the other hand, the naval profession is suggested to be even "more distinguished in its domestic virtues." The fashioning of the nation, the novel seems to almost say in this way, also takes place at home, suggesting Austen's concern with connecting the notion of conduct and the notion of community.

The naval profession is not the only profession featured in the narrative. In an examination of the theme of profession in *Persuasion*, Charles J. Rzepka highlights the role of the seemingly marginal character of Mrs. Rooke, "a nurse by profession" (*P* 1998: 138). Mrs. Rooke is professionally employed as a private nurse, but Rzepka points out that she is also "a story-teller by avocation" (Rzepka 1994: 109), who, in Mrs. Smith's words, provides an insight into the social world of the characters: "Call it gossip, if you will; but when Nurse Rooke has half an hour's leisure to bestow on me, she is sure to have something to relate that is entertaining and profitable, something that makes one know one's species better" (*P* 1998:

images: strife and tyranny were banished by peace and victory, and beneath them processed a triumphant Britannia, preceded by 'Prudence, Temperance, Justice and Fortitude' and followed by 'the Arts, Commerce, Industry and the Domestic Virtues'" (Cannadine 2017: 83). The celebrations took place in the summer of 1814, and Claire Tomalin mentions in her biography of Austen that she visited with her brother Henry in London in August (Tomalin 1999: 244), but I haven't been able to ascertain whether Austen knew of or attended the celebrations. It is tempting to think that the novel's association of the war against Napoleon and the phrase "domestic virtues" may have been motivated by the language of the festivities.

139). Rzepka observes that “Mrs. Smith calls Nurse Rooke ‘my historian’ [...], but the shrewd nurse is, more properly speaking, Anne Elliot’s ‘historian,’ the omniscient teller of a tale in which Anne has thus far participated without full knowledge” (Rzepka 1994: 112-13). In Rzepka’s reading the significance of Nurse Rooke is in the analogies constructed in the text between her form of storytelling and the very profession of writing, but also in bringing up the question of women in professional employment. Examining the theme of profession in the novel and the conjunction of naval and domestic themes in the novel, Monica Cohen states that “*Persuasion* wants us to see structural affinities between the nineteenth century’s incipient professionalism and a domesticity aimed at expanding the woman’s sphere by defining it as social and ethical expertise” (Cohen 1996: 363). This has been argued often in one way or another—that the shift away from land is coupled in the novel with a specific emphasis on domesticity as the forge of a new kind of moral and social anchor. As both Rzepka and Cohen point out, the character of Mrs. Rooke, the nurse, brings into focus the very notion of woman in a professional role. In addition, women who marry into the naval profession, such as Mrs. Croft, project a new emphasis on authority of women as efficient household managers. Anne is early on suggested to be well-suited to that role as she helps manage the handover of Kellynch-hall from the Elliots to the Crofts as tenants. Moreover, she assumes a moral authority in domestic spaces, reinforced by her ability to act as a sort of moral arbiter, albeit a relatively reserved one, in the domestic contexts of Uppercross and those of Bath.

That the novel is concerned with a shift towards a different understanding of wealth and status, a new role for women, and a reconstructed domestic space is a big part of its narrative work. However, two kinds of comments need to be attached to that kind of reading. First, the shifts and reconstructions are still imagined only within the world of the landed gentry, since the naval class is not featured as an example of independent social mobility but a profession that still largely functions within the established structure of hierarchy, which is only slightly modified in the story. Other kinds of occupation such as trade and manufacturing, which exist in a large way in the actual historical world of the time, are not acknowledged at all in the novel, let alone endorsed as models of new ways of generating wealth or new models of social authority. The significance of the naval profession in *Persuasion* resides in its national role—national not simply for its part in fighting Napoleon, or for its more congenial forms of domestic sociality but also for the fact of its emplacement within the armature of the state, an armature thoroughly dominated by the landed classes.²⁵ The novel is well-aware that its new focus on the naval

²⁵ Anne Frey makes a much more specific argument about the navy in the novel: “For Austen, the old aristocratic structures no longer instill a sense of social responsibility in the upper classes. The navy’s organizational structures, in contrast, place individuals into relationships that define their duties toward one another and toward the community as a whole. The novel insists that these relationships

profession still represents only a very limited widening of the narrative lens on the world of landed classes. Yet even this slight shift in optics, limited as it is, does speak of the novel's ambition to present a voice in the national conversation about the state of the nation.

The second comment to be attached to the readings cited above has to do with the self-understanding of this novel. Austen had a keen appreciation of the fact that the language of class is a socially contested arena: when Anne's father opposes characterization of the curate Wentworth as gentleman we are in fact reminded that different definitions of the term are in circulation. When Sir Walter decides at the end of the story that Captain Wentworth is no longer a nobody, we are in effect told that even his farcical beliefs on distinction are undergoing redefinition. Austen's lens, trained on a very small social world, didn't preclude a social imagination of change; on the contrary, *Persuasion* seeks to delineate a world marked by a measure of flux, in which the language of social relations is open to a measure of contestation. The novel imagines some of its purpose as rhetorical work of addressing the idiom of class; the purpose is to defamiliarize the very social ideas, the acknowledged truths about class it portrays as dominant.

Another useful avenue to examining the novel's snapshot of the social flux may be to look again at the theme of reading in the novel, and the almost complete absence of novels as reading in the text. Like all of Austen's writing, *Persuasion* is constructed on the tension between the supposed universality of the world of the gentry and its acknowledged truths (which are acknowledged only in order to be subjected to the satirical work of narrative) and the vantage point of an intended audience which is posited as an effect of the text but which is neither wholly epitomized within it nor assumed to be a significant presence in the contemporary world outside it. Within its own world *Persuasion* doesn't feature a kind of reader or a community of readers upon whom it could unequivocally bestow cultural affinity to itself. At best, we may ascertain that the novel is populated by better readers and not so good readers, with Anne at one end of the spectrum, Benwick in the middle, and Elizabeth at the other end. But within the novel neither a community of readers nor a commonality of texts exist. Conspicuously, while poem titles are mentioned, no single novel title is mentioned in *Persuasion*.²⁶ It is as if Austen deliberately sought to highlight a paradox framing the text: *Persuasion* takes upon itself to dramatize a shift in social perspective, a movement away from the landed classes, but also a shift in cultural perspective, a movement towards a growing cul-

continue when the navy returns home, and that communities accumulate through and around the friendships of the naval officers" (Frey 2005: 219). My emphasis, however, is that the armature of the state, of which the navy was a part, was still controlled by patrician interest, an aspect acknowledged by the novel.

²⁶ Anne thinks at one point of "the inimitable Miss Larolles" (*P* 1998: 168), a character from Fanny Burney's novel *Cecilia*, but the novel's title isn't mentioned.

tural authority of the novel as a genre, all of this without really allowing for a substantive widening of the novel's social lens and without having the benefit of being able to comfortably take advantage of a well-established cultural authority of both writing and reading novels. It is not only that Austen's actual contemporary national readership was quite limited,²⁷ which it certainly was also because the reading public was generally small. Rather, the point is that *Persuasion* makes manifest, under these limiting circumstances regarding the existing social world and the existing literary field, its ambition to claim great social and literary significance as a novel.²⁸

Not even Anne does function as completely representative of the novel's views on literature. Even though she does possess a cultivated mind already at the outset of the story, and even though she presents a sharp delineation of male domination in the history of writing, Austen is careful not to associate Anne directly with the novel's central assumption of the emerging social authority of the genre of the novel. Much of the complexity of *Persuasion* is generated precisely by the fact that within its own world it is not entirely readable, as it is quite formally fastidious in presenting itself as requiring a readerly perspective external to that world. This is not to say that *Persuasion* is less concerned with the moral issue of conduct than Austen's other novels, or that Anne is less of a protagonist whose role is to make visible the right kind of conduct. The theme of conduct is still there, and

²⁷ *Emma*, for instance, was published in 1815, and Claire Tomalin mentions that the novel's publisher, John Murray, "printed 2,000 copies, her largest edition yet" (Tomalin 1999: 249). According to Richard D. Altick, the first edition of Walter Scott's first novel *Waverley* (1814) was 1,000, and in six months it sold 6,000 (Altick 1998: 383). By comparison, Scott's poem *Marmion* (1808) sold 2,000 in the first month, and *The Lady of the Lake* (1810) sold 20,300 in the first year (*ibid.*: 386). The two poems as well as poems by Byron are mentioned in *Persuasion*, a nod to the cultural prestige of poetry at the time. The events of *Persuasion* take place in 1814 and 1815; by 1814 Austen already published three novels and Scott only his first. As *Persuasion* shows, Austen was quite aware that she was not working in the most popular genre of literature, just as it shows that she tried to build up its cultural authority.

²⁸ The cultural attitudes to the genre of the novel were changing at the time, and Austen was part of that change. For instance, a contemporary reviewer, Richard Whately wrote in 1821, in a review of *Northanger Abbey* and *Persuasion*, that "[t]he times seem to be past when an apology was requisite from reviewers for condescending to notice a novel [...] The delights of fiction, if not more keenly or more generally relished, are at least more readily acknowledged by men of sense and taste" (Whately 1995: 196-97). Whately surveyed a cultural field in which the genre didn't enjoy great critical acclaim, but was beginning to garner critical attention and cultural stature. He saw in Austen's novels examples of a "new school of fiction," which arose at the turn of the 19th century, and whose ambition was to present a "picture of common life" (*ibid.*: 197). He praised Austen's novels for basing their "moral lessons" in specific kind of literary representation: "her's is that unpretending kind of instruction which is furnished by real life; and certainly no author has ever conformed more closely to real life, as well in the incidents, as in the characters and descriptions." Her literary style, he noted, primarily involves description of "private conversations and uncommunicated feelings" (*ibid.*: 201); the latter appears an early recognition of the technique of focalization. Whately's review was published in *Quarterly Review* 24 (1821). Note: the Norton Critical Edition of Austen's novel, which includes a large excerpt of Whately's text I am quoting from, renders his name as is Whately.

a common Austenian premise is present that conduct requires a dynamic adaptation to changing social processes, but there is no great dramatic emplotment to reaching the right kind of conduct: Anne is early on established as a blend of developed social attitudes of Elizabeth Bennet and Fanny Price, in judgement and action.²⁹ As Tatjana Jukić observes in a recent reading of *Persuasion*: “Anne in the end knows little that she did not know as the novel began” (Jukić 2022: 76). With character development given a relatively secondary focus, the narrative necessarily calls attention to its own design and status as novel, as well as its ambition of engaging the broad question of the condition of contemporary society. There is a modernity to this literary aspiration that conceives of the genre of the novel as a species of social thought. Jukić argues that reading *Persuasion* must take into account its pronounced (and within Austen’s work unprecedented) historicity as well as its positing of the genre of the novel as “an apparatus instrumental to negotiating the modern condition” (Jukić 2022: 82).³⁰

In its own fashion *Persuasion* is about claiming its own authority as an instrument of social analysis. Elizabeth’s refusal to interest herself in publications dealing with the “states of the nation” seems a small event in the design of the text, but it throws into sharp relief the novel’s implicit self-understanding as yet another form of discourse on the state of the nation, and a superior one at that. In the sense of assuming the authority to overview the national condition, and in spite of its focusing only on a small segment of the national fabric,³¹ *Persuasion* may even be seen as anticipating some of the cultural poise of the industrial novel or the condition of England literature of the middle of the 19th century. Its social lens is narrower than that of mid-Victorian novels, but it does propose to discuss the nation and its condition. Regarding its understanding of what constitutes the national community, it is both conservative and moderately open to modification, insofar as on the one hand it doesn’t relinquish the political horizon of the existing order dominated by landed families from Austen’s earlier novels, while on the other hand it welcomes the process of renewal of the old order exemplified by the more affable Musgroves and presents a case for greater appreciation of the naval profession,

²⁹ From the start of the novel it is clear that Anne’s moral and social attitudes are presented as superior to those of Elizabeth, Mary and their father; in that regard, it may also be said that the basic traits of Anne’s idea of conduct, defined at the outset of the narrative, remain substantially the same at the end of it.

³⁰ Along with discussing the significance of the genre of the novel in the 19th century, Jukić also examines the place of *Persuasion* in Austen’s fiction as a text which is designed to work out her views on the genre of the novel.

³¹ This could be said of Austen’s other novels as well. Claire Tomalin, for instance, states that “*Mansfield Park* is, among other things, a novel about the condition of England” (Tomalin 1999: 226), which in her reading means pointing to similarities between the worldliness of the Crawfords and “the highest Regency society” (*ibid.*: 227). Some of the complexity of Austen’s fiction comes from evoking this level of topicality, as well as from observing the more general questions and processes related to landed wealth and hierarchy.

“who have done so much for us” (*P* 1998: 19). In those words by Anne, the referent of the “us” is arguably not meant to include everyone living in the country; conceivably, the “us” here may still mean, conservatively, only the social order anchored by patrician landowners. Thus the novel doesn’t so much insist that its view of the national community is new, as it does clearly imply that the inflexible one espoused by Sir Walter Elliot is antiquated, restrictive and foolishly ineffective. The novel’s view of the nation also shapes its light on the state of this nation, a light that reveals instability and change without proposing to predict (as in fact Tanner too remarked), the contours of a new order of things. The novel’s image of the national community is one created by social bonds connecting the archipelago of landed neighbourhoods, the patrician state with its hierarchies, privileges and careers, the social pull of London and fashionable tourist haunts, the printed culture of newspapers, navy lists, publications on the state of the nation, a common discourse about poetry, taste in poetry and more generally taste in literature, and a pursuit of admiration of the picturesque of natural and historical character as part of personal cultivation, all that in a text that does not mention cotton or cotton mills, social conflict, trade policies, the East India Company, the recent war with America, or even Napoleon by name, or any of the English political figures from the period for that matter. The novel’s social lens is largely shaped by the sense that the society it observes is one of a gradual reconfiguration of social hierarchies and relations rather than an abrupt break with the existing order. The mood of the novel in this regard is one of discontentment with the staleness of the social order, but as to its appreciation of actual new social developments and forces at play in contemporary society, the novel’s choice to focus on the navy is arguably a matter of its affinity with (rather than difference from) the established order. In addition, the “national importance” (*ibid.*: 221) of the naval community is linked to the threat of war, which infuses Wentworth and Anne’s future with a strong sense of uncertainty; also, it doesn’t quite become apparent how the naval profession as a community may be featured in the role of instrument or catalyst of social transformation in peacetime. It is certainly arguable that the social attitudes of the naval officers in the novel present a strong contrast to the tiredness of the world of the gentry, but the novel is very cautious in characterizing the organizational or bureaucratic aspects of the navy, and it does not look closely at its actual professional work. Not to mention that the novel, for all its mockery of the gentry world, doesn’t exclude the possibility of a reformation of the significance of the landed order: the Crofts are possibly on their way to settle down on land, and Anne and Wentworth might imaginably follow suit. Yet this is left unresolved, which is a telling indication that the novel doesn’t seek to fashion a radical break from the countryside setting for its main characters, just as it doesn’t seek to address with greater resolve the possibility of decoupling its imagination of personal conduct from rootedness in the world of the rural gentry, a reluctance that runs through Austen’s fiction in general.

Persuasion may be said to invest most of its work in a more general direction, as a cultural intervention, a work of persuasion about its own significance, a claim to be a social discourse that proffers opinion on the state of the nation and demands that its authority to do so, as well as the authority of the genre of the novel to which it belongs, be recognized. This feature of *Persuasion* is not attendant on a sweeping overview of the social world; rather it grows out of a perception of small and gradual changes in the parochial but socially still powerful world of the gentry. The novel's claim of authority is both the method and the goal of its work: broadcasting its own social importance, domestic and national, and establishing its authority in the act of doing so. It takes itself seriously, not merely as a way for the gentry class to achieve a critical self-awareness, as Williams argued, but as an instrument of surveying the broader social landscape, taking part in the national conversation about the state of the nation, and establishing the novel as a new literary richness of the age.

WORKS CITED

- Altick, Richard D. 1998. *The English Common Reader: A Social History of the Mass Reading Public, 1800—1900*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.
- Armstrong, Nancy. 1989. *Desire and Domestic Fiction. A Political History of the Novel*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Auerbach, Nina. 1972. "O Brave New World: Evolution and Revolution in *Persuasion*." *ELH* 39, 1: 112-128.
- Austen, Jane. 1996. *Mansfield Park*. London: Penguin Books.
- 1985. *Northanger Abbey*. London: Penguin Books.
- 1998. *Persuasion*. London: Penguin Books.
- 1996. *Pride and Prejudice*. London: Penguin Books.
- Cannadine, David. 1999. *The Rise and Fall of Class in Britain*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- 2017. *Victorious Century. The United Kingdom 1800-1906*. London: Allen Lane.
- Chaucer, Geoffrey. 1998. *The Canterbury Tales* (A verse translation by David Wright). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cohen, Monica F. 1996. "Persuading the Navy Home: Austen and Married Women's Professional Property." *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction* 29, 3: 346-366.
- Frey, Anne. 2005. "A Nation without Nationalism: The Reorganization of Feeling in Austen's 'Persuasion.'" *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction* 38, 2/3: 214-234.
- Gunn, D. P. 1987. "In the Vicinity of Winthrop: Ideological Rhetoric in *Persuasion*." *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 41, 4: 403-418.
- Johnson, Claudia L. 2001. "'Let Me Make the Novels of a Country': Barbauld's 'The British Novelists' (1810/1820)." *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction* 34, 2: 163-179.
- Johnson, Paul. 1992. *The Birth of the Modern. World Society 1815-1830*. New York: Harper Perennial.
- Jukić, Tatjana. 2022. "Austen and Osterhammel. The Transformation of the World and the Novel in the Nineteenth Century." *Zagreber Germanistische Beiträge* 10: 69-84.

- Piketty, Thomas. 2014. *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press.
- Rzepka, Charles J. 1994. "Making it in a Brave New World: Marriage, Profession, and Antiromantic 'Ekstasis' in Austen's 'Persuasion.'" *Studies in the Novel* 26, 1/2: 99-120.
- Tanner, Tony. 1986. *Jane Austen*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Tomalin, Claire. 1999. *Jane Austen. A Life*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Whately, R. 1995. Review of *Northanger Abbey* and *Persuasion*, pp. 196-205, in Jane Austen, *Persuasion*. A Norton Critical Edition (Edited by Patricia Meyer Specks). New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Williams, Raymond. 1975. *The Country and the City*. New York: Oxford University Press.

SAŽETAK

STANJE NACIJE I ROMAN: UVJERAVANJE JANE AUSTEN

Roman Jane Austen *Persuasion* (1818) često je u kritičkim čitanjima analiziran zbog svojega prikaza društvenog svijeta nižeg plemstva (*gentry*); za neke kritičare taj je prikaz svojevrsan otklon od njezina prethodnoga fikcionalnog svijeta, osobito u pogledu uloge likova iz redova mornaričkih časnika. Ovaj rad razmatra "stanje nacije", odnosno viziju društva u romanu, kroz analizu uloge i karaktera tematskog pomaka u fokusu od zemljoposjednika prema mornaričkoj profesiji. U tom pogledu pozornost je posvećena prikazu bogatstva i društvenog statusa u romanu te načinu na koji se mornarički likovi uklapaju u etablirane društvene hijerarhije; rad se u tom kontekstu osvrće na neke od važnih kritičkih interpretacija društvene vizije u romanu. S druge strane, rad naglašava da je riječ o romanu koji sadrži zanimljiva tematiziranja književnosti i čitanja (koja se pak uglavnom ne odnose izravno na žanr romana). Naposljetku, rad ukazuje na to da *Persuasion* ističe svoj status književnog teksta kao oblika društvene analize, pri čemu nastoji afirmirati svoj kulturni autoritet te kulturni autoritet romana kao žanra.

Ključne riječi: Jane Austen, klasa, nacija, roman, čitanje

Look at This Blue and the Discontents of the Anthropocene

Introduction

Allison Hedge Coke is a liberal, ecologically concerned, and scientifically informed humanist. While deriving inspiration from California's socio-cultural and environmental context, her poem *Look at This Blue* actively addresses globally oriented inquiries and concepts that drive ecological thought. Hedge Coke's tireless campaign for the environment and Indigenous rights designs *Look at This Blue* as an emergent message. Her inference that "[w]here man goes, comes inevitable loss" (2022: 21) encapsulates the belief that humans harm ecosystems as they intervene in nature because of insufficient environmental concern or understanding that stems from a reference system (Western, capitalist, colonial) that privileges one type of human while neglecting other human and nonhuman life forms.

Hedge Coke is an Indigenous humanist whose cognitive eyes open from holistic cosmogony. Assuming from this environmentally just axiom, her language is characterized by humility while attempting to poetically articulate the discontents of, as Keller (2017) calls it, a "self-conscious Anthropocene." In this manner, while examining "the blue of extinction, the blue of the last butterflies, the blue of arson, howls of species gone, the last note of Ishi and his people," the judges of the National Book Award quote, "[t]he speaker's blue spirals of compassion and action, flora and fauna endangered, the blue of facts, lists, documents, missionization of First Peoples propel us through the poem, commit us to zig-zagging across stanzas of lives lost." Other critics praise the poem as radical and experimental (Heelein 2022). *Look at This Blue* blends poetic and documentary genres to highlight the system's all-pervading deceptiveness, which immerses humanity in an abundance of material in the age of the Internet but does not provide consolation. Chickasaw writer Linda Hogan (2022) states that Hedge Coke's poems "have so much to say that they can't talk fast enough, and this poet is not afraid to speak the dangerous truth."

Hedge Coke's poetic profundity, linguistic and visual subversiveness, and continuous concern for justice force us to confront the implications of colonialist ecological racism and capitalist exploitive and coercive power. Thus, *Look at This*

Blue joins Indigenous ecological activism, whose centuries-old knowledge offers holistic, sustainable, and justice-oriented solutions to the growing field of environmental humanities. Consequently, *Look at This Blue* becomes more than just a book; it represents a “scary” (Fisk 2024) action that engages readers in the extinction and survival processes in the world they navigate.

Where Hedge Coke writes from

The deep-rooted inequalities in environmental practices experienced by minority communities in North America, especially Native Americans, are marked by ongoing “ecological racism” (Gilio-Whitaker 2019) and “slow violence” (Nixon 2011). As Gilio-Whitaker discusses in her (ironically titled) study *As Long as Grass Grows*, supported by the narrative of progress, colonial practices facilitated the theft of Indigenous lands, genocide, and slavery, laying the foundation for the accumulation of wealth in America at the expense of ecological and cultural sustainability (2019: 32-3). The commodification of sacred land into private property facilitated the formation of economic surpluses, which, in turn, demanded a constant migration, displacement, and slow erasure of Indigenous communities (*ibid.*: 6). The disruption of traditional food systems has exacerbated chronic health issues in these communities (*ibid.*: 21). Besides, a large percentage of displaced Indigenous communities populate areas contaminated by uranium and toxic waste that have caused a series of health problems and shorter life spans (*ibid.*: 23-4), eventually resulting in historical trauma (Aloma 2016: ii). Still, in the 21st century, the U.S. legal system continues to marginalize Indigenous populations, frequently excluding them from decision-making processes about their lands and resources, as evident in the 2016 Dakota Access Pipeline controversy when the U.S. ignored the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (Gilio-Whitaker 2019: 31-2), denying them the status of legal subject, water rights, and an opportunity to heal.

Technology that advances capitalist practices also shapes nature and our perception and communication with it, perpetuating the paradox of the Anthropocene (Solnick 2017: 7, 10). While humanity’s increasing power results in greater environmental destruction, the accumulation of environmental knowledge still leaves humanity inactive or emotionally paralyzed (Keller 2017: 67, 150). In this context, poor communities incapable of adapting to abrupt changes suffer the most. In deteriorating and unsustainable areas, the direct violence of physical relocation is coupled with the “slow violence” of delayed destruction, which, Nixon elaborates, is incremental, accretive, and exponential (2011: 2-3). It is also mediated by bureaucratic and media violence, which perpetuates control over marginalized populations’ visibility. This process results in “spatial amnesia,” Nixon continues, which “imaginatively” shelters the privileged from reality (*ibid.*: 151). As a result,

disasters continue, exposing the limits of current systems and eroding trust in institutions. Indigenous ecological efforts join mainstream environmentalism in warning against this dangerous “multipolar order” (Stewart-Harawira 2005: 32), with the aim of ending suffering and achieving justice for past and present crimes.

Although “traditional indigenous knowledge forms have a profound contribution to make towards an alternative ontology for a just global order” (*ibid.*: 27), the academy tends to neglect tribal intellectualism mainly because it is transmitted through stories the dominant education understands as myths (Tuhiwai Smith 2007: 33). Building on this neglect and imploring that their data be “honorably harvested,” Melissa K. Nelson explains that stories carry the power of connectivity, serving as an Indigenous means of “re-writing and re-righting history and combating the erasure of our people’s presence on the land” (2023: 319). While calling out for joined academic and civic activities, Indigenous environmentalists also seek to cooperate with the settler societies (cf. Powys Whyte 2017: 210). For example, discussing how the COVID pandemic has highlighted social estrangement and vulnerability, Joy Harjo emphasizes the necessity of collective navigation (2022: 80). Instead of selfish and fragmented answers to global difficulties, interrelated crises necessitate collaborative solutions and a narrative that logically links them.

Indigenous contribution to ecological humanities, therefore, comes from their holistic epistemology that sees creation as a constant evolution of an ecosystem found in the sustainable and balanced cooperation of its diverse parts, thus incapacitating hierarchies (Deloria 2003: 77). As species communicate, learn from each other, and change into different life forms, the tribe includes all living and non-living entities that acquire the quality of intelligence and spirituality, i.e., personality. In her influential book *Braiding Sweetgrass*, Robin Wall Kimmerer discusses how the “Honorable Harvest” is founded on our accountability to both the physical and metaphysical realms and emphasizes that when we understand the beings we harvest as persons, possessing intelligence and spirit, family and home, taking life for sustenance gains a more profound significance (2013: 192). Creek ethnohistorian Donald Lee Fixico calls the overall connectedness of this animated world “Natural Democracy” (2003: 45-9). As Rosanne Kennedy derives, it requires Indigenous science—which she describes as “eco-memory” (2017: 276)—to take a multidirectional and multispecies approach and recognize the “ecological vulnerability neither exclusively in human-animal nor nonhuman animal terms but as interconnected” (*ibid.*: 269).

On this basis, Kyle Powys Whyte elaborates that, embedded in the acknowledgment of the “multiple relationships among living beings, non-living things, and the environment,” the traditional body of knowledge “is viewed as the process of participating (a verb) fully and responsibly in such relationships [...] it is the relationship with Creation” (2017: 4). The inclusivity of Indigenous thought and the concept of kinship with surrounding phenomena, Shawnee philosopher Thomas Norton-Smith describes as a “dance of person and place” (2010). Thus, when the

world is perceived as an energetic expanse in constant motion, its linguistic description is dominated by verbs that depict the perceived processes. Developing meanings through combinations of verbs, for example, the Hopi express that a cardinal is red through an utterance close to “cardinal is redding” (*ibid.*: loc. 487). Almost diagonally across the continent, the Anishinaabe word *puhpowee* means forcing “mushrooms to push up from the earth overnight” (Kimmerer 2013: 61). The Ojibwemowin verb *wiikwegamaa*, “to be a bay,” releases the expression from humanly enforced bondage, understanding that the living water “has decided to shelter itself between these shores, conversing with cedar roots and a flock of baby mergansers” (*ibid.*: 67). Ojibwemowin is listed in the Guinness Book as one of the most challenging languages to learn because “two-thirds of the words are verbs, and for each verb, there can be as many as six thousand forms” (Erdrich 2003: 59). Similarly, verbs comprise 70% of Potawatomi (Kimmerer 2013: 65).

From this position, Melissa K. Nelson proposes that “ecological knowing” is an active and continual process—therefore, an action—that “implies a plurality of ways or methods,” and humility because it does not express one “authorized” body of information, be it even Indigenous. “Knowledge as a noun,” she says, “can get turned into a thing, a product, a commodity. It can become mono-cognitive, mono-cultural, mono-lithic, *one way*” (2023: 317-8). Drawing from physicist Vandana Shiva, Nelson explains that “monocultures of the mind,” originating in the colonial hierarchical thought system, are irreconcilable with Indigenous perception. The Indigenous is the “grammar of animacy,” Nelson uses Kimmerer’s concept, which “opens poly-cognitive and poly-cultural ways of knowing” (*ibid.*: 318). Thus, ecological language is that of a relationship that acknowledges responsibility for a variety of lives, “oak trees and shale mountains, hummingbirds and saguaro cactus, or lizards and flowing rivers, and of course, with our own species, fellow mammalian two-leggeds of the five-fingered clan of many ages, colors, sizes, languages, places, and worldviews” (*ibid.*).

Finally, Creek poet and American Laureate (2019 – 2021) Joy Harjo considers the oversaturation of language in the digital era that has reduced the value of words and meaningful communication (2022: 76). She underscores that the Anthropocene cannot express justice because its language (scientific, economic, and political), founded on control, dominance, and separation, views the natural world as an object to be described, measured, and exploited. In line with Anthropocene history, the extension of European languages brought on the coercive myth of national progress (*ibid.*: 35), justified the oppression of Indigenous peoples, their languages and epistemologies, and aided in the global deterioration of ecosystems (*ibid.*: 11). On the contrary, Indigenous justice is inherently restorative and rooted in rebalancing relationships.

Look at This Blue as a reflection of the Anthropocene disorder

Look at the Blue is intensely centered on decolonizing justice by fostering respect for Indigenous methodologies and reestablishing rightful relationships of responsibility among humans and between human and non-human life. By weaving together historical and present, ecological, social, and individual adversities, the poem articulates a simple message that recognition of mercy and kindness will benefit both the colonized and the colonizers, who must relearn how to respect themselves and others. This message develops into an invitation for joint action, conveyed through a complex form that involves numerous, sometimes conflicting, languages and visual renderings, reflecting the chaos of the Anthropocene.

The poem's two epigraphs signal that it understands itself as a dynamic medium that seeks to intervene in readers' recognition. The mixture of tenses in the first epigraph evokes cognitive dissonance:

*once, the world was gleaming, open,
we entered unknowing, believing all we came to
we must deserve, knowing we did not faced
extinction.* (Hedge Coke 2022: xi)¹

These first words—"once, the world was gleaming"—recall the beginning of storytelling and the disturbing destiny of Indigenous people. However, the pause, typical of this poem's discourse, transfers the poem's grievance for the lost language and alarms that we are all endangered, i.e., unless we learn to "honorably harvest" what is gifted to us. The second epigraph quotes Inuk musician Tanya Tagaq's song "Retribution," indicating that Indigenous environmental struggles are gaining momentum: "*The path we have taken has rotted/ Ignite, stand upright, conduct yourself like lightning*" (*ibid.*: xiii). This dialogue introduces *Look at This Blue* as a critique of the idolatry of wealth as the primary cause of environmental damage and spiritual emptiness and as an electrifying call to action.

On the following page, the poem is introduced as "*an assemblage*" (*ibid.*: xiv). We will see that it is an assemblage of man-induced catastrophes and expect it to be subversive of the linear thought that has carried domination and oppression. However, the choice of the concept of "assemblage" inevitably calls to mind Deleuze and Guattari's conceptual model of a "book as assemblage of the outside" and not an "image of the world" (2005; 23). As "an assemblage," a book establishes multiple connections with the world, becoming a rhizome (*ibid.*: 11). Built on multiplying modes of attention, the rhizome is heterogeneous and nonlinear. While disallowing hierarchies, the rhizome has neither beginnings nor endings but

¹ Italics are original unless otherwise noted.

only middles that form plateaus through which it progresses in many directions (*ibid.*: 23) and can be approached from various sides. Another principle of the rhizome is “asignifying rupture” (*ibid.*: 9), which means that it is “stratified, territorialized, organized” along the lines of segmentarity and deterritorialization (*ibid.*). Yet, every “line of flight is part of the rhizome” and “always tie[s] back” to other lines (*ibid.*). Thus, while trying to map the diverging consequences of the Anthropocene’s inherent flaw, *Look at This Blue* develops as this multidirectional message, offering various perspectives on relationships that overcome scale and temporality, immersing within its subject both the language and the lyrical persona. As a result, the poem’s fragmented discourse and seemingly dispersed images emerge through growing lists, historical projections, literary allusions, political commitment, and emphatical lyrical grievance, which strive to look into the middle of the problem as if trying to untie the Gordian knot of the Anthropocene.

In its visual subversiveness, the poem opens by inviting readers to imagine an extinct blue butterfly:

Look at This Blue

Xerces blue butterfly from the sand dunes of San Francisco
first-known American butterfly to become extinct due to humans
first known (Hedge Coke 2022: 1)

Urban development destroyed the lotus plant it fed on, and the butterfly died. The rest of the first page is empty, prompting us to reflect that the butterfly cannot be seen except as its photographed replica. The anthropocentric perspective emphasizes the iconic visualizations of its force and invisibilizes the vulnerable and the extinct. The juxtaposition of these incongruous phenomena, when something so silent as a butterfly produces noise, triggers consideration of what humanity might do with the space if fed by images of beauty and kindness instead of power and brutality.

Highlighting human agency in maintaining life on Earth, the invitation interweaves the book. It repeats five times, referring to the endangered “Palos Verdes blue [...] *one of the best claims to being the world’s rarest butterfly*” (*ibid.*: 11), “Mutant blue-eyed coyotes” (*ibid.*: 53), “Mission blue butterfly *from coastal chaparral*” (*ibid.*: 73), “Blue Whale *alongside Monterrey* [...] first thought extinct by development” (*ibid.*: 94), and the “Hidden Lake bluecurls” (*ibid.*: 119), which are so small that “fifty flowers might fit on a penny” (*ibid.*: 119). Aesthetic appreciation here is ethical, and the authorial intention is obvious—“finding something beautiful,” Emily Brady agrees, “contribute[s] to developing a caring attitude towards it” (2017: 208). Pointing to the phenomena invisibilized by the capital-driven frame of mind, these five summonses function as rhizomatic plateaus that provide a unifying power to the sections that interweave human and nonhuman disasters. Thus, although the poem is sometimes insistently abecedarian—evoking the concept of lin-

earity—and pregnant with lists of the extinguished and endangered life, *Look at This Blue* relates that there are no visible beginnings and endings of the discontents. As one human action starts a rhizome of consequences, it becomes problematic to define the reason behind the vandalizations of parks or restaurant massacres, of which Hedge Coke gives numerous examples. Ignorance, greed, or an untreated illness are only “symptoms of something massive faster” (2022: 14), and incapable of caring: “Those who rage are,” paradoxically, “*full of emptiness*,” she argues, “hollow people, unfilled, vacant” (*ibid.*: 101). The mechanical force of the late industrial society feeds on this emptiness, objectifying humanity and overall life.

On the contrary, Indigenous understanding of relationality, kinship or “kinning” (Nelson 2023: 318), mutual accountability, and reciprocity cancels divisions and hierarchies, not only within the human landscape but also between humans and nonhumans. Connectivity and empathy are expressed in *Look at This Blue* through a seemingly irregular succession of images of destruction—brisk and elaborated, as well as personal and historical. Spectacular climate problems, like glacial melt—“Glacial melt, waves and waves./ 100 times faster than previously imagined” (Hedge Coke 2022: 86)—alternate with accretive violence, as seen in the poaching of redwood burls.

Redwood burls cut like blisters shaved from trunks
poach life source from root
killing giants in knobby growth removals
baseline / canopy-height bud tissue
unsprouted genetic code for clone of parent-tree emergence— (*ibid.*: 2)

The burls produce highly textured wood for which reason they are poached even from national parks. The acknowledgment that the burls preserve a tree’s life creates a profound shock, which leads the poet to draw a parallel between their devastation and a harrowing incident from her upbringing. Specifically, the tree is viewed as a living entity and its burls are perceived as the buds that supply it with life. However, the poachers are ruthless in disregarding the need for genetic replication, which is why the dash sign appears. The image instantly contrasts with a more visible threat to life—that of a person unable to breathe due to a gun barrel held at their mouth.

Barrel at my mouth, ready-cocked held there
by my baby brother’s bared grip. (*ibid.*)

The space following the anecdote conjures the absent air. We learn that the barrel is held by an infant, a human incapable of sufficiently reasoning the action, which is why his grip is described as “bared.” The murdering of a tree is, thus, compared to killing a person.

Seeing forests as persons with agency, *Look at This Blue* presents several consequences of their destruction. It recalls the 2017 arson ignited by Southern California Edison's equipment that burned around 280,000 acres of Los Padres National Forest. The fire destroyed thousands of homes, producing a massive wave of developmental displacement, including animal species unlikely to find shelter: "First the puma in Santa Paula palm branch, then coyotes, fox, rabbits appear,/ Birds overcome the sky" (*ibid.*: 8) producing a "plume," a mass of feathers or a long choking cloud of smoke resembling it. After this, the lyrical persona notices that "undulating fleas" cover the earth in thick "wrapping" that makes the path "barely passable" (*ibid.*). The destruction of one habitat inflicts transformations of another so that the denial of nature's agency generates a pronounced emotional reaction, from which springs intense recognition and identification when, as Margaret Ronda says, "the 'I' empties or expands into other beings" (2024: 54), with care and anxiety (*ibid.*: 51). The same recognition is evident in Hedge Coke's response to the "defunding" (2022: 115) of Joshua Park during the COVID-19 shutdown. Namely, with few rangers on-site, careless vacationers damaged trees, which may not recover in hundreds of years, spray-painted the sand rocks, and used sensitive areas as off-roads, thus destroying the macrobiotic dust of the trees' habitat. After experiencing the forest's grandeur as a "rangy succulent majesty" (*ibid.*: 115), Hedge Coke personifies its march across the U.S. Southwest—"said to straddle Mojave and Colorado Deserts" (*ibid.*). However, the fact that the pandemic shutdown brought a unique desert park to risk also provokes irony reinforced by the sorrow surrounding the prediction that climate change may destroy forests anyhow, underlying that those currently destroying them may simply be rushing towards the inevitable end: "by 2100 climate change rising temperatures/ may take it all, they're hurrying along" (*ibid.*).

As environmentally conscious narratives intertwine ecological facts with cultural histories and values, we are reminded of the genocide performed over the California tribes and, in particular, of the Yahi, of whom Ishi was thought to be the last surviving member. Hedge Coke narrates that Ishi was found in 1911 and mostly kept for studying in a museum directed by the Berkley anthropologist Alfred Kroeber. Unable to cope with European diseases (similar to the butterfly whose habitat was destroyed), Ishi died five years later, while his brain was returned to his relatives only in 1999. Explaining that Ishi was not the original name of this objectified person—it meant "human" in the Yana language, which also became extinct—Hedge Coke emphasizes that the whole culture was erased with the disappearance of its language: "*The Yana/ language was distinctive in having different/ word forms used by male and female speakers,/ an unusual trait that does not exist in the other/ languages of this region*" (*ibid.*: 6). The story about Ishi opens the way for the poet to warn that the dominant thought system rejects alteration. The poem lists nearly 150 animals and 265 endangered or extinct plants (*ibid.*: 33-52), provides an abecedarian register of 320 missionized Californian

tribal groups (*ibid.*: 64-66), and records 32 massacres of California tribes (*ibid.*: 67). Simultaneously, these lists mimic the language that facilitates the mechanical linearity of the deterministic system to affect readers' awareness of their discontent with the Anthropocene.

Coming from an inclusive culture, Hedge Coke must remember other unprivileged communities to show that, as the communities that bear the least responsibility for the environmental crisis, they endure its consequences most frequently. However, in the accelerating capitalism, they are invisible, like the butterfly. Discussing the environmentalism of the poor, Nixon alarms that the concept of progress discounts the unprivileged on three levels: "as political agents," "long-term casualties of slow violence," and "cultures possessing environmental practices and concerns of their own" (2011: ix). This recognition drives not only *Look at This Blue* but environmental humanities in general, which examine how these communities are abstracted from national narratives and stigmatized as irrational, inconvenient, unworthy, surplus, disposable, expendable, invisibilized (Stewart-Harawira 2005: 24), unimagined (Nixon 2011: 150), monstified (Giuliani 2021), uninhabitants (Nixon 2011: 153), etc. In *Look at This Blue*, however, they are approached with solidarity from an equally abject position of an Indigenous woman excluded from the realms of the privileged (Kristeva 1982) and endangered on multiple levels (LaDuke 2015: xvii). Because these communities are least likely to achieve redress, it becomes the poet's priority to show, as her fellow feminists say, how "alienation and disempowerment make it [...] difficult for communities to fight against a system that is poisoning them" (Cuomo 2001: 37) and how it is only "when our values and decisions do not center solely on our own interests that our thinking is ethical" (*ibid.*: 64). █

Hedge Coke presents numerous burning issues among California non-white residents, in particular Latinos, African Americans, Chinese, and Japanese. On the same page (2022: 96), we learn about the 1852 "*harsh fugitive slave law that condemned/ dozens of African American migrants to deportation and lifelong slavery*," "THE CHINESE EXCLUSION ACT OF 1882," the 1929 forced removal of "400,000 Mexican American people/ from their state,/ their country of birth." The poem emphasizes that these communities are "[d]eprived, defrauded," as their property is stolen to buy "trains, cars, buses,/ planes" (*ibid.*). They are also unjustly forced out of their neighborhoods, "with no due cause," by—the poem is now disturbed and employs a series of progressive forms—"Enacting threats, committing/ violent acts, raiding targeted persons,/ misnaming them illegal aliens,/ despite legal residence, citizenship" (*ibid.*). The caesura after "citizenship" takes Hedge Coke to revisit the World War II internment of over 100,000 Japanese Americans that followed the Pearl Harbor attack. She focuses on the Tanforan relocation facility constructed of former horse stalls, where, among the interned, "haystack beds, stinky stalls, rank from manure" (*ibid.*), she finds Miné Okubo (1912 – 2001), a California citizen born in Riverside. To reflect on art's witnessing and empowering function,

Hedge Coke reminds that Okubo's book *Citizen 13660* (1946), which documents her experience at the camp, received the American Book Award in 1984, almost forty years after she was "banned from living on the west/ coast" (*ibid.*) by the 1942 Executive Order 9066. At this point, the poem pleads, connoting the deprivation by repeating the most straightforward choice of the past participle "taken": "for all taken, taken, taken, taken, occupied, or destroyed/ discourage future violations of civil liberties/ Make credible, make sincere, concern" (*ibid.*: 99).

Recalling COVID-19—"deaths, hospitalizations,/ cases soaring in encampments, detentions, between borders, nations, between worlds" (*ibid.*: 80)—Hedge Coke also remembers the riots organized mainly by the whites to highlight how racial dichotomies and poverty combine to render the "others" invisible. "The LA Times" quotes that "[t]he crowds protesting California's stay-at-home orders [...] have a litany of grievances: Open the beaches. Free the churches. End the tyranny of a governor" (Branson-Potts et al. 2020). While the privileged protestors "hop barricades to surf," "cite the Constitution," "wave American flags," "sport Trump 2020 gear," "rail against vaccines," the "others" dared not voice concerns despite the analysis showing that African Americans and Latinos under fifty years of age were impacted by the virus in significantly greater numbers, primarily due to their employment in "essential" service jobs that required them to leave their homes (Rust 2020).

When the political, economic, or pandemic crises culminate, their most visible aspects are immigrants and refugees. Through the example of immigration department performance, Hedge Coke presents bureaucratic violence and the tendency to equalize and, thus, abstract, all "colored" communities and individuals:

Where are your mother's
naturalization papers? Her green card. Can you fax them
to INS, to IRS? They put your mother in a van to deport
to Mexico. She's Canadian, you note. Black hair, black eyes,
short, dark complexioned, Mexican enough, he says... (2022: 17)

Hedge Coke records that "[t]wenty-four immigrants have died in ICE custody, by August 2019" (*ibid.*: 74) and documents their mistreatment and the way media presented it. The images of the grieving and unattended refugees, separated families, inadequately equipped detention centers, overworn or inattentive border, and medical agents, exhibit what Ronda calls "relationality without unity" (2024: 58)—the world that lacks cohesion and needs an urgent collective navigation (Harjo 2022: 80), to address the crises.

In the climate of injustice, the homeless, the picaro, become the most apparent "discomforting reminder" of the "studied amnesia" of the elite (Nixon 2011: 55). Now, the poem develops an observative ethnographic tone and through plain diction looks at the raw essence of urban diversities—a street as a microcosm of systemic displacement:

Here, streets lined with fresh refugees, straggler homeless, cardboard box men, prostitutes, pimps, beautiful neighborhood people who teach me you can get a great meal for \$2 on this block. How to eat with chopsticks, which store gives free bread if you don't have \$. Lots of Skins pass through. (Hedge Coke 2022: 62)

In its ethic of witnessing, the poem shows the ongoing crisis in the imagery of neglect, precarious sheltering, and objectification of humans in the margins into categories (“cardboard/ box man”). Yet, this evocative cinematic moment shifts the perspective from the street level to make the hardships relatable and flip the power dynamics noticing the resourcefulness and connection amid adversity. The city block, although apparently decayed, becomes a site of education, generosity, and beauty, a lesson in survival, community, and defiance of capitalism. Its concerned inhabitants demonstrate harmony and cohesion—the large system lacks, as we have seen—leading to a higher level of empathy when the poet identifies with the destitute:

the riverbottom people begged
 for when we were them

scruffed, scuffed, sleeping under overpass, in dryers
to keep warm, kids, we were under shattered skies (*ibid.*: 108)

Permeated with profound emotional scars, the speaker recounts a time when her people lived in extreme poverty and social marginalization as “riverbottom people.” The colloquial language of “scruffed, scuffed, sleeping under overpass, in dryers to keep warm” emphasizes the hardship and the indignities of homelessness. The picture of children living under “shattered skies” conveys the profoundness of their lives’ adversity, brokenness, and disarray. Yet, despite the fractured lines and lack of punctuation that reflect the instability and disorientation, the shift from “we” to “them” generates tension between remembering and transcending the past and develops a tone of resilience.

Among other endangered, so-called “equalities” communities (Bell 2021: 148), are the sick, the elders, and children. We see a senior “[w]alking on an unattended broken leg” (Hedge Coke 2022: 13). The following verses depict an everyday living experience in instrumentalized urban landscapes that prioritize vehicles over humans, growing into an elegy for the preventable tragedy:

Reaching back for slipped skateboard
he was hit so hard he flew while breaking.

[...]
on Martin Luther King Road

near Bordwell Park, Eastside, where the speed limit suddenly increases
while approaching two close crosswalks leading to homes from Stratton
Community Center, Bordwell, Emerson Elementary—Eastside; Black,
brown kids; elders—

Anyone can see someone once worked this out. (*ibid.*: 5)

The violence of unexpected destruction of the delicate life is highlighted by the stark contrast between the ordinary action, a boy “reaching back for slipped skateboard,” and the disastrous outcome when he was hit because the car could not instantly stop. The mention of Martin Luther King Road, often located in African- or Latino-American neighborhoods, contributes to the social critique of urban infrastructure. Although the terms “Stratton Community Centre,” “Bordwell,” and “Emerson Elementary” illustrate a community-focused environment, they also emphasize the dangers inherent in areas not designed with pedestrian safety in mind, especially where “the speed limit suddenly increases/ while approaching two close crosswalks.” The concluding remark—“Anyone can see someone once worked this out”—conveys a sense of resigned acknowledgment regarding the planning insensible to the safety of the community.

Look at This Blue dramatizes the gendered dichotomy through abuse, both domestic and social, directly brutal and extended, such as being denied sympathy, medical treatment, or legal protection, especially if the woman’s witnessing authority is racially discounted. The speaker’s body projects the repeated violence and the lasting impact of assaults and interventions through reflections that take us out of the domestic and into the social sphere.

Somewhere on my left face, you can still see
where it was sewn back on.
On the right, the line across eyelid
where it was sewn back on.
On the abdomen the line
where it was sewn back, sewn back, sewn back.
Somewhere on my right hand
where it was sewn.
All the heres and theres
where sewn.
All the labia biopsies, removals, explorations, assaults, sewn. (*ibid.*: 9)

The act of sewing symbolically suggests a process of repair. However, the repetition of “sewn back” implies a cycle of damage and restoration, highlighting an on-

going experience. Every colored woman suffers “ethnostress,” LaDuke elaborates (2015: xvii). As a woman of color, she adds, “your politics will be race based, your analysis marginalized, and your experience seen as limited” (*ibid.*). Among the many instances when the lack of concern is experienced as a prolonged insult, Hedge Coke demonstrates how even the legal system is permeated by gender and racial biases, minimalizes justice, and fails to speak in terms of fairness and safety.

After he cut this hand, severed tendon,
Punched this face, mocked,
Bruised, cut—punched again—
His Ventura County public defender, a woman,
asked me to drop charges so he
wouldn’t miss class.

Not happening.
Not happening.
Not happening.

Guilty; she won Suspended Imp anyway.

This is how roadside trash pick-up equates even. (2022: 27)

The speaker expresses a profound frustration with a justice system that trivializes severe violence (“severed tendon,” “bruised, cut—punched again”) and dismisses the pain of this woman in the bargain “so he/ wouldn’t miss class.” The system’s outcome (“Suspended Imp anyway”) transforms justice into a hollow process, almost a mockery, especially when the guilty verdict—roadside trash pickup—stands absurdly disproportionate to the harm caused, further diminishing the woman’s worth. The speaker’s defiant rejection of the system, underlined in the repeated “Not happening,” recalls the history of abstracting the injustice suffered by humans who are marginalized due to gender and race.

Justice requires the excluded, the subaltern, to speak because diverse life experiences bring new forms of communication and knowledge (cf. Bell 2021: 4; Powys Whyte 2017: 210). Apart from being a poetic appeal for an inclusive and just society, *Look at This Blue* offers academic, civic, and individual solutions toward this aim. In the context of Indigenous suffering, the poem recommends “[s]olutions set out in Vizenor’s tribunals” (2022: 68), referring to Gerald Vizenor’s lecture that initiates the establishment of formal tribunals across the U.S. to prosecute perpetrators of crimes against humanity, and Native Americans in particular, by international conventions and declarations (Vizenor 2007). Hedge Coke explains that these are “assembled in the academy, investigated, fully researched trials, for the premeditated serial genocide committed through government role/s” (2022: 68). Besides, an inclusive approach to environmental justice necessitates partnerships outside the academy. Environmentalist scholars (Powys Whyte 2013: 7; Brown 2022: 17-20) discuss “stewardship” as the essential civic agency that works to repair the damaged relations between society and the environ-

ment by empowering us to recognize our shared humanity and respond to the violations it suffers. Reinforcing this message, Hedge Coke presents the responsible participation in the biosphere, family, and language of the Amah Mutsun tribe, engaged in “[r]estoring indigenous knowledge and practices/ to Popeloutchom ancestral homelands” (2022: 54). Yet, the climate of justice sometimes only needs good intentions. *Look at This Blue* presents a woman who “forced the city to put in a crosswalk/ for grade school kids crossing, running late, between cars—who might fall down be hit—” (*ibid.*: 112) and finishes the account after another visual break, suggesting: “Something anyone might do—” (*ibid.*). The last statement is characterized by commonality and inclusivity. The pause emphasizes that advocating for children’s safety is not only civic responsibility but simply an act of kindness, a natural response to the situation. In this way, *Look at This Blue* advances communication among academic, civic, and individual domains and provides the language of recognition and care.

The language of *Look at This Blue*

While it remains explicitly committed, Native American literature is sensitive to the level of its proximity to the “master’s” language and functions as the “language of survivance” (survival and resistance, Vizenor 1999). Indigenous appropriation of the dominant language produces literature that Louis Owens describes as “frontier writing” (1998: 26). Owens uses the cartographic (colonialist) metaphor to explain that while the territory is secured and mapped, the frontier “is always unstable, multidirectional, hybridized, characterized by heteroglossia, and indeterminate” (*ibid.*). In other words, while Native American writers use English—which to them is “the linear tongue of colonial discoveries, racial cruelties, invented names, the simulation of tribal cultures, manifest manners, and the unheard literature of dominance” (Vizenor 1999: 105)—they subvert or reinvent it (Bird and Harjo 1997). They produce works in familiar forms to trick the reader into an alternative literary experience. Thus, the covers of *Look at This Blue* present the text as a poem, but on page xiv, the text insists it is an assemblage. Nevertheless, we proceed to the main content, failing to notice that the enumeration style in the front matter conventionally suits discursive writing, which, by the end, provides further reading, an index, and works cited. As an activist poem, *Look at This Blue* must reject the comfort of one genre, while its affecting and loosely structured verses oscillate from lyrical to documentary. The most obvious sign of the poem’s discontent with the form is the profuse listing that places the names of the extinguished and endangered lives in abecedarian order, as well as registering the massacres and cultural genocide committed against California’s Indigenous peoples. This documentary maneuver mimics the seeming order of the dominant language to provoke the reader’s discontent with its linearity, such as when page

67 introduces aporia: “How many massacres?” The poem’s final call—“Do the work.” (*ibid.*: 123)—is followed by a colon and a list of sources to be consulted in reclaiming our agency in the world we navigate. This invitation turns the poem into action, an active participation in the Creation.

Hedge Coke’s diction often changes to mimic the disoriented and fragmented experience of the present. In the first place, she alludes to and quotes discerningly—journals, books, statistics, politicians, activists, educators, artists—not to add another layer of realism to her count as much as to increase the implication of her words by suggesting the unstable relationship between reality and its representation. Thus, interrogating the authorities and juxtaposing disparate elements evoke an atmosphere of disjunction. However, this discursive tone proposes that not every human should be equally judged for the discontents of the Anthropocene, as the following statistics illustrate:

Still, estimates of fatalities exist:

300,000 to 250,000 Spanish-rule killed
250,00 to 150,000 under Mexico
Under US, after 1848

in two years of gold fever, 100,000 killed.

of 150,000 people, 20,000 more killed in the next 25 years,

when *the state spent \$1.7 million to murder*

16,000. (*ibid.*: 63)

Therefore, to uncover the social stratification of the Anthropocene, *Look at This Blue* is pronouncedly subversive of the official discourse. It often imitates legal documents in presenting facts in a clinical, factual, detached manner to evoke the inhumanity of bureaucracy:

His country of origin

Vietnam

admitted as lawful, permanent resident

1984

final order of removal

2004

2005

released on supervision

2017

found guilty of disorderly conduct

upon imprisonment, denied medical issue

was taking prescription for schizophrenia

for major depressive disorder

2018

transferred, unresponsive, no reflexes, gag or pupils. (*ibid.*: 82)

There is no room for the fallacy of euphemism in *Look at This Blue*. It intrepidly calls out the politicians: “Donald Trump is literally destroying America” (*ibid.*: 115). It calls a deputy sheriff a bigot. It suggests that the casualties were not addressed promptly because politicians routinely deal with environmental issues during electoral cycles: “*California has joined with 21 other states [...] in a legal challenge to the Trump administration’s repeal of Obama-era clean power rules*” (*ibid.*: 85; cf. also Nixon 2011: 8). It calls out businesses: “*California’s largest utility could face murder charges*” (Hedge Coke 2022: 20). The hypocrisy of the missionaries is underlined by repeating their “father” function, ending in another aporia: “How many villages could be missionized, enslaved for one mission?/ Led by Father Junípero Serra/ Father Estévan Tapís” (*ibid.*: 64).

In line with Norton-Smith, Kimmerer, and Harjo, *Look at This Blue* understands that a thought system informs the language we use. To this aim, the poem reflects that technologies not only physically modify nature but also communicative systems that construct human consciousness and its response to the environment (cf. Solnick 2017: x). Returning to the visual metaphor from the beginning, we notice how the font changes from regular to italicized and capitalized while using differing sources, shifting voices and perspectives to bring another visual dimension to the text. As the butterfly contrasts the images of violence that flood our screens, the font changes disrupt the reading experience, making it comparable to watching the news. The poem almost compulsively documents hundreds of pieces of news and repeats keywords to build up the verisimilitude of the hysteria perpetuated by the media. Its register of massacres, fires, shootings, etc., demonstrates the information overload that confuses the brain. While humans are bombarded by the news, especially sensationalists, language strays, as Harjo warns (2022: 76), and needs to be focused. To focus attention, for example, page 7 consists of only one line: “*It’s all going to burn,*” says man accused of setting Holy Fire,” referring to the 2018 fire set in Holy Jim Canyon that destroyed more than 22,000 forested acres. Margaret Ronda’s concept of “acceleration” (2018) serves to point out that when subjected to a series of abrupt changes, humanity is left without time for retrospective analysis and, thus, with unresolved traumas. Then, contrary to the media spaces that use visual stimuli to either prompt the reading or divert attention, *Look at This Blue* uses blank spaces to prolong the time for readers’ cognition:

blue eyed chance mutation (2022: 53).

Here, the textual silence becomes an ethical space that invites the reader’s active engagement in constructing meaning. The fragmentation of the quoted line urges readers to consider the profound consequences of genetic chance and the interplay between aesthetics and ethics. Similarly, the unfinished phrase “Land of the—” (*ibid.*: 68) forces confrontation with the contested meaning of freedom in historical and contemporary contexts.

When the documentary discourse cannot reach pathos, the language moves to colloquial—"My gut aches. All this, all this indelible hurt" (*ibid.*: 84)—that suggests an intense bodily reaction and emphasizes the profound and lasting impact of the hurt through repetition, creating a sense of despair as the speaker grapples with pain. The minimalist, stark, paratactic, fragmented style also captures the gravity of distress, such as in the verses:

She left her children with her mother
He didn't have ID
They were in a car Suspicious
Severe dehydration
She needed insulin
He had pneumonia
He had pneumonia
He had pneumonia
He needed heart medicine
He had a seizure (*ibid.*: 76)

Repetition here does not serve as a mnemonic or incantatory device but, as Keller notes (2010: 80), to intensify distress and extremity. Comparably, pages 74-76 list the coercive tools in a driving, forceful rhythm with strong accents and a relentless beat. The steady tempo appears to aim at the crescendo as the physical and psychological violence alternate: “Use of the largest federal law enforcement entity U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP)/ Use of force/ Use of ignorance/ Use of weapons/ Use of fascism [...]”.

The dramatic driving force behind the poem, the urgency to account for the dispersion of violence and how it affects our response to it, is emphasized by the variations in rhythm and lineation, rhythmic and visual breaks, and changing meters, as visible in the images of the copied pages 44-49 of concrete poetry:

[illegible]

These unstable lines, short and long, linear and zigzagging, sometimes forced, sometimes pouring down as the rain of tears, reflect the flux, the disturbing nature of experience, and the disjointed nature of contemporary life and memory. Yet, to-

gether with lists and quotes, these lines create an evocative design that reflect multivocality and layers of consciousness.

The “dance of person and place”

The disturbing message of *Look at This Blue* is interwoven by contemplative lyricism informed by Indigenous wisdom and counterbalanced by the emersion of the poetic “I” in the beauty of life seen in the “dance of person and place” (Norton-Smith 2010). The following verses build an image of the balanced world by centering on the River as a nurturing force that gathers varied life forms and will continue to do so unless humans destroy the riparian zones. Capitalization of the word stresses that the River possesses the qualities of a person. It is not an image or an object of contemplation but an active agent that keeps life together, invoking and encapsulating Creation. The following verses musically and rhythmically echo an undisturbed flow of life, expressing the poem’s profound reverence for the natural world.

We need balance. Need keep from
what may kill us all what may
End us. Distinguish an atom, a
gathered molecule, something we must
in each and every touch in this life in
every single moment of solitude and in
silence in the coming and going of River and her
embodiment of so many other beings she
nurtures to replenish us with the life gives the
fish she bears and birds who seek her
for snails and protection as we seek River for
healing to rekindle us in our own winterings.
Now is the time to return to what we do with
our partnerships in life, the cranes impressing
us for generation upon generation giving us
dances and life and reason and approach to
enjoy the reason we were gifted these particular atoms. (Hedge Coke,
2022: 25)

The verses are structured with differing levels of indention that shift perspectives and emphasize fragmentation to contrast the observed balance in the scene that enlivens the traditional wisdom about the importance of relationality and continuity. The visual markers in the form of gaps prompt the reader to pause and recognize the significance of what is said before and after, in particular, the consequences of the actions that are now given the form of fragmentation. The fragmentation in this poem reflects the fear and the image of the fragmented Cre-

ation, which, to an Indigenous mind, means the Apocalypse. At this moment, Hedge Coke takes over several cultural roles to elicit the reader's response. The Indigenous woman, who identifies with Creation, cannot stop grieving, seeing this image of herself shattered, with no hope of recovery unless a higher voice orders reconsideration and recognition. An Indigenous poet joins the action by giving these tears words that are read worldwide. Then, the Indigenous teacher of culture names the poet's creation as an invitation to lose our gaze at this rare color in nature, whose scarcity adds to its allure.

The repetition of the phrases "we need balance" and "what may" create a rhythmic cadence, enabling the message to dive from the straightforward conditionality (assumed in the choice of "need" and "may") into the uninterrupted lyricism of the flow of the river of life, i.e., Creation. The continuity is built by the image of the cranes dancing with respect to the River's rhythms. The repetition of the soothing rhythmic patterns and the soft and gentle quality of the sounds "n" and "s" conjure the sounds of the untamed river. The lineation appears to no longer reflect the fragmentation but reads as enjambment to contribute to the seamless blend of visual and auditory imagery, inviting an immersion into peace of the "silence in the coming and going of River."

The pulse then fluctuates to disturbance to warn us about the reciprocity that may be extinguished when Creation stops. Hedge Coke's phrases "in each and every touch," "in every single moment," and "generation upon generation" emphasize continuity but also prolonged anxiety. Thus, the short diction in "end us" strengthens the message that humanity is facing destruction, while the consonant clusters in "what may kill us all" and "gathered molecule"—the quintessence of human—create a dense texture and a sense of immediate weight. The stressed syllables in "We need balance" and "Now is the time" draw attention to the urgency of the message.

Conclusion

Drawing from environmental humanities and Indigenous philosophies, we approached *Look at This Blue* as a contemplative lyrical grievance and a call to action that reflects the diverging consequences of the Anthropocene. The poem visualizes the vulnerable and the extinct abstracted from the dominant discourse to disclose the corruption of the narrative of progress. Developing as a metonymy of the Anthropocene, the poem employs fragmented discourse and dispersed imagery to mirror the disrupted experience perpetuated by technology that hampers understanding of the human role in preserving the ecosystem. The poem's blurring of genres, loose verses, empty spaces, and changing script express the prolonged stress the violent system causes. To subvert the narrative of progress and mechanical linearity of the deterministic system, *Look at This Blue* interweaves past,

present, ecological, social, and individual adversities in a rhizomatic format. By doing this, the poem works within the Indigenous body of knowledge, participating fully and responsibly in the world and encompassing experiences of different life forms. Through the mixture of languages, *Look at This Blue* invites every reader to actively withstand the impacts of environmental destruction and join in creating alternative stories through academic, civic, and individual engagement. Finally, *Look at This Blue* is a commanding lecture by an Indigenous humanist on how to overcome the present disorder through recognition and mercy.

WORKS CITED

- Aloma, A. 2016. *Exploring Proximal and Distal Psychosocial Stressors Influencing the Health Outcomes of Urban American Indians in the Midwest*. Ph.D. Milwaukee: University of Wisconsin.
- Bell, K. Ed. 2021. *Diversity and Inclusion in Environmentalism*. London–New York: Routledge.
- Bird, G., J. Harjo. 1997. Eds. *Reinventing the Enemy's Language: Contemporary Native Women's Writing of North America*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Brady, E. 2017. Climate Change and Future Aesthetics. In *Climate Change and the Humanities: Historical, Philosophical and Interdisciplinary Approaches to the Contemporary Environmental Crisis*. Eds. Alexander Elliott, James Cullis Vinita Damodaran. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Branson-Potts, H., et al. 2020. At protests, mostly white crowds show how pandemic has widened racial and political divisions. *LA Times*. <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2020-05-08/california-coronavirus-protests-race>. Accessed January 10, 2024.
- Brown, M. T. 2022. *A Climate of Justice: An Ethical Foundation for Environmentalism*. Berkeley, CA: Springer.
- Cuomo, C. J. 2001. *Feminism and Ecological Communities—An Ethic of Flourishing*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Deleuze, G., F. Guattari. 2005. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Translation and Foreword by Brian Massumi. Minneapolis-London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deloria, V. 2003. *God Is Red*. Fulcrum, Col: Golden.
- Erdrich, L. 2003. *Books and Islands in Ojibwe Country*. Washington, D.C.: National Geographic. Kindle edition.
- Fisk, M. 2024. Praise for *Look at This Blue*. *Black Earth Institute*. <https://blackearthinstitute.org/pre-order-allison-hedge-cokes-newest-poetry-collection/>. Accessed December 11, 2024.
- Fixico, D. L. 2003. *The American Indian Mind in a Linear World*. New York-London: Routledge.
- Gilio-Whitaker, D. 2019. *As Long as Grass Grows: The Indigenous Fight for Environmental Justice, from Colonization to Standing Rock*. Boston: Beacon, 2019.
- Giuliani, G. 2021. *Monsters, Catastrophes and the Anthropocene: A Postcolonial Critique*. London–New York: Routledge.

- Harjo, J. 2022. *Catching the Light (Why I Write)*. New Heaven – London: Yale University Press.
- Hogan, L. 2022. Poetry by Allison Adelle Hedge Coke. Coffeehouse Press. <https://coffeehousepress.org/products/look-at-this-blue> Accessed December 13, 2023.
- Keller, L. 2010. “Post-Language Lyric”: The Example of Juliana Spahr. *Chicago Review*, Vol. 55, No. 3/4: 74–83. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23065677> Accessed November 24, 2024.
- , 2017. *Recomposing Ecopoetics: North American Poetry of Self-Conscious Anthropocene*. Charlottesville-London: University of Virginia Press.
- Kennedy, R. 2017. Multidirectional eco-memory in an era of extinction: colonial whaling and indigenous dispossession in Kim Scott’s *That Deadman Dance*. In *The Routledge Companion to the Environmental Humanities*. Eds. Ursula K. Heise, Jon Christensen, Michelle Niemann. London–New York: Routledge: 268–277.
- Kimmerer, R. W. 2013. *Braiding Sweetgrass: Indigenous Wisdom, Scientific Knowledge and the Teachings of Plants*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Milkweed, 2013.
- Kristeva, J. 1982. *Approaching Abjection, Powers of Horror*. New York: Columbia University Press: 1–31. https://thepoeticsseminar.files.wordpress.com/2017/09/approaching_abjection.pdf. Accessed December 22, 2023.
- Powys Whyte, K. 2013. On the role of traditional ecological knowledge as a collaborative concept: a philosophical study. *Ecological Processes*: 2–7.
- , 2017. Our ancestors’ dystopia now: indigenous conservation and the Anthropocene. In *The Routledge Companion to the Environmental Humanities*. Eds. Ursula K. Heise, Jon Christensen, Michelle Niemann. London–New York: Routledge: 206–215.
- LaDuke, W. 2015. Foreword. In Andrea Smith. *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- National Book Foundation. 2022. *Look at This Blue*. Finalist, National Book Awards 2022 for Poetry. <https://www.nationalbook.org/books/look-at-this-blue/>. Accessed December 11, 2024.
- Nelson, M. K. 2023. The honorable harvest of Indigenous data. *EPF: Philosophy, Theory, Models, Methods and Practice*. Vol. 2(1-2) 316–321.
- Nixon, R. 2011. *Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor*. Cambridge, Massachusetts–London, England: Harvard University Press.
- Norton-Smith, T. 2010. *The Dance of Person and Place*. State University of New York: SUNY.
- Heelein, J. 2022. Praise for *Look at This Blue*. *Black Earth Institute*. <https://blackearthinstitute.org/pre-order-allison-hedge-cokes-newest-poetry-collection/>. Accessed December 11, 2024.
- Owens, L. 1998. *Mixedblood Messages*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Ronda, M. 2024. “Lyric/Time: Capitalist Ecologies, Timefulness, and the Lyric ‘I.’” *The Hopkins Review*. Volume 17, Number 1: 49–63. Johns Hopkins University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1353/thr.2024.a918450>. Accessed November 24, 2024.
- , 2018. *Remainders: American Poetry at Nature’s End*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Rust, S. 2020. Latinos test positive for coronavirus at overwhelming levels in San Francisco survey. *LA Times*. <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2020-05-06/latinos-tested-positive-for-coronavirus-at-overwhelming-levels-in-san-francisco-survey>. Accessed January 10, 2024.
- Solnick, S. 2017. *Poetry and the Anthropocene: Ecology, biology and technology in contemporary British and Irish poetry*. London–New York: Routledge.

- Stewart-Harawira, M. 2005. *The New Imperial Order: Indigenous Responses to Globalization*. Aotearoa-New Zealand: Huia.
- Tagaq, T. 2016. *Retribution*. Performance by Tanya Tagaq, Jesse Zubot, and Jean Martin, *CBC Music*. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=W4EFnt6pbJs>. Accessed November 19, 2024.
- Tuhiwai Smith, L. 2007. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London-New York: Zed, University of Otago Press.
- Vizenor, Gerald. 2007. American Genocide and Justice. TPT, Twin Cities PBS. <https://www.tpt.org/american-genocide-and-justice>. Accessed May 5, 2024.
- , 1999. *Manifest Manners on Postindian Survivance*. Lincoln-London: University of Nebraska Press.

SAŽETAK

LOOK AT THIS BLUE I NEZADOVOLJSTVO ANTROPOCENA

Look at This Blue (2022) autorice Allison Adelle Hedge Coke poema je u formi knjige. Bila je finalistica za National Book Award 2022. te dobitnica nagrada Emory Elliot i Thomas Wolfe 2023. godine. Poema predstavlja poetsko istraživanje bioraznolikosti Kalifornije, njezine povijesti genocida i urgentne potrebe za ekološkom i društvenom pravdom. *Look at This Blue* odlikuje se inkluzivnim aktivizmom: pjesnikinja iz perspektive autohtone učiteljice kulture poziva Kaliforniju na odgovornost prema ljudskom i neljudskom životu – životu koji je u njoj izvorno nastao i onome koji u Kaliforniju dolazi s nadom. Moja rasprava bavi se tematskim i stilskim obilježjima poeme *Look at This Blue* te načinom na koji njezina forma odražava sadržaj kako bi izrazila autohtonu percepciju ekoloških problema i nadu u ljudski potencijal da se prepoznavanjem i milosrđem prevlada kapitalistički sustav. Moje čitanje oblikovano je spoznajama iz područja ekološke humanistike i autohtone kritike antropocena.

Ključne riječi: antropocen, narativ progresa, ekološki rasizam, ekološka humanistika, indigene studije

“Or se’ tu quel Virgilio...” (On the dedicatee of the elegy *An Autumn Flower* by Father Gjergj Fishta)

Il n’y a pas de hors-texte?

Elegy, after the detachment from a primarily metrical and thematically variative identity in antiquity, as a lyric mode of articulation, (at least since the 16th century),¹ is modeled and functions on a *more or less* codified topology. Besides the topological matrix – lamentation, contemplation, and consolation – it is also characterized by a specific melancholic and reflective tone, a sepulchral, pastoral, mortuary and gothic figurativeness and imagery, and many other conventional motifs (e.g., “memento mori”, “vanitas”, “danse macabre”, “ubi sunt”, “timor mortis sontubat me”, “tempus fugit”, etc.). Among these, elegy is also characterized predominantly by a defined dedicatee who may be real or fictional, historical or mythical, and in personal or impersonal relation with the elegist. Therefore, the nominal marking of a dedicatee, whether in open, synecdochical, metonymical, or abbreviative form, can be said that the elegy has historically internalized as a genre arch-convention. The dedicatee is inscribed either in the title, subtitle, in referential paratexts, or is intratextually vocativized as the addressee, either to preserve the purpose of the specific dedication or to perform the function of a rhetorical pretext; I think it suffices to consider the countless examples in ancient Latin lyric as well as in English and Italian elegy.²

¹ See, J. A. Cuddon, *A Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory* (5th ed.), Wiley-Blackwell, 2013, p. 229 ff.

² In Latin lyric, e.g., Corinne in Ovid's *Amores* (even if it is just an archetypal paradigm of the maiden), Tibullus in the *Elegy for Tibullus*; Epicurus in *De Rerum Natura* of Lucretius; Veranius, Licimius, Fabul, Lesbia, Manlius, Ortalus and brother to Catullus; to Horace Alceus, Virgil, Tibullus; Cynthia, Calimah, Filetas in Propertius; Delia, Nemesis, Sulpicia to Tibullus etc.; in English elegy: e.g. Henry King to Milton's *Lycidas*, Clough to Mathew Arnold, Donne to Thomas Carew, Ben Johnson to Cleveland, *The Unfortunate Lady* to Pope, Mr. Robert Levet to Dr. Johnson, Duke of Wellington to Tennyson, Yeats to Auden, etc. In Italian elegy: Silvia in *A Silvia* and *The beautiful lady* in *Sopra il ritratto di una bella donna scolpito nel monumento sepolcrale della medesima* by Leopardi, Giovanni in *In morte del fratello Giovanni* by Foscolo, etc.

Therefore, the dedicatory tribute in elegy explicitly indicates more than in other lyrical forms, the personal offering, or at least to some extent, the important inspirational role of the death of “someone” to induce in the poet the mournful and reflective elegiac stimulus. Due to the dominance of reflectivity or contemplation that is strongly substantialized in elegiac discourse, elegy diachronically has not conventionalized the anonymity of the dedicatee. In cases where this has happened or happens,³ we are not primarily dealing with anonymous intentions of dedication *per se*, but with the actualization of a quasi-dedicative variant of elegy that is constructed rather as an *elegiac idiom*.⁴

In this variant, therefore, the lamenting, contemplative and consolatory mode is developed, embodying provisionally an object, concept or situation that is metonymically or symbolically linked to death, to meditation of death, temporality, vanity, the perennial tragic fate of humanity, etc. In this version of actualization of elegy, the universalizing intention of elegiac meditation is truly felt more strongly, because from a receptive position, we are freed from those limitations that the dedicatory act of the canonical elegy itself can potentially presuppose and which, as such, encourage personalization and contextualization, respectively directing receptive and interpretative orientation towards the *sitz im leben*.

Taking into account what we have said, Father Gjergj Fishta's poem *Një lule vjeshtet* (*An autumn flower*)⁵ appears quite idiosyncratic when viewed from the perspective of elegiac genre conventions, actualizing a non-typical convention for canonical elegy to which it belongs, namely the anonymity of the dedicatee, which in this poem also has the status of the addressee.⁶ Regardless of whether we tend to relativize it for the sake of the “misinterpretation” of the *Il n'y a pas de hors-*

³ E.g., in Hervey's *Meditations among the Tombs*, Gray's *Elegy Written in a Country Churchyard*, Pope's *Elegy to the Memory of an Unfortunate Lady*, Leopardi's *Sopra il ritratto di una bella donna scolpito nel monumento sepolcrale della medesima*, or even in other cases in the altered format of contemporary modern and postmodern elegy where nominalization is symbolic and often ironic, e.g., Cesare Pavese's *Death shall come, using your eyes*, Anna Akhmatova's *Death of a Poet*, Ali Podrimja's *My Dead King Diocletian and Dumvenio* or Azem Shkreli's *The death of the Highlander*, etc.

⁴ One of the scholars of English elegy, David Kennedy, suggests that in modernity we can also speak of an elegy which “is as likely to be a distinct idiom, mode of inquiry or species of self-description as a distinctive form.” He even raises the dichotomy between canonical and contemporary elegy and between its role as a subgenre and as an idiom. In one instance, he cites Hollander, who explains that in English poetry, “elegiac tone [is] a mood rather than ... a formal mode” (David Kennedy, *Elegy*, Routledge, New York, 2007); although for these authors the object of inquiry is English elegy, the phenomenon as such is universally configurable, i.e. the co-functioning of elegy as a subgenre and as *stimmung*.

⁵ Hereafter abbreviated and cited as *AAF*.

⁶ Since the elegiac mode presupposes a specific addressee where “the dedication and the text are con-substantial” (see for this Gerard Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, Cambridge University Press, p. 117). Genette insists on identification, however in some cases this should be viewed with caution because the dedicatee can also be referred to as an inspirational instance, but the elegiac addressee may not necessarily be him/her/it, but the “concept of death” itself placed in the role of an anthropomorphized addressee, both in the sense of the implied reader and as a concept.

texte,⁷ the main component that makes this poem special is precisely this latent dedicatee. However, for elegiac poetic *techné*, a nominally marked dedicatee/addressee, although it represents, as we mentioned, an elegiac arch-convention, does not necessarily have canonical genre significance or artistic value in itself. Nevertheless, when we consider the poem *AAF* which unfolds as a monologic litany with a strong conative focus (but also equally phatic and metalingual, in a Jakobsonian sense)⁸ within intrapoetic communication, and also when we compare it with Fishta's richly dedicatory and elegiac poetry where the convention of nominal dedication is always present, the impression is inevitably created that in *AAF* this absence is significant because, as Genette defines it: "the absence of a dedication in a system that includes the possibility of one is as important as degree zero."⁹ Acknowledging also the Staigerian conception of lyric, where its optimal realization is emphasized at the point where the distance between the lyrical subject and the object, as well as between the lyrical subject and the recipient is eliminated,¹⁰ the poem *AAF* seems to become a sublimation of this elimination, which, moreover, makes incredibly inquisitive the absence of the dedicatee, who is suggested and anticipated and who is everywhere and nowhere concomitantly.

In addition to the particularity in the elegiac genre perspective and in contrast with the conventional precedence cultivated in other dedicatory poems,¹¹ *AAF* also reflects a double "exception", both, within this poem itself (when considering the religious persona of the author), and also within the standard Fishtian *techné* in terms of artistic creation. Regarding the former, it is striking how Fishta employs consolatory proceedings. Although all typical elegiac conventions are realized (with a modicum of exceptions),¹² the most distinctive aspect remains the order of consolatory poetic revelations that inevitably leads to a hierarchical-axiological interpretation of this sequence. Thus, when considering the religious vocation of the poet (his priestly status), one cannot help but notice the lack of religious compensation in consolation, as a typical and anticipated compensation when considering the author's vocation. Consequently, it is expected that the consolation will be concluded with that famous "No," that comes after the agnostic question:

⁷ For a treatment of "misinterpretation" of *Il n'y a pas de hors-texte*, see the review, Max Deutscher (Macquarie University/University of Queensland), "IL N'Y A PAS DE HORS-TEXTE"—ONCE MORE, Symposium, Vol. 18, Issue 2 (Fall/Automne, 2014).

⁸ Roman Jakobson, *Linguistics and Poetics on Modern Criticism and Theory – A Reader* (Third Edition) edited by David Lodge and Nigel Wood, Pearson Education Limited, UK, 2008, p. 141 ff.

⁹ Gerard Genette, *ibid.*, p. 135.

¹⁰ See, Emil Staiger, *Basic Concepts of Poetics* (Grundbegriffe der Poetik), Pennsylvania University Press, 1991.

¹¹ We are talking about other dedicatory poems published either in *Pika Voestet* or later in *Mrizi i Zanavet*.

¹² For a list of elegiac conventions (primary and secondary) see: Peter M. Sacks, *The English Elegy – Studies in the Genre from Spenser to Yeats*, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985.

But, is it likely that death swallowed you into nothingness
and left you nothing but a handful of bones and dust?¹³
(verses 25-27)

or at least with the heavenly imagination where the addressee is imagined while dancing with the angels under the gaze of God. However, this religious form of consolation, as well as the second variant of consoling through personal and virtuous memory where the addressee becomes an *imago virtutis*,¹⁴ although simultaneous, are not axiologically equal because after them, the elegist proceeds further with the interjection “Oh”. So, “Oh! How many times, when, in the dark of night, nature fades.../and then I think about you”.¹⁵ What does this exclamatory sigh signify after all that previously triumphant articulation of the victory of eternal life over death; an articulation which, apart from other figures, through a cacophony that emerges through lexical abbreviations and the prolonged poetic sentence, reaches even a suffocating effect on reading? The image of the fading nature (“Oh! How many times, when, in the dark of night, nature fades...”)¹⁶ with the previous heavenly light (“And there, in that light full of sweetness...”)¹⁶ is a powerful antithesis where the eternal can be read as something consciously provisional. The final and reviving consolation that balances the anxiety and the initial mourning, is the construction of the “Memorial over the grave” through the “author's upcoming songs” (*heroic songs* and *sharp arrows* symbolizing epic and satire) to be transformed then into “the song of dedicatee/addressee” that will be sung “as long as the sun falls on the earth.” This is supported also by the sedimentary position of the subject with an orientation towards writing/reading in the first two modes of consolations (note: in the religious consolation: “And now, while I myself am writing these letters,/ You, perhaps, walking through eternal meadows...”¹⁷ and in the consolation through the *imago virtutis*: “Oh! How many times (...) / I, exhausted over the letters of ancient wise men”).¹⁸ Therefore, the final consolation of the poet is

¹³ Henceforth, all translations of the poem *AAF* in English are my own (ib) taken as they are from the Rilindja edition (Gjergj Fishta, *Lirika*, Rilindja, Prishtinë, 1997, p. 200-201), which is an identical variant to the complete edition of Fishta's works in 1941. Except in rare cases, we have followed a fairly literal model of translation for reasons of semantic clarity since Fishta's language is dialectal, even with many sub-dialectal nuances that make it difficult to understand. Also, except in rare cases for explanatory needs of a linguistic nature, from now on we give the verses of the poem only in English.

¹⁴ (e.g., verses 111-118: “On your grave, indeed, I am beginning to keep/ the word given for the sake of our friendship;/ (...) / to give a hand to the weak and let the strong/ not be flattered; when it is time for justice to be spoken/ to not turn our gaze away from the goal which mind/ desires to reach, and we should never weaken/ Even through the toughest times, that the years might bring us.”); in Gjergj Fishta, *ibid.*, p. 212-213.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, verse 75.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, verse 68.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, verse 50-51.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, verse 75-78.

constructed not through meditation and reflection on letters/books (so not from a sedimentary and passive disposition), but from the performative act of the pledge of honor (in Albanian, *besa*), to create the upcoming songs. Thus, axiologically, this final consolation of the poet emerges neither as a belief in religious immortality, nor the paradise topos, nor the comforting memory through virtues, but as *the song*, which stands in antithesis with the recollections and memories, just as letters/books (writing and reading) stand in antithesis with the song/songs (singing/listening).

The other exception is that of Fishta's standard artistic *techné*. Fishta, within his standard literary discourse, regardless of genre convention, does not cultivate crypticism or ambiguity in any dimension of the literary text, and very weakly tends towards figurative discourse. Even when he does so, whether in satirical, dramatic, or epic mode, except in specific cases and due to genre and compositional modalities, he does not tend towards the ambiguity of references and mainly relies on a symbolic or allegorical model easily decipherable or entirely arbitrary (e.g., the mythic battle of the Dragon with the Kulshedra; the situations and functions of mythical characters: Fairies, Hours and Nymphs; the hypertextualization with allegorical or symbolic tendencies in the *Odyssey*,¹⁹ *Judas Maccabeus*, or in *Jerina or the Queen of Flowers*. Thus, Fishta's literary cognition does not employ heavy figuration and even less crypticism – perhaps to “prove” by this, the predilectional poetic background that his religious and (specifically) Franciscan vocation, gives him, namely taking into account his discipleship in the order created by the author of *Laudes Creaturarum* and being, albeit distantly, a *frāter* of Jacopone da Todi. This approach, as can be understood, is primarily due to the permanent dominance of the missionary motivation, national-centrist, and Christian-centrist ideothematic dimension, to which other dimensions of Fishta's literary text are somehow subordinated, competing with it, perhaps even surpassing it, only the powerful literary language.²⁰

Due to this, it is also possible to understand the somewhat unrefined expression of the scholar Aurel Plasari that *AAF* emerges as a surprising oasis,²¹ because here Fishta steps outside the horizon of expectation (*Erwartungsrichtung*)²² by not

¹⁹ For this reason, it is worth mentioning a letter from Fishta addressed to Father Pal Dodaj on 5-XII-1909, where, among other things Fishta reveals his consciousness in relation to the potential of the symbolic interpretation of his work *Odyssey*. See: At Gjergj Fishta OFM, *Letërkëmbimi*, Botime Françeskane, Shkodër, 2020, p. 98.

²⁰ For the Fishtian literary language and its style at all levels, we suggest the work of Shefkije Islamaj, *Gjergj Fishta (Gjuha dhe Stili) I & II*, Instituti Albanologjik, Prishtinë, 2012, but also the thoughts in this report by Eqrem Çabej, Mark Ndoja, Lasgush Poradeci, Namik Resuli and Ernest Koliqi quoted in Aurel Plasari, *Fishta i dashuruari* (An adventure of criticism), Marin Barleti, Shkodër, 1996, p. 31-32.

²¹ Revista *Jeta e Re* (Nr. 3), Prishtinë, 1996, f. 410.

²² See, Hans Robert Jauss, “Theory of Genres and Medieval Literature” in *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1982, p. 76-109.

determining the identity of his elegiac dedicatee. It is precisely this latent quality that, we believe, prompts Plasari (the first to deal with it specifically, far from the brief reviews of Mark Ndoja and Klara Kodra) in the early 90s to engage with it, and as it is easily noticeable, with high doses of critical speculation that are consequences of a reading with one eye closed of many signs of the text, or better yet, by filling them ambiguously, which to some extent makes sense in my opinion, with the aim of an alternative reading way out of the “Reformed Albanian Reading Church” of the first post-dictatorial years, which once again, as has happened almost everywhere in similar situations, was euphorically proving the truth of the Tacitean aphorism: *punitis ingeniis gliscit auctoritas*.²³ Fishta's insistence on preserving the latent addressee in this poem, as is evident even from a rudimentary reading, gives it a genuine personalism that merges with intimacy, a quality that in my readings has always been symptomatic of a real addressee and not, as was claimed by the most famous commentator of Fishta, Viktor Volaj that the Poet “first wanted to express the feelings of pain for this or that specific person, but, in the development of drafting, came stripping it” “i.e., the person” (emphasis added) *by whatever distinctiveness...*²⁴ Nevertheless, considering Fishta's “literary cognition” and “culture of behavior”²⁵ in literary writings generally, and more narrowly, considering some of the textual references articulated in a proleptic mode, as well as the continuous pulse of absence and longing that, beyond digressions and figures, neither fades nor disintegrates, the real dedicatee for me, perhaps quite naively, has been simply a concealed acrostic awaiting revelation, yet not as easily revealed as Plasari brought it out in his famous text.

The “Kranjčević” hypothesis

After many assumptions that have circulated discursively saying he could have dedicated this poem to his mother or brother, a girlfriend from his youth or some local or national hero, etc., the veil with which the mystery of the dedicatee was wrapped has already been removed by the scholar Blerina Suta, whom I believe has defined it quite accurately. According to her, he is precisely the friend of

²³ See, Aurel Plasari, *ibid.* From here, whether we consider it as a hermeneutic indifference, a dysphoria with the sublimating euphoria of reading Fishta or an alternative reading *per se*, Plasari's approach is understandable when considering the critical-literary climate that prevailed at the time of writing this text. Fishta, returned from the coma where the communist regime had pushed him for fifty years, was appearing once again before the Albanian public and critical cultural-literary community that somnambulant, but full of enthusiasm, was squirming to catch up with the countless threads of cultural-literary perspectives that were denied for half a century.

²⁴ Gjergj Fishta, *ibid.*, p. 200.

²⁵ For the concepts of “literary cognition” and “behavioral culture”, see the Croatian edition of Rexhep Murtez Shala, *ANALIZA kognicija i modeliranje*, Izdavačka Illyricum-dea, Zagreb, 2017.

Fishta's youthful years and studies, the renowned Croatian poet Silvije Strahimir Kranjčević.²⁶ In two essays dedicated to this case, Suta, firstly, through documentary and archival research, has undertaken a very serious philological work to identify Kranjčević as the real dedicatee of the poem. Without delving into a critical analysis of Suta's two essays, which is not our aim here, regarding the second one which exclusively deals with the argument that it is precisely Kranjčević the dedicatee of *AAF*, we can say that Suta, in approximately eleven arguments she provides, has succeeded in justifying her hypothesis even in textual analysis, in addition to contextual arguments – the friendship between Fishta and Kranjčević and the time context of the publication of *AAF* which coincides with less than a year after Kranjčević's death. In terms of textual argumentation, among others, we would highlight: a) the connection noted between some images of the poem *Al valente poet Mr. Silvije Kranjčević* (an unpublished poem that Fishta had dedicated to Kranjčević in 1892) and the poem *AAF*, b) the evocation of Kranjčević's ideas about the Genius Poet and their materialization by Fishta both in *AAF* and in his entire opus, c) the potential interpretation that in the first published version of the poem in the book “Pika voeset” (1909) the verse: “kan me i rritun/ Me shum kujdes per çark silvija t’blerta” (Eng: “they will raise/ with great care around green cypresses”)²⁷ the form “silvija” (Eng: cypresses) besides being a printing error, may present an intentional solipsism, as if to say: “willingness to mention his friend's name”²⁸ (that is Silvije); however, we note that the similar form “silvija” is also found used by Mjedja in the poem *Andrra e Jetës* (p. II, v. 42): “Ndoshta po avitet nji djal’i ri,/ I holl’e i giatë porsi’j silvië...”²⁹ (my emphasis) and it is likely that we are dealing either with a sub-dialectal form of the lexeme or with an intentional literary usage established in dialectical literature of the time (perhaps as a background indication of the cultural-linguistic influence of the Latin *sylvia* to rival the popular form /selvi/ so commonly used and clichéd in folk lyric songs; [cf. *Dictionary of Bashkimi* (1908) which perhaps due to the selection of the super-dialectal forms gives it as /Sélvii/]);³⁰ d) the heterogeneous intertextual relations between Kranjčević's poetic figuration and that which is embedded multi-layeredly by Fishta in his opus, to indicate with this, according to Suta, Fishta's specific dedication to him; this includes: stellar symbolism, ideas about the Genius Poet, the Prophet Poet, images of death, the grave and paradise, imaginary situations in poetic fictional contexts, and other Christian, ancient, and natural symbolism. Accepting Suta's discovery but convinced that it suffers from an excessive philologi-

²⁶ See, Blerina Suta, *Hulumtime mbi veprën e At Gjergj Fishtës*, Onufri, Tiranë, 2018.

²⁷ Gjergj Fishta, *Pika Voeset*, Zader, Vittaliani, 1909.

²⁸ Blerina Suta, *ibid.*, p. 71-72.

²⁹ Ndre Mjedja, *Vepra I*, Rilindja, Prishtinë, 1982.

³⁰ “*Fjalori i Bashkimit*”, Rilindja, Prishtinë, 1978.

cal zeal to necessarily link the first poem that Fishta dedicates to Kranjčević *Al valente poet Mr. Silvie Kranjčević* and *AAF*, (although it is understandable that this poem in such an investigation serves as a *sine qua non* argument), I will try here in an expository manner and only to further reinforce her arguments, to provide some additional indications of the intertextual relationships between *AAF* and Kranjčević's poetic work in general, in order then to move on to what interests us most: why Fishta, as in the first edition as well as in all subsequent editions, does not reveal Kranjčević's name.

“Oûτός estin o Plátōnos ánthrōpos?”

The poem *Kad mi klonë*³¹ by Kranjčević is one of his poems that thematizes the poet's own death. Through the proleptic mode, Kranjčević projects his death and expresses feelings, thoughts, and desires on the afterlife, his grave, and figuratively intertwines ideals of freedom and sacrifice for his people (the nation), as lasting beyond his physical death. Although the entire poem contains lexemes and images also found in *AAF* (e.g., grave, flowers, nightingale, song) worth examining, we will focus only on one typical phrase that we consider to be consciously reconfigured in *AAF*. In these two poems, we notice the analogy between the phrase “Samilosna ruka” within the lines: “Kad mi mrtve oči sklopi /Samilosna ruka koja...” and the somewhat equivalent Fishtian phrase, “qi e pershpirtshme nji dorë ta vu te kryeni” (Eng: “that a soulful hand placed it over your head”). Although “Samilosna” and “pershpirtshme” (soulful) are not entirely equivalent, they are not far apart, as the latter also denotes the semantic reference to 'mercy' (cf.: the third meaning given by *FGJSSH*)³² albeit in a more focused religious aspect, while its primary meaning is 'devotion', specifically – if we follow grammatical logic – 'a [devoted] hand' in our case, which is also cited in the *Dictionary of Bashkimi* (1908)³³ in the Italian explanation: “Pio, divoto”, which also highlights Viktor Volaj, prioritizing rightly the reference to the meaning 'charitable': “a charitable hand, prompted by religious feeling”.³⁴ However, if we were to consider and attempt to interpret theoretically the specific *forma mentis* generally sublimated in the elegiac poet, we can say that the poetic creation which derives from a lamentable inspiration, primarily reconfigures in a paraphrastic mode rather than applying the *ad litteram* citation in the case of articulating the iconic signs of the elegiac

³¹ All of Kranjčević's poems quoted here are taken from Silvije Strahimir Kranjčević, *Izabrane Pjesme*, Bulaja naklada d.o.o., 2011 (e-book edition).

³² PËRSHPIRTSHËM/ËM(i), ~ME (e) mb. 3. (...) who is merciful (according to the morality of religion). See, *Fjalor i gjuhës së sotme shqipe*, Rilindja, Prishtinë, 1981, f. 1466.

³³ *Fjalori i Bashkimit*, Rilindja, 1978, Prishtinë, f. 342.

³⁴ See comment № 16 of V. Volaj in, Gjergj Fishta, *ibid.*, p. 204.

addressee, in this case, his verses. Therefore, we suppose that Fishta, to a considerable extent, has created under such inspiration and state that primarily articulates under a paraphrastic mode (thus also in the case of the reconfiguration of the quotation), prioritizing the articulation of intertext over the basis of mnemonic modification, rather than a kind of citation where the intertext is clearly differentiated.³⁵ However, we believe that this syntagmatic reconfiguration is intentional, not only due to the powerful inspiration that may modify the intertext internally, but also because it seems that in the part of the poem where it is articulated, Fishta plays quite a lot intertextually. Thus, it is preceded by the Horace intertext, “Deka, qi baras m’derë t’pellazvet / Trakllon, si m’tinë t’kolibavet”³⁶ (Eng. “Death, which knocks on the door / of palaces, as on the wicket of huts”) that emerges in parentheses, as well as the Foscolo intertext which is not referred to but highlighted by Volaj: “kur dielli bjen me shndritun mbi kobe t’dheut”³⁷ (Eng. “when the sun shines on the evils of the earth”). The Horatian intertext translated and configured almost literally may indeed contest the procedure we defined as articulation through a “mnemonic transformation”, however, it is interesting also in this case (besides the replacement of “derë” [Eng. door] with “tinë” [Eng. wicket), the placement of the non-essential emphatic apposition “ku i vorfni me lot njomë buken...” (“where the poor softens the bread with tears”) which Fishta adds to the intertext. This apposition reflecting a modification of the idiom of the folk source, demonstrates a Fish-tian tendency for articulation, if not entirely paraphrastic, at least modified. However, the co-presence of the Horatian and Foscolo intertexts in the same poetic sentence (notice in verses 9-14 the non-disruption of articulation while constructing the poetic image of ‘the coming of death’) and immediately after them (verse 16) the articulation of the phrase “qi e përshpirtshme nji dorë...” (Eng. “that a soulful hand...”) we can assume that they come both simultaneously (in the cognitive-paradigmatic plane) and successively (as observed in the syntagmatic plane) as stimuli of the *lyrical remembrance* (Ger. Erinnerung),³⁸ in the sense attributed to this word by Emil Staiger in relation to the essence of lyric, and which also resem-

³⁵ In such cases, we assume, even potential later editing is unlikely to filter or cohere in favor of citation correctness, because in that case, it would take away much of the poetic sensibility and articulative spontaneity that is also conditioned by a proclassical proceeding through the eleven-syllable blank verse (in the *Leopardian* manner which tends towards a somewhat cumulative syntax and therefore without strict supervision of phrases and sentences). In addition to the lyrics, this is a proven practice of Fishta in almost all his work, but especially in the epic, where Fishta incorporates and merges the typical popular idiomatic register into the authorial text.

³⁶ Cf. *Pallida mors aequo pulsat pede pauperum tabernas/ Regumque turres* (Q. Horatius Flaccus (Horace), *Carmina*, I-4, v. 13-14); see, *Horatius Opera*, edidit Friedrich Klingner ‘Editio Stereotypa Editionis Teriae (MCMLIX)’, Walter de Gruyter, 2008, p. 7.

³⁷ Cf.: “...e finché il Sole – risplenderà su le sciagure umane” (Ugo Foscolo, *I Sepolcri*, vv. 294-5; see comment no. 13-14 of Volaj in, Gjergj Fishta, *ibid.*, p. 203.

³⁸ See chapter *Lyric Mode: Remembrance*, in Emil Staiger, *ibid.*, p. 43 ff.

bles Fishta's own conception on this issue.³⁹ Here, however, we are using it more technically, to signify the author's *lyrical remembrance* in relation to readings that at the 'momentum' of creation and articulation of lyrical expression on a specific topos, either they "wake up" and are consciously configured as a recapture (hence appearing co-present in the same poetic sentence), or the others after they first emerge and are unconsciously articulated within what is known as *free association* in psychoanalytic terminology. However, since the phrase above "qi e përshepirtshme një dorë..." (Eng. "that a soulful hand...") is articulated anastrophically as in the original text ("Samilosna ruka koja..."), we consider primarily that we have to do with a conscious configuration of this minimal intertextual form, with allusive intention through the condensed level of syntagmatic form. This is because the anastrophic articulation, beyond the well-known Fishtian proclassicism in modeling lyrical verses, is likely to suggest in this case the Kranjčevićian reference, precisely through maintaining the syntactic logic of the Croatian language, namely by preserving the same structure, which indeed sounds 'poetic' in Albanian and which also prompts Volaj to comment on this syntactic inversion pro-aesthetically: "The placing of the attribute before the name, here in this instance, is to emphasize the feelings of that hand..."⁴⁰ Therefore we consider that the input of this phrase is to suggest the cognitive-emotional relationship of Fishta with certain Kranjčevićian poetic expressions, and that here, it is evidence of (and perhaps an internal demand to demonstrate) the recognition and passionate reading of his work.

Similar to this, there is another syntagmatic analogy which may suggest even something more. In the poem *Uspomeni August Šenoa (In Memory of August Šenoa)*,⁴¹ dedicated to the memory of one of his favorite authors, Kranjčević among other things, reflects poetically:

Izvjedljiv vid mi na sve željan pado,
I gledah nebu one kruge tajne,
A lagan uzdah kidao se rado
Pod vedre zvijezde – božje oči sjajne⁴²

Here, it is much easier to notice the intertextual relationship between the last verses and verses 82-83 of *AAF*: "E kqyri hyjt, qi, thue, se njaq sy Zotit/ Flakojnë mbi dhe..." (Eng. "I look at the stars, so that your mind goes, that as many eyes of God/ Shine over the earth...") and that after the poetic *exempla* ("...perhaps, to scare..."), concludes the sentence with: "e atë botë mendoj per ty" (Eng. "and then

³⁹ See the letter he sends to Pal Dodaj (Shkodër, April 6, 1910) in Gjergj Fishta, *Letërshkëmbimi*, Botime Françeskane, Shkodër, p. 102-103.

⁴⁰ See comment № 16 of V. Volaj in, Gjergj Fishta, *Lirika*, Rilindja, Prishtinë, p. 203.

⁴¹ Silvije Strahimir Kranjčević, *ibid.*

⁴² *Ibid.*

I think of you” suggesting through the double semantic coding of the verses, both the identification (further in verses 86-89) of the brightest star with the dedicatee of his poem, as well as the play at the metatextual level, as an expression of the internal revitalization of the motives of his friend's poetry; considering this double coding, even the concluding sentence resonates more powerfully semantically than simply as a conclusion of a poetic *exempla*. We also note that, as in this case, as in many of Kranjčević's poems, there is a strong presence of the aspect of contemplating and invoking nature as a particular mode of proxemic language that generates meanings, suggests states, or makes figurative allusions with specific references. However, what is specific to him is the contemplation of the sky, stars and the sun, which is likely to be connected with the beginning of *AAF* and the much-discussed verse: “... Aty dy sy t'jan errun / Ku qiella prirej me sa hana e diella / Terthores s'eper m'sharte vrejn t'njerezimit!” (Eng. “... Those two eyes have dusked / Where heavens mirrored with all the moons and suns / From lofty orbit they deem the human plight”). We base the possibility of such an allusion on an aspect of Fishta's literary cognition that manifests itself in other dedicatory poems, e.g., *On the day of the name of an Albanian Franciscan* or *To F. Anton Zannoni S.J* (written at that time, in 1908, but published only in 1931), where the author tends to enumerate explicitly (in eidetic disposition) or sometimes through minimalist allusions, specific character or biographical references to those to whom he dedicates the poems. However, regarding the latter allusion, we cannot claim interpretive validity, because in this case, the influence of Foscolo and Leopardi, namely the beginning of *Dei Sepulcri* and *A Silvia* can be just as close, as in both cases successively, we have references to sight and hearing, so indexically, to the eyes and then the voice as signs of memory for the deceased.⁴³

Another slightly more complex intertextual relationship, which intertwines and can be justified in terms of hypotaxis with the previous example, can be observed between some highly commented verses of *AAF* and the poem *Ja sam (I am)* of Kranjčević. The poem *Ja sam* articulates, among other things, this poetic thought: “... / Niz koji me sudba rinu, / Lutajući, kako luta / Mrtva zvijezda kroz prazninu./”,⁴⁴ and continues in the second and final stanza that we are providing in full:

Al kad tvoje oko pane
Na tu zvijezdu, moje dijete,
Tada pjesma opet plane

⁴³ Cf. first to Leopardi: “Silvia, rimembri ancora/ quel tempo della tua vita mortale / quando beltà splendea / negli occhi ridenti e fuggitivi...” and in the second stanza: “Sonavan le quiete / stanze, e le vie dintorno./ al tuo perpetuo canto...”; while in Foscolo: “... Ove pru il Sole / per me alla terra non fecondi questa / bella d'erbe famiglia e d'animali/” and which continues there, “Ne da te, dolce amico, udrò più il verso / e la mesta harmony che lo governa/...”

⁴⁴ Silvije Strahimir Kranjčević, *ibid.*

Ko da iskre nebom lete; –
A ti gledaš kako sjaje
Ispred tvoga čista vida,
A ne znadeš, dušo, šta je
Kad se srce tako kida!⁴⁵

It might be a bit difficult to grasp the intertextual relationship that Fishta build with this poem through the verses:

And, where I see a brighter star shining/
with myself I say that there you have your place/
I keep my eyes fixed on that star and it seems to me
that I'm looking at you. By name then I call you
through the night...
(verses 86-90)

So the basis of the intertextual relationship we are suggesting has to do with the fact that Fishta within one of his own poetic motives, precisely that of contemplating the sky and stars when nature fades into darkness (note: “Oh! How many times, when, in the dark of night, nature fades... I go out the window to see the tent... I look at the stars”), Fishta implants precisely the “visionary” topos of Kranjčević in the poem “Ja sam”, where he identifies himself with the star (initially with the dead star wandering through the void and then in the second stanza with the star that begins to shine when the ‘intimately implied reader’ (note the emphatic vocatives: “moje dijete”, “dušo”) fixes his eyes on it and sees its sparks flying and shining in front of the pure vision of the one ‘who sees’: “Al kad tvoje oko pane / Na tu zvijezdu, moje dijete,/Tada pjesma opet plane/Ko da iskre nebom lete; – / A ti gledaš kako sjaje/Ispred tvoga čista vida”. Therefore, we can say that in this case Fishta configures exactly that “moje dijete” through himself. If Fishta’s desire for dialogue with his dedicatee is merely projected (note: “e m’bahet si me t’pa”, [Eng. “and it seems to me that I’m looking at you”]; “me emen/Un t’thras atbēbotē n’per terr”, [Eng. “By name then I call you through the night...”]; “e m’duket/Se bisedoj me ty!...” [Eng. and it seems that/ I’m talking to you!...]), this projection takes place within Kranjčević’s “visionary” topos in the poem *Ja sam*, which Fishta appropriates intertextually without decontextualizing it but simply by changing the roles of the communication constituents; the lyrical ‘I’ of *AAF* articulates in the role of the implied reader of *Ja sam*, while the lyrical ‘I’ of *Ja sam* becomes the ‘implied reader’ of *AAF*.

Another example that connects *AAF* and Kranjčević’s poetry could be the poem *Neznani grob* (*The Unknown Grave*). The intertextual relationship estab-

⁴⁵ Ibid.

lished by Fishta with this poem is constructed through the metonymic principle, wherein the insertion of signs from Kranjčević's text into *AAF* metonymically alludes to the identification of the unknown hero (junaka) of the poem with its author, Kranjčević, who embodies in Fishta's poetic discourse the attributes of the hero and consequently reconfigures as the Hero with an unknown grave. The first thing we notice in the intertextual relationship between these two poems is the topos of the 'unknown grave'. The signs we encounter in "Neznani grob" regarding the attributes of this unknown grave are reconfigured periphrastically in *AAF*. Note:

Al na grobu nepoznatom
Nema krsta, nema znaka;
Nitko ne zna gdje se skriva
Osušena krv junaka.⁴⁶

Just as unknown and desolate is poetically conceptualized the grave of the dedicatee of *AAF*. In Fishta's poem, the cross is not missing (cf: Nema krsta), but it is lost among thorns and mandrake, hence equally missing:

... Today the nettles and mandrake
on your grave have bloomed. A juniper cross,
That a soulful hand placed it over your head
Among them has been lost, not another thing
Do not soften the sadness of your tomb...
(verses 14-18)

Moreover, within the poem *Neznani grob*, a poetic image is shaped that we can reasonably assume echoes suggestively in *AAF*. This image is that of the guardian angel which in Kranjčević's poem emerges as a symbol of care and protection against even the slightest noise that disturbs the song of freedom emanating from the unknown hero's grave. The last stanza of *Neznani grob* highlights the angel guarding the unknown hero's grave: "Već slobodno srce igra, / Slobodnom se pjesmom blaži – / Ah, otako anđel valjda / Na neznanu grobu straži!/" which Fishta remodels through a proleptic mode as inspiration for his work through the metaphor of the Fairy:

... The Angel of God/
Who as a faithful watchman, keeps away the dark powers/
So that they do not disturb your death sleep/
Until the moon and the sun are extinguished in the sky/
And time stops and the whole world is destroyed/

⁴⁶ Ibid.

And come the day of judgment of the world/
He will be my Zana⁴⁷...
(verses 122-128)

In the absence of a Fishtian *Dichtung und Wahrheit* that would not let these interpretations emerge as a *bricolage* of compared intertexts, we are adding something we believe somewhat strengthens the arguments in favor of Suta's hypothesis that this poem is dedicated to Kranjčević. Within the context of Fishta's correspondence with Pal Dodaj, perhaps his closest friend, as evidenced by the quantity and content of the letters they exchanged, there is a letter from Fishta to Dodaj sent from Shkodra on February 3, 1909, several months before the publication of his book *Pika Voëset* in Zara and, as understood, before the first publication of *AAF*.⁴⁸ The letter is fragmented in many parts, or more precisely, self-censored by Dodaj in some parts indicated by dots, therefore we only have its beginning and end. According to the information provided by Dodaj himself, this is a response from Fishta to a letter he sent earlier, in which he requested assistance with references for an article he wished to publish regarding the literary reviews made of Fishta's work up to that time.⁴⁹ What is relevant for us in this context is the last part of the letter where Fishta, after the references he was supposed to give Dodaj in the first and missing part of the letter, adds the following data:

Dr. Patsch of Sarajevo wanted to send, by all means, to the Museum, for which he is supervisor, a manuscript of my own, and has told me that when the new Museum is built, which is going to cost 1,800,000 crowns, there will be a section for Albanian literature, in a room, which could simply be a facsimile of my work. (...) ⁵⁰

As is known, Karl Patsch (1865-1945), a linguist and archaeologist, founded the Institute for Balkan Studies (Institut für Balkanforschung) in Sarajevo in 1908,⁵¹ and as understood from Fishta's information, immediately after its establishment, he asked Fishta for a manuscript to be placed in the Museum within the institute, which also had a room dedicated to Kranjčević. Now, we have two testimonies for two manuscripts by Fishta in the museum room dedicated to Kranjčević at the Balkan Institute in Sarajevo. The first is the manuscript of the poem in Italian that Fishta dedicated to Kranjčević, "Al valente poeta sig. Silvie Kranjčević",

⁴⁷ Here Zana (Fairy) means and embodies 'poetic inspiration'.

⁴⁸ The publication of the book *Pika Voëset* must have happened after July 1909, because the poem *Peng Nderimi* is intratextually dated as written in July 1909.

⁴⁹ See Pal Dodaj's footnote to *Gjergj Fishta 1871-1940* (Commemorative number published under the care of Father Benedikt Dema OFM, 1943), Nositi, Prishtinë, 2011, p. 74; also, for something more related to this, see Ernest Marku, *Libri i Fishtës*, Botimet Fishta, 2020, p. 76.

⁵⁰ Gjergj Fishta, *Letërshkëmbimi*, Botime Françeskane, Shkodër, p. 92 ff.

⁵¹ Robert Elsie, *Historical Dictionary of Albania* (second edition), Scarecrow Press, Inc., 2010, f. 249.

which was found, transcribed, and published in 1927 by Vladimir Ćorović and later published several times⁵² (most recently in Albanian, translated and accompanied by the aforementioned study by Blerina Suta). The other manuscript, which has not been found so far, is mentioned by Ljubomir Maraković in an article from 1927 titled *Na rub Kranjčević pjesama*:

It happened to me to see in Sarajevo, in the room dedicated to the memory of Kranjčević at the Balkan Institute, the verses in the Albanian language by Gjergj Fishta from a later period, when, passing through Sarajevo, he visited the room of memories of his unfortunate friend, who was then resting under the sign of a disputed genius, in the cemetery of Koševo.⁵³

Suta connects this latter information with Viktor Volaj's paratextual explanation: "Some say that the first manuscript was lost",⁵⁴ and thus it is possible, as evidenced by this letter from Fishta to Dodaj, that Fishta sent Patsch exactly the manuscript of the poem *AAF* upon request, which although we do not have precise information, we suppose he may have written only after the request from Karl Patsch. This assumption can only be loosely supported based on a characteristic of Fishta's literary cognition: I believe that Fishta is an author who, in addition to 'individual talent', is always dependent on external stimulation in creation, and here we have in mind the essayistic testimony of his friend Pashko Bardhi, who, in relation to the idea of creating the epic poem *Lahuta e Malcis* (his greatest work) among other things, emphasizes: "although all glory and honor belong to Father Fishta, we will know a small part of the praise to Marash Uci, because if he had not met him, perhaps Father Fishta would not have written "Lahuta e Malcis."⁵⁵ The same can be said for his dramatic works, which, as Fishta himself points out, took shape after a long study of Shakespeare,⁵⁶ while the earlier ones were mainly based on well-known models, with familiar subjects that Fishta subordinated to an appropriate adaptation for Albanian cultural context.

In addition to this, there is also a justifiable textual argument at the figurative level of the text. Fishta's poem begins with an almost Gothic tone and a declarative expression that terrifies with its simplicity:

In that dead assart within the ghastly tomb
Now dust thou are.
(verses 1-2)

⁵² See, Blerina Suta, *ibid.*, p. 41 ff.

⁵³ *ibid.*, p. 65-66.

⁵⁴ Gjergj Fishta, *Lirika*, Rilindja, Prishtinë, 1997, p. 200.

⁵⁵ At Pashk Bardhi, *Si xuni fill "Lahuta e Malcis"* in *Gjergj Fishta 1871-1940* (Commemorative number published under the care of Father Benedikt Dema OFM, 1943), Nositi, Prishtinë, 2011.

⁵⁶ See Letter addressed to Pal Dodaj (Shkodër, January 20, 1911) in Gjergj Fishta, *Letërshkëmbimi*, Botime Françeskane, 2020, p. 106.

while it ends with the name of the addressee inscribed in oaks (an old topos that will be discussed later) which will grow together with them, to become much clearer after a few centuries, for later grandchildren to sing and never be forgotten.

Volaj's semantic explication for the spatial deictic: "rrah" (Eng. assart) is self-evident and comes as a paraphrase from the *Dictionary of Bashkimi* (1908), therefore Volaj evaluates it simply as a metaphor for the *simulacrum* of the cemetery. However, we believe that here Fishta also amalgamates a figurative meaning that coheres when placed in parallel with the final verses and image constructed through them. "The assart" – explains Volaj – "is the name for the place where trees have been cut to be converted into agricultural land..."⁵⁷ Thus, Fishta begins his poem with the suggestive image of a destroyed forest, a "cut" forest (lat. *Caedua Silva*), indicating an allusion through spatial reference, namely the name of his deceased friend "Silvije" since Silva in Latin, and in variations in other pre-Latin languages, denotes a forest. Taking into account, as we said, the final image of the poem with the name engraved in the oak, which grows together with the oaks to become clearer, we clearly observe the parallelism, and at the same time the contrast that Fishta constructs. Initially, the cut, destroyed, dead forest, is synonymous with the state of the friend who bears the name of the "forest" (Silvije), and in the end, the change of state, namely the projection of reforestation, indicated by the grown oaks and name that grows with them. It is highly suggestive, the chiasmic conception at the eidetic level, considering the initial and final focalization. The poem opens with a closure and closes with an opening. From the graveyard, to the darkness of the grave, to the dust, to the dark eyes, and then, from the razor to the oak, from the oak to growth, from growth to clarity, until it arrives in song - a symbol of immortality. Chiasmic structure is very noticeable. Its osmoses that we notice between the beginning and the end, are all conceived chiasmatically and through the *chiaroscuro* technique, whether at the level of minimalist images or even at the level of more cohesive structures.

We allow ourselves to call these considerations of ours, a "surplus of arguments" of Blerina Suta's hypothesis, although we are aware that they do not escape the aprioristic character of the justification of that hypothesis, because as it is understood, like a *circulus in probando*, takes Kranjčević for granted as the dedicatee of the poem *AAF* and tends to argue in favor of that conclusion. However, taking this into account, we can say that in essence, as was hypothesized even before Suta's philologically based revelation, the poem *AAF* is a poem about a friend, the death of a friend, a variant that many other scholars have taken into account (although without a concrete name and with a "glance" towards his Franciscan brethren or other friends).

⁵⁷ See comment № 1 in Gjergj Fishta, *Lirika*, Rilindja, Prishtinë, 1997, p. 201.

Now, indeed, anyone could bring a plucked chicken and tell us, as Diogenes the Cynic did: *Oûtos estin o Plátōnos ánthrōpos*. Nevertheless, we consider this *anagnorisis* is a necessary premise in the hermeneutical perspective to understand the special proceeding of Fishta in *AAF*. As such, the recognition of the dedicatee of *AAF* is not a philological eureka *per se* nor simply a satisfaction of the Fishtian reader's curiosity, but it generates new and important questions for Fishta's poetics. Being one of Fishta's most distinctive and almost universally resonant poems (where the historical setting is very neutral), it is important to understand why Fishta chooses only in this case an absolute pronominal vocativity, whereas the poem deifies this dedicatee more than each of the other dedicatees of other dedicatory poems. Is there a compulsive relationship between deification and latentism and what can draw an interpretation of Fishtian cryptic intention? Let us consider two hypotheses.

The Prudence

The first hypothesis takes into account the fact that latentism is primarily determined by a self-censoring effort of Fishta that is based on the almost controversial aura of Kranjčević's personality and what he and his work were claimed to represent from a religious, namely clerical, point of view. As the scholar Ellen Elias-Bursać informs us in a brief and concise biography of Kranjčević, after the publication of the second book "Izbrane pjesme" (1898) and the third book *Trzaji* (1902), Kranjčević became the subject of great controversy between Catholic literary critics and Liberal anti-clerical critics.⁵⁸ According to Bursać, Catholic literary critics began to attack Kranjčević's work from a religious perspective. The first of these, Antun Mahnić, attacked the anti-dogmatic implications in the Kranjčevićian philosophy *that people find solace and strength in work and nature rather than in the Church* (emphasis added).⁵⁹ He accused Kranjčević in an article in the periodical "Hrvatska straža" of having socialist tendencies because *Kranjčević expressly calls work a source of human salvation* (emphasis added) and accuses him of being a Darwinist; and although he says that Kranjčević uses the name of God in his verses, Mahnić sees this only as a mask hiding the weakness of his godless science,

⁵⁸ See *Silvije Strahimir Kranjčević* (February 18, 1865 – October 19, 1908) by Ellen Elias-Bursać, in *Dictionary of Literary Biography*, Volume 147: *South Slavic Writers Before World War II* (Edited by Vasa D. Mihailovich), University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Gate Research Inc., Detroit, 1995, p. 108. (Note: such a typological conception of the Croatian critical currents of the time is under the competence of the above-mentioned scholar; our knowledge of these phenomena is limited, therefore we carry them descriptively without problematizing them, although it is likely they may be ideologically motivated or reflect atrophies that have been established due to historical perspective and temporal distance).

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

materialism, pantheism, and Buddhism, accusing Kranjčević of replacing belief in God with belief in one's own power and work and emphasizing that these beliefs stem directly from modern socialism.⁶⁰ Other liberal or relatively less conservative critics like Jakša Čedomil, Ferdo Rožić, and Milan Marjanović tried to defend Kranjčević, as Elias-Bursač says, by giving him a more generous *reading*.⁶¹ These problems of ideological interpretation of his literary work also had consequences in other aspects of his life, e.g., in the case of the proposal (after the closure of the magazine *Nada* where he had worked for a long time) for his appointment, or as director of the women's teaching college, or as supervisor of the education of women and girls there (i.e., in Sarajevo, my emphasis).⁶² The latter proposal was immediately opposed by Josip Štadler, Archbishop of Sarajevo, who accused Kranjčević of having written "travesties completely stripped of the Christian spirit, severely hurting Christian religious sentiment."⁶³ He refused to allow such an *infidel* (emphasis added), to act as superintendent of the Catholic girls' school in Sarajevo.⁶⁴ This is probably also the reason why the scholar Ljubomir Maraković refers to him as an "opposed genius".⁶⁵ However, it seems that Kranjčević's conflict with the ecclesiastical authorities of the time has a history that precedes the stigmatizing ideological interpretation of his later literary work. Already in adolescence, Kranjčević had shown rebellious tendencies against authorities, both ecclesiastical and administrative-secular. As we learn, during secondary school he was encouraged to partake in political activities culminating in his membership in the Stranka Prava movement led by Ante Starčević, the latter being a representative figure of radical Croatian nationalism opposing what was known as Illyrianism.⁶⁶ In one case highlighted by Elias-Bursač, in his last year of secondary school (late 1870s), encouraged by this fiery emotional rhetoric (of Starčević, my emphasis), clashed with the Franciscan authorities administering the school and *offended the Franciscans* (sic.), which resulted in their refusal to give him his matura.⁶⁷ Without further delving into the other troubles Kranjčević had with the Austro-Hungarian political-administrative authorities, especially on identity policies they applied in Bosnia,⁶⁸ we conclude that Fishta must have been aware of the controversial aura surrounding

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ See, Ljubomir Maraković, *Na rub Kranjčević pjesama*, in: "Hrvatska Prosvjeta", year XV, №. 2, 25.02.1927 and №. 3, 25.03.1927, f. 64; quoted in Blerina Suta, *Hulumtime mbi veprën e At Gjergj Fishtës*, Onufri, 2018, p. 66.

⁶⁶ *Silvije Strahimir Kranjčević* (18 February 1865 – 19 October 1908) by Ellen Elias-Bursač. Ibid., p. 105.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 106.

Kranjčević's public personality after 1900 (because of the polemic we mentioned) but also after his death. Is it not likely that this post-mortem controversy is also indicated by the verses:

... Now the nettles and mandrake
on your grave have bloomed
(verses 14-15)

and

that pile of stones that weighs on your grave,
even to soulless cruelty that kills people,
on the run when he passes near the grave, they look to him like witches
And a shudder then crosses his heart.
(verses 21-24)

So (o heresy of paraphrase!), now, after death there are even more insinuations and rumors against you that weigh you down (nettles, stones, mandrake) that terrify even a murderer. "Mandrake" also, considered as quite a unusual lexeme here in relation to nettles, has the potential to suggest an allusion to Machiavelli's satirical comedy *La Mandragola*, where within the framework of the dramatic action, built the very action that has already received the name Machiavellianism and where among other things, a corrupt clergyman is depicted represented by the character of Brother Timothy.⁶⁹

Therefore, we believe that the thirty-eight-year-old Fishta (in 1909), established in the positions he held (as a Franciscan cleric, director of Franciscan schools, one of the first definitors of the Albanian Franciscan Province, guardian of the Gjuhadol Assembly, with sufficient contributions and experience in many fields, at the height of the fame he was gaining through literary publications and engagement in cultural issues,⁷⁰ and also with problems and troubles of a political and administrative nature that had happened not long ago from the time of the publication of *AAF*,⁷¹ certainly, had developed much more prudent awareness⁷² in rela-

⁶⁹ See *The Comedies of Machiavelli 'The Woman from Andros, The Mandrake, Clizia'* (Bilingual Edition), edited and translated by David Sices and James B. Atkinson, Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., Indianapolis/Cambridge, 2007.

⁷⁰ Precisely at the time of Kranjčević's death, Fishta was active and among the main exponents of the 'Congress of Manastir' for the solution of the issue of the Albanian alphabet.

⁷¹ Here we can mention one of the problems that had arisen for Fishta two years earlier, when – to paraphrase – "it is not known for what reason, in 1906 he was dismissed from the position of director of the Franciscan schools of Shkodra and ordered to return from where he came, namely as parish priest in the village of Gomsiqe..." See Tonin Çobani, *Gjergj Fishta – Fillimet letrare*, Botimet Fishta, 2017, p. 81 ff.).

⁷² By 'prudent awareness' here I presumably mean Fishta's maturation in terms of the complexity of social and bureaucratic life (both religious and national), his dysphoria in the relationship between ide-

tion to what Plasari once called, demands of “social imperative” or “institutional dispositions”,⁷³ which would have made him hesitant to display through dedication, the friendship and identification at an ideal level, with such a “controversial” figure as Silvije Strahimir Kranjčević. We believe that Fishta neither had the enthusiasm of his student years, when just a few months after his first meeting with Kranjčević (December 12, 1892), he dedicated a poem to him with a dedication in the title, *Al valente poet sig. Silvije Kranjčević*, nor the characteristic youthful rebelliousness that disregarded the authorities when he thought they were interpreting something unfairly.⁷⁴ Although uncompromising in the ideals he held and aimed to express in his work, we believe that now much more mature and consolidated, Fishta did not want to “lower his behavior grade”⁷⁵ as he did in secondary school, nor to be dismissed from the position of director of Franciscan schools as had happened two years prior (in 1906), when he had been ordered to “return from where he came, that is, to become a parish priest in the village of Gomsiqe...”⁷⁶ when, although the reasons are not known, Father Dodaj notes that the problem had occurred “prompted by the anger of some, who did not understand Fishta...” As evidenced by the poem *AAF*, he kept on a pedestal the respect and memory of his former friend, and did not hesitate to express it there in the form of lament and euphoric glorification, but self-censored the display of the friend's name, to, as Father Dodaj said “not incite anger of some” who probably still “wouldn’t under-

ality and reality and, of course, as a consequence, a necessary and imposed conformism in relation to many institutional-religious issues as well as in terms of national issues. To illustrate this, we can quote here, among other things, only part of a letter sent to Dodaj on 15.X.1907: “You tell me: “...never have I suffered in my soul as in these days [1] the miseries of the Motherland; I feel all the bitterness of the abyss we are in.” You're lucky that you haven't passed your thirties and you can still have pathetic feelings! As for me, to tell you the truth, today I would try to kill such thoughts, if nothing else, with a bottle of rakija; because it would be the same as if we wanted the impossible: and it is impossible to have a Fatherland according to our ideal. (At Gjergj Fishta O.F.M., *Letërshkëmbimi*, Botime Françeskane, Shkodër, 2020, p. 86-87); also see his personal attitude in relation to the clergy in another letter addressed to Pal Dodaj on April 8, 1909 (*ibid.*, p. 93-94), in which a subtext such as in the previous letter can also be assumed, so that “...it is impossible for us to have a clergy according to our ideal.” Beyond the assumption of this ‘prudent awareness’ that Fishta may have developed over time, he nevertheless knew how to be unpredictable with his temper; that is why even much later, he “knew how to forget” he was wearing the Franciscan robe. It is enough, among so many examples, to mention his speech at the grave of Avni Rustemi (assassin of former Prime Minister Esad Pasha Toptani), which caused him so much trouble with his superiors, that the Minister General of the Franciscan Order in Rome, Padre Bernardino Klumper OFM, through a complaint to Dodaj as Provincial of the friars, makes serious remarks to Fishta, threatening to, let us paraphrase: “ban the publication of the magazine where the speech was published, even with punishment” (See, Frano Kulli, *Fishta - Rileximi në kohën e lirisë*, Botimet Fishta, 2022, pp. 61-62.).

⁷³ Aurel Plasari, *ibid.*, p. 24.

⁷⁴ Blerina Suta, *ibid.*

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

⁷⁶ See footnote № 67.

stand”, to avoid “friction” with the clerical authorities, who, as we have seen, saw the personality and literary work of Kranjčević with stigma, especially in terms of faith, something which, understandably, the clergy cannot compromise. Could this second hypothesis make us reconsider more carefully some of these almost final verses of the poem,

... And his children then
They will sing your name. The field and the mountain
Always fresh, counting terrible frenzies
Sweet from your name will echo.
They will write on the oaks with the tip of the razor
In letters known only to shepherds:
The oaks will grow, because neither the ax nor the lightning
don't touch the wood where that name is written:
As the oaks grow, the letters will grow
And so clearer after several centuries
The grandchildren will sing them
And your name will be sung as soon as the sun sets on the earth
(verses 151-162)

where the proceeding through conduplication (*conduplicatio*) namely the quadruple articulation of the word 'name' only in the last eleven verses of the poem, suggests the author's compulsion for non-nomination, relativizing Volaj's thesis that he is lost, in the sense that he is abstracted (Volaj as understood from the commentative paratext, conceptualizes the addressee of *AAF* as a chimerical figure, which starts as something defined but loses its contours; it seems that Volaj is not convinced that there could exist a concrete person that Fishta idealizes so much). However, precisely because of this strong reference to “the name” (i.e. “the name” as a syndecode and metonymy of the addressee), Fishta demonstrates that he is not developing his motives “in the air”, he is not engaging in an Ovidian-like rhetorical exercise by monotonizing it through atypical prolongation for lyric, nor is he consciously falling into the trap of universality of poetic discourse *per se*. No, but it is precisely the real referent, his friend who stands before his mind's eye in an eidetic mode, and even if the temptation of nomination no longer existed, the insistence through the conduplication of 'name' reveals this awareness. Indeed, the “name” may have the semantic surplus of Albanian ethnocultural axiology, which marks the “sublimation” of the man, his emblematic transformation into the “extraordinary” in “the name”, however, this may be only suggestive because we believe that here we are primarily dealing with indexicalization due to the suppression of the desire for nomination; thus, it is an emphasis of self-awareness and compulsion for lack of a signifier. This becomes even more clearer if we observe in two of the verses we just quoted, Fishta's materialization of a double coding:

They will write on the oaks with the tip of the razor
In letters known only to shepherds
(verses 155-156)

From Volaj, the literal meaning of these verses is taken for granted, which simply relates to the bucolic convention of writing signs on trees by shepherds. However, within the framework of the hypothesis we have given, here we also see two possibilities of figurative interpretation. The first is the allusive marking within the Christian figural code, where the *ordo clericus* is marked through the shepherds. There are two levels on which we believe Fishta could have constructed such an allusion. The first is the dedicative-specific allusion, which may refer to its closest brethren, that “only from them” the name of dedicatee of *AAF* is known, while the second may be the ironic allusion, where the *ordo clericus* could denote all the “clerical” adversaries who stigmatized Kranjčević as “infidel”. Within the framework of the ironic allusion, the Fishtian subtext of this verse is understandable. Meanwhile, the second figurative interpretation beyond the Christian figural code, we believe, can be linked to Virgil's Tenth Eclogue. The topoi of 'writing on trees' (known and widely used in literature in poets such as Theocritus, Virgil, Propertius, Ovid, Ariosto, Boiardo, Tasso, Shakespeare, Sidney, Spenser, etc.) is present in both texts, although we do not have congruence between the situations being poetized. What links Virgil's Tenth Eclogue and *AAF* through the somewhat thin layer of the archaic graffiti in wooden material, is their common dedicatory object: in both, characters are poets esteemed by their poet friends, namely the poet Gallus by Virgil and Kranjčević by Fishta, but discredited by authorities, the former by Octavian and the latter by the clergy. Due to a lack of ancient evidence and absence of the poetic work of Gallus (considered from an Ovidian projection also as the first elegiac poet),⁷⁷ scholars have concluded that this suggests a *damnatio memoriae* initiated against the poet;⁷⁸ although the reasons are speculated, Ovid in *Tristia* (2.1.445-6) attributes this fall to his *licentia* (freedom of expression) when he was intoxicated. In relation to this (although ambiguities are mentioned),⁷⁹ Virgil in the aforementioned Eclogue poses a significant question: “neget quis carmina Gallo?” (Ecl. 10.3, and who could deny Gallus's poems?)⁸⁰ alluding to the prohibition of his work. Considering Fishta's classicist influence, education, and preference, it seems possible that at least the motive for this intertextualized topos came

⁷⁷ *Tristia*, 4. 10.53-4, taken up by Quintilian in *Institutio Oratoria*, 10.1.93.

⁷⁸ See Emmanuelle Raymond – Caius Cornelius Gallus ‘The Inventor of Latin Love Elegy’ in, *The Cambridge Companion to Latin Love Elegy*, edited by Thea S. Thorsen, Cambridge University Press, 2013, f. 60-61.

⁷⁹ Ibid. p. 60, footnote (11).

⁸⁰ Also, Ovid, in a part where the immortality of poets is sublimated in *Amores*, takes up the image of Gallus in this form: “Gallus et Hesperis et Gallus notus Eois / et sua cum Gallo nota Lycoris erit” (Am. 1,15, 29-30).

from knowledge of the real and poetic context, and perhaps at the euphoric end of his poem, it may have stemmed as 'intertextual unconsciousness', as a syllepsis in the sense given by Riffaterre.⁸¹ However, the integration of such intertextualization of the image of 'writing on trees' that we are claiming for the construction of a suggestive partial analogy for the similar relationship of 'appreciation' for admired poets, as well as the compulsion to not accept the *damnatio memoriae* for them [which is explicitly in Virgil (with official imperative) while in Fishta as implicit pressure (which suggests the latentism of the name)], can be argued beyond "intertextual unconsciousness", so as an allusive technique of Fishtian articulation itself. This technique, I consider, is manifested to us already in the paratextual motto of the book *Pika Voestet: carmina proveniunt animo deducta sereno*, which in a way can be read as ironic and contrastive because in the Ovidian text it serves to highlight the opposite of what this verse claims, namely his state and consequently the nature of his poetry which that state inspires. This is indicated by the subsequent verses in *Tristia* I, I, 39-42: *carmina proveniunt animo deducta sereno;/ nubila sunt subitis tempora nostra malis;/ carmina secessum scribentis et otia quaerunt;/ me mare, me venti, me fera iactat hiems*. (Beautiful verses come from a calm mind;/ my days are clouded by sudden misfortunes/ the verse demands a writer with time and solitude/ I am crushed by winter storms, by tempests, by the sea). Therefore, we think that the poetic context oriented towards the Gallusian issue is implicitly indicated in the topos of "writing on trees". Perhaps it is too much to emphasize that Virgil's eclogues have long been given an allegorical interpretation in political terms.

"For you, silence is praise" or epistolary conception

If we were to start from the assumption we gave, that Fishta had not yet written *AAF* when Karl Patsch asks him for a manuscript for the Balkan Institute Museum, namely for Kranjčević's museum room, then we believe that the modeling strategy of the text took other forms that are worth discussing on a hypothetical level.

First among them is that after Patsch's request, the status of the addressee has taken on contours of a rhetorical pretext rather than being a mere mnemonic inspiration. Thus, its placement in the museum as a manuscript (as Patsch requested) has meant that Fishta did not feel the need for explicit mention of the friend's name because the very act of physically submitting the poem and placing it in the museum has internally inscribed the specific dedication to Kranjčević. Thus, Fishta may not have even considered its publication in the book *Pika Voestet*, (a publica-

⁸¹ See, Michael Riffaterre, *The Intertextual Unconscious*, *Critical Inquiry* 13 (Winter 1987).

tion that could have been realized quickly once the opportunities were offered in 1909)⁸² and he conceived it epistolarily, simply as a poem that would remain in manuscript in the friend's museum room. The strong delineation of the addressee as a 'rhetorical pretext' in Fishta's intermediate epistolary conception of the elegy is also justified by the opening verses of the poem, which indicate both the implicit Dantesque influence and explicit Gurakuqian reconfiguration. Implicitly Dantesque in the sense of the initial image that, through hypotyposis and similar tone, truly alludes to the obscurity of the beginning of the *Divina Commedia*, i.e. to that "selva oscura" and "esta selva selvaggia e aspra e forte" except in Fishta's poem with a cut down forest, but equally "oscura" and equally "aspra e forte". However, this Dantean influence becomes doubly implicit due to the explicit appropriation of this metaphor by Luigj Gurakuqi, namely his poem *Dega e Zanavet* (Eng. *The Branch of Fairies*).

In that assart of dark pain, in that place of desolation⁸³

where Gurakuqi reconfigures in the Dantesque context the topos of Limbo. Thus, this double Dantean influence and explicit Gurakuqi influence indicate the pretextual rhetorical delineation of the addressee in Fishta's work: he, in Patsch's request, certainly enthusiastic in the midst of his "troubles" that we have emphasized, so "in the middle of the path of this life" ("Nel mezzo del cammin di nostra vita"), has finally found (even if only imaginatively) his own Virgil to lead him through hell (cf. verses 107-110: "me, for whom the world and a desire for freedom/ have paved a steep road in life/ verily, my heart upon thy afflicted grave,/ stirs me to good works and to manhood"). However, if we stick to Patsch's demanding assumption, also intertextuality (especially in relation to Kranjčević's work) proves how much it will have played a role in the authorial cognition and predispositions that each poet has in advance in relation to his audience, a potential translation later. Consequently, the intended Fishtian audience for this poem-manuscript in the museum is no longer the Albanian mass audience (as for his epic and satire) nor elite audience (his friends and intellectuals of the time) but the Croatian-speaking one, which has certainly modified the atypical textual strategy of the Fishtian proceeding. In this case, Fishta presumably forcibly strove for the universalist tendency of the poetic proceeding by not contextualizing it through nominalization and leaving the interpretation open.

⁸² The problems of publishing at the time of Fishtian literary activity are already known; most of these publications were institutionally financed by offices, consulates or certain circles with cultural and political interests. The publishing problems are indicated by Fishta himself in several cases in his correspondence. See, Gjergj Fishta, *ibid.*

⁸³ Luigj Gurakuqi, *Vepra 1*, Rilindja, Prishtinë, 1988, p. 50.

On the other hand, after the experience with the epic poem *Lahuta e Malcis* (the first two cycles) and satirical poem *Anzat e Parnasit* (essentially with a pro-popular aim) which we notice have achieved a very good and strong reception, in the mainly lyrical book *Pika Voëset* and specifically in *AAF*, Fishta is in the field of preferred classic and pure lyric, which even the most lyrical Albanian poet, Lasgush Poradeci, appreciates as an undeniable feature of Fishta even in epic. He uses the enthusiasm provided by Patsch's request to build a virtual dialogic monologue with the admired poet (or rather the precursor) to whom he once in the poem *Al valente poet sig. Silvie Kranjčević* asked to write an epic about Skanderbeg. Now that the epic project was taking shape in his mind, we can see the need for virtual dialogue, and also the compulsion to surpass the predecessor in a Blumian sense. After his death, the epic idea he once entrusted to his abilities is revitalized; not only is it revitalized, but "it must" be carried out in his name: (cf. "Then I will build heroic songs.") This may have led Father Fishta due to the Kranjčevićian "controversiality" on matters of faith, in a struggle with himself, in a *terror animi*. How many "Oh's" and "Alas's" after each crescendo, how many returns to a sedimentary position "on letters and books", how many paradise imaginations full of light and love, how many virtuous aspects do not calm Fishta's struggle with himself. Only *the song* (Alb. Kanga) survives this struggle, both as *meaning* and as consolation.

As we tried to lay out in this paper, the essence of elegiac poetic dedication in its canonical form, is the lamentation of *absence*. This *absence*, apart from the need to be articulated, equally requires compensation, so it must be overcome. Formally and substantially, as both a convention and *stimmung*, elegy is an idiom where the poet exercises the craft of lamenting the absence, aims to overcome it and artistically surpasses it. In the elegy *AAF* Fishta for the first and last time sublimates a surpassing of personal pain that we will later encounter only in the initiatory investment and self-sacrificing purpose of his fictionalized epic characters. After the beginnings of his epic project (*Lahuta e Malcis*), a "little" satire (*Anzat e Parnasit*), and some translated Manzonian *Te Deum*-s, Fishta was shaping his literary and life project. And, surprisingly, in these first euphoric but equally troubled steps, he returns to youth, he returns to an old friend who had just died; he returns to where friendship was formed and a pledge given "ideally". To lean on and find his own Virgil! To overcome the pain as well as his precursor (Kranjčević), To detach, in order to move on! Fishta here has "turned to himself" and in loneliness develops a dramatic monologue with his friend and with other 'literary friends' (we are referring to the multitude of intertexts not only by Kranjčević) achieving almost an eclogic elegy. Fishta is alone here in the narrowest sense of the word and from today's perspective we can say that: if in his epic *Lahuta e Malcis* he "cuts and grinds" in the epic sense of the phrase and in satire "he swears and spits" in the satirical sense, but always with a public-dependent eye, in order "to create" an ideal Albanian and to educate him, in *AAF* Fishta is alone, without the need to convince anyone of anything, except perhaps himself. Because as Shtaiger says: "The

poet who is not addressing anyone and is speaking only to a few spirits similar to him, does not need the powers of persuasion. That is where the concept of lyricism excludes all rhetorical effect.”⁸⁴ Fishta sublimates in this unaddressed artistic text the type of devotional poetry that old Albanian writer Pjetër Bogdani (1685) had initiated for the first time in Albanian literature and which he also dedicates to a Croatian friend, Andre Zmajevic. And we are also concluding the paper with a Bogdanian psalmic quote desacralized only quantitatively, as a way to more proverbially conceive the essence of this Fishtian poem: “For you, silence is praise.”⁸⁵

LITERATURE

- Atkinson, James B. and David Sices (ed.). 2007. *The Comedies of Machiavelli 'The Woman from Andros, The Mandrake, Clizia'* (Bilingual Edition). Indianapolis–Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company.
- Ballabani, Ndue and Tonin Çobani. 2021. *At Gjergj Fishta (Vende–Vite–Vepra)*. Prishtinë: Botimet Fishta dhe Drita.
- Bogdani, Pjetër. 2015. (ed. A. Omari). *Cuenus Prophetarum 'Çeta e Profetëve'* (Botim kritik). Tiranë: ASHSH.
- Bursač, Ellen Elias. 1995. “Silvije Strahimir Kranjčević (18 February 1865 – 19 October 1908)”. U: *Dictionary of Literary Biography (South Slavic Writers Before World War II)*, vol. 147. Ed. Vasa D. Mihailovich. Detroit: University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Gale Research Inc.
- Cuddon, J. A. 2013. *A Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory* (5th ed.). Malden–Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Dema OFM, At Benedikt (ed.). 2011. *Gjergj Fishta 1871–1940*. Prishtinë: Nositi.
- Deutscher, Max. 2014. “IL N’Y A PAS DE HORS-TEXTE—ONCE MORE”. *Symposium*, 18(2): 98–124.
- Elsie, Robert. 2010. *Historical Dictionary of Albania* (2nd ed.). Maryland: Scarecrow Press.
- Fishta, Gjergj. 1909. *Pika Voeset*. Zadar: Shtypshkronja Vittaliani.
- Fishta, Gjergj. 1997. *Lirika*. Prishtinë: Rilindja.
- Fishta, Gjergj. 2020. *Letërshkëmbimi*. Shkodër: Botime Françeskane.
- Fjalori i “Bashkimit” (ed. Shqonia Bashkimi). 1978. Prishtinë: Rilindja.
- Fjalor i gjuhës së sotme shqipe (ed. ASHSH). 1981. Prishtinë: Rilindja.
- Genette, Gérard. 1997. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gurakuqi, Luigj. 1988. *Vepra I*. Prishtinë: Rilindja.
- Islamaj, Shefkije. 2012. *Gjergj Fishta: Gjuha dhe stili I–II*. Prishtinë: Instituti Albanologjik.

⁸⁴ Emil Staiger, *ibid*.

⁸⁵ Pjetër Bogdani, *Cuenus Prophetarum* (Çeta e Profetëve), Botim kritik, përgatitur nga Anila Omari, ASHSH, Tiranë, 2015, p. 6.

- Jauss, H. Robert. 1982. "Theory of Genres and Medieval Literature". U: *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Kennedy, David. 2007. *Elegy*. New York: Routledge.
- Klingner, Friedrich (ed.). 2008. *Horatius Opera* (Editio stereotypa editionis tertiae MCMLIX). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Kranjčević, S. Strahimir. 2011. *Izabrane pjesme* (e-book edition). Zagreb: Bulaja naklada.
- Kulli, Frano. 2022. *Fishta – rileximi në kohën e lirisë*. Shkodër: Botimet Fishta.
- Lodge, David i Nigel Wood (ed.). 2008. *Modern Criticism and Theory: A Reader* (3rd ed.). Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Marku, Ernest. 2020. *Libri i Fishtës*. Shkodër: Botimet Fishta.
- Mjedja, Ndre. 1982. *Vepra I*. Prishtinë: Rilindja.
- Naso, Publius Ovidius. 1907. *Amores*. Lipsiae: B. G. Teubneri. [http://data.perseus.org/...](http://data.perseus.org/) Accessed 24. march 2024.
- Naso, Publius Ovidius. 1939. *Tristia*. London–New York: W. Heinemann & G. P. Putnam's Sons. [http://data.perseus.org/...](http://data.perseus.org/) Accessed 24. Mars 2024.
- Plasari, Aurel. 1996. "Nji lule vjeshtet". *Jeta e Re*, nr. 3: 401 ff.
- Plasari, Aurel. 1996. *Fishta i dashuruari (Një aventurë e kritikës)*. Shkodër: Marin Barleti.
- Poradeci, Lasgush. 2010. *Vepra II*. Tiranë: albPAPER.
- Riffaterre, Michael. 1987. "The Intertextual Unconscious". *Critical Inquiry*, 13(1): 371–385.
- Quintilian. 1920–1922. *Institutio Oratoria*. London–Cambridge: W. Heinemann & Harvard University Press. [http://data.perseus.org/...](http://data.perseus.org/) Accesed 24. Mars 2024.
- Sacks, Peter M. 1985. *The English Elegy: Studies in the Genre from Spenser to Yeats*. Baltimore–London: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Shala, Kujtim. 2004. *Fishta përballë Fishtës*. Prishtinë: Buzuku.
- Shala, Rexhep M. 2017. *Analiza, kognicija i modeliranje*. Zagreb: Izdavačka Illyricum-dea.
- Staiger, Emil. 1991. *Basic Concepts of Poetics (Grundbegriffe der Poetik)*. Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Suta, Blerina. 2018. *Hulumtime mbi veprën e At Gjergj Fishtës*. Tiranë: Onufri.
- Thorsen, Thea S. (ed.). 2013. *The Cambridge Companion to Latin Love Elegy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

SAŽETAK

“OR SE’ TU QUEL VIRGILIO...”

(O ADRESATU ELEGIJE JESENSKI CVIJET FRA GJERGJA FISHTE)

“Kanonska” elegija kao lirski modus artikulacije, uz topološke (lamentacija, meditacija i utjeha) i tonske (melankolične, refleksivne) žanrovske konvencije, imala je, povijesno gledano, strogo definiranoga adresata. On je bio ili inspirativni poticaj ili retorički povod za pjesničku meditaciju o dihotomiji između života i smrti. Kanonska elegija *Nji lule vjeshtet (Jesenski cvijet)* poznatoga albanskog pjesnika Gjergja Fishte ističe se upravo latentnošću adresata, što je osobito zanimljivo u svjetlu uzvišene glorifikacije neimenovanoga primatelja, kao i načelne nekriptičnosti fishtijanske poetike. Novija arhivska istraživanja i filološke

analize upućuju na to da je pjesma posvećena Fishtinu starom prijatelju, poznatom hrvatskom pjesniku Silviju Strahimiru Kranjčeviću. Stoga se u ovome radu nastoje dodatno podastrijeti argumenti u prilog toj tezi te se iznose određene hipoteze o razlozima zbog kojih je Fishta oklijevao javno obznaniti svoju posvetu Kranjčeviću.

Ključne riječi: elegija, adresat, Gjergj Fishta, Silvije Strahimir Kranjčević, latentna posveta

Pjesnički krug oko Stefana Georgea s očišta povijesti znanja i obrazovanja

Od pjesničkog kruga do salonskog kružoka obrazovanog građanstva

U središtu su interesa ovog rada prostori znanja na čijem početku stoji Stefan George, iznimno samosvjestan mladić malograđanskog podrijetla koji je u krugovima pariške boeme prikupio mjerodavna iskustva o oblicima, metodama prezentacije i djelovanju simbolističke umjetnosti na grupnu dinamiku. Već se u naslovima njegovih zbirki pjesama *Himne* (*Hymnen*, 1890) i *Hodočašća* (*Pilgerfahrten*, 1891) anticipira onaj svečani smjer u kojem će George oformiti krug svojih sljedbenika u Njemačkoj. Taj je krug bio nužan za postizanje cilja koji je sebi odredio, a koji je bio ni manje ni više do “opća estetika bitka” (Keller 2001: 183) i lirska obnova Njemačke. Prve nositelje svojeg pothvata, koji je bio zamišljen kao esteticistički pokret, George je pronašao u jednoj akademskoj zajednici mladih u Niederschönhausenu. Upitamo li se što je temelj te zajednice, mogli bismo ga, oslanjajući se na Hans-Georgea Soeffnera, pronaći u simboličkom, točnije, u znanju o učinku aprezentacije kao opažanja neizrecivoga. Iz protosociološke perspektive upravo taj oblik opažanja konstituira socijalnost (Soeffner 2004: 49).

Socijalnost koju je konstituirao George ubrzo je nadišla lokalni okvir mladenačke zajednice. Aktivno su se uspostavljali kontakti te su se u novim prostorima okupljale nove skupine koje su u umjetnosti i znanosti širile ono što je Stefan Breuer mjerodavno označio pojmom “estetski fundamentalizam” (Breuer 1995a). Sam pojam sugerira kruto pridržavanje načela te strogo odbijanje novina i prilagodbe, što se u nastavku relativizira usmjeravanjem pozornosti ponajprije na dva momenta: s jedne strane na prilagodljivost Georgeova esteticističkog programa novim kontekstima, a s druge strane na usporedno znanstveno promatranje i refleksiju samog estetskog fundamentalizma koji provode Georgeovi sljedbenici. Time

se ne osporava postojanje čvrstih načela, samo se utvrđuje da su se oblici prezentacije i širenja modificirali od početaka kruga u akademskoj mladenačkoj zajednici preko obrazovane elite okupljene u umjetničkim salonima pa sve do etabliranja u sveučilišnoj znanosti. Valja prikazati kako je tu modifikaciju bilo moguće i potrebno provesti jer se estetski fundamentalizam nije oslanjao isključivo na opću estetiku bitka, nego ju je povezivao s programatski poticanom lirskosimboliškom obnovom Njemačke; taj se zahtjev pak mogao ostvariti samo zahvaljujući znanju o oblicima, metodama produkcije i djelovanju simboličkoga.

Nije slučajno da se osnivanje kruga 1892. godine podudara s pokretanjem časopisa *Blätter für die Kunst* (*Listovi za umjetnost*), u kojem je objavljen program kruga u kojem nedvosmisleno stoji da valja služiti umjetnosti, osobito pjesništvu i književnosti, te isključiti sve državno i društveno. Časopis i Georgeovi sljedbenici obvezali su se da će se zalagati za duhovnu umjetnost, za novi način osjećanja i za umjetničko preoblikovanje života (Klein 1892, I i d.: xxx).¹ To na prvi pogled nije ništa novo i, uz rani romantizam, podsjeća ponajprije na *l'art pour l'art* francuskih simbolista. No George je u pogledu konkretnih praksi za provedbu tog programa otišao znatno dalje, pa se može reći da je s jasnoćom sasvim nove vrste izložio svoje znanje o djelovanju svečane prezentacije i percepcije onog u konačnici neizrecivog. To se može iščitati iz činjenice da je George u početku u potpunosti igrao na kartu intimnosti i ekskluzivnosti, računajući konkretno na zatvoren krug osobno i poimence pozvanih čitatelja časopisa *Blätter für die Kunst*. Usto je i samo grafičko oblikovanje časopisa upućivalo na poznavanje snage simbola. Podrazumijevalo se i pokazivalo da su amblemi i znakovi zapravo ključan “komunikacijski materijal za nesvakodnevno i izvanredno” (Soeffner 2004: 60). Očito je postojala i svijest o značenju rituala kao ključnog akcijskog oblika simbola, oblika u kojem “ritualno djelovanje, onima koji mu se prepuste, nameće unaprijed oblikovan red i afekte” (Soeffner 2004: 63).

Sam je George bio majstor rituala: na svojim je čitanjima pred ekskluzivnim krugom slušatelja nastupao u svećeničkoj odori, a potom bi odabrane slušatelje primao u audijenciju u susjednoj sobi. Te su se sobe nalazile – a tu dolazimo do prostora znanja izvan sveučilišta – u jednom berlinskom salonu, dakle u društvenom kontekstu sasvim osebujne vrste. U europskim se salonima, kojima su često upravljale žene, još od 17. stoljeća sastajalo šaroliko društvo i raspravljalo o političkim i kulturnim temama. Prisjetimo li se Rahel Varnhagen ili Henriette Herz, možemo reći da upravo salonska kultura kao prostor znanja ima dugu tradiciju. U taj je baštinjeni prostor u jesen 1896. stupio George s “gestom proroka” (Dorgerloh 2002: 218). Salon umjetničkog bračnog para Lepsius nalazio se točno nasuprot kazalištu Theater des Westens, u Kantstraße 162, i Georgeu je osigurao željeni teatralni okvir (Aurnhammer *et al.* 2016: 36). Georgeova čitanja imala su ceremo-

¹ *Blätter für die Kunst* I, str. 1 i II, str. 5.

nijalni oblik: kako je zabilježila Marie von Bunsen za novine *Vossische Zeitung*, sjedilo se u prigušeno osvijetljenim prostorijama, na “izbljedjelom brokatu”, među poznatim ljudima, i govorilo se prigušenim glasom. Sam prorok “uklizao bi kroz pokrajnja vrata” i, naklonivši se, zauzeo mjesto ispred izloženih lovorovih grančica prije nego što bi “teških vjeđa”, “izražajno vibrirajućih usana” hipnotički počeo tiho čitati (*Vossische Zeitung* od 9. 1. 1898, cit. prema Aurnhammer *et al.* 2016: 36 i d.).

Ulaskom u berlinski salon pjesnik je prvi put iskoračio iz pomno odabranog kruga, nadišao prostor boemske mladenačke kulture te postao dijelom etablirane kulture, u kojoj je ubrzo postao blistav gost kojem su se svi dodvoravali. Tek je salon Georgeu otvorio mogućnost da svoj esteticistički program predstavi potencijalno novim slojevima. Sam čin predstavljanja nije tekao diskurzivno, nego, kako je gore ilustrirano, prezentacijom simbolički nabijenog tipa percepcije, djelovanja i komunikacije, potpuno udaljenih od svakodnevne zbilje. Domaćica Sabine Lepsius bila je istinski oduševljena takvim pristupom i zdušno je pomagala u inscenaciji Georgeove doživljajne umjetnosti. Ono što Rainer Kolk u svojoj mjerodavnoj studiji o Georgeovu krugu naziva “načelom karizmatiskog vodstva” (Kolk 1998, XI) – što već upućuje na sociološku klasifikaciju estetskog fundamentalizma – moglo je uhvatiti korijen upravo unutar salonske kulture. George je toga bio svjestan, pa je svoju zahvalnost ljubaznim domaćinima pokazao posvetivši im pjesmu *Sjetan čas* (*Blaue Stunde*).²

No nisu ti sati bili baš tako sjetni, što se pak može pripisati posebnom sastavu salona. U njemu nije započelo samo sljedbeništvo lišeno distance, nego i refleksija vođena znanstvenim interesom koju se može pratiti od berlinskih znanstvenih boemskih krugova preko Hajdelberškog kruga oko Maxa Webera pa sve do središta kulturoloških istraživanja. U berlinskom je salonu u trenutku Georgeova “pojavljivanja” uz Heinricha Wölfflina, Wilhelma Diltheya, Edith Landmann i Gertrud Kantorowitz bio i Georg Simmel.³ A ono što je on vidio nije ostalo bez znanstvenih posljedica. Simmel je, naime, uočio oboje – i upečatljivo inscenirane Georgeove nastupe i njihov odjek – te iznio prva promišljanja o klasifikaciji tog fenomena. Ono što je trebalo razumjeti s kulturno-filozofskog stajališta točno je formulirao Friedrich Gundolf, član Georgeova kruga koji je poslije ušao u germanističku znanost o književnosti, kada je u tim nastupima retrospektivno vidio

² Pjesma je objavljena 1892. u prvom svesku časopisa *Blätter für die Kunst*. Ponovno je otisnuta u: Stefan George. *Sämtliche Werke*, sv. V, Stuttgart 2011, str. 62. O kontekstualnoj klasifikaciji pjesme vidi i Nina Herres. *Die Lieder von Traum und Tod*. U: *Stefan George – Werkkommentar*. Ur. Jürgen Egyptien. Berlin 2015, str. 307–332.

³ Ovdje valja uputiti na povezanost Georgeova programas Diltheyevim pristupnim predavanjem, održanim već 1867, u kojem je bilo riječi o oblikovanju sebstva, o porivu za oblikovanjem novog “životnog ideala” te o sadržaju vrijednog života i “istinskom obrazovanju”. O tome opširnije vidi Pieper i Schefold 2010: 9.

ozračje “monumentalne intimnosti” (Gundolf, cit. prema Picht 1964: 37). Privremeni bi zaključak mogao glasiti da su Georgeovi odnosi s Georgom Simmelom, Maxom Weberom i Friedrichom Gundolfom generirali znanje proizašlo iz umjetničkog salona oko 1900. godine. To se dogodilo istodobno u dva smjera: s jedne strane prema sociologiji kulture moderne umjetnosti *avant la lettre*, a s druge prema formalističkoj znanosti o književnosti. Na početku prvog usmjerenja nalazi se Simmelovo sustavno bavljenje Georgeovim krugom kao simptomatičnim fenomenom moderne kulture utemeljeno na neposrednom promatranju. Drugo usmjerenje započelo je ulaskom istaknutih Georgeovih učenika u germanističku znanost o književnosti.

Zadržimo li se još koji trenutak na “sjetnim trenucima”, utvrdit ćemo kako su oni uvelike počivali na dvama zajedničkim intelektualnim temeljima: odbacivanju Pruske i vilhelmske umjetnosti te uvjerenju koje je George formulirao pod naslovom “Pravilo Listova iz vremena njihova praskozorja”, gdje stoji “da je bezvrijedno sve što podilazi javnosti i da je nužno samo jedno: hrabro naprijed u pobožnosti, radu i tišini” (Gundolf, cit. prema Picht 1964: 196). Samo je po sebi razumljivo da je izostala samorefleksija kruga o tome da je sâm salon činio ekskluzivnu djelomičnu javnost u kojoj se ciljano radilo na izgradnji mreže namijenjene kasnijem utjecaju na opću javnost. Posve intimni, sudionici su se okretali od prostačkog dnevnog žamora i pobožno slušali čitanja koja je ubrzo počeo pratiti glas tajanstvenosti i ekskluzivnosti (Dorgerloh 2002: 219). Istodobno se, međutim, kako je već rečeno, obrazovano berlinsko društvo pokazalo ne samo važnim multiplikatorom Georgeova kruga već i njegovim najkritičnijim i najpažljivijim promatračem (Dorgerloh 2002: 219). George i njegova esteticistička pozicija posebno su pobudili Simmelovu znanstvenu znatiželju te ga potaknuli na pisanje eseja *Stefan George. Umjetničko-filozofsko razmatranje* (*Stefan George. Eine kunstphilosophische Betrachtung*), objavljenog 1898. godine u časopisu zvučnog imena *Die Zukunft* (*Budućnost*).

Pogledamo li esej поближе, postaje jasno da se Simmel zanimao za poziciju čiste umjetnosti po sebi, a time i za pitanje može li se i u kojoj mjeri održati vladavina načela čiste forme. U “pobožnoj zajednici” salona, smještenoj daleko od društvenih sukoba koje je tematizirao naturalizam, Georgeov program nije stoga naišao samo na plodno tlo, već je postao i izvorom specifičnog znanja (Dorgerloh 2002: 224). To se znanje vrti oko “osebujne važnosti estetskog načela” (Simmel 1992 [1898]: 300). Činjenicu da je upravo Simmel uočio tu važnost valja pripisati društvenom afinitetu tog filozofa kulture prema “svom pjesniku”. Simmel je u to vrijeme bio privatni docent na Berlinskom sveučilištu; tek je 1900. dobio poziv na mjesto izvanrednog neplaćenog profesora filozofije. U tom se smislu Simmela, kako kaže Helmut Kreuzer, može ubrojiti među takozvane znanstvene boeme (Kreuzer 1968: 360). Znanstveni su boemski krugovi, prema Kreuzeru, najveći procvat doživjeli ponajprije na Sveučilištu u Heidelbergu, kamo će se ubrzo zaputiti i George. Od 1904. godine George se okrenuo od berlinskog salona i inten-

zivnije se koncentrirao na izgradnju vlastitog saveza (Dorgerloh 2002: 226). No čak i ideja saveza formiranog oko majstora ostaje neodvojiva od berlinskih boemskih krugova u kojima je dominirala misaona figura genija i duhovne aristokracije, neraskidivo povezana sa simbolizmom (vidi o tome opširnije Linse 1983). Stoga se možemo složiti s Ottom Gerhardom Oexleom i reći da su Georgea i Simmela, uz “kritiku kulture”, povezivale i njihove autsajderske pozicije (Oexle 2004: 29). Činjenicu da se Simmel, kojeg su ignorirali mnogi predstavnici njegove struke, uopće približio Georgeovu krugu valja dakle zahvaliti zajedničkom štovanju velikih autsajdera, koji su shvaćeni kao vjesnici “višeg razvoja čovječanstva u moderni” (*ibid.*: 44).

U ovom je kontekstu presudno to da je sa Simmelom oko 1900. godine došlo do preklapanja umjetničkih i znanstvenih boemskih krugova, što je bilo značajno za funkcioniranje prostora znanja izvan sveučilišta. Okupljena obrazovana elita – uz Simmela valja navesti Richarda Moritza Meyera, Kurta Breysiga i Maxa Dessoira – prokrčila je Georgeu put onamo kamo on, prema vlastitim izjavama, nikada nije htio dospjeti: u znanost. Složimo li se s Rainerom Kolkom, recepcija Georgea u suvremenoj kulturologiji započinje upravo s esejima te četvorice znanstvenika s Berlinskog sveučilišta (Kolk 1998: 139). Ostanemo li kod Simmela i njegova umjetničko-filozofskog razmatranja Georgea, treba naglasiti da se Simmel u početku referirao isključivo na Georgeovo pjesništvo. Novost tog pjesništva, prema tom filozofu kulture, bila je u činjenici da je u simbolizmu osjećaj postao prevladavajuće sredstvo za postizanje umjetničke svrhe. Takvim je postavljanjem stvari, prema Simmelu, dosegnuta kritična točka njegova razvoja, za koju se još nije moglo reći predstavlja li završetak starog niza ili početak novog.

Danas znamo da je to bio početak novog niza, i to ne samo zato što se “krug bez majstora” (Rauff 2009) nastavio sve do 1980-ih. Taj je razvoj pratila akumulacija kulturološkog znanja, koje je iz supkulturnog prostora pjesničkih boemskih krugova preko znanstvenih boemskih krugova okupljenih u salonu ušlo u sveučilišnu znanost. Valja navesti tri konkretna korpusa znanja: kao prvo, već spomenuto znanje o načelu i funkcioniranju čiste forme, vezano upravo uz pitanje njezina održanja. Naglašavajući osebujnu važnost estetskog načela, Simmel je ukazivao na snagu čiste forme te je sustavno razvijao tu spoznaju preuzetu iz Georgeove umjetnosti. Najkasnije s *Filozofijom novca* (*Philosophie des Geldes*, 1900), taj je filozof kulture izradio studiju u kojoj je, uz pojam “društveni smisao otmjedenosti” (Simmel 1989: 535), jasno formulirao i prije obrazloženi pojam promjene odnosa između sredstva i svrhe te znanje o dijaboličnoj ulozi čistih formi. Pritom, George vjerojatno nije razumio “ni riječi” od Simmelovih tekstova i u njima je u biti vidio samo mogućnost za promicanje vlastite agende (Norton 2002: 204). Međutim, sigurno je da su se ta dvojica u salonu cijenjenih autsajdera uzajamno promatrala te jedan na drugom i jedan s drugim otkrivala privlačnost osebujnog i singularnog. Tek se na tim temeljima moglo nastaviti s promicanjem obiju agendi – one umjetničko-kulturne i one znanstvene, kulturno-filozofske.

Kao drugo, valja istaknuti spoznaju, također preuzetu iz zbivanja u salonu, da osobni nastupi i teorijske diskusije očito imaju jednaku važnost kao i sama umjetnička djela (Dorgerloh 2002: 232). Na scenu stupa prošireni pojam umjetnosti, ključan za kulturologiju i ikonologiju, a s njime i koncept koji se emancipirao od duhovnog pokreta. U krug tog znanja spada i sve snažnija refleksija o autorovoj (samo)inscenaciji. Dok je ona u početku još bila povezana s predodžbom da je tijelo oličenje duha, to je shvaćanje poslije ustupilo mjesto znanstvenoj obradi tog fenomena pod pojmovima kao što su inscenacija, performativnost ili kustoski pristup (vidi o tome Wolf i Zierfas 2005; Molis 2009; Magerski 2024). George, čiji je markantni profil bezbroj puta portretiran, kultivirao je samoinscenaciju vezanu uz uzvišeni status u dosad neviđenoj mjeri. Tijelo, ili barem lice, postalo je simbolom u punom smislu riječi; to je korak za koji u suvremenom društvu inscenacije više nije potreban teatralni okvir salona. No od teatralnosti izložene u salonu put vodi prema razumijevanju teatralnosti kao kulturotvornog načela, koje se pak u “vremenima refleksivnih odnosa inscenacije” može smatrati iznimno relevantnim (Norton 2002: 214).

Kao treće, i povezano s prethodno rečenim, valja ukazati na znanje o važnosti ekscentričnosti i idiosinkrazije. Kako je Robert E. Norton zorno izložio, nije samo Simmel promatrao specifičnu tehniku prezentacije kod Georgea, već ju je i George promatrao kod Simmela. Podrugljivo govoreći o “simeliranju”, George je kritizirao “umijeće” tog znanstvenog autsajdera koji je sve intelektualno nastojao razložiti u isključivo apstraktne relacije (*ibid.*). George je smatrao da se Simmel, pokušavajući te relacije pretočiti u pojmove, sprema “pojmovno potkopati specifičnu ‘istinu’ lijepoga i mita” (Kolk 1998: 143). No usprkos uzajamnoj kritici, a upravo je to ovdje bitno, pjesnika simbolistički zaljubljenog u formu i njegova filozofa povezivalo je promatranje djelovanja rituala i simbola, a time i znanje o integralnim sastavnicama “razina i procesa društvenih (samo)promatračkih i percepcijskih postupaka” (Giesen, Schlögel i Osterhammel 2004: 5). George je to znanje u nastavku ciljano upotrijebio kako bi se odmaknuo od ograničenog prostora salona i posvetio preustroju vlastitog kruga u pjesnički savez (Dorgerloh 2002: 226).

Između umjetničkih i znanstvenih boemskih krugova u usponu

U ovoj fazi središte događaja postaje Heidelberg. Tu je došlo do susreta koji je, prema Wolfu Lepeniesu, gotovo egzemplaran za konkurenciju između književnog i sociološkog tumačenja moderne (Lepenies 1985: 259), točnije, do sraza između Georgeova simbolizma i sociološki trijezne analize Maxa Webera. Weber je bio u središtu kruga formiranog oko Sveučilišta u Heidelbergu, na kojem su pak, prema riječima Helmuta Kreuzera, znanstveni boemski krugovi kao “društveni

element” bili osobito utjecajni (Kreuzer 1968: 360).⁴ Iako je i sam svjesno njegovao pojačane idiosinkrazije, Weber se isprva nije zanimao za četiri godine mlađeg Georgea, premda je ovaj od kasnih 1890-ih bio itekako poznat i premda mu ga je filozof Heinrich Rickert preporučio. Weberovo zanimanje za Georgea počelo je rasti tek nakon što se razbolio i napustio katedru.

Iako su u religijskom i političkom smislu prije bili antipodi, Weber je sada počeo pozornije motriti pjesnika, vidjevši u njemu isprva tek jednog od mnogih asketa koji su naumili mijenjati svijet naglašenim suzdržavanjem. Njihov se odnos intenzivirao nakon što su se osobno upoznali u rujnu 1910. godine. Te se godine sociolog sa suprugom Marianne uselio na prvi kat gospodске vile prvobitno zvane Kuća Fallenstein, prema Georgu Friedrichu Fallensteinu, djedu Maxa Webera koji ju je dao izgraditi, a poslije poznate kao kuća Maxa Webera (Kaesler 2014: 113). U toj se kući okruženoj velikim parkom između 1910. i 1919. godine nedjeljom održavao susret uglednih profesora i mladih znanstvenika, tzv. “akademsko druženje”, među kojima su bili i Ernst Bloch, Karl Jaspers, Georg Lukács te Friedrich Gundolf. Potonjem ćemo se vratiti poslije. Ovdje je važno istaknuti da su se Weber i George zbližili u trenutku pogodnom za razvoj uzajamnog razumijevanja. Bez obzira na naziv, Weber i druženje pokrenuto na njegovu inicijativu otvorili su se kulturnoj sferi, dok je Georgeov krug sve više težio akademizaciji. Tomu je pridonijela i zajednička potraga za orijentacijom – čak i uz Weberovo kritičko odbijanje svake vjere u nadređeni smisao, pa tako i vjere u nadmoć umjetnosti, ta je potraga, pojačana Prvim svjetskim ratom, bila temelj dovoljan da omogući preklapanje hajdelberških krugova.

Najkasnije s tim preklapanjem definitivno se pokazuje ono što se može smatrati društvenim temeljem ovdje skiciranog transfera znanja kroz posve različite prostore: obrazovani građanski sloj koji ciljano traži blizinu Georgeova kruga. Carole Groppe zaslužna je za detaljan prikaz povezanosti obrazovanog građanstva i Georgeova kruga, istaknuvši Georgeov krug kao gotovo idealtipski objekt u smislu povijesti obrazovanja. Njezina studija *Moć obrazovanja (Macht der Bildung)*, (1997) pokazuje da je zapravo s drugom generacijom zaista započelo znanstveno bavljenje Georgeovim krugom. Groppe dalje razlaže kako su drugu generaciju kruga, u koju se uz Simmela i Webera ubrajaju i filozof Karl Joel te univerzalni povjesničar Kurt Breysig, činili gotovo isključivo humanistički obrazovani sveučilišni profesori i docenti koji su između 1910. i 1933. godine radili na uglednim sveučilištima (Groppe 1997: 623). Usredotočimo li se sada na Webera s obzirom na ono što istraživanje o Georgeu naziva “dijalektikom znanosti i kruga” (Schlieben, Schneider i Schulmeyer 2004: 15), moglo bi se govoriti o “zavisti na karizmi”

⁴ U središtu Weberova kruga okupljenog oko Sveučilišta u Heidelbergu bila su trojica znanstvenika – Georg Jellinek, Ernst Troeltsch i Max Weber – koji su upravo tim redom došli u grad na Neckaru gdje su im ponuđena profesorska radna mjesta i gdje su se isto tako vrlo brzo umrežili.

(Lepenes 1985: 343). Intenzivnije poznanstvo pjesnika i njegova sociologa uslijedilo je u trenutku u kojem je George već intenzivno radio na stvaranju “lijepog novog čovjeka”, čovjeka kojemu je uzor bio spasitelj u liku “sunčanog dječaka”. Stega i uljudenost dospjeli su sada u središte kvazireligioznog odnosa između majstora i učenika, vođenog jezikom i stavom. Teško se u ovom kontekstu može pretjerati ako utvrdimo da su mjere inzistiranja na jeziku i na posebnim grafičkim znakovima igrale važnu ulogu. Razmislimo li još jednom o vezi između simbola i aprezentacije, moglo bi se reći da grafički znakovi, zbog “umjetnog” odnosa između prisutnog znaka i predodžbe aprezentirane tim znakom, sadrže “eksplicitni poziv na aprezentaciju” (Soeffner 2004: 56).

Taj je poziv imao odjeka. George je postao kolektivni simbol – što je Weber pak pratio s velikom pozornošću.⁵ Pritom je Weber s jedne strane kritizirao simbolistički stvorenu privlačnu snagu kao “čisto formalno proroštvo”,⁶ dok je s druge strane upravo taj specifični oblik proroštva kao sekte pretvorio u predmet znanosti te na Georgeu kao “objektu proučavanja” razradio vlastiti znanstveni vokabular.⁷ Činjenica da je do toga uopće došlo vjerojatno se, što nije manje važno, može pripisati okolnosti da je i sam Weber znanost smatrao izrazito “duhovnom aristokratskim problematikom” (Weber, cit. prema Keller 2001: 195). Samo je tako mogao uočiti vezu između jedinstvenih osobina ličnosti i visoke identifikacije vjernih sljedbenika. Jednom zaintrigiran, Weber je uvidio da ta identifikacija može iznjedrili izvanredna djela i postignuća te u konačnici utemeljiti zajednicu; zajednicu utemeljenu na emocionalnom i idejnom odnosu koju bismo danas, riječima Zygmunta Baumana, mogli nazvati “estetskom zajednicom” (Bauman 2009: 82).

Želimo li pratiti put institucionalizacije toga znanja, bacimo pogled na prvi kongres njemačkih sociologa 1910. godine. Na njemu je Weber u svojem *Poslovnom izvješću* preporučio umjetničko stvaranje sekti kao osobito vrijedan istraživački zadatak. Doslovce navodi:

[...] sekte nošene umjetničkim osjećajima svijeta [...] i danas, baš poput religijskih sekti, imaju svoju inkarnaciju božanskog – podsjećam na sektu Stefana Georgea – a oblikovanje praktičnog načina života i unutarnjeg stava prema cjelokupnom životu njihovih pristaša može biti vrlo dalekosežno. (1910: 58 i d.)

Tako su razvijeni pojmovi poput “stvaranje sekte”, “rentijerske” egzistencije, “proroštvo” ili pak “karizmatično” sljedbeništvo, koji su imali odjeka i u znanosti.⁸

⁵ O kolektivnom simbolu i njegovu utjecaju na kolektivnu percepciju, orijentaciju i kolektivno djelovanje vidi opširnije Soeffner 2004: 59. O grupnoteorijskom povezivanju društvenog svijeta i simboličkih svjetova sa značenjem specifičnim za grupu vidi također Wille 1978.

⁶ Pismo Maxa Webera Dori Jellinek od 9. lipnja 1910. (cit. prema Moraw 2009: 222).

⁷ Vidi o tome opširnije Moraw 2009: 203.

⁸ O ovim pojmovima usp. Moraw 2009: 203.

Činjenica da je Georgeov krug to postajanje objektom znanstvenog proučavanja doživio kao omalovažavanje, što je dovelo do otuđenja između Georgea i Webera, nije mogla promijeniti okolnost da je George zahvaljujući Weberu ušao, barem kao predmet proučavanja, i u sociologiju. Pritom je Weber, imajući na umu upravo vjeru, ciljao na stvarni motor onog “golemog mobila sastavljenog od ljudi, slika i ideja” koji je George kao majstor u njegovu središtu morao neprestano “održavati u pogonu” i fino ugađati (Raulff 2009: 14). Krug okupljen oko izrazito samosvjesnog Georgea imao je dalekosežne posljedice za sociologiju u nastajanju upravo zahvaljujući kategoriji karizmatične vlasti.⁹ U tom kontekstu valja barem spomenuti da je “karizma” bila Weberova “najatraktivnija pojmovna kreacija” te da je, generalizirana i sekularizirana, postala “sjecištem” posve različitih znanstvenih područja (Radkau 2005: 601 i 956).

Stefan Breuer je rezultat tog specifičnog oblika vlasti, utemeljenog na obećanju nadilaženja svakodnevice, prilično točno nazvao “sindikatom duša”, i to u zborniku znakovita naslova *Heidelberg u sjecištu intelektualnih krugova (Heidelberg im Schnittpunkt intellektueller Kreise, 1995)*. Možemo otići i korak dalje pa se oko tog sjecišta složiti s Manfredom Riedelom, autorom studije *Tajna Njemačka (Geheimes Deutschland, 2006)*, te razmotriti je li Weber kod Georgea mogao proučavati svojevrсни trokorak asketskog bavljenja umjetnošću, karizme i pro-roštva (Riedel 2006: 343–360).¹⁰ George je pak – promatrajući to promatranje – reagirao uvrijeđeno, te je znanstvenike poput Webera otad smatrao “još gorima od plebsa” (Salin 1954: 293). Pritom je u svojoj kritici mogao ciljati još dublje i, poput Felixa Kellera gotovo stotinu godina poslije, ukazati na estetizirajuću i stilizirajuću praksu prisutnu osobito u Weberovu “idealnom tipu kao misaonoj figuri i istraživačkoj djelatnosti” (Keller 2001: 201).¹¹ No Georgeova kritika ipak nije išla tako daleko. Umjesto toga svoj je stav potkrijepio uvodno citiranim riječima kako od njega nijedan put ne vodi prema znanosti.

⁹ Usp. o tome opširnije Breuer 1995b: 328. O “otkriću karizme” na temelju korespondencije između mlade Dore Jellinek i Maxa Webera vidi Moraw 2009.

¹⁰ Riedel ovdje također navodi da se Webera može smatrati onim koji je Georgeu otvorio oči “za nužna pomicanja povijesnih polazišta njegova pjesništva (2006: 343). U tom smislu obojica su dijelila “otpor prema Pruskoj” kao i “spoznaju o opasnostima od ‘amerikanizacije’ Europe” (*ibid.*).

¹¹ Keller u tom kontekstu doslovce navodi: “[...] onkraj zajedničkog ‘osnovnog raspoloženja’, onkraj identičnog načina pisanja koji ne može bez patosa, ovdje se otvara zajedništvo u pokretu kojim i George i Weber stvaraju vlastiti identitet u književnosti odnosno znanosti: u *obliku izricanja* kojim se svijetu oduzima njegova realnost, te se on upravo zato ponovno otvara kao estetika percepcije i stoga se može iznova imenovati. I Weber i George provodili su taj projekt s najvećom mogućom radikalnošću” (Keller 2001: 201 i d. Istaknuto kao u izvorniku). Valjalo bi se zapitati mogu li se Weberovi idealni tipovi čitati u Luckmannovu smislu kao simboli-zastupnici transcendencije (Schütz i Luckmann 2017: 139–177).

Razvoj prema jednoj od škola unutar društvenih znanosti

Zapravo su putovi koji su od Georgea vodili prema znanosti bili još raznolikiji nego što smo to mogli vidjeti na primjeru berlinskog salona i Hajdelberškog kruga okupljenog oko sociologa Maxa Webera. Stasao je novi naraštaj, a s njime i povjesničar, liričar i prevoditelj Friedrich Wolters. Wolters, najprije izvanredni profesor u Marburgu, a od 1923. redoviti profesor u Kielu, ubrajao se 1920-ih među najvažnije sljedbenike Georgeova kruga, a s Gundolfom je izdavao *Godišnjak za duhovni pokret (Jahrbuch für die geistige Bewegung)*. Pod naslovom *Stefan George i Listovi za umjetnost. Njemačka povijest duha od 1890. (Stefan George und die Blätter für die Kunst. Deutsche Geistesgeschichte seit 1890)* Wolters je 1929. napisao monumentalnu povijest u tom trenutku još uvijek aktivnog kruga. Tu povijest, međutim, ne bi trebalo shvatiti ponajprije kao autorefleksivnu povijest kruga, već kao jedan od brojnih ozbiljnih pokušaja širenja i učvršćivanja Georgeova programa u znanosti.

Friedrich Wolters se oko 1900. godine kretao u krugu okupljenom oko univerzalnog povjesničara Kurta Breysiga u Niederschönhausenu. Wolters zauzima posebno mjesto u krugu jer je, slično kao i Gundolf u Heidelbergu, nakon stupanja na profesorsku dužnost u Marburgu oformio vlastiti krug, koji se istodobno može shvatiti kao neka vrsta tematskog proširenja Georgeova kruga nakon što je ovaj zauzeo svoje stalno mjesto u povijesti. U poimanju povijesti tog povjesničara ekonomije i pjesnika George nije samo “tajni, ali sada ponovno vidljivi car” (Raulff 2004: 97), nego, u okviru “prosvijećenog despotizma” (Schefold 2005: 26), postaje personificirano uporište obrazovne maksime usmjerene isključivo na “vladavinu i službu” (Wolters 1923). Naposljetku, riječ je o specifičnom obliku “politike djela” (Martus 2007) koji najkasnije od 1920-ih snažno zahvaća njemačku povijest obrazovanja, a u kojem se djelo i autorova ličnost stapaju u jedinstven uzor.

Od 1920-ih niz je znanstvenika koji su se bavili Georgeom, među kojima valja spomenuti Waltera Benjamina, Otta Brauna, Richarda Benza i Victora Klemperera, ali i Edgara Salina, Klause Kyriandera te Hans-Georga Gadamera. “Cjelokupna suvremena intelektualna kultura, društvene znanosti na sveučilištima, književnost i njezina percepcija”, kako stoji u uvodu zbornika *Slike povijesti u Georgeovu krugu. Putovi prema znanosti (Geschichtsbilder im George-Kreis. Wege zur Wissenschaft)*, “doživjele su Georgeov krug kao izazov” (Schlieben, Schneider i Schulmeyer 2004: 7). Krug tako postaje škola unutar društvenih znanosti pod čijim se utjecajem, poimence sa Salinom, ekonomija proučavala kao povijest duha (Groppe 2001: 498). Pokušaj uvođenja legende, mita i “izloga” u znanost, dakle, barem je djelomično uspio. Georgeovci su uspješno djelovali protiv relativizirajućeg pristupa historicista i tragali su za likovima visoke ekspresivnosti, vječnih vrijednosti i povijesnih konstanti. I dok je u početku dominirala memoarska književnost, sa znanstvenim promišljanjem kruga počeo je proces objektivacije.

Ugledni predstavnici znanosti iz Georgeova kruga, poput Carla Heinricha Beckera, Friedricha Gundolfa i Kurta Hillebrandta, aktivno su sudjelovali u znanstvenim raspravama i diskusijama o visokoškolskoj politici. Groppe je prilično točno definirala tu tendenciju ustvrdivši kako je Georgeov krug prema vlastitom poimanju možda bio pjesnički krug, ali je prema svom “društvenom obliku” bio, što nije manje važno, “znanstveni krug” (*ibid.*: 623). Dok se već druga generacija kruga sastojala od akademski obrazovanih članova iz područja društvenih znanosti, u trećoj su generaciji Max Kommerell, Woldemar von Uxkull, Alexander von Stauffenberg i Ernst Kantorowicz, a četvrta generacija seže sve do Gadamera (*ibid.*: 637 i d.). Na tom se razvoju može promatrati kako su u sve većoj mjeri strateški osvajane katedre na studijima društvenih znanosti. Od povijesti, germanistike, klasične filologije, nacionalne ekonomije pa sve do filozofije punom je parom djelovao “kartel citiranja”, a pod njegovim su utjecajem nastajale i tradicionalne disertacije i habilitacije.¹² Od 1920-ih Georgeovi prijatelji i štovatelji nalaze se na sveučilištima u Berlinu, Bonnu, Frankfurtu na Majni, Heidelbergu, Kielu i Marburgu, što potvrđuje da se “analogni istraživački interesi i metodološke koncepcije” inovativnog potencijala (*ibid.*: 633–640) nisu se razvijali samo u sociologiji. Sve u svemu, može se govoriti o sveobuhvatnom pokušaju novog utemeljenja društvenog značaja društvenih znanosti.

Znanstvena škola tako izrasla iz pjesničkog kruga i sjetnih sati berlinskog salona imala je “vrednujući temeljni stav, bila je određena mjestom djelovanja i imala je jasan cilj”: “rekonstrukciju obrazovnog načela kao temelja identiteta obrazovanog građanstva te – u nastavku – odgoj mladog naraštaja” (*ibid.*: 638). “Georgeov krug”, ističe Groppe sažeto, “kao društvena formacija uspostavlja vezu između književnoestetskog, znanstvenog i školsko-pedagoškog područja” (*ibid.*: 15). Time je jasno formulirana veza između prostora znanja kojima se bavimo u ovom radu. Zajednica oblikovana prema modelu pjesničkog kruga prenesena je preko obrazovanog građanstva na znanost i u znanost. Pritom sâm pojam obrazovanja dobiva dvostruko značenje: ono je s jedne strane najvažniji način izražavanja identiteta obrazovanog građanstva, a s druge izraz socio-estetske tehnike formiranja skupine i zajednice po uzoru na Georgeov krug.

Kako Groppe kaže, George je javno prakticirao “život pjesnika-znanstvenika” i uvidio da njegova uvjerenja mogu zaista zaživjeti samo ako im osigura mjesto u znanstvenom diskursu. Stoga je uložio znatan napor kako bi krug sačuvao od “stapanja sa supkulturnim miljeom, a time i od gubitka važnosti za obrazovano građanstvo” (*ibid.*: 623 i d.). Zahvaljujući (iskustvenom) znanju prikupljenom u društvenim prostorima boemskih krugova, uključujući i one znanstvene, dogodio se iskorak u smjeru znanosti, pa je od prvobitno naglašeno kultiviranog “s onu

¹² Tako se Salin 1920. u svojoj habilitaciji izričito pozvao na Georgea (*ibid.*: 633–636).

stranu znanosti” postalo “s ovu stranu znanosti”. Uz sudionike poput Friedricha Gundolfa ili pak Friedricha Woltersa moglo je uspjeti ono što se u početku činilo nemogućim – ostvarivanje “dugoročno golemog utjecaja na znanstvenom, svjetonazorskom i književnom području” (*ibid.*: 624). Groppe uvjerljivo ističe kako je veza između znanosti, pjesništva i odgoja, uspostavljena upravo u Georgeovu krugu, širom otvorila vrata sveobuhvatnoj rekonstituciji obrazovanja. Naglasimo još jednom da to područje djelovanja nisu dijelili samo Georgeovi učenici i književnici poput Huga von Hofmannsthala, Thomasa Manna i Rudolfa Borchardta, nego i brojni znanstvenici. Groppe dakle iznosi teze suprotne onima Wolfa Lepeniesa iznesenima u studiji *Tri kulture (Die Drei Kulturen)* te tvrdi kako su upravo znanstvenici Georgeova kruga pridonijeli uobličavanju i stilizaciji Georgeove karizme (*ibid.*: 627, vidi o tome i Zöfel 1987).

Koračajući kroz prostore znanja, George je prerastao ulogu pjesnika-proroka i postavio posve nova mjerila. Tako je od znanstvenih publikacija članova kruga zahtijevao “argumentaciju koja omogućuje stvaranje znanstvenog diskursa” te isticao važnost eseja kao specifične forme koja omogućuje povezivanje znanosti i pjesništva, a koja istovremeno zadržava neznanstvena obilježja (Groppe 2001: 628–631). U tom smislu posebno je važan Friedrich Gundolf, kojemu je George najprije osigurao mjesto lektora u Heidelbergu. Napredovavši do titule profesora, Gundolf je objavljivao djela koja su u Weimarskoj Republici dosezala neobično visoke naklade. Iako je njegova veza s Georgeom poslije oslabjela zbog privatnih okolnosti, Gundolfa se ipak može smatrati moćnom sponom između pjesničkog kruga i znanosti obilježene sviješću o poslanju koje nadilazi čisto estetske ciljeve. Premda se Georgeov krug još od 1910. godine izričito smatrao avangardom duhovnog pokreta, taj je pokret najkasnije s Gundolfom u potpunosti ušao i u znanost.

Poput Woltersa, Gundolf je u “majstoru” vidio ni manje ni više do uskrснуće velikog duha, samo što ga taj književni znanstvenik ne povezuje s likom cara, nego s likom pjesničkog kneza Shakespearea (Egyptien 2005: 167). Pjesnička i obrazovnopolitička obnova ovdje čine jedinstvo. Iako Gundolfov odnos s Georgeom nije bio lišen napetosti zbog njegove prvotne homoerotske komponente (Hergemöller 2010: 466–468), bivšem miljeniku među učenicima pripada središnja zasluga za prihvaćanje Georgeovih načela u akademskim krugovima. Kad je 1920. imenovan redovitim profesorom povijesti književnosti na Sveučilištu u Heidelbergu, usredotočio se u istraživanju i nastavi na velike “pjesničke ličnosti” – među njima i na Georgea, kojemu Gundolf nije dugovao samo svoje ime (George ga je potaknuo da židovsko prezime Gundelfinger pretvori u Gundolf), nego i brojna poznanstva. U Heidelbergu se kretao u krugu okupljenom oko braće Alfreda i Maxa Webera te je kao docent snažno utjecao na povjesničare književnosti i javne ličnosti, poput Richarda Alewyna i Friedricha Sieburga.

Gundolf i Wolters već su kao izdavači stajali iza časopisa *Jahrbuch für geistige Entwicklung (Godišnjak za duhovni razvoj, 1910–1912)*, a u sljedećem su razdoblju i u znanosti učvrstili sliku o Georgeu koja ga je nastojala prikazati kao

vođu. Od 1911. pod zajedničkim naslovom *Znanstvena djela iz kruga Listova za umjetnost* (*Werke der Wissenschaft aus dem Kreis der Blätter*) objavljen je niz djela, a od 1921. taj je izdavački niz nastavio s objavljivanjem pod naslovom *Djela za izlog i istraživanje iz kruga Listova za umjetnost* (*Werke für Schau und Forschung aus dem Kreise der Blätter für die Kunst*). Također valja zabilježiti tendenciju primjerno utjelovljenu u povjesničaru Ernstu Kantorowiczu, koji je znao spojiti način razmišljanja i rad dvaju krugova: s jedne je strane preuzeo znanstvenu misao Maxa Webera, dok je s druge dijelio Georgeovu umjetničko-pjesničku imaginaciju (Schiller 2000: 23). Most između dviju kultura uvijek je gradilo obrazovano građanstvo u potrazi za orijentacijom u kaotičnom svijetu; svijetu na koji je George u ime umjetnosti odgovorio strogom formom i hijerarhijom. Nakon emancipacije pojma umjetnosti od umjetničkog djela slijedila je emancipacija pojma forme od estetike. U biti se radilo o izgradnji škole usmjerene na poticanje duhovne obnove Njemačke s onu stranu utilitarizma modernog gospodarstva i društva (Pieper i Schefold 2010: 9).

Na religijsko-povijesne konotacije škola upozorio je Wolfgang Ißbach u okviru svoje sociologije intelektualaca (Ißbach 1988: 92–94). Ovdje je to dovoljno samo spomenuti kako bismo se još jednom vratili na vezu između Georgeova kruga i sociologije. Kako je istaknuo Wolf Lepenies, Simmel i Weber su s krugom oko Georgea zapravo dijelili pesimistično, čak i tragično raspoloženje kojim odiše djelo tih sociologa (Lepenies 1985: 336). Premda su se u tim dvjema kulturama susreli umjetnički doživljaj i metodološka strogost, postojalo je dodirno područje u kojemu pjesničko raspoloženje nije prošlo samo sociologiju, već je i izričaj kruga doživio analitičko otrežnjenje. To dodirno područje između onostranosti i ovostranosti akademskoga svijeta čini mi se presudnim ako želimo razumjeti kako je George mogao postati “njemačka kulturna institucija” (Amos 2010: 444). Taj uspjeh pak otvara uzbudljivo pitanje nije li se sociologija u pogledu znanja generiranoj s Georgeovim krugom i oko njega možda prevarila u odlučujućoj točki: čini se kako uspon karizmatičnoga ne vodi nužno do slabljenja institucionalizacije. Štoviše, moglo bi se tvrditi da su pokušaji estetizacije društvenoga – poduzeti ne samo usred duboke krize društvenih znanosti i njihovih kognitivnih orijentacijskih obrazaca nego i na pozadini društvenog obezvređivanja “inteligencije, nositeljice kulture” – iznjedrili posve nove institucije (Kolk 1998: 149; Ringer 1983).

U prilog tomu govori činjenica da se s Georgeovom smrću 4. prosinca 1933. krug raspao, ali je njegovo djelovanje nastavljeno. Postojao je “krug bez majstora” (Raulff 2009) – i to zato što su mu se 1920-ih već neformalno priključili brojni znanstvenici i književnici. To što su sudionici poput Ernsta Jüngera simpatizirali Georgeov obrazovni program bez ostvarenog izravnog kontakta s “majstorom” Thomas Amos vidi kao jasan znak da je George “postao takoreći njemačka kulturna institucija te da ga je u napetoj završnoj fazi Weimarske Republike nacionalna strana primjećivala, recipirala i instrumentalizirala” (2010: 444). Ideja saveza, koju su Simmel i Weber odbacili pozivajući se na individualizam, uspjela se

realizirati.¹³ No bilo kao krug ili kao savez, s majstorom ili bez njega, ekskluzivni okvir, a time i stroga forma olabavljeni su, čime je omogućeno prenošenje kulturoloških znanja proizišlih iz izvorno estetskih praksi na sveučilišta.

U te se prakse od samoga početka uz vjeru ubrajalo i potanko promatranje učinka vlastitog djelovanja te s time povezano prilagođavanje novim okolnostima. Tek je ta sposobnost prilagodbe dovela do onoga “križanja društvenih krugova”, koje je pak pokrenulo cirkulaciju znanja kroz različite prostore znanja (Lepenies 1985: 336; Schiller 2000: 28). Drugim riječima: kada je Karl Mannheim, neuspješan u pokušaju da se etablira u bilo kojem od hajdelberških krugova, sveučilišnu kulturu i književnu kulturu podijelio na dva pola – pol protestantskih sveučilišnih sociologa i pol katoličkih sljedbenika Georgea kao “slobodniji izvansveučilišni književni svijet” – previdio je otvorenost i dinamiku povijesti znanja što ih je dotad određivalo obrazovano građanstvo (*ibid.*: 29).¹⁴ Upravo se ta polarnost u konačnici pokazala iznimno produktivnom – i premostivom.

Ako bismo “bezdanu povijest” Georgeova kruga, kako ju je zacrtao Ulrich Raulff, dopisali do današnjeg dana, mogli bismo se vratiti u Berlin i na mjesto privatnog salona postaviti onaj Znanstveni kolegij (*Wissenschaftskolleg*), za koji je Jacob Taubes običavao reći da se njegovo osnivanje temelji na predodžbi o obrazovanoj eliti te da se može čitati kao “revanš Georgeove škole” (Rahden, Kapferer i Raulff 1982: 67). Taubes se pozivao na Petera Wapnewskog, koji je kao krunskog svjedoka utemeljenja novog kolegija prizvao Friedricha Gundolfa, najznačajnijeg akademskog predstavnika Georgeove škole. Kad bi Taubes bio u pravu, vjera i prezentacija morale bi biti važne čak i na samom Znanstvenom kolegiju. U prilog tomu govorila bi činjenica da se još i danas na Kolegij izričito pozivaju “pojedine istaknute umjetnice i umjetnici”. Protiv toga pak govori to što se barem danas na Znanstvenom kolegiju svjesno računa na “efekt iritacije”, a time i na oblik kritičkog samopropitivanja (*Wissenschaftskolleg* bez god., bez str.). Ukratko: između umjetničkog salona i Znanstvenog kolegija leži duga povijest znanja i obrazovanja. Promatra li se ona s njezina privremenog kraja, čak se ni povijest Georgeova kruga ne čini bezdanom, jer bi taj krug uz pomoć institucija poput Znanstvenog kolegija zapravo stvorio vlastiti prostor, svjesno usmjeren na kritičku refleksiju.

Prevela s njemačkoga Snježana RODEK

¹³ O odbacivanju saveza vidi Oexle 2004: 46.

¹⁴ Vidi o tome također Hoeges 1994: 48.

LITERATURA

- Amos, Thomas. 2010. Ernst Jünger am Rande des George-Kreises. U: *Kreis aus Kreisen, Zu den Freundesrunden im Zeichen Stefan Georges*: 443–458. Ur. Bruno Pieger i Bertram Schefold. Frankfurt a. M. Hildesheim: Olms.
- Aurnhammer, Achim, Wolfgang Braungart, Stefan Breuer i Ute Oelmann (ur.). 2016. *Stefan George und sein Kreis. Ein Handbuch*. 2. Auflage. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Baumann, Zygmunt. 2009. *Gemeinschaften. Auf der Suche nach Sicherheit in einer bedrohlichen Welt*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Blätter für die Kunst, herausgegeben von Carl August Klein*, 1892, I,1; II, 5. Berlin: Klein.
- Blätter für die Kunst. Eine Auslese aus den Jahren 1904–1909*. 1909. Berlin: Bondi.
- Breuer, Stefan. 1995a. *Ästhetischer Fundamentalismus. Stefan George und der deutsche Antimodernismus*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Breuer, Stefan. 1995b. Das Syndikat der Seelen. Stefan George und sein Kreis. U: *Heidelberg im Schnittpunkt intellektueller Kreise, Zur Topographie der "geistigen Geselligkeit" eines "Weltdorfes": 1850–1950*: 328–375. Ur. Hubert Treiber i Karol Sauerland. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
- Dorgerloh, Annette. 2002. *Das Künstlerehepaar Lepsius. Zur Berliner Porträtmalerei um 1900*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Egyptien, Jürgen. 2005. Die Apotheose der heroischen Schöpferkraft. Shakespeare im George-Kreis. U: *Wissenschaftler im George-Kreis. Die Welt des Dichters und der Beruf der Wissenschaft*. Ur. Bernhard Böschstein, Jürgen Egyptien, Bertram Schefold i Wolfgang Graf Vitzthum: 159–185. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Eßbach, Wolfgang. 1988. *Die Junghegelianer. Soziologie einer Intellektuellengruppe*. München: Fink.
- Giesen, Bernhard, Rudolf Schlögel i Jürgen Osterhammer (ur.). 2004. *Die Wirklichkeit der Symbole. Grundlagen der Kommunikation in historischen und gegenwärtigen Gesellschaften*. München: UVK.
- Groppe, Carola. 2001. *Die Macht der Bildung. Das deutsche Bürgertum und der George-Kreis 1890–1933*. Köln: Böhlau.
- Hergemöller, Bernd Ulrich. 2010. Gundolf, Friedrich. U: *Mann für Mann. Biographisches Lexikon*: 467–468. Ur. Bernd Ulrich Hergemöller. Münster: LIT.
- Herres, Nina. 2015. Die Lieder von Traum und Tod. U: *Stefan George – Werkkommentar*: 307–332. Ur. Jürgen Egyptien. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Hoeges, Dirk. 1994. *Kontroverse am Abgrund. Ernst Robert Curtius und Karl Mannheim: intellektuelle und "freischwebende Intelligenz" in der Weimarer Republik*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Kaesler, Dirk. 2014. *Max Weber. Eine Biographie*. München: Beck.
- Keller, Felix. 2001. Stefan Georges Ästhetik als Kritik an einer Wissenschaft der Gesellschaft. U: *Soziologie und Antisozioologie. Ein Diskurs und seine Rekonstruktion*: 183–209. Ur. Peter-Ulrich Merz-Benz i Gerhard Wagner. München: Fink.
- Klein, Carl August. 1892. *Blätter für die Kunst. Blätter für die Kunst* 1, 1–2. Berlin: Klein.
- Klein, Gabriela. 2003. Theatralität des Politischen. *Soziale Welt* 14: 605–618.
- Kolk, Rainer. 1998. *Literarische Gruppenbildung. Am Beispiel des George-Kreises 1890–1945*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Kreuzer, Helmut. 1968. *Die Boheme. Beiträge zu ihrer Beschreibung*. Stuttgart: Metzler.
- Lepenies, Wolf. 1985. *Die drei Kulturen. Soziologie zwischen Literatur und Wissenschaft*. Hamburg: Rowohlt.

- Linse, Ulrich. 1983. *Barfüßige Propheten. Erlöser der zwanziger Jahre*. Berlin: Siedler.
- Magerski, Christine. 2014. Zur szenischen Selbstdarstellung zeitgenössischer Avantgarde. Kim de l'Horizon als Autor und Performer. U: *Sozioautobiographie und szenische Künste. Abhandlungen zur Literaturwissenschaft*: 17–26. Ur. Raffael Hiden. Berlin: Metzler.
- Molis, Katja. 2019. *Kuratorische Subjekte. Praktiken der Subjektivierung in der Aus- und Weiterbildung im Kunstbetrieb*. Bielefeld: transcript.
- Moraw, Frank. 2009. Neues zur "Entdeckung des Charismas". *Dora Jelineks Seminararbeit über Stefan George und Max Webers Brief an sie*. Heidelberg: Heidelberg Jahrbuch.
- Norton, Robert E. 2002. *Secret Germany. Stefan George and his Circle*. Ithaca – New York: Cornell University Press.
- Oexle, Otto Gerhard. 2004. Georg Simmels Philosophie der Geschichte. U: *Geschichtsbilder im George-Kreis. Wege zur Wissenschaft*: 19–49. Ur. Barbara Schlieben, Olaf Schneider i Kerstin Schulmeyer. Recklinghausen: Wallstein.
- Picht, Werner. 1964. *Besinnung auf Stefan George*. Düsseldorf – München: Küpper.
- Pieper, Bruno i Bertram Schefold. 2010. Vorwort. U: *Kreis aus Kreisen, Zu den Freundesrunden im Zeichen Stefan Georges*: 9–20. Ur. Bruno Pieper i Bertram Schefold. Frankfurt am Main: Olms.
- Radkau, Joachim. 2005. *Max Weber. Die Leidenschaft des Denkens*. München: Hanser.
- Rahden, Wolfert von, Norbert Kapferer i Ulrich Raulff. 1982. Elite oder Avantgarde? Jacob Taubes im Gespräch mit Wolfert von Rahden und Norbert Kapferer. *Tumult* 4: 64–76.
- Raulff, Ulrich. 2004. "In unterirdischer Verborgenheit". Das geheime Deutschland – Mythogenese und Myzel. Skizzen zu einer Ideen- und Bildergeschichte. U: *Geschichtsbilder im George-Kreis. Wege zur Wissenschaft* Schlieben: 93–115. Ur. Barbara Schlieben, Olaf Schneider i Kerstin Schulmeyer. Recklinghausen: Wallstein.
- Raulff, Ulrich. 2009. *Kreis ohne Meister. Stefan Georges Nachleben*. München: Beck.
- Riedel, Manfred. 2006. Asketische Kunstübung, Charisma und Prophetentum. Stefan George und Max Weber. U: *Vernunft und Glauben. Ein philosophischer Dialog der Moderne mit dem Christentum*: 343–360. Ur. Steffen Dietzsch i Gian Franco Frigo. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Ringer, Fritz K. 1983. *Die Gelehrten. Der Niedergang der deutschen Mandarine 1890–1933*. München: dtv.
- Salin, Edgar. 1948. *Um Stefan George*. München – Düsseldorf: Bondi.
- Salin, Edgar. 1954. *Um Stefan George. Erinnerung und Zeugnis*. Berlin: Küpper.
- Schefold, Bertram. 2005. Die Welt des Dichters und der Beruf der Wissenschaft. U: *Wissenschaftler im George-Kreis. Die Welt des Dichters und der Beruf der Wissenschaft*: 1–34. Ur. Bernhard Böschstein, Jürgen Egyptian, Bertam Schefold i Wolfgang Graf Vitzthum. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Schlieben, Barbara, Olaf Schneider i Kerstin Schulmeyer (ur.). 2004. *Geschichtsbilder im George-Kreis. Wege zur Wissenschaft*. Recklinghausen: Wallstein.
- Schiller, Kay. 2000. *Gelehrte Gegenwelten. Über humanistische Leitbilder im 20. Jahrhundert*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.
- Schütz, Alfred i Thomas Luckmann. 2017. *Strukturen der Lebenswelt*. München: UVK.
- Simmel, Georg. 1992. Stefan George. Eine kunstphilosophische Betrachtung. U: *Gesamtausgabe. Sv. 5: Aufsätze und Abhandlungen 1894–1900*: 287–300. Ur. Heinz-Jürgen Dahme i David P. Frisby. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Simmel, Georg. 2009. Philosophie des Geldes. U: *Gesamtausgabe. Sv. 6*. Ur. Ottheim Rammstedt. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

- Soeffner, Hans-Georg. 2004. *Protosozilogische Überlegungen zur Soziologie des Symbols. Die Wirklichkeit der Symbole*: 41–72. Ur. Rudolf Schlögl, Bernhard Giesen i Jürgen Osterhammel. Konstanz: UVK.
- Weber, Max. 1910. Geschäftsbericht. U: *Verhandlungen des ersten Deutschen Soziologentages vom 19.-22. Oktober 1910 in Frankfurt a. M.*: 39–62. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck.
- Wille, Helmut. 1978. Elemente einer Systemtheorie der Gruppe. Umweltbezug und Prozeßsteuerung. *Soziale Welten* 29: 343–357.
- Wissenschaftskolleg Berlin (bez godišta) <https://www.wiko-berlin.de/institution/das-kolleg>. Pristupljeno 4. travnja 2025.
- Wolf, Christoph i Jörg Zirfas. 2005. *Ikonologie des Performativen*. München: Fink.
- Zöfel, Gerhard. 1987. *Die Wirkung des Dichters. Mythologie und Hermeneutik in der Literaturwissenschaft um Stefan George*. New York – Brüssel: Peter Lang.

SUMMARY

THE STEFAN GEORGE CIRCLE: A CULTURAL-INTELLECTUAL FORMATION AT THE INTERSECTION OF AESTHETICS, KNOWLEDGE, AND EDUCATION

“Starting from my perspective,” goes the oft-quoted remark attributed to the symbolist poet Stefan George, “there is no path to science” (Salin 1948: 249). Yet this formulation is itself a mediated account, attributed to Edgar Salin – an economist and early advocate of interdisciplinary inquiry who maintained personal ties with George. This circumstance alone complicates the apparent opposition between art and science, while also indicating the central concern of this article. The study examines the emergence of a distinctly modern, aesthetically inflected form of cultural knowledge, taking the George Circle as a paradigmatic case. The first section analyzes the artists’ salon as a performative and social space in which fin de siècle aestheticism not only achieved heightened visibility but also stimulated early forms of scholarly reflection. The second section turns to the points of contact between the George Circle and the Heidelberg milieu surrounding the sociologist Max Weber, highlighting the formation of a specifically cultural-sociological mode of knowledge. The third and final section traces the gradual institutionalization of the George Circle within the university system, approached from the perspective of the history of education.

Keywords: Stefan George Circle; aestheticism; cultural knowledge; sociology of culture; history of education

Elementi baladičnog u noveli *Duga* Dinka Šimunovića: između estetskog, intimnog i političkog

Balada i tragedija: između neterminološkog i terminološkog određenja

U dosadašnjim radovima o opusu Dinka Šimunovića, a osobito o noveli *Duga*, često se ističe prisutnost tragičnih elemenata. Pritom se pojmovi “tragedija” i “tragično” najčešće ne upotrebljavaju strogo terminološki, već u značenju koje ambivalentno oscilira između usko teorijskog i šireg, neterminološkog razumijevanja (usp. Detoni Dujmić 1994: 79, 85; Barešić 2015¹). Danijela Bačić-Karković (2000) pak razmatra temu nevine tragične krivnje kod Šimunovićevih proznih junaka, ali se ne osvrće posebno na *Dugu*, dok Evelina Rudan (2002) govori upravo o “nevinosti krivnji” u kontekstu analize te novele.

Viktor Žmegač u studiji *Folklorni impresionizam: “Duga” Dinka Šimunovića* (1998) pak inzistira na prisutnosti doslovno terminološki shvaćenih tragičnih elemenata u toj noveli, ističući sljedeće:

Važno je napomenuti da pridjev “tragična” ovdje ne uzimamo u njegovu svakodnevnom značenju, koje nije specifično, nego je tek inačica u nizu riječi koje kazuju da je nešto žalosno, razorno, smrtonosno. Srnina je tragičnost izvorna, njezina je sudbina autentična u smislu antičke tragedije. Težeći ostvariti svoje sklonosti, ujedno ponesena idolima društvene sredine (a možda potaknuta i podsvjesnim strahom pred njima?), djevojčica dopijeva u žrvanj tragedijskoga proturječja: želeći poletjeti onamo kamo je duša vuče, ona hrli u smrt. Tragedija, kako su je shvaćali klasičari, od Aristotela do Hegela, sadrži nerazrješivu opreku. Poneseni strašću i razornom postojanošću, a svakako privrženi nekoj vrijednosti, junak/junakinja stradavaju zbog razornoga paradoksa: upravo u postojanosti, u kojoj se mijesha dobro i zlo, vodi u propast. Takva je – da također navedemo ženski lik –

¹ Barešić pri tome *Dugu* pogrešno svrstava u ruralnu prozu, premda je zaplet upravo utemeljen na suprotstavljanju individualne žudnje i rigidnih okvira varoške sredine, pa se nerijetko i tematizira kontekst nove pogospodene klase same priče i problematiziranih rodni normi (vidi npr. Detoni-Dujmić 2015: 79).

Sofoklova junakinja Antigona, koja zastupa ono što smatra moralnom obvezom, a svojim činom dovodi do okrutnoga rasapa obitelji. U Šimunovića tragedija, dakako, nije građena s pomoću armature načela; u njoj su razumski neprokrčive regije skrovitih čežnji, djetinjih snova, kobnih predrasuda. Svojom psihološkom složenošću ta je hrvatska novela karakterističan primjer. (Žmegač 1998: 199)

Veći dio citirane Žmegačeve ocjene ukazuje na konkretne tragične elemente u *Dugi*, no upravo predzadnja rečenica nagovještuje odmak od žanrovske strukture tragedije, i to u smjeru baladičnoga. Za razliku od tragedije, balada nije smještena u prostor javnog i političkog, nego u prostor intimnog, i sklonija je estetizaciji i mistifikaciji smrti lika koji je počinio transgresiju.

Istovremeno, Žmegač svoju studiju zaključuje ocjenom koja jasno upućuje na baladični karakter novele: “Šimunović je tako spojio dvije prozne balade, koje se uzajamno upotpunjuju: baladu o tragičnom ushitu neobične djevojčice i baladu o doživljaju promašena života njezinih roditelja” (*ibid.*: 202). Na baladične elemente u toj noveli upućuju i drugi autori; na primjer na autorovu vlastitu žanrovsku intenciju upućuje i Mithad Begić, navodeći da je Šimunović u pismu Stjepanu Roci iz 1906. godine pripovijetku kvalificirao kao “oblik balade u prozi” (Roci prema Begić 1984: 53).

Tragedija i balada, kako kao zasebni žanrovi tako i kao sklopovi nadžanrovskih estetskih i semantičkih kvaliteta – tragičnog i baladičnog – u velikoj se mjeri preklapaju. Stoga ne čudi njihovo često izmjenjivanje u opisima bez jasnog razgraničenja. Čak i proučavatelji koji se posebno bave žanrom balade nerijetko rabe odrednicu tragičnog, dok rijetko pokušavaju precizno odrediti odnos između tih dvaju žanrovskih načela. Tako još Franjo Marković u radu *Prilog estetičkoj nauci o baladi i romanci* (1899: 118–205) na baladu i romancu primjenjuje Aristotelova kompozicijska načela oblikovanja tragedije. Iako se iz današnje perspektive takav pristup može činiti zastarjelim i metodološki problematičnim, on jasno svjedoči o doživljaju srodnosti između balade i tragedije, čak i kada se ta srodnost najmanje ostvaruje u formalnoj kompozicijskoj strukturi.

Mira Sertić u studiji *Razvitak umjetne balade u hrvatskoj književnosti* (1970) polemički odbacuje Markovićevu tvrdnju o nužnosti tragičnog završetka kao temeljne odrednice balade. Istodobno, međutim, baladu povezuje s tmurnim raspoloženjem i predosjećajem tragičnog oslanjajući se na stereotipni paralelizam između klime i poetičkih obilježja – što se danas doima zastarjelim oblikom poetološke stereotipizacije: “Razlika je i u atmosferi balada, koje su nastale u hladnim sjevernim krajevima, zrcale većinom tmurno, zloslutno raspoloženje s predosjećajem nečeg tragičnog” (Sertić 1970: 214). Premda odbacuje potrebu za tragičnim završetkom kao razlikovnom značajkom u odnosu na romancu, upravo takvo tmurno raspoloženje, koje navodi kao ključno obilježje balade, ukazuje na njezinu povezanost s tragičnim, koje i izravno – iako neterminološki – prepoznaje kao bitnu žanrovsku odrednicu. Tako Sertić, unatoč načelnom protivljenju žanrovskoj važ-

nosti tragičnog kraja, posredno afirmira tragično kao ključno obilježje balade, koju definira kao spoj dramskog, epskog i lirskog (*ibid.*: 207).

Smatram da se upravo kroz tragično ostvaruje dramska komponenta balade. Kao i tragedija, balada svoj zaplet temelji na momentu transgresije – prekoračenju granice čije je značenje povezano s društvenim, etičkim ili arhetipskim poretком. U tragediji, osobito antičkoj, riječ je o kršenju duboko ukorijenjenih normi koje prethode kodificiranom zakonu i često su povezane s mitom i religijom: tabu incesta, patricida i infanticida, normiranje legitimiteta i smjene vlasti, nužnost pokopa kao svetog čina, sukob starih običaja i novog političkog autoriteta. Takve su, primjerice, tragedije iz tebanskog ciklusa i *Medeja*. U baladi se pojavljuju slične vrijednosne tenzije, ali se prelamaju kroz intimniji okvir: transgresija se zbiva u prostoru obitelji, unutar međuljudskih i međugeneracijskih odnosa, gdje se sukobljavaju različiti oblici nepisanih pravila, moralnih uvjerenja i emocionalne lojalnosti. Upravo je to ključna razlika između tragedije i balade – prva tematizira konflikt u javnom, političkom prostoru, dok druga to čini u sferi osobnog i obiteljskog, iako obje problematiziraju poredak, krivnju i kaznu.

Stoga bih donekle korigirala ocjenu Dunje Detoni-Dujmić (1991: 41) da Srna u *Dugi* “postaje tragična, gotovo antička žrtva”. Iako Srna doista funkcionira kao žrtva sukoba dvaju nepomirljivih svjetonazora i poredaka, njezina transgresija i pogibelj zbivaju se u intimnom okviru karakterističnom za baladični model. Za razliku od tragedije, koja pretpostavlja jasno artikuliran politički i javni kontekst funkcioniranja zakona, balada sukob problematizira kroz etičku refleksiju osobnoga i obiteljskoga.

Rodna transgresija i relacijska žudnja: struktura konflikta u baladi

Simona Delić kroz čitav rad *Između klevete i kletve – tema obitelji u hrvatskoj usmenoj baladi* (2001) sustavno tematizira rodnu problematiku, odnosno položaj žene u patrijarhalnom društvenom okviru, pri čemu posebno ističe motive suprotstavljanja nepravdi proizišlog iz nejednake raspodjele moći. Također naglašava da se u baladi sukob često oblikuje napetošću između institucije nuklearne obitelji i težnje pojedinca za slobodom (Delić 2001: 78). Međutim, pritom izvan razmatranja ostaje pitanje središnje uloge same obitelji u reprodukciji društvenih normi putem discipliniranja njezinih članova – osobito onih koji se nalaze u ovisnom položaju, a u patrijarhalnom kontekstu to su prvenstveno žene i djeca. Smatram da upravo iz nedostatka refleksije o povezanosti obiteljske i društvene razine proizlazi autoričin pojednostavljen i jednostran zaključak (Delić 2001: 127) prema kojemu su sloboda pojedinca i institucija obitelji već strukturno i načelno u stanju trajne napetosti koju je nemoguće razriješiti. To je doista točno u kontekstu patrijarhata. No ostaje pitanje: je li moguće imaginirati drukčiji društveni kontekst – i drukčiju obitelj? Osim rada Simone Delić brojni drugi autori kao središnji

sukob u žanru balade – u različitim društveno-povijesnim kontekstima – prepoznaju upravo napetost između težnje za slobodom žene i krutih patrijarhalnih okvira.²

Rodna transgresija jedan je od motiva što se ponavljaju u baladi, što ističe i Simona Delić, osobito motiv preodijevanja žene u muškarca (2001: 130). Takva transgresija često funkcionira kao sredstvo izlaska iz ograničenog obiteljskog kruga i ulaska u društvenu sferu kako bi se ostvario određeni cilj. Nakon ispunjenja zadatka junakinja se redovito vraća u okrilje obitelji, a poredak koji je zbog pretrpljene nepravde privremeno bio doveden u pitanje biva obnovljen. Takve balade, kako ističe Delić, “prepoznaju uzroke sukoba, ali ne uspijevaju nametnuti ‘novu’ obiteljsku koncepciju” (*ibid.*: 130). Drugim riječima, rješenje nepravdi koje proizvodi patrijarhalni poredak traži se u privremenoj transgresiji rodne uloge, dok se trajnije propitivanje samog poretka izostavlja i ostaje izvan dosega refleksije.

U pripovijetki *Duga*, međutim, glavni narativni zaplet temelji se na motivu žudnje za potpunom – a ne privremenom – rodnom transgresijom na individualnoj razini. Upravo tragični rasplet, koji uključuje smrt glavnog lika, ali i prošireni epilog koji uključuje smrt još troje likova, otvaraju mogućnost dubljeg preispitivanja patrijarhalnog poretka. Radovi koji se bave problemom patrijarhalnosti u *Dugi* nerijetko nespretno zahvaćaju specifičan način problematizacije patrijarhata u toj noveli. Tako Dean Durić, nakon što je iznio fragmente različitih oblika kritike patrijarhata i nametanja rigidnih rodni uloga, iznosi tezu da “Srna treba pronaći dugu te proći ispod nje ne bi li promijenila spol kako bi u novom spolnom, muškom tijelu konačno bila slobodna, odnosno kako bi se njezin biološki spol poklopio s rodom” (Durić 2012: 265). Ovdje Durić, zapravo, nakon što je iznio kritiku roda kao nametnute uloge u funkciji održavanja patrijarhalne moći, implicira da Srna ima neki esencijalni rod koji se zbog nekih razloga ne poklapa s njezinim biološkim bićem i time opet upada u mistifikaciju samih mehanizama nametanja ograničavajućih rodni normi koje omogućuju patrijarhalnu vlast nad ženama, onemogućuju njihovu osobnu afirmaciju te u konačnici žensku djecu čine manje poželjnom. Srna ne umire zbog nekog urođenog identiteta, nego zato što ne uspijeva biti idealno dijete kakvo, smatra ona, njezini roditelji žele – zato što ne uspijeva biti sin kao poželjnija varijanta potomka, a usto trpi onu stegu koju joj roditelji nameću kao u zadanim okolnostima poželjnu društvenu normu za djevojčice i žene.

Naime, premda se nakon prvog čitanja Srnina transgresivna žudnja najčešće shvaća kao težnja za slobodom, tekst sam više puta naglašava da je njezina pri-

² Usp. Anne J. Cruz, *Genre Transformations and the Question of Gender: La Bella Malmaridada as Ballad and Play* (1983) gdje se problem suprotstavljanja bračnim i patrijarhalnim normama analizira u kontekstu španjolske renesansne kulture. Sličnu tematiku obrađuje i Barbara Fass Leavy u studiji *In Search of the Swan Maiden: A Narrative on Folklore and Gender* (1994) analizirajući motive bijega žene iz rigidnog braka pomoću fantastičnih elemenata – što je jedan od čestih obrazaca u baladičnoj naraciji.

marna žudnja relacijska: Srna želi udovoljiti želji svojih roditelja, želi biti dijete koje odgovara slici koju oni imaju o poželjnom djetetu: “Ali, kakva bila da bila ta Srna, ljubila je ona svoje roditelje i bijaše joj drago da se o njoj dobro misli” (Šimunović 2014: 46). Njezina želja nije naprosto postati dječak, nego upravo *sin* – dakle žudnja za promjenom identiteta ovdje se pojavljuje unutar trokuta koji čine Srna, roditelji i simbolički zakon patrilinearnog nasljedovanja obiteljskog identiteta. Impuls za transgresiju dolazi iz opaske udovice Klare: “Šteta da vam nije sin”, a nakon toga Srna ubrzo pomišlja: “Još malo pa ću biti sin” (isto: 56). Taj moment otkriva strukturu žudnje koja ne proizlazi samo iz individualne težnje za oslobođenjem od tegobnog discipliniranja ženskog tijela, već iz internalizacije društvenih očekivanja i pokušaja da se udovolji želji Drugoga.

Srnina transgresija nije usmjerena samo prema društvenim normama, nego i prema estetskoj matrici koja oblikuje poimanje roda i smrtnosti. Zanimljiva je pripovjedačka konstrukcija prema kojoj je Srna zdrava *usprkos* tomu što mora piti lijekove, što sugerira da patrijarhalna kultura – sažeta u metafori lijekova, *usprkos* kojima je Srna zdrava – zapravo počiva na dokidanju ženske vitalnosti. Kako kaže pripovjedač: “Pa uza sve te trave i ljekarije Srna nije oboljela, samo joj se grstilo kad-god” (Šimunović 2014: 48).

Estetska konstrukcija roda i smrti

Estetski kôd novele temelji se na suprotstavljanju dvaju modela razumijevanja svijeta. S jedne je strane mitsko-fantastična predaja, a s druge racionalistički pogled pripovjedača, koji je bliži modernističkom, raščaranom pogledu na stvarnost. Evelina Rudan (2002) upućuje na napetost između tih dvaju pogleda, ističući da se njihovo pomirenje u *Dugi* događa tek smrću glavnog lika. Njihov se odnos dodatno usložnjava aktiviranjem estetske funkcije, osobito tematskim oblikovanjem smrti i roda. Sukob se odvija između dvaju estetskih obrazaca: s jedne strane estetizirane vitalnosti povezane s konceptom muškosti, a s druge strane estetizirane smrti projicirane na ženstvenost. Šimunovićeva pripovijetka u tom smislu pripada modernističkoj poetici u kojoj smrt i rod nisu samo motivi, nego nositelji simboličke strukture.

Paralelna priča o nesretnoj sudbini djevojke Save i komentar udovice Klare nude mitsko tumačenje Srnina položaja: ženska sudbina jest nesretna, ženskost je nesretni udes. Ili kako to formulira lik udovice: “Ženskomu se ni Bog ne veseli” (Šimunović 2014: 55). Razumijevanje društvene pozicije žene kao fatuma u tom okviru blokira svaku mogućnost kritičkog preispitivanja društvenih normi i zakonitosti koje takvu poziciju oblikuju. Mitski svjetonazor uspostavlja se kao sustav u kojem su “stvari takve kakve jesu” i nije ih moguće promijeniti. Predaja, jedina koja nudi magičnu transformaciju i izlaz iz zadane pozicije, pokazuje se nemoćnom u srazu s racionalističkim poretком, u kojem Srna tragično strada. Raciona-

listički pogled osporava predaju, ali ni sam ne nudi alternativu. Spoznajni pomak događa se tek u drugoj narativnoj liniji – u priči roditelja.

Evelina Rudan (2002) u analizi *Duge* pokazuje kako predaja zadržava svoju unutarnju logiku i istinitost i unutar fikcionalnog svijeta pripovijetke. Budući da Srna ne uspijeva ispuniti uvjet – nije protrčala ispod duge – promjena spola se ne događa, čime predaja ostaje “istinitim” tekstom unutar vlastitog pučkog svjetonazorskog okvira. U tom smislu, prema Rudan, *Duga* uspostavlja pomirenje između mitskog svjetonazora predaje i racionalističkog pogleda pripovjedača, koji ne vjeruje u mogućnost magične transformacije spola prolaskom ispod duge.

Nadalje, Rudan uspoređuje *Dugu* sa Šimunovićevom autobiografskom prozom *Mladi dani*, u kojoj je prepričan događaj iz djetinjstva Šimunovićeve majke, koja je pokušala protrčati ispod duge kako bi promijenila spol i time zadobila očevu ljubav. Dok Rudan s pravom primjećuje da *Mladi dani* završavaju restauracijom patrijarhalne harmonije – djevojčica zadobiva očevu ljubav, a obiteljska hijerarhija biva stabilizirana rođenjem muškog potomka – treba istaknuti i ključnu razliku: u *Dugi* se harmonija više ne može uspostaviti jer dijete umire, a poslije umiru i roditelji. Reprodukcijski lanac patrijarhalnog obiteljskog identiteta i društvenog poretka time je konačno prekinuta.

Upravo Srna smrt razotkriva nasilje patrijarhalnog poretka, koje je u *Dugi* sublimirano estetizacijom smrti – ne samo njezine nego i smrti roditelja te mladog vojnika, čije su sudbine smještene u istu epilošku simboličku zonu. Te tri smrti, prikazane poetičkim postupcima mistifikacije i lirizacije, čine baladičnu tanatološku strukturu u kojoj smrt ne predstavlja etički rasplet kao u tragediji, nego emocionalno, simboličko i ideološko zasićenje. Višestruka estetizacija smrti nije potvrda mitske istine, nego prikriveni simptom njezine destruktivnosti.

Srna svojom smrću plaća cijenu tragične spoznaje koja se prekasno počinje oblikovati u svijesti njezinih roditelja. Oni tu spoznaju plaćaju žrtvom vlastitog djeteta:

Sjetili su se kako su gojili svoju jedinicu brižno nastojeći da je otmu prirodi i radostima života, za čim je njezina mlada duša toliko čeznula, i razumješe svu onu borbu, što se morala biti u njoj. Znali su, da i njezinu dušu držahu za nešto drugo, što je bila žensko, pa njezine želje nijesu za njih imale nikakva smisla. (Šimunović 2014: 60)

U toj rečenici otvara se prostor kasne, ali duboko tragične svijesti: da je nepriznavanje Srninih želja bilo rezultat društveno uvjetovane interpretacije njezina spola, što je onemogućavalo razumijevanje njezine osobnosti. Srna nije smjela željeti drukčije jer je njezina želja iščitavana isključivo kroz kategoriju roda, a ne kroz prizmu autentične individualnosti. U tom smislu, *Duga* ne završava povratkom narušenom poretku, nego otvara pukotinu u njegovoj simboličkoj strukturi. Patrijarhalna figura sina kao savršenog djeteta ne biva ostvarena; reprodukcijski lanac obitelji se prekida; i u toj pukotini – kroz tragično iskustvo – rađa se mogućnost

prepoznavanja vrijednosti individualne žudnje, bez obzira na spol. Kroz smrt djeteta novela završava apoteozom individualizma: kao prekasnim priznanjem da želje pojedinca ne mogu biti podređene unaprijed zadanim identitetskim okvirima.

Liminalni prostori, simbolički poredak i baladična tanatologija

U analitičkoj literaturi o *Dugi* najveći se broj tumačenja zadržava na središnjoj pripovjednoj liniji – priči o Srni i njezinoj tragičnoj sudbini. Rjeđe se spominje paralelna narativna linija o djevojci Savi, a samo poneki autori upućuju na epilošku priču o roditeljima kao na drugu baladu unutar cjeline, kako smo na početku vidjeli da upućuje Žmegač. Međutim, fragment o smrti mladog vojnika koji se ubio skočivši s bedema tvrđave ostaje u potpunosti previđen u znanstvenim interpretacijama iako predstavlja izrazito baladičan mikronarativ.

Taj ulomak oblikovan je kao samostalna mikrobalada u prozi – s vlastitim prostorom, ritmom i unutarnjom logikom. Prostor je obilježen klasičnim baladnim oznakama liminalnosti: tvrđava, vjetar, šuma i, nadasve, rijeka:

Rijeka je dolje u dubinama uvijek jednako šumila kao da prolaze vjekovi kroz tu provaliju, a za njim je golema crna tvrđava sve jednako jecala pod udarcima vjetra.

I najednom je taj lijepi, mladi vojnik osjetio čarobni zagrljaj vječnosti, pa ga je obuzela neka čudna radost i silna želja, da se u njoj raspline sasvim.

Taj neprestani i jednaki šum, pa neizmjerana praznina oko njega opojiše ga tako, da se krikom neke čudne želje baci u čarobnu prazninu pod sobom punu šuma i tmine. (Šimunović 2014: 58)

Upravo ta rijeka, sa svojim neprekinutim, jednakim šumom, funkcionira kao metafora vječnosti i zova smrti, a čin samoubojstva mladog vojnika opisan je kao mistična ekstaza, “čarobni zagrljaj vječnosti”. U njemu nema racionalnog razloga, nema etičkog sukoba, nego samo neodoljiva, zagonetna žudnja, koja završava u praznini “punoj šuma i tmine”.

Motiv rijeke dodatno potvrđuje liminalni status prostora u kojem se odvija ta baladna smrt: ona nije uzrok smrti, nego njezin prostorni posrednik, granica između svijeta i onostranog. U simboličkom smislu, rijeka ovdje predstavlja apsolutnu tišinu i privlačnost praznine, što se u baladi često pojavljuje kao poziv smrti, posebno kada smrt nije kazna, već mistično ispunjenje.

U kontekstu pripovijetke, ta smrt ima strukturnu funkciju kao još jedna paralela Srninoj nesretnoj sudbini te kao anticipacija smrti njezinih roditelja. Funkcionira kao mikrobalada u velikoj baladi, kao prethodna priča koja ne izaziva spoznaju, nego samo utvrđuje postojanje nevidljivog zakona. Za razliku od Srnine smrti, koja otvara mogućnost refleksije (u roditeljskoj priči), smrt mladog vojnika ostaje neinterpretirana i zatvorena. Taj mikronarativ pokazuje kako se u *Dugi*

baladna estetika smrti ne ograničava na glavnu priču, već prožima cijeli narativni prostor.

Time Šimunović gradi tekst u kojem višestruki, žanrovski različiti slojevi smrti – reflektirana (Srna), okamenjena (roditelji) i neprotumačena (vojnik) – oblikuju ono što bismo mogli nazvati baladnom tanatološkom polifonijom. U toj višeglasnosti smrt postaje prostor susreta estetike, ideologije i žudnje, a žanr balade najprimjereniji okvir za njezinu narativnu i simboličku obradu.

Za razliku od Srnine smrti i smrti mladog vojnika, epiloška priča o samoubojstvu Srninih roditelja stavlja u prvi plan motiv “života u smrti” – tipičan baladni topos – kojim se otvara prostor za problem refleksije i krivnje, ali i za estetizaciju smrti deskripcijom. Za razliku od tragedije, koja smrt prikazuje kao etički ishod sukoba vrijednosti, balada se smrću često koristi kao poetičkim mjestom emocionalnog zasićenja i mitske zatvorenosti. Bugarski književni povjesničar Valeri Stefanov ističe da su u folklornoj tradiciji utopljenici znakovi povezanosti svijeta živih i onostranog (Stefanov 2000: 65), a liminalni prostori – rijeka, tvrđava, šuma – ujedno su prostori baladičnih (protu)svjetova. U *Dugi* je upravo takav prostor ukleta tvrđava: nakon Srnine smrti roditelji ne “žive” u njoj, nego obitavaju kao “živi kosturi”. Epiloški dio novele preplavljen je elementom vode – neumornim kišama i rijekom – čime se stvara atmosfera smrti kao beskrajnog međuprostora u kojem je poredak ostao bez funkcije, a pokajanje bez djelovanja.

U tom baladičnom prostoru smješten je i estetizirani opis Srnine smrti kao smrti utopljenice. Taj motiv iznimno je značajan za modernističku i romantičarsku poetiku u kojoj se smrt lijepe žene pojavljuje kao estetski vrhunac teksta, istodobno i sublimacija i poricanje smrti. Elisabeth Bronfen u eseju *The Most Poetic Topic* (1992) polazi od teze Edgara Allana Poea da je “smrt lijepe žene nesumnjivo najpoetskija tema na svijetu” (Poe prema Bronfen 1992: 59) te da je savršena pozicija za njezino opisivanje ona ljubavnika koji oplakuje svoju mrtvu dragu (*ibid.*: 61). Melankolija se pritom uzima kao estetski najprofinjenije raspoloženje. Bronfen zaključuje da androcentrična kultura projicira smrtnost na žensko tijelo, a estetska funkcija ostvaruje se upravo u istovremenom razotkrivanju i prikrivanju te činjenice (*ibid.*: 62). U *Dugi* se taj obrazac ostvaruje u opisima Srnina mrtvog tijela:

Kroz njihove se uzburkane uspomene provlačili traci nekog novog svjetla, a među njima su vidjeli blijedo i mokro Srnino lice kao da mirno spava. Mlade i nježne prsi, pokrivene bijelom košuljicom, tiho se nadizale, a tanka ručica podrhtavala u zlatnoj kosi.

Dugo su gledale njihove duševne oči to izmučeno lice na novom krasnom svjetlu, pa su vidjeli i to, kako je postajalo sve milije i blaže.

Najednom vidješe, kako se po tom dragom djetinjem licu rasplinu divna sreća, a ustanca zatrephtaše od radosnog smiješka.

– To je Srna sanjala, da je postala sin. Pomisliše oni (Šimunović 2014: 36).

Taj opis smrti ujedno je melankoličan i ambivalentan: smrt je prisutna, ali prikazana kao san; tijelo je beživotno, ali opisano kao da se nadima i diše; lice zrači “divnom srećom”, jer je – barem u estetiziranoj fantazmi roditelja – Srna *konačno postala sin*. Estetizirana smrt djevojčice koja nije uspjela ispuniti zahtjeve društva ni ostvariti svoju žudnju funkcionira kao metapoetska struktura: tekst istodobno razotkriva i mistificira ono što ne može izreći: smrtnost, rod, krivnju, žudnju. Upravo na toj ambivalentnoj i višeslojnoj strukturi počiva estetika balade: u njoj smrt nije kraj, nego prostor otkrivanja dubljih zakonitosti poretka, koje se ne mogu dokinuti riječima, nego samo prikazom – slikom estetiziranog mrtvog tijela. Kao sin, Srna bi mogla imati još jednu simboličku funkciju kojom se patrijarhalni poredak brani od prihvaćanja smrtnosti – funkciju produljenja očinskog patri-linearog obiteljskog identiteta. Estetizirana smrt djevojčice koja želi udovoljiti takvoj žudnji roditelja i koja je ktome opisana kao utješna negacija smrti i realizacija fantazije o ostvarenom muškom identitetu funkcionira kao vrlo složena metapoetska struktura kojom se razotkriva funkcija estetiziranih fantazija o rodu kako bi se ipak priznala i istovremeno mistificirala činjenica ljudske smrtnosti.

Međutim, estetska utjeha, ostvarena liriziranim opisom Srnina mrtvog tijela – ljepota, spokoj, osmijeh, privid ostvarene želje – pokazuje se privremenom i krhkom. Njezin učinak ne traje: ne sprečava tragičnu, zakašnjelu i preskupo plaćenu spoznaju roditelja o dubokom nesporazumu s vlastitim djetetom. U temelju tog nesporazuma stoji slijepa reprodukcija rodnihi normi i društvenih predrasuda koje Srni uskraćuju pravo na vlastitu vitalnost, žudnju i osobnost.

Kada roditelji konačno shvate istinu – da su njezine želje bile stvarne, opravdane, i da je nisu izgubili zbog njezine devijacije, nego zbog vlastitih očekivanja – više nema mogućnosti povratka. Njihova smrt, pokajničko samoubojstvo na istom mjestu gdje je stradao i vojnik, ne donosi iskupljenje, nego zaključuje krug patnje. Novela završava apoteozom individualizma, ali priznatog tek naknadno – u smrti. *Duga* time premošćuje razliku između žanrovske strukture balade i etičkog naboja tragedije i nudi sliku svijeta u kojem ženska žudnja ne smije biti potisnuta, jer njezino nijekanje svima donosi gubitak.

Zaključak

Novela *Duga* Dinka Šimunovića otvara se unutar strukture prozne balade, ali postupno prerasta u kompleksan modernistički tekst u kojem se baladično i tragično uvelike prožimaju. Smrt nije samo poetički završetak, nego simbolički središnji moment oko kojeg se organizira cijeli narativni, emocionalni i ideološki svijet pripovjednog teksta. U fokusu nije transgresija iz moralne ili mitske perspektive, nego sukob osobne žudnje i rigidnih rodnihi normi koje se osobi nameću u ime društvene stabilnosti.

Naoko devijantna Srnina žudnja u stvarnosti je proizvod Zakona koji krši upravo nastojeći ga zadovoljiti, jer roditelji nisu mogli razumjeti da njezina želja da bude sin nije bila pobuna, nego pokušaj da im pruži ljubav i pripadnost na način za koji je vjerovala da će im biti prihvatljiv. Riječ je o nemogućem pokušaju da žensko dijete stekne ljubav i priznanje unutar patrijarhalnog poretka. Estetizacija njezine smrti, iako poetski snažna, ne uspijeva prikriti tragičnu istinu: da u tom poretku djevojčica ne može zadobiti ljubav i priznanje u mjeri u kojoj to može sin.

Baladična struktura širi se epiloški kroz likove roditelja i mladog vojnika, čime novela poprima tanatološku gustoću i simboličku zatvorenost. Svaka smrt postaje znak nespoznatog, nepriznatog, potisnutog. U završnom prizoru, kada roditelji shvate što su izgubili i počine samoubojstvo, ne dolazi do katarze ni moralnog razrješenja, nego do zakašnjelog priznanja da je njihovo dijete imalo pravo željeti, bez obzira na spol. *Duga* se, dakle, zaključuje ne restauracijom poretka, nego njegovim razotkrivanjem: smrću se ne potvrđuje istina predaje, nego nasilje njezine simboličke moći. U tom smislu, novela završava apoteozom individualizma, ali ne kao afirmacijom oslobođenja, već kao tragičnom, zakašnjelom potvrdom autentičnosti žudnje koju nitko nije prepoznao na vrijeme.

LITERATURA

- Bačić-Karković, Danijela. 2000. Nevina krivnja Šimunovićevih proznih junaka. *Fluminensia* 1–2: 89–108.
- Barešić, Marina-Irina. 2015. Ženski likovi u kontekstu hrvatske ruralne proze 20. stoljeća: slike stilskih, socijalnih i rodnih stereotipa u prikazu tragičnih junakinja hrvatske književnosti. *Zadarska smotra* 64, 1: 52–62.
- Begić, Mithad. 1984. *Umjetnost pripovijedanja: D. Šimunović, B. Stanković, P. Kočić*. Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša.
- Bronfen, Elisabeth. 1992. The 'Most' Poetic Topic. U: *Over Her Dead Body: Death, Femininity and the Aesthetic*: 59–75. Manchester – New York: Manchester University Press – Routledge.
- Cruz, Anne J. 1988. Genre Transformations and the Question of Gender: La bella malmaridada as Ballad and Play. U: *Ballads and Other Genres / Balladen und andere Gattungen*, Special Issue 11: 69–80. Zagreb: Zavod za istraživanje folklor.
- Delić, Simona. 2001. *Između klevete i kletve: Tema obitelji u hrvatskoj usmenoj baladi*. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada.
- Detoni-Dujmić, Dunja. 1991. *Dinko Šimunović*. Zagreb: Zavod za znanost o književnosti.
- Detoni-Dujmić, Dunja. 1994. Pripovijesti Dinka Šimunovića. U: *Večernji akt Pavla Pavličića: Mor Đure Sudete; Pripovijesti Dinka Šimunovića (Mrkodol, Muljika, Duga, Alkar)*: 55–101. Ur. Vlatko Pavletić, Dubravko Jelčić, Mirko Tomasović, Joža Skok i Zvonimir Diklić. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Durić, Dejan. 2012. Patrijarhat, rod i pripovijetke Dinka Šimunovića. *Croatica et Slavica Iadertina*, vol. 8/1, br. 8: 259–276.
- Leavy, Barbara Fass. 1994. *In Search of the Swan Maiden: A Narrative on Folklore and Gender*. New York: New York University Press.

- Marković, Franjo. 1899. Prilog estetičkoj nauci o baladi i romanci. Rad JAZU: Knjiga 138: 118–205.
- Rudan, Evelina. 2002. O predaji u “Dugi” i kazivačkoj situaciji u “Mladosti”. U: *Zbornik radova i pjesama. Kijeovski književni susreti*. 1. Ur. Stipan Matoš. Kijevo: Općina Kijevo.
- Sertić, Mira. 1970. *Razvitak umjetne balade u hrvatskoj književnosti*. Zagreb: Hrvatsko filološko društvo.
- Stefanov, Valeri. 2000. “Asen Raztsvenikov”. U: *Literatura 11. klas*. Sofija: Anubis.
- Šimunović, Dinko. 2014. *Novele*. Ur. Tihomir Tonković. Zagreb: Naklada Karijatide.
- Žmegač, Viktor. 1998. Folklorni impresionizam: *Duga* Dinka Šimunovića. U: *Hrvatska novela: interpretacije*: 182–202. Ur. Ivo Frangeš i Viktor Žmegač. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.

SUMMARY

ELEMENTS OF THE BALLADIC IN DINKO ŠIMUNOVIĆ’S NOVELLA DUGA: BETWEEN THE AESTHETIC, THE INTIMATE, AND THE POLITICAL

This article examines the balladic elements in Dinko Šimunović’s short story *Duga*, with a focus on the interplay between the balladic and the tragic. Particular attention is given to the terminological and structural proximity of these two concepts, both of which reflect deep ethical contradictions, though within different frameworks: the tragic tends to dramatize moral conflict in the political and public sphere, while the ballad transposes it into intimate, personal experience. Through the analysis of Srna’s relational desire and her aestheticized death, as well as the broader symbolic and gendered implications of the text, the article explores how patriarchal norms are first reinforced and then disrupted. The balladic structure enables a poetic treatment of transgression, mortality, and emotional repression, while tragedy remains an implicit structural undercurrent. The article also emphasizes the connection between aesthetic and ethical dimensions within the genre, and the way in which the ballad reflects social codes through personal conflict. Unlike tragedy, which tends toward resolution and the articulation of guilt, the ballad mystifies death and embeds moral struggle in an emotionally and symbolically charged private space. *Duga* does not resolve in the restoration of order, but in the exposure of its symbolic violence and the belated recognition of individual desire beyond gendered expectation.

Keywords: ballad, Dinko Šimunović, genre, gender, desire, death, ethics

Schillerova drama *Wilhelm Tell* u svjetlu Kantove i Rousseauove misli

Uvod

Posvetiti se Schillerovoj drami *Wilhelm Tell* (1804) znači ponajprije se uhvatiti ukoštac s djelom koje se smatra vrhuncem autorova stvaralaštva, i to ne samo u užem književno-kazališnom pogledu već i s obzirom na njegov kulturno-povijesni i idejni značaj. Drama o Tellu počiva na nizu ideja iz programa o estetskom odgoju čovjeka koji je Schiller razvijao od sredine 1790-ih, a koji je naposljetku postao temelj i njegova i Goetheova književnog stvaralaštva i promišljanja niza estetskoteorijskih i kulturno-povijesnih problema (usp. Safranski 2004: 368–371). Cilj je tog programa bio da u burnim vremenima političkih sukoba pruži platformu s koje bi se oba autora mogla ne samo upustiti u analizu umjetničkog stvaralaštva i čovjekova kulturnog razvoja već i ponuditi rješenja za političke i socijalne sukobe koji su preplavili Europu nakon Francuske revolucije (usp. *ibid.*: 387–390).¹

Na Schillerov su intelektualni razvoj osobito utjecala dva istaknuta mislioca osamnaestog stoljeća: Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712–1778) s promišljanjem ljudske prirode i kritikom suvremene civilizacije te Immanuel Kant (1724–1804) s kritičkom filozofijom koja je postala temelj suvremene spoznajne teorije, filozofije morala i estetike (usp. Höffe 2007: 11–19).

Schiller se Rousseauovom misli upoznaje već tijekom studija u vojnom sjemeništu u Stuttgartu,² a 1780-ih slijedi još pomnija lektira, prije svega *Društveni ugovor* (1762) i *Emil* (1762). Na njega silno utječe “Rousseauova ideja prirodnog stanja, njegova filozofija odgoja, kao i odbacivanje društvenih konvencija” (Alt 2000: 74), koje ugrađuje i u vlastita estetskoteorijska promišljanja i književna

¹ Usp.: “Svojim programom estetskog odgoja Schiller je pokušao dati odgovor na političku krizu Europe – i to ne neposrednim djelovanjem, već obrazovanjem čovjeka” (Safranski 2004: 370–371).

² Tako Safranski navodi da Schiller “Rousseaua čita – potajno, strastveno – te kod njega otkriva ideal slobode i prirodnog morala” (*ibid.*: 54).

djela. Schiller se u kriznom razdoblju krajem 1780-ih i početkom 1790-ih, kada u potpunosti jenjava njegova književna produkcija, sve više posvećuje studiju antičke kulture i povijesti (usp. Menzer 1956: 122) i sve se intenzivnije bavi Kantovom misli (usp. Oellers 2005: 48–55). Uolikoj se mjeri divio kenigsberškom filozofu, svjedoči i njegovo pismo Körneru od 18. veljače 1793. godine u kojemu tvrdi:

Zasigurno još nikada nijedan smrtnik nije izgovorio veću riječ od one Kantove, koja je i sadržaj njegove cjelokupne filozofije: odredi se iz samoga sebe. A tako je i u teorijskoj filozofiji: prirodom upravljaju zakoni razuma. (Menzer 1956: 128)³

Premda je oduševljen Kantovom filozofijom, njegov odnos spram nje nije isključivo afirmativan. Tako u pismu Jacobiju iz 1795. godine priznaje da “ondje gdje stvari samo rušim i nastupam ofenzivno spram drugih nauka postupam strogo kantovski; ondje gdje gradim stojim u opoziciji spram Kanta” (*ibid.*). Povjerujemo li tim riječima, čini se da je Schillerov odnos spram Kantove filozofije u najmanju ruku ambivalentan: s jedne strane preuzima niz ideja i filozofskih postavki, a s druge se njima, kao filozof koji to nije po struci,⁴ koristi prije svega u izgradnji estetskog zdanja na kojemu želi utemeljiti i svoju praktičnu, književnu, odnosno, još uže promatrano, dramsku produkciju (usp. Stiening 2019: 3). Uolikoj je mjeri Schiller pobornik Rousseauovih i Kantovih ideja, osobito je vidljivo iz idejnog ustroja njegove drame o Wilhelmu Tellu kao osebnog spleta predodžaba te dvojice mislilaca o ljudskoj naravi i o zahtjevima koji se postavljaju pred nju.

Schillerov *Wilhelm Tell*

Wilhelm Tell (1804) Schillerovo je posljednje dramsko djelo, koje je odmah polučilo silan uspjeh, o čemu svjedoči i to da je nakon njegova uprizorenja na čitavom njemačkom govornom području srednjovjekovna legenda o otporu alpskih seljaka zadiranju Habsburgovaca u njihova nasljedna prava postala općeprihvaćen nacionalni mit o osnivanju švicarske konfederacije (usp. Matt 2006: 277–285).

Premda je Goethe tijekom putovanja u Švicarsku 1797. prvi od njih dvojice upoznao legendu o Tellu, koja mu se odmah učinila primjerenom za “epsku obradu” (Koopmann 1977: 83), on odustaje od nje te je, po vlastitom sjećanju, prepušta Schilleru (usp. *ibid.*). Tomu nasuprot, Schiller tvrdi da se dramskoj građi o ustanku Švicaraca posvetio

³ Svi prijevodi navoda iz sekundarne literature na njemačkom jeziku potječu od autora priloga.

⁴ Usp.: “Nisam filozof u strogom smislu te riječi, već sam pjesnik koji se služi filozofijom kako bi ostvario više ciljeve” (Schiller 2002: 124).

samo stoga što su kružile glasine da radim na takvom komadu, na što nisam ni pomišljao. Tek mi je ta posve neutemeljena glasina skrenula pažnju na tu građu, proučio sam izvore, zainteresirao, ideja o komadu počela se razvijati i tako se proćanstvo, kao što to često biva, ispunilo svojim ostvarenjem. (*ibid.*: 84)

U kolovozu 1803. Schiller se u potpunosti posvećuje radu na drami, smatrajući da oblikuje “ogromnu stvar” (*ibid.*: 85) koja će protresti kazališni svijet. Praizvedba, koja je polučila silan uspjeh, održana je 17. ožujka 1804. godine, a u listopadu iste godine komad je objavljen i kao knjiga (usp. *ibid.*).⁵ S vremenom će *Wilhelm Tell* postati jedna od najvećih uspješnica njemačkog kazališta i stati uz bok Goetheovoj *Ifigeniji na Tauridi* i Lessingovu *Nathanu mudrom* (usp. Römer 2015: 153).

Schiller je dramu izgradio razvijajući dvije linije radnje koje se u završnim dionicama stapaju u sveobuhvatnu scenu proslave oslobođenja švicarskih prakantona: s jedne se strane nižu scene u kojima se prikazuje Tellov život lovca u alpskim vrletima kojemu je najvažnija njegova obitelj, a s druge scene koje prikazuju položaj domaćeg stanovništva koje ugnjetavaju namjesnici Habsburgovaca, čiji je cilj ustoličenje vlasti te velikaške obitelji i u tim područjima, čime bi teritorij pod habsburškim žezlom bio cjelovit, protežući se od Elzasa i Švapske pa sve do austrijskih pokrajina.

Vrhunac samovolje namjesnika i njihova ponižavanja lokalnog stanovništva predstavlja zapovijed da se svi moraju pokloniti klobuku koji su stavili na motku usred sela kad prolaze pokraj njega (usp. Schiller 1860: 22; 88). Nakon što Tell to iz nehaja ne učini, namjesnik Gessler zapovjedi mu da gađa jabuku na glavi vlastitog sina, obećavši mu da će ga, učini li to, poštediti kazne zbog nepoštovanja klobuka (usp. *ibid.*: 93). No Gessler ga ipak daje uhapsiti jer je primijetio kako je Tell prije hica pripremio dvije strelice, jednu za jabuku, a drugu, kako je sam priznao, za namjesnika u slučaju da prvom pogodi sina (usp. *ibid.*: 97–98).

Paralelno s tom obiteljskom dramom odvija se i ustanička linija radnje: predstavnici triju prakantona, Urija, Schwyza i Unterwaldena, okupljaju se pod okriljem mraka na proplanku Rütli uz Vierwaldstättersee gdje polažu prisegu da neće mirovati dok ne protjeraju habsburške namjesnike i ne uspostave stari poredak neposredne podložnosti vrhovnoj carskoj vlasti, a ne onoj regionalnoj Habsburgovaca (usp. *ibid.*: 47–68). U ustanku će sudjelovati cjelokupno stanovništvo, a signal za početak bit će krijesovi zapaljeni po brdima. Nakon toga napast će namjesničke gradine kao središta tiranije, osloboditi sve nepravedno zatočene te gradine uništiti (usp. *ibid.*: 66–67).

⁵ Prvi hrvatski prijevod Schillerovih djela kojemu je moguće ući u trag upravo je prijevod drame *Wilhelm Tell* iz 1860. Špire Dimitrovića Kotoranina, što će ostati i jedini hrvatski prijevod te drame do današnjeg dana. U radu se većinom navodi tekst iz Dimitrovićeva prijevoda, dok su autori priloga sami preveli pojedina mjesta na kojima objavljeni prijevod znatno odstupa od njemačkog izvornika, što je označeno paginacijom iz njemačkog izvornika.

U međuvremenu Tell se spašava s čamca kojim ga preko olujnog jezera sprovode u zatvor (usp. *ibid.*: 105–107) te se upućuje do uskog puteljka koji vodi do Küssnachta s namjerom da ondje, skriven u žbunju, presretne i ubije tiranina Gesslera (usp. *ibid.*: 121). Na puteljku Gesslera čeka i seljanka Armgard čiji je suprug već šest mjeseci bez presude u zatvoru dok djeca gladuju (usp. *ibid.*: 126). Kada Gessler, rasrđen postupkom seljanke koja mu se isprijčila na putu, zaprijeti da će konjem nasrnuti na nju i djecu, Tell odapne strijelu koja usmrti namjesnika te potom, zakoračivši na proplanak, obznani: “Sve kolibe slobodne su sada, / Nejačad je spašena od tebe / Našu zemlju hulit više nećeš” (usp. *ibid.*: 131).

U završnim scenama drame iznose se rezultati ustanka: u tri su prakantona osvojene sve namjesničke gradine i oslobođeni nepravедno zatočeni mještani (usp. *ibid.*: 134–136), dok je motka s klobukom, taj simbol potlačivanja, pretvorena u simbol slobode (usp. *ibid.*: 138). U međuvremenu se Tell vraća kući i na pragu zatječe Johannesa Parricidu, nećaka rimsko-njemačkog cara Albrechta koji je ubio carskog ujaka zbog zemlje koju mu ovaj nije htio predati u legitimno nasljedstvo (usp. *ibid.*: 140). Ubojica traži pomoć od Tella (usp. *ibid.*: 149–150), ali on smatra da njihova ubojstva nisu jednaka te mu savjetuje da se uputi u Rim i obrati papi kao jedinom koji mu još može pomoći (usp. *ibid.*: 153).

Nakon Parricidina odlaska na pozornici se pojavljuju predstavnici naroda koji kliču Tellu te, bratimeći se, slave oslobođenje od habsburške tiranije. Na scenu dolazi i plemićki par, Berta von Bruneck i Ulrich von Rudenz, koji uspjeh ustanka okrunjuju svojim vjenčanjem kao simbolom ujedinjenja švicarskog plemstva i naroda, pri čemu Ulrich sve svoje kmetove proglašava slobodnim ljudima (usp. *ibid.*: 156).

Rusoovski horizont inicijalne postave dramske radnje

Već je i sam početak drame u znaku Rousseauove predodžbe o životu čovjeka u prirodnom stanju:⁶ radnja je smještena na jezerce s raštrkanim zaselcima obasjanim suncem nad kojima se uzdižu planinski vrhovi s glečerima zaogrnutim oblacima (usp. *ibid.*: 3). U pozadini se čuje mukanje krava i zvonjava stada koja se vraćaju s pašnjaka, dok ribarev sin pjeva na čamcu, a u pjesmi mu se pridružuju pastir i planinski lovac (usp. *ibid.*: 3–4). Idiličan je to prikaz zavičaja švicarskog stanovništva, kamo su u davna vremena, prema kazivanju jednog od ustanika, njihovi preci prispjeli sa sjevera gdje ih je “glad ljuta pritisnula bila” (*ibid.*: 57), zbog

⁶ Usp.: “Već je i Rousseau [...] idealno stanje ljudske egzistencije smjestio u epohu prijelaza iz ‘état de nature’ u ‘état civilisé’, u kojemu su ljudi, još ne posjedujući zemlju, živjeli kao pastiri” (Rohner 2018: 5), što u Schillerovoj drami, na njezinu početku, korespondira s predodžbom o švicarskom puku kao pastirima, lovcima i ribarima.

čega je svaki deseti ždrijebom bio odabran da napusti svoj dom (usp. *ibid.*).⁷ Izgnanici su na svom putu dospjeli i do alpskog gorja, čije su im se šume, jezera i pašnjaci učinili toliko izdašnjima da su odlučili zauvijek se tu nastaniti (usp. *ibid.*). Zahvaljujući mukotrpnom kultiviranju taj je dotad nenastanjeni dio Alpa postao vlasništvo priprostih stanovnika švicarskih prakantona, koji su se svojevolumno pokorili caru Svetog Rimskog Carstva (usp. *ibid.*: 58–59) kao vrhovnoj vlasti koja će osigurati pravo i pravdu u razmiricama među slobodnim stanovnicima alpskih dolina i uzvisina (usp. *ibid.*: 58).⁸

Tako Schiller na pozornici uprizoruje soj ljudi koji, napustivši civilizaciju imaginiranog sjevera, s kojim na kraju osamnaestog stoljeća korespondira život u gradovima i onaj elite na feudalnim dvorovima, žive u pitoresknoj kulisi predcivilizacijskog krajolika alpske regije kao arhaično-statičnog prostora prebivanja izvornog čovjeka. Prikaz je to zamišljenog predcivilizacijskog načina života tzv. *starih Švicaraca* kao helvetskih brđana koji u *arkadijskoj zabiti* alpskih vrleti ostvaruju ideal savršenog života, pri čemu dramski prikaz “prirodne ljepote podupire predodžbu o skladu između čovjeka i prirode i o uzajamnoj harmoniji miroljubivih ljudi” (Luserke-Jaqui 2015: 221). Danas se to čini začudnim, no još su i u kasnom 18. stoljeću uzvisine alpskih planina sa svojom florom i faunom predstavljale nepoznanicu i stoga egzotičan kutak svijeta u koji je Schiller tako mogao smjestiti i vlastitu obradu života Švicaraca s ciljem uprizorenja Rousseauove predodžbe o načinu življenja čovjeka u prirodnom stanju.

Budući da je prema Rousseauu čovjeku u prirodnom stanju “vlastito očuvanje bilo gotovo jedina briga, sposobnostima kojima se najviše koristio morale su biti one koje su kao glavni cilj imale napad i obranu, bilo da bi sebi prigrabio plijen, bilo da bi se zaštitio da sam ne postane plijen” (Rousseau 1978: 35). Od životinje koja djeluje u skladu sa svojim instinktom ne odvaja ga toliko um koliko “svojstvo slobodnog pokretača” (*ibid.*: 36), a to znači sloboda izbora da nešto čini ili ne čini, što onda predstavlja i osnovu samo njemu svojstvenog umijeća usavršavanja (usp. *ibid.*). To ga je umijeće, međutim, ne samo “izvuklo iz onih prirodnih uvjeta u kojima bi on proživio mirne i nevine dane, ono ga je, razvivši u toku stoljeća nje-

⁷ Referenca na odabir iseljenika ždrijebom povezuje sadržaj drame s predodžbom o zlatnim vremenima u antičko doba, kada se u atenskoj demokraciji ždrijeb koristio kako bi se osigurala što pravednija raspodjela javnih dužnosti među građanima i na taj način spriječila korupcija, odnosno koncentracija moći u rukama pojedinaca (usp. Buchstein 2009: 20–34; Wesel 2006: 118–124). Spominjanjem *ždrijeba* Schiller želi sugerirati izvornu demokracičnost švicarskog stanovništva i time legitimirati borbu za slobodu kao borbu za *stare pravice* puka stečene dolaskom u alpski zavičaj (usp. Schiller 1860: 56).

⁸ Utoliko je švicarsko stanovništvo – osim Wilhelma Tella – u trenutku početka dramske radnje (kasni srednji vijek) već izašlo “iz prirodnog stanja u kojemu svatko radi po svome” i podvrgnulo se “javnoj zakonskoj izvanjskoj prisili”, stupajući na taj način u “građansko stanje” (Kant 1999: 104). Kao jamstvo pravne sigurnosti njihova građanskog stanja u drami posve logično i konzistentno funkcionira carska vlast.

gove spoznaje i zablude, poroke i vrline, učinilo konačno tiraninom sebe sama i prirode” (*ibid.*).

Na put razvoja u suvremenog čovjeka divlji je čovjek zakoračio “s posve životinjskim funkcijama” (*ibid.*), naime sa zamjećivanjem i osjećanjem, na čemu počivaju njegove želje koje u to doba ne premašuju fizičke potrebe, a to su “hrana, ženka i počinak” (*ibid.*: 37). Kao takav, smatra Rousseau, prirodni se čovjek “predavao osjećaju trenutnog postojanja, ne misleći uopće na budućnost [...], a planovi su mu [...] dopirali jedva do kraja dana” (*ibid.*).

U tom su stanju ljudi bili “slobodna bića čije je srce mirno a tijelo zdravo” (*ibid.*: 43), koji, “zato što među sobom nisu imali nikakve moralne odnose ni priznate obaveze, nisu mogli biti ni dobri ni zli, niti su imali poroka ili vrlina” (*ibid.*), već su se rukovodili “samoljubljem” kao “željom za (samo)održanjem” (*ibid.*) te milosrđem kao prirodnim suosjećanjem s drugim koje “pridonosi uzajamnom održanju čitave vrste” (*ibid.*: 46). Nepostojanje civilizacijskih spona čovjeka u prirodnom stanju čini divljim, no samoljublje i milosrđe čine ga plemenitim, jer se rukovodi minimalističkim načelom samoodržanja: “Ostvari svoje dobro a da pritom učiniš što je moguće manje zla drugome” (*ibid.*). S obzirom na tu maksimu plemeniti divljak u sućutnom samoodržanju održava ne samo sebe već i drugog, što je naposljetku i osnova za očuvanje svekolike prirode.⁹

Takvim se plemenitim divljakom čini glavni lik Schillerove drame. Wilhelm Tell je usamljen lovac koji lovi divljač po alpskim vrletima (usp. Schiller 1860: 69), živeći u prirodi i od prirode, a sve sa svrhom očuvanja vlastite obitelji (usp. *ibid.*: 72). Kada ga Stauffacher, jedan od vođa ustanka, pozove da im se pridruži i time aktivno sudjeluje u oblikovanju svoga zavičaja, Tell se poziva na autarkičnu samodostatnost egzistencije lovca koji, odvojen od ostalih stanovnika, živi zadovoljan sobom u osami, smatrajući da “jaki junak sam je ponajjači” (*ibid.*: 24). Schiller Tellu namjerno dodjeljuje ulogu usamljenog lovca jer se kao takav čini “potomkom junaka i ratnika” (Luserke-Jaqui 2011: 218) koji je sposoban, s jedne strane, učiniti slavna djela iz “sfere čuda, saga i legendi” (Ueding 1992: 287), a, s druge, u svojoj osamljenosti iznijeti svu moralnu težinu središnje odluke drame, one povezane s ubojstvom tiranina Gesslera.¹⁰

Na početku drame Tell tvrdi da će drugima uvijek rado priskočiti u pomoć, no neka mu vijećnici kažu što treba činiti u zajednici, jer, priznaje, “sam nemogu

⁹ Na kraju prvog dijela *Rasprave* Rousseau zaključuje “da je, lutajući besposleno šumama, bez riječi, nastambe, rata i vezivanja, bez ikakve potrebe za sebi sličnima ali i bez ikakve želje da im naškodi, možda čak nikoga osobno i ne poznavajući, divlji čovjek, osoba s malo strasti, dovoljan samom sebi, posjedovao osjećaje i saznanja primjerena tom stanju, da je osjećao samo svoje istinske potrebe, gledao samo ono što mu se činilo da ima interesa da vidi, i da njegova inteligencija nije napredovala mnogo više od njegove taštine” (Rousseau 1978: 48).

¹⁰ Schiller se time referira na ambivalentnost motiva ubojstva tiranina, koje je “za 18. stoljeće bilo vrlo fascinantna koncepcija, sve dok Francuskom revolucijom nije prodrlo u europsku svakodnevnicu na zastrašujuće konkretan način” (Herbst 1998: 431).

dugo i natenane razbirati”, tj. promišljati (Schiller 1860: 25). Kao čovjek od akcije smatra čak da “tko odviše misli, malo radi” (*ibid.*: 72), a da je on po svojoj naravi pozvan da djeluje. Za razliku od ustanika poput Stauffachera sebe ne vidi kao političara koji promišlja strategiju, već mu je svojstvena neka vrsta prirodne ljudskosti kojom se rukovodi u svojem miroljubivom životu s onu stranu svih aktualnih zbivanja u zajednici. To mu se čini opravdanim jer, smatra, uvijek će postojati neki oblik vlasti koji će se htjeti nametnuti (usp. *ibid.*: 24), pri čemu

Zli carevi prekratko caruju.
Kad se bura iz burnjaka digne,
Poternu se vatre, a brodovi
Luku ištu, silovita bura
Preko zemlje ne škodeći prodje. (*ibid.*)

Tell je toliko čvrsto ukorijenjen u svoje prirodno okruženje da i društveno-povijesne mijene, odnosno uspone i padove vladarske moći sagledava tek kao prirodnu nepogodu, pred kojom se ljudi poput njega sklanjaju dok se vlast ne istutnji, odnosno dok se odnosi ne stabiliziraju u toj mjeri da primjena sile, koja je bila nužna prilikom uspostave nove vlasti, postaje izlišna. S tim je neposredno povezan i njegov kredo: “Svak nek žive mirno u svom domu, / Nitko mirnom' neotimlje mira” (*ibid.*), pogotovo ako “nedraži zmiju, da te u svom neujede gnjevu” (*ibid.*), dok će se vlasti smiriti “kada vide, da je zemlja mirna” (*ibid.*).

Pritom se pojedinac, smatra Tell, može i mora pouzdati samo u sebe, što je i prevoditelj iz 1860. godine preveo poznatom hrvatskom poslovicom: “Uzdaj s' u se i u svoje kljuse!” (*ibid.*). Oslanjajući se isključivo na vlastite vještine i sposobnosti, Tell tako utjelovljuje Rousseauovu predodžbu o *le bon sauvage*, dobrom divljaku, koji daleko od previranja u zajednici uživa u idiličnom životu švicarskih Alpa, očito demonstrirajući pravo pojedinca na samoodređenje u vidu autarkično-obiteljskog života kao primjer egzistencije čovjeka u prirodnom stanju.

Radikalnu promjenu u toj idili nagovještava na samom početku drame prirodni element – skupljanje olujnih oblaka nad jezerom – koji najavljuje dolazak seljaka Baumgartena. Bježeći pred progoniteljima zbog ubojstva namjesnika koji je kanio silovati njegovu ženu (usp. *ibid.*: 7–8), moli ribara da ga prebaci na drugu obalu i tako spasi od vojnika. No oluja koja se sprema plovidbu čini opasnom, pa mu pomoć ostaje uskraćena. U toj situaciji Tell postupa kao čovjek od akcije, koji bez razmišljanja, rukovodeći se urođenim suosjećanjem s drugima, progonjenog seljaka usprkos “biesnom jezeru” (*ibid.*: 10) čamcem prebacuje na drugu stranu. Kada bližnjega treba spasiti, smatra Tell, “čovjek pravi dockan na se misli” (*ibid.*), jer čini “dužnost svetu” (*ibid.*: 10), odnosno, kako Schiller kaže u izvorniku, jer “naprosto nisam mogao a da to ne učinim” (Schiller 2016e: 561).¹¹ Spontanost

¹¹ Kao znak da su Schillerov tekst preveli autori priloga navodi se mjesto iz njemačkog izvornika.

svog djelovanja Tell naglašava i u trenutku kada se opravdava pred Gesslerom zbog nepoštovanja klobuka. U toj krajnje napetoj situaciji tvrdi da se ne bi ni “zvao Tellom da je promućuran” (*ibid.*: 609), čime ponovno ističe svoju priprostu narav koja vrhuni u autarkičnom životu usred prirode i s onu stranu svih civilizacijskih spona, koje nadilaze tu vrstu prirodne egzistencije i koje su, prema Rousseauu, čovjeka i dovele u stanje tiranije nad samim sobom, nad drugim i nad cjelokupnom prirodom (usp. Rousseau 1978: 36). Tim se sponama Tell nastoji ukloniti prije svega pod plaštem *naivnog čovjeka* koji svojom iskrenošću i neposrednošću na udaljenosti drži i Gesslera (usp. Schiller 1860: 88) i ustanike (usp. *ibid.*: 23–25).

Društveno-povijesni kontekst i impetus represalija habsburških namjesnika nad alpskim stanovništvom

S onu stranu Tellova idiličnog života samodostatnog lovca habsburški namjesnici, predvođeni najokrutnijim od njih, Hermannom Gesslerom, nastoje stanovništvo, kako ono gradova i sela tako i autohtone plemićke obitelji poput one Wenera von Attinghausena ili Ulricha von Rudenza i Berte von Bruneck, prisiliti da odustane od *starih pravica* (usp. *ibid.*: 59–61), koje su stekli dolaskom na to područje i njegovim kultiviranjem, te da se pokore supsidijarnom teritorijalnom hegemonu, odnosno da prihvate širenje vlasti Habsburgovaca na njihov zavičaj. Nasilje za kojim u tu svrhu posežu seže od teškog tjelesnog kažnjavanja, poput osljepljivanja Melchthalova oca (usp. *ibid.*: 31), preko neopravdanog utamničenja pa sve do otimanja imetka nedužnim stanovnicima (usp. *ibid.*: 26–27).

Vrhunac ugnjetavanja predstavlja postavljanje klobuka na motku usred Altdorfa, središnjeg mjesta u kantonu Uri, kojemu se svi u prolazu moraju pokloniti (usp. *ibid.*: 22–23).¹² U kasnosrednjovjekovnom kontekstu dramske radnje to je ritual koji bi trebao pridonijeti bezuvjetnoj lojalnosti stanovnika vlasti habsburške kuće, dok je njezin osamnaestostoljetni kontekst onaj uspostave apsolutističke države (usp. Luserke-Jaqui 2011: 220) u kojoj vlast leži u rukama vladara i njemu podložne dvorske birokracije spram koje su svi ostali samo podanici obvezani na bezuvjetnu poslušnost. Promatrano iz suvremenog horizonta dvadesetoga i dvadeset prvog stoljeća, Gessler nije tek sadističko-tiranski pojedinac opijen svojom

¹² Gesslerov klobuk vrlo je polivalentan dramski rekvizit: s jedne je strane sredstvo podjarmljivanja stanovnika jer mu se moraju pokloniti, s druge je strane riječ o blasfemičnom činu, jer se takvo klanjanje obavlja samo u crkvenom ritualu (usp. Waider 1968: 397), s treće je riječ o nakaradnoj naredbi jer je za nepoštovanje klobuka predviđena drakonska kazna – smrt i konfiskacija imovine, što ritual približava pokladama i fašničkoj povorci u kojoj vladaju nakaradni rituali. Nakon uspješne pobune taj simbol podjarmljivanja proglašava se, s četvrte strane, simbolom slobode, što ukazuje na Schillerov postupak podiranja jednoznačnosti njegova dramskog narativa, kao što je to primjerice i vrlo znakovita Tellova šutnja u završnim dramskim scenama sveopćeg bratimljenja švicarskog stanovništva.

nadmoći, već su on i drugi namjesnici agenti suvremene države koji su, kao dio birokratskog mehanizma, usredotočeni isključivo na uspješno funkcioniranje sustava kojemu je jedino stalo do samoodržanja, i to s onu stranu bilo kakvih moralnih ili humanih granica. Tako je vlast namjesnika oličenje svekolikih autokratsko-totalitarnih režima, počevši od perzijskih satrapija i spartanske oligarhije u antici preko srednjovjekovnog feudalno-teokratskog autoritarizma pa sve do despotija poput onih apsolutističkih vladara od 17. do 19. stoljeća, ali i totalitarnih režima poput frankističkog, fašističkog ili nacionalsocijalističkog u 20. stoljeću te antidemokratskih i antiliberalnih tendencija u suvremenom društvu globalizacije i unifikacije društvenog bića u doba interneta.

Posljedica namjesničkog podjarmljivanja sveopća je obespravljenost stanovništva, jer samovoljno i nasilno postupanje habsburških namjesnika prema svima, bez obzira na stalež, položaj i boravište, ugrožava život, slobodu i imovinu svih. Riječ je o stanju koje je odriješeno od svakog prava i zakona (usp. Waider 1968: 398), gdje važi jedino samovolja namjesnika kao simbol “izvanredne zlouporabe državne moći” (*ibid.*).¹³ Ne želeći to više trpjeti, predstavnici triju prakantona okupljaju se na proplanku Rütli gdje drže sabor na kojemu polažu zakletvu da neće mirovati sve dok ne protjeraju habsburške namjesnike.

Na tom se mjestu u drami Schiller razračunava sa suvremenom društvenopovijesnom situacijom u kojoj njegova drama i nastaje. Riječ je o razdoblju nakon Francuske revolucije 1789. godine i njezina pokušaja uspostave *slobode, jednakosti i bratstva* pod okriljem Prve francuske republike rušenjem starog, feudalnog režima i uspostavom novog, građanskog društva, zajedno s njezinim društvenopovijesnim devijacijama poput jakobinske diktature (1793–1794), smaknuća francuskog kraljevskog para (1793)¹⁴ i carevanja prvog modernog diktatora, Napoleona Bonaparte (1804–1815). U toj drugoj sceni drugoga čina, gdje Schiller uprizoruje okupljanje predstavnika švicarskih kantona, nameće se, naravno, paralela s tadašnjim zbivanjima u Francuskoj. No je li u drami riječ o takvom uprizorenju revolucionarnih zbivanja kojim Schiller iskazuje svoj pozitivni stav u najmanju ruku spram navedenih temeljnih ideja Francuske revolucije, a u najgorem slučaju i spram njezinih devijacija? Odnosno kakvu to revoluciju priziva Schiller u drami o ustanku švicarskih stanovnika protiv jarma habsburških namjesnika?

Već na samom početku vijećanja ustanika Schiller ugrađuje prvu ogradu spram Francuske revolucije: na proplanak čamcem dolazi Melchthal, koji je pobje-

¹³ Vrlo poentirano na to ukazuju i Gesslerove posljednje riječi koje uspijeva izgovoriti prije negoli ga pogodi Tellova strijela: “Novi zakon u toj zemlji / objaviti – želim –” (Schiller 1860: 130), čime je do kraja ogoljen *politički voluntarizam* namjesnika. Gessler svojim *will* izriče srž jakobinske diktature, revolucionarnog terora, koji u ime želje da se ustoliči ono *novo gazi stara prava i običaje*.

¹⁴ Schiller je Francusku revoluciju isprva odobravao, a poslije je bio užasnut njezinim “ključnim događajima, egzekucijom Luja XVI. i s ‘grande terreur’ koji je, po njegovim riječima, ‘velik dio Europe, a i cijelo stoljeće, vratio u barbarstvo i ropstvo’” (Rohner 2018: 1).

gao u šumu nakon što se suprotstavio vojnicima koji su njegova oca napali korbačem. Budući da ga nisu mogli pronaći, vojnici su oslijepili oca (usp. Schiller 1860: 49–50), pa Melchthal odmah pri dolasku ističe da je došao isključivo zbog osvete. Stauffacher, jedan od trojice vođa ustanka, to energično otklanja: “O osveti sada ne govori. Ono što se još desilo nije, / zlo što nam prijeti, tomu se želimo suprotstaviti” (Schiller 2016e: 585). Stauffacher, naime, kao trezven glasnogovornik puka, odmah otklanja paralelu ustanka s osvetoljubivošću kojom su se rukovodili francuski revolucionari, pogotovo jakobinci tijekom svoje strahovlade.¹⁵ Time se već na samom početku vijećanja ističe otklon dramskog zbivanja od Francuske revolucije, odnosno skiciraju se drukčiji ciljevi ustanka, a time i profil ustanika.

U skladu s Melchthalovom tvrdnjom da je “naroda celog serce ovdje, / nazočni su ponajbolji ljudi” (Schiller 1860: 55) kako bi vijećali “po starinskoj [...] navadi” (*ibid.*: 54), Schiller i sastav vijeća i način vijećanja oblikuje u otklonu od modela predstavničke demokracije u kojoj glasači biraju članove skupštine. Tomu nasuprot, na proplanku se okuplja *srce naroda*, odnosno *ponajbolji ljudi*, dakle ne oni izabrani glasovanjem, već oni koji se odlikuju kvalitetama *srčanosti i dobrote*, što u Schillerovoj antropolškoj tipologizaciji odgovara tzv. *lijepim dušama*.¹⁶ Čovjek se, naime, sukladno Schillerovu programu estetskog odgoja, odlikuje prije svega nastojanjem da uspostavi harmoniju “između osjetila i razuma, sklonosti i dužnosti” (Lukić 2019: 71), što se načelno teško i većinom rijetko postiže, “jer smo prije svega prirodna bića i kao takva smo podložni boli” (*ibid.*). No “u odlučnosti da se ne prepusti boli lijepa duša postaje uzvišena duša” (*ibid.*), koju više ne karakterizira samo dražesnost kao “ljepota forme [ljudske duše ostvarene] pod utjecajem slobode” (*ibid.*: 70), već i *dostojanstvo* koje lijepa duša očituje u patnji, a koje toj patnji pruža i estetsku ljepotu i moralnu vrijednost.

Upravo su se takvi ljudi okupili na proplanku, i to ne s namjerom da osnuju neki “novi savez” (Schiller 1860: 56), pod čime se s obzirom na kontekst dramske radnje koja se odvija krajem 18. stoljeća misli na modernu, demokratsku republiku, već da obnove “od diedovah [...] uviet stari!” (*ibid.*), odnosno svoje pravo na slobodu i na život kakav su do sada vodili u švicarskim Alpama, i to bez posrednika između sebe i cara kao vrhovne vlasti, što znači da je uvođenje bilo kakve supsi-

¹⁵ Sukladno tomu i Tell “tri puta naglašava da *želi* učiniti ono što misli da mora učiniti; tri puta svoju nakanu otvoreno naziva *ubojstvom*. Ništa ne ukazuje na trijumfalno zadovoljstvo njegovim činom, sve ukazuje na ozbiljnost obavljanja dužnosti u ime više instance” (Herbst 1998: 434).

¹⁶ Schiller u spisu *Über Anmut und Würde* lijepu dušu poima kao “pečat dovršene ljudskosti”, smatrajući da su u njoj “usklađeni osjetilnost i um, dužnost i sklonost” (Schiller 2016a: 408–409). Taj se “ideal ljudske *ljepote* doseže sjedinjenjem dražesnosti i dostojanstva” (Pieper 2010: 369), pri čemu je u tom sjedinjenju “dostojanstvo – u smislu ovladavanja nagonima – pretpostavka dražesnosti, dok dražesnost vrlini oduzima prisilu, u njoj se sklonosti i nagoni sami po sebi podudaraju s čudorednošću” (*ibid.*: 386–387).

dijarne vlasti nelegitimno (usp. *ibid.*: 60). Naime, jedino Švicarci posjeduju vlast nad zemljom u kojoj žive jer

Zemlju ovu za nas smo stvorili,
Našim znojem, staru šumu gustu,
Gdje je berlog medviedima bio,
U ljudske smo pretvorili dvore.
[...]
Naša j' ovo stečevina mila
Kroz tisuću i više godinah –
A rob sada tudjeg gospodara
Da nas smije jarmom zajarmiti
I na našoj pohuliti zemlji?
Za nevolju taku nema l' lieka? (*ibid.*)

Stare su, dakle, *pravice* one koje je autohtono stanovništvo steklo kultiviranjem zemlje, a koje sada žele povratiti. U slučaju noćnog vijećanja Švicaraca riječ je o revoluciji u antičko-srednjovjekovnom, a ne u suvremenom značenju te riječi, o *re-volutio* u izvornom značenju povratnog kruženja nebeskih tijela, odnosno planeta na putanji oko Sunca, a ne o iznenadnoj i radikalnoj promjeni društveno-političkog poretka kao što je bila Francuska revolucija, kojom su ukinuti stari i uspostavljeni novi društveni odnosi. Schillerovi Švicarci ne traže promjenu društveno-političkog ustroja u svom zavičaju, ne prizivaju građansku revoluciju, već povratak *starih prava* stečenih kultiviranjem zemlje, što znači da je riječ o pravu stečenom prije uspostave civilizacijskog stanja, dakle o *prirodnom pravu* kada su se autohtoni stanovnici Alpa borili sa samom prirodom i ostvarili pravo na njezino uživanje (usp. Waider 1968: 396).

Sljedeći Schillerov odmak od Francuske revolucije odnosi se na uvjete u kojima se diže ustanak. Ističući kako su autohtoni stanovnici alpskog područja obradom zemlje došli u njezin posjed, što im je, uostalom, potvrdio i sam car svojom poveljom, Stauffacher smatra da svako “samosilje” (Schiller 1860: 60) mora imati kraj, pa tako i ono habsburških namjesnika. Pritom pravo na pobunu protiv nasilne vlasti puk stječe tek nakon što “biednik pravicu nenadje / kad gnienje nesnosno postane” (*ibid.*). Dakle, prema Schilleru, dva su temeljna uvjeta da se posegne za otporom: kada su iscrpljena sva moguća legalna sredstva ostvarenja vlastitog prava (usp. Weider 1968: 399) i kada tiranija postane neizdrživa, tek tada puk može posegnuti za otporom, ali ne radi ostvarenja nekih novih prava i društvenih odnosa, već onih koja mu kao vječna prava pripadaju jer su ljudskoj prirodi inherentna i utoliko neotuđiva, a to su temeljna ljudska prava na slobodu, jednakost, život i imovinu.

Schiller težinu i značaj tih prava dodatno ističe tako što ih smješta na nebeski svod, odakle kao zvijezde “gore od vječnosti vječne / neprodatne nikad pogažene” (Schiller 1860: 61), a posezanjem puka za njima kao za “svojim vječnim pravima” (*ibid.*) “ponovno se vraća prastaro stanje prirode gdje čovjek susreće čovjeka”

(Schiller 2016e: 592).¹⁷ To pravo na uspostavu izvornog poretka istinske ljudskosti Schiller daje jedino i isključivo *ponajboljim ljudima*, onima koji se ističu *plemenitošću duše*, a ne puku kao prostom zbiru podložnika, odnosno subjekata.

Da su se stekla oba uvjeta pobune, potvrđuje Konrad Hunn, jedan od ustanika, koji izvještava da je bio kod cara kako bi mu iznio njihove nedaće, no on ga nije htio primiti (usp. Schiller 1860: 63). Time je ispunjen prvi uvjet prava na pobunu, naime da su iscrpljena sva pravna sredstva, a nasilje koje trpe od habsburških namjesnika, dakle drugi uvjet, već je odavno prevršilo svaku mjeru. Na temelju toga ustanici zaključuju da ne preostaje ništa drugo do “satèrt valja nesnosno nasilje, / naša stara sačuvati prava / što nam otci ostaviše naši” (*ibid.*: 64), pa svi okupljeni polažu zakletvu da “kano otci bit' ćemo slobodni. / Prije ćemo pogubiti glave, / nego i kad da priznamo robstvo” (*ibid.*: 68).

Tako je *revolucija* koju zaziva Schiller ona koju poduzimaju ljudi *plemenite duše* kako bi sačuvali stare pravice, odnosno vječno važeća temeljna ljudska prava. Oni za pravom na otpor posežu tek nakon što su iscrpili sva druga, nenasilna sredstva, dok revolucionarno nasilje primjenjuju isključivo kako bi vratili oduzeta im prava.¹⁸

Ubojstvo tiranina kao središnji motiv Schillerove drame

U središtu je dramske radnje svakako naslovni lik Wilhelm Tell, ali ne toliko zbog same radnje, koliko stoga što uprizoruje pretvorbu priprostog čovjeka u *plemenitu dušu*, čime naznačuje smjer transformacije i svih ostalih sudionika ustanka.

Tell sve do odlaska sa sinom u selo Altdorf živi kao čovjek u prirodnom stanju, ne mareći odveć za zbivanja oko sebe, a tragove civilizacijskog nasilja na koje nailazi, kao primjerice u Baumgartenovu slučaju, nastoji ukloniti tako da poput kakvog *plemenitog alpskog gorštaka* pomaže ugnjetenima i ugroženima. Tako se ponaša i kada ga Gessler prisili da gađa jabuku (usp. *ibid.*: 88–90). Dapače, i nakon pogotka Tell je ono što Schiller u svojoj antropološko-tipologizacijskoj terminologiji naziva *naivni čovjek* (usp. Schiller 2016d: 546), pod čime podrazumijeva Rousseauova *dobrog divljaka* koji reagira neposredno: Tell, naime, bez ikakve himbe i posve iskreno priznaje da je drugu strijelu pripremio upravo za Gesslera, što namjesniku daje razlog da ga ipak dade uhapsiti (usp. Schiller 1860: 97–98).

¹⁷ Tako je Schilleru moguće ustvrditi i da je prirodno pravo, “sukladno starom izvornom stanju prirode – ponovno u Rousseauovu smislu – naposljetku božanskog podrijetla” (Luserke-Jaqui 2015: 229).

¹⁸ Schiller, za razliku od prakse Francuske revolucije, od svojih švicarskih ustanika traži da nasilje primijene tek u mjeri u kojoj je to nužno kako bi se postigao cilj, dakle da uporaba sile bude što manja, pa tako jedan od ustanika, Walther Fürst, kaže: “Neka se desi što se mora desiti, no ni za dlaku više. / Namjesnike s njihovim slugama otjerat' ćemo i porušit' im kule. / I to, ako Bog da, bez prolijevanja krvi. Car / Nek' vidi da smo prisiljeni bili / odbaciti tek plašt štovanja naše obveze. [...] Jer opravdani strah budi onaj puk / koji se s mačem u ruci *suzdržava*” (Schiller 2016e: 594).

No u tom se trenutku Tell definitivno i nepovratno pretvara u *sentimentalističkog čovjeka* kao opreku *naivnom čovjeku* (usp. Schiller 2016d: 557–560). Povod toj pretvorbi, kao prvo, leži u Gesslerovoj namjeri da gađanjem jabuke postavljene na glavu Tellova sina dezavuirao njegov ugled najboljeg strijelca i time demoralizira lokalno stanovništvo, prihvaćajući pritom posve svjesno da bi dijete moglo i poginuti. U tom trenutku Tell je prisiljen odbaciti pacifistički stav *naivnog čovjeka* o neupletanju u društvena zbivanja jer uviđa da se vlast koja na kocku stavlja život djeteta može obuzdati jedino silom.

Takav *civilizacijsko-sentimentalistički* stav, kao drugo, dodatno učvršćuje Gesslerova pogažena riječ da ga neće uhapsiti, čime je dezavuirao svoj autoritet i pokazao i sebe, a time i vlast koju zastupa kao krajnje nečasne. Takva vlast svojim nečasnim, sadističkim i okrutnim postupcima naprosto izaziva na pobunu, odnosno u puk unosi ideju o nužnosti uklanjanja vlasti i *ubojstva tiranina*. Vrhunac je to spirale nasilja začetog nametanjem supsidijarne vlasti Habsburgovaca, koje se mogu osloboditi jedino progonom namjesnika i likvidacijom Gesslera kao onog koji je u život alpskih gorštaka obilježen miroljubivošću, odanošću obitelji i predanošću radu unio nasilje i time cjelokupni *alpski societas* gurnuo iz stanja *naivne egzistencije* u stanje *civilizacijske kalkulacije društvenih odnosa*.¹⁹

Utoliko je motiv *ubojstva tiranina* središnji motiv drame,²⁰ u kojemu, s jedne strane, kulminira razvoj Tellova lika od *naivnog* preko *sentimentalističkog čovjeka* pa sve do čovjeka *plemenite duše*, a s druge se ocrtava i specifičan karakter ustanka domicilnog stanovništva. Taj je motiv ujedno okosnica i jedinog Tellova dužeg monologa, u trećoj sceni četvrtog čina. Budući da su sve njegove dosadašnje replike uglavnom bile kratke i gotovo sentencijskog karaktera,²¹ taj monolog već i na jezično-formalnoj razini naznačuje Tellov izlazak iz “stanja idile, u kojemu volja, čin i njegovo ostvarenje [...] tvore nerazdruživo jedinstvo” (Herbst 1998: 431), te na njegovo uviranje u civilizacijsko-sentimentalistički svijet (političkih) sukoba.

Čekajući u zasjedi iznad klanca kojim Gessler treba proći na povratku u Küssnacht, Tell, izjedan “latentnim osjećajem krivnje” (Guthke 1994: 297), naglas progovara o svom naumu. Do sada je, smatra, “ubijoj strijelom samo zvijer” (Schiller 1860: 121), a sada mora strijelu odapeti na čovjeka, što je – čini se – čisto ubojstvo, nedostojno *plemenite duše*. Skokovitost misli i veći broj odsutnih sugo-

¹⁹ To je moguće sagledati i na temelju Tellovih postupaka nakon što je bio prisiljen gađati jabuku, koje Tell poduzima “svjesno, namjerno i uz prihvaćanje posljedica” (Herbst 1998: 432), dakle ne više na spontan i naivan, već na krajnje promišljen i proračunat način.

²⁰ O dvojbenosti toga motiva i njegovoj mogućoj instrumentalizaciji svjedoči između ostalog i činjenica da se jedan od Fatahových terorista, koji su osuli paljbu iz automatskih pušaka na izraelski zrakoplov u zračnoj luci u Zürichu 1969. godine, pozivao na “borca za slobodu Wilhelma Tella” (dhr/lmm 2014).

²¹ Usp. primjerice Tellovu reakciju na izgradnju namjesničkih gradina: “Što su ruke sagrađile trudno / Opet ruke porušiti mogu” (Schiller 1860: 22).

vornika kojima se Tell u monologu obraća ukazuju na grčevitost njegove unutarnje borbe i na napor da svom činu podari “osjećaj nužnosti i pravednosti” (Thalheim 1956: 220).²² U tu svrhu u sebi oblikuje i optužbu protiv Gesslera koja ima tri točke: prvo, namjesnik se uhićenjem obrušio na njega osobno, drugo, prijetio je njegovoj obitelji, treće, tlači cijeli njegov zavičaj (usp. Römer 2015: 147), drugim riječima, tiraniju proživljava i na osobnoj, mikrorazini i na društvenoj, makrorazini. Premda Schiller na taj način nastoji što čvršće utemeljiti opravdanost Tellova čina, sva dvojba s kojom se taj lik suočava ukazuje na to da izlazak iz naivno-idilične svakodnevice lovca ne znači automatski potiskivanje sirovog barbarstva, koje se u prirodnom stanju čini prirodnim. Tako posredstvom i Tellova lika i likova ostalih ustanika, poput Melchthala, nad cjelokupnom radnjom lebdi duh *férocity*, naime prijetnja prodora izvornog primitivnog divljaštva i okrutnosti, što se pod svaku cijenu mora izbjeći kako se ne bi ponovili grijesi Francuske revolucije i time delegitimirao ustanak švicarskih gorštaka (usp. Rohner 2018: 6).

Schiller je scenu Gesslerova ubojstva zajedno s navedenim monologom oblikovao tako kako bi odgovorio na Kantovo odlučno odbacivanje bilo kakve mogućnosti da se tiranski vlastodržac silom skine s vlasti (usp. Thalheim 1956: 231). Naime, Kant u *Metafizici čudoređa* tvrdi da “vladar u državi ima spram podanika sve sama prava, a nikakve (prisilne) dužnosti” (Kant 1999: 110), a ako “vladarov organ, *namjesnik*, [što je *de jure* Gessler u *Wilhelmu Tellu*, op. a.] postupa protivno zakonima [...] podanik se na tu nepravdu doduše smije *žaliti* (gravamina), ali joj ne smije pružati otpor” (*ibid.*). Premda je Kant “najveći spekulativni teoretik ideje revolucije, u svojoj filozofiji države je najodlučniji protivnik prava na aktivni politički otpor, svakoga prevrata ili revolucije” (Barišić 1999: 38). Iako Kant načelno “smatra neodrživom zlorabom vrhovne vlasti i osuđuje despociju ili tiraniju” (*ibid.*: 39), nalazi da građani imaju tek pravo na javnu kritiku, “čija je zadaća da vladara prisili na reforme s ciljem postizanja pravednosti u zajednici” (*ibid.*). Nasuprot tomu, pravo na otpor smatra nedopustivim “čak i onda kada je zloraba vrhovne vlasti na izgled nepodnošljiva” (*ibid.*), jer bi aktivni politički otpor “poništio [...] svako zakonito uređenje” (*ibid.*) promovirajući rivalstvo dvaju izvora vlasti, one aktualnog vlastodržca i one ustaničkog puka, što je u proturječju s pojmom nedjeljivosti vlasti suverena. Naprotiv, dobrobit države leži, smatra Kant, upravo u jedinstvu zakonodavne, izvršne i sudske vlasti kao “stanje najvećeg sklada između uređenja i pravnih principa, a um nas kategoričnim imperativom obvezuje da težimo za tim stanjem” (Kant 1999: 109).

²² Tek tim monologom Tell “prihvaća svoju ulogu djelatne osobe u javnoj sferi. Spoznao je da je uništen identitet prirodi privrženog samotnjaka koji je sam odabrao: On mora učiniti ‘nečuveno’, ‘zatrovati’ svoj moralni integritet pomisli na ubojstvo” (Römer 2015: 148). Tell se ovdje očituje kao lik koji osvještava da njegov čin nije čin klasičnog dramskog junaka, već *zločin* koji mora opravdati ne samo pred sobom već i pred svijetom. Otud i nužnost Tellova jedinog dužeg monologa kojim se “ [uloga] obiteljskog samotnjaka proširuje političko-javnom perspektivom” (*ibid.*) dramskog zbivanja.

Usto, ubojstvo tiranina moglo bi htjeti biti legitimno sredstvo moralnog djelovanja (usp. *ibid.*: 113), čime bi se osobno uvjerenje stavilo iznad općeg moralnog zakona kako ga je Kant formulirao, primjerice, u kategoričkom imperativu. Problem leži u tome da bi se u slučaju kada bi se pravo na otpor učinilo bezuvjetnim pravom kojim raspolaže svaki pojedinac postojeći društveni poredak ili destabilizirao ili, još gore, upao u anarhiju, jer bi svatko u trenutku kada osjeća da su povrijeđena njegova prava mogao posegnuti za otporom i silom si priskrbiti svoje više ili manje ugroženo pravo.²³ S obzirom na to, pravo na otpor, a s njime i ubojstvo tiranina, narušava, smatra Kant, samu osnovu pravnog poretka jer onemogućuje bezuvjetno važenje kategoričkog imperativa koji nalaže da se “djeluje samo prema onoj maksimi za koju možeš ujedno htjeti da postane opći zakon” (Kant 2016: 47), a to ubojstvo tiranina, prema Kantu, ne može biti (usp. Kant 1999: 113).²⁴ Ubojstvo tiranina nije moguće opravdati kao legalni čin obrane ni zato što je riječ o ubojstvu drugoga čovjeka, dakle o činu koji, pretvori li se u opću maksimu društva, poništava nepovredivost ljudskog života.²⁵ Stoga ubojstvo kao takvo ne može biti regulativna ideja i nitko nema pravo vladaru, koliko god bio okrutan ili samovoljan, oduzeti život, a što proizlazi iz rigoroznosti Kantove deontološke etike.²⁶

Kant nadalje smatra da je čovjek biće čije je individualno djelovanje uvijek proizvoljno, jer proizlazi iz njegovih aktualnih nagona, odnosno sklonosti i naguća da nešto čini ili ne čini (usp. Kant 2016: 25–30). Upravo je stoga nužna strogost općeg čudorednog zakona pomoću kojeg se djelovanje pojedinca stavlja pod vlast uma, odnosno ljudska se osjetilnost vođena nagonom podvrgava despotizmu kategoričkog imperativa, jer čovjek kao osjetilno biće sam po sebi ne bi slijedio zapovijedi uma (usp. *ibid.*: 29–35).

²³ Usp.: “Nema dakle zakonitog otpora što bi ga narod mogao pružiti zakonodavnom poglavaru države; jer samo podvrgavanje njegovoj općoj zakonodavnoj volji omogućuje pravno stanje; nema dakle nikakvog prava na *ustanak* (seditio), još manje na *pobunu* (rebellio), a ponajmanje na pobunu protiv *njega* kao pojedinca (monarha) pod izlikom da on zlorabi vlast (tyrannis), ne postoji nikakvo pravo na *napadaj* na njegovu osobu ili čak njegov život (monarchomachismus sub specie tyranicidii). I najmanji takav pokušaj je *veleizdaja* (proditio eminens), a takav se izdajica kao onaj tko pokušava *ubiti svoju domovinu* (patricida) ne može kazniti blaže nego smrću” (Kant 1999: 111–112).

²⁴ Usp.: “Pomisao na monarha kojega *njegov narod* osuđuje na formalno smaknuće jezovita je dakle stoga što *ubojstvo* valja smatrati samo *iznimkom* od pravila koje je narod sebi postavio za maksimu, dok je *smaknuće* potpuno *izvrtanje* principa u odnosima između suverena i naroda” (*ibid.*: 113).

²⁵ Usp.: “Formalno smaknuće je ono od čega dušu ispunjenu idejama ljudskog prava odmah podiđe jeza kada god zamisli takav prizor, poput sudbine Karla I. ili Ludwiga XVI.” (*ibid.*: 112).

²⁶ Kant naposljetku smatra da “promjenu (nedostatnog) državnog uređenja, koja je povremeno zacijelo potrebna, može prema tome provesti jedino sam suveren reformom, a ne narod revolucijom” (*ibid.*: 113–114), dok u slučaju uspješno provedene revolucije i uspostave novog uređenja “nezakonitost njegova početka i dovršenja ne može podanike lišiti obveze da se pokoravaju novom poretku stvari kao dobri državljani, te oni ne mogu odbiti da pošteno slušaju ono vrhovništvo koje sada ima vlast” (*ibid.*: 114).

Schiller je s tim u vezi nešto drukčijeg mišljenja. I on, doduše, smatra da je djelovanje poduzeto u skladu s moralnim zakonom, odnosno kategoričkim imperativom nužno, no ne i “savršeno slobodno” (Lukić 2019: 72). “Savršena sloboda”, smatra Schiller, “nalazi se u harmoniji, u moralnoj organizaciji” (*ibid.*), koja počiva na “sklonosti dužnosti, a ne obavezi prema istoj” (*ibid.*), a iz te sklonosti, prema Schilleru, nastaje i “estetska igra”²⁷ u kojoj *lijepa duša* “ujedinjuje prirodnu slobodu s moralnošću i dužnošću” (*ibid.*: 74). Stoga Schiller u *Wilhelmu Tellu* oblikuje svojevrсни *protuprogram ljepote i slobode*, kojim želi “prevladati ljudsku dihotomiju između osjetilnosti i razuma i na tome utemeljiti i istinsku humanost” (Höffe 2006: 2).

Ishodište razilaženja Kanta i Schillera leži u različitom poimanju zadaće čovječanstva: dok prema Kantu čovječanstvo treba stremiti pobjedi uma nad osjetilnošću, i to iz poštovanja spram dužnosti i jedino spram nje, jer su čovjeku “kao tjelesnom i potrebitom biću svojstvene pokretačke snage koje se mogu opirati moralu, zbog čega mu čudoredni zakon nije prirodni zakon koji neminovno slijedi, već imperativ koji ga poziva da ga slijedi” (Höffe 2006: 18), Schiller smatra da bi se čovječanstvo trebalo podvrgnuti estetskom odgoju koji polazi od harmonije čovjekovih osjetilnih i umnih sposobnosti i umijeća, a koja vrhuni u idealu oblikovanja *lijepa duše*. Za Schillera je čovjek biće koje je izručeno i jednom i drugom, i osjetilnosti i umu, pa bi utoliko zadaća čovječanstva trebala biti unapređenje oboga, a ne – kao što misli Kant – samo jednog, onog umnog, i to nauštrb osjetilnosti. Za Schillera, ističe Stiening, veliku ulogu igraju i (emocionalno obojena) *nagnuća spram dužnosti*, “jer unaprijed upleću i onog ‘neprijatelja’, ljudsku prirodu, u oblikovanje moralnog uvjerenja. Schiller ne želi prirodu ‘savladati’ kao neprijatelja, već je želi odista prevladati. Samo onaj koji za sebe kao prirodni individuum želi ono što treba učiniti za etičku općost uistinu je prevladao prisilu etičkih propisa, *jer njegova osjetila već žude za onim što traži praktički*” (Stiening 2019: 4).

Tako Schiller Kantovoj projekciji *rigorozno-moralnog čovjeka* suprotstavlja projekt *estetsko-moralnog čovjeka* kao proizvod uzajamnog unapređivanja uma i osjetilnosti u smislu samoostvarenja totaliteta ljudske prirode. Pritom Kantovu *štovanju dužnosti* suprotstavlja *ljubav spram dužnosti* kao pokretačku snagu ljudskog djelovanja koja će, doduše – kao i kod Kanta – iziskivati žrtvovanje svekolikih osjetilnih sklonosti i nagnuća pojedinca radi ostvarenja dužnosti.²⁸ No ondje gdje

²⁷ Pod tim Schiller podrazumijeva djelovanje onog čovjeka koji “sav svoj život, i tijelom i dušom, posvećuje bezinteresnoj stvari” (Höffe 2006: 14): “Time što se igra, što je kreativan, čovjek ne utiskuje samo tragove svoga uma u materijal koji obrađuje, već mijenja, kaže Schiller, i samoga sebe: ‘Kako mu se forma postupno približava izvana, u njegovoj kući, u njegovim kućnim spravama, u njegovoj odjeći, tako ona konačno zahvaća i njega kako bi ga promijenila, na početku tek izvana, a na kraju i iznutra’” (Van Herpen 1983: 336).

²⁸ Za Schillera podjednako vrijedi “nepovredivo dostojanstvo dužnosti kojoj se sve ostalo – svi nagoni, potrebe, sklonosti, preferencije i osjećaji – treba podrediti” (Pieper 2010: 374).

kod Kanta pojedinac *treba* djelovati sukladno moralnom zakonu, Schiller smatra da će taj isti pojedinac *htjeti* to činiti ako se estetski i moralno obrazuje, odnosno oblikuje.²⁹ Temelj toga tvori Schillerov ideal *lijepa duše*,³⁰ jer po njegovu mišljenju samo estetski čovjek može postati i moralni, a maksimum karakterne savršenosti čovjek doseže kada mu dužnost postane prirodom, što nije ništa drugo do ostvarenje potpunog čovjeka kao najzreliji plod humanosti (usp. Schiller 2016b: 467–468).

Dramski kontekst u kojemu dolazi do uzdizanja Tellova lika do ideala *lijepa duše* sastoji se od više elemenata: kao prvo, to je **univerzalna situacija** u koju ne dopijeva samo on kao pojedinac, već svi stanovnici njegova alpskog zavičaja stoga što su sve više izloženi nasilju i samovolji habsburških namjesnika, uslijed čega se samo povećava apsolutna pravna nesigurnost. Takvo narušavanje pravnog statusa svih pojedinaca opći je okvir u kojemu pravo na otpor postaje legitimno sredstvo borbe za ponovnu uspostavu sigurnosti pravnog poretka, i to bez obzira na to jamči li taj poredak – kao u drami – sama vrhovna carska vlast, dakle pojedinac apsolutist, ili pak parlament i njegovi izvršni organi kao u slučaju Francuske revolucije.

Kao posljedica takvog stanja opće nesigurnosti Schillerov se Tell, kao drugo, uzdiže iz inicijalne samodostatne uronjenosti u prirodno stanje i upleće u zbivanja u kojima se sukobljava sa samovoljno-voluntarističkim aparatom moći: primjer su za to, s jedne strane, prisila Tella da gađa jabuku, čime se ugrožava život njegova sina, a s druge Gesslerova jasna namjera da konjem pregazi seljanku i njezinu djecu. U tom drugom koraku uzdizanja u *lijepu dušu* Tell pounutruje svrhu vlastita društvenog djelovanja, dakle prelazi iz stadija *sentimentalističkog čovjeka* u stadij *plemenite duše*, utoliko što se prilikom primjene sile rukovodi isključivo **humanom svrhom** zaštite ugroženih.

Da pritom nije riječ tek o spontanom, impulzivnom činu ubojstva vođenom isključivo osvetoljubivošću, već o smišljenom, hladnom i proračunatom koraku, svjedoči i činjenica da prije samog čina ubojstva Tell promišlja o svom naumu i proživljava svu dramatičnost dileme je li u slučaju Gesslerova ubojstva riječ o političkom atentatu ili o oslobodilačkom činu. Time se naznačuje da se Tell za taj čin svjesno priprema, uzimajući u obzir prije svega svoj moralni dignitet, do kojeg mu je naročito stalo i zbog kojeg ni u kojem slučaju ne bi htio postati ubojica. U

²⁹ S obzirom na to čini se da je presudna razlika između Kanta i Schillera u tome da Schiller estetski odgoj čovjeka smatra “nužnim i dostatnim da bi ga doveo do moraliteta, dok Kant [...] ne smatra da je estetsko iskustvo nužno, a kamoli dostatno, za moralitet” (*ibid.*: 381).

³⁰ Riječ je o duši koja se “ne zadovoljava samo estetskom ljepotom; ona predstavlja cjelinu i sveobuhvatnu vrijednost, savršenu i ujedno dovršenu humanost čiji je bitni sastavni dio moral” (Höffe 2006: 8). Samo onom čovjeku “koji posjeduje najviši stupanj humanosti svojstvena je i lijepa duša” (*ibid.*: 9). Pritom se “lijepa duša sastoji od pokretačke snage koja je u sebi harmonična jer je po svojoj naravi usmjerena na moral. A tko svojim životom upravlja pomoću te pokretačke snage, taj se može dičiti slobodnom i suverenom ćudorednošću i nazivati se maestrom bivanja čovjekom” (*ibid.*: 14).

Tellovu monologu na vrhu litice Schiller uprizoruje *autonomnu ljudsku volju* kao treći moment na putu uzdizanja do *lijepo duše*, koja iz vlastite slobode i na temelju promišljanja situacije donosi odluku kojom će se uzdići iz uronjenosti u osjetilnost, odnosno iz zapletenosti duše u nagnuća, sklonosti i prirodni nagon, te učiniti ono što čovjek mora moći činiti – postupati kao autonomno humano biće. Stoga ono što je u Tellovu monologu na vrhu litice isprva bilo naznačeno kao čisto ubojstvo, koje se ne bi smjelo učiniti, u trenutku kada Gessler prijeti da će konjem pregaziti seljanku i njezinu djecu postaje human čin pomoći slabijima, odnosno oslobodilački čin, koji ubojstvo tiranina čini legitimnim jer se rukovodi humanim kriterijem spašavanja ljudskih života.

U otklonu od rigoroznog Kantova zahtjeva da nikakav oblik ubojstva ne može biti legitiman, Schiller u sceni u kojoj Tell nakon ubojstva ne bježi i ne skriva se, već s vrha litice svima obznanjuje da je on to učinio i da je spreman snositi sve posljedice toga djela, legitimnim čini ubojstvo tog i takvog tiranina koji je svojim postupcima ugrozio *bonum commune*, naime opće dobro svih stanovnika, odnosno njihov život, slobodu i imovinu. Da je upravo to opće dobro, kao prvo, jedina i isključiva svrha pobune, svjedoči i Stauffacherovo završno obraćanje ustanicima na proplanku: “Pravedni gnjev nek' zauzda svaki, / A osvetu usmjeri na cijelu stvar, / Jer oskvrnut' će onaj opće dobro, / Tko si sam pomaže u vlastitoj stvari” (Schiller 2016e: 596–597).³¹ Da je, kao drugo, uspostava općeg dobra temeljna misao vodilja i ustanika i Wilhelma Tella, proizlazi već iz toga što Tell Gesslera, strogo gledano, ne ubija u ime ili po nalogu ustanika, već to čini na svoju ruku, neovisno o planiranom ustanku, zbog čega i ima silnih problema da pred samim sobom opravda taj čin. No nalazeći svrhu ubojstva u simboličkom činu spašavanja života seljanke i njezine djece, njegov se čin poklapa s gore citiranom Stauffacherovom kantovskom zabranom uzimanja pravde u svoje ruke u osvetničke svrhe. Pored toga i sam ustanak započinje napadom na gradine prije Tellova ubojstva i neovisno o njemu, što konzekventnim čini i ustroj cjelokupne dramske radnje na temelju dviju odvojenih linija zbivanja, one Tellova konkretnog, individualnog spašavanja ljudskih života i one ustaničkog, kolektivnog posezanja za ostvarenjem starih prava, dok obje linije stoje pod zvijezdom vodiljom ponovne uspostave općeg dobra (usp. Waider 1968: 406–407).

Kako bi se potpuno uklonio svaki trag sumnje u to da je Tellov obrazac djelovanja legitiman, njegov se čin u završnim scenama odmjerava s onim drugog ubojice u drami, odbjeglog carskog nećaka. Johann Parricida, bježeći od progonitelja, nada se da će mu Tell ponuditi utočište i razumijevanje za njegov *paricid*, govoreći:

³¹ Na ovom mjestu prevoditelj iz 1860. godine uvelike odstupa od izvornika jer tvrdi: “Gnjev pravedni nek zauzda svaki / I pričuva do osвете svete” (Schiller 1860: 68), čime aktivnost švicarskih ustanika svodi na osvetu, čega u Schillerovu izvorniku nema, već se osveta kao takva u svakome pogledu nastoji izbjeći.

Ti s' ubio
Nastojnika, što ti j' učinio?
I ja ubih dušmanina svoga
Jer mi nehtie otčevinu dati –
Tvoj je dušman kano i moj bio,
Ja sam zemlju spasio od njega. (Schiller 1860: 149)

No Tell se toliko zgraža nad “stricoubicom” (Schiller 1860: 150) da tjera ženu i djecu iz kuće kako im njegova prisutnost ne bi okaljala dušu. Premda sebe i dalje doživljava kao “griešnika” (*ibid.*: 153), smatra da njegov čin nije usporediv s Parricidinim, koji nije moguće ničim opravdati jer se prilikom ubojstva cara rukovodio isključivo osvetoljubivošću i egoističnom ambicijom da se pošto-poto dočepa nasljedne zemlje (usp. *ibid.*: 150–153). Pozitivnopravno gledajući, Parricida je imao puno pravo na tu zemlju i carski mu je ujak, uskrativši mu je, činio nepravdu. No to ne može utemeljiti Parricidino pravo da zbog pretrpljene nepravde počini ubojstvo. Stoga je u njegovu slučaju riječ isključivo o zločinu iz sebičnih pobuda, dakle o postupku koji se ne može moralno opravdati, dok je u Tellovu slučaju riječ o *tiranoubojstvu* u službi općeg dobra. Jednostavno rečeno, Schillerova je poanta na kraju drame da je nasuprot Kantovoj striktnoj zabrani primjene ustaničkog nasilja ono opravdano onda kada je krajnje, a to znači posljednje sredstvo otpora nepravednoj i neograničenoj tiraniji, ali da se za njim nikada ne smije posegnuti iz osobnih, osvetoljubivih pobuda, već isključivo radi obrane ugroženog općeg dobra.

Usto, otklon švicarskih ustanika od barbarstva počinjenog u ime Francuske revolucije dodatno ističe Stauffacher u govoru na kraju drame, poentirajući: “Ubojica i pakostna zloća / Dobit nikad dostanuli nisu. / Al' mi čistom ukinusmo rukom / Plod blaženstva od kervave zloće” (*ibid.*: 142), tako da se posve jasno ističe razlika njihova postupanja s one strane egoistične pohlepe uslijed koje su ruke krvave, a savjest uprljana, kao što je to slučaj i s Parricidom i s Gesslerom. Tomu nasuprot stoji borba Švicaraca za slobodu koja se vodi isključivo *općim dobrom*, čime u Schillerovoj drami “utopijska misao njegove filozofije povijesti i estetike postaje kazališnim događajem, a ne tek regulativnom idejom koja trijumfira nad tragičnim ishodom” (Römer 2015: 153). Da se ishod drame može pojmiti i kao tragičan, pokazuje Tellova vrlo znakovita šutnja u završnoj sceni (usp. Hofmann 2003: 175) koja, čini se, ističe ambivalentnost njegova čina: iz perspektive njegovih sunarodnjaka Gesslerovo ubojstvo važan je doprinos uspjehu ustanka, dok je ono za Tella čin kojim je izgubio nevinost svoje prethodne, idilične egzistencije lovca, zbog čega u podtekstu drame predstavlja klasični tragični lik. No i po Rousseauu i po Schilleru taj je gubitak čovjekovim ulaskom u društveno-povijesne procese neumitan, tako da se u tom civilizacijsko-sentimentalističkom prevratu čovjekove egzistencije pravo na otpor pretvara u *dužnost pružanja otpora* (usp. Herbst 1998: 430), čime se dodatno ističe tragično dostojanstvo Tellova lika.

Na kraju je potrebno skrenuti pažnju i na anarhoidno-restruktivni potencijal drame kao jednu od posljedica Schillerova opravdanja prava na otpor. Naime, ako svi, doista svi pripadnici neke zajednice poput Wilhelma Tella prođu razvojni put od *naivnog čovjeka* preko *civilizacijsko-sentimentalističkog* pa sve do *lijepo duše* i ako svi djeluju isključivo iz *ljubavi prema dužnosti*, tada će u takvoj zajednici nestati potreba za izvanjskom prisilom,³² a to znači za zakonima te zakonodavnim, izvršnim i sudskim tijelima. Jednom riječju, više neće biti potrebe za *državom* kao aparatom izvanjske prisile da se obavlja dužnost, pa će svi pripadnici takve zajednice svojim zajedničkim djelovanjem moći inicirati proces dokidanje države kao prinudne institucije. Tada će se ostvariti ono što Schiller vidi kao ideal čovječanstva: da čovjek u stvaralačkoj igri oblikuje ljepotu “posredstvom koje se putuje u smjeru slobode – i one moralne i one političke” (Pieper 2010: 369). Zbog toga za Schillera idealno političko stanje nije ćudoredna država, već “estetska država” (Schiller 2016b: 519), u kojoj čovjek ne strema ni *osjetilnom dobru* ni *apsolutnom dobru*, već *ljepoti*: “Samo ljepota usređuje sav svijet, a svako biće, podvrgnuto njezinoj čari, zaboravlja svoje granice” (*ibid.*).³³

Čini se da je Schiller tako u završnoj sceni sveopćeg bratimljenja stanovništva i klicanja Tellu kao središnjoj ikoni ustanka uprizorio ostvarenje ideala vajmarske klasike, odnosno svojeg programa estetskog odgoja utoliko što tek *lijepa duša*, a to znači *duša s oblikom*, odnosno *oblikovana duša* koja poznaje granice svijeta i same sebe, može odgovorno djelovati, jer ne samo da zna kako treba djelovati već i želi djelovati isključivo na onaj jedini način primjeren čovjeku – na humani način. Tek takva duša može moći (htjeti) biti i slobodna, zbog čega za Schillera sloboda ne stoji na početku procesa humanizacije čovjeka, već na njegovu kraju, kada on doista postane biće koje će svoju slobodu ostvarivati na odgovoran način. S obzirom na to, klicanje Tellu kao ubojici tirana nije samo usklik oduševljenja švicarskih gorštaka nad uspostavom slobode, već autorov apel svim budućim naraštajima da ne zaborave promišljati humanističko naslijeđe, gajiti humanistički odnos spram svijeta i boriti se za pravo na humani suživot i u suvremenom trenutku. *Sapere aude!*

³² Van Herpen ističe da Schiller “problem političkog otuđenja pokušava riješiti ‘oplemenjivanjem’ individue pomoću ljepote. Ako se većina individua kreativno razvija u igri, nastaje ‘carstvo lijepog sjaja’. [...] To ‘carstvo lijepog sjaja’ je *estetska* država u kojoj nije dokinuta samo prirodna prisila egoističnog nagona, već i moralna prisila dužnosti, tako da je čovjek tada doista slobodan” (Van Herpen 1983: 337).

³³ Pieper ukazuje na to da Schiller u središte svog estetskog zdanja stavlja “istinski lijepo” kao ono “u čemu su najstroža istinitost i zakonitost sjedinjene s neusiljenom, prirodnom igrom oblika u kojoj se ‘pomiruju’ razum i uobrazilja” (Pieper 2010: 371) kako bi se na taj način pronašao put do “sretnog odnosa između izvanjske slobode i unutarnje nužnosti” (Schiller 2016c: 525). U takvom istinski lijepom “čisto jedinstvo duha i osjetilnosti progovara harmonizirajućoj cjelini čovjeka ‘kao priroda prirodi’” (Pieper 2010: 372).

LITERATURA

PRIMARNA

- Kant, Immanuel. 1999. *Metafizika čudoređa*. Prev. s njemačkoga Dražen Karaman. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- Kant, Immanuel. 2016. *Utemeljenje metafizike čudoređa*. Prev. s njemačkoga Josip Talanga. Zagreb: KruZak.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. 1978. *Raspravo o porijeklu i osnovama nejednakosti među ljudima. Društveni ugovor*. Prev. s francuskoga Dalibor Foretić. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Schiller, Friedrich. 1860. *Vilim Tell*. Prev. s njemačkoga Špiro Dimitrović Kotaranin. Zagreb: Naklada Leopolda Hartmána.
- Schiller, Friedrich. 2002. *Sämtliche Werke. Briefe und Dokumente. Bd. 5: Briefwechsel 1787–1805*. Stuttgart – Bad Cannstatt: Böhlau.
- Schiller, Friedrich. 2016a. Über Anmut und Würde. U: Schiller, Friedrich. *Werke in drei Bänden*. Sv. II: 382–424.
- Schiller, Friedrich. 2016b. Über die ästhetische Erziehung des Menschen in einer Reihe von Briefen. U: Schiller, Friedrich. *Werke in drei Bänden*. Sv. II: 445–520.
- Schiller, Friedrich. 2016c. Über die notwendigen Grenzen beim Gebrauch schöner Formen. U: Schiller, Friedrich. *Werke in drei Bänden*. Sv. II: 521–539.
- Schiller, Friedrich. 2016d. Über naive und sentimentalische Dichtung. U: Schiller, Friedrich. *Werke in drei Bänden*. Sv. II: 540–606.
- Schiller, Friedrich. 2016e. Wilhelm Tell. U: Schiller, Friedrich. *Werke in drei Bänden*. Sv. III: 553–650.

SEKUNDARNA

- Alt, Peter-André. 2000. *Leben – Werk – Zeit*. München: C.H. Beck.
- Barišić, Pavo. 1999. Kantova filozofija prava i kreposti. U: Kant, Immanuel. *Metafizika čudoređa*: 7–46. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- Buchstein, Hubertus. 2009. *Demokratie und Lotterie*. Frankfurt/M.: Campus-Verl.
- Guthke, Karl Siegfried. 1994. Wilhelm Tell. Der Fluch der guten Tat. U: Guthke, Karl. *Schillers Dramen. Idealismus und Skepsis*: 279–304. Tübingen – Basel: Franke.
- Herbst, Hildburg. 1998. Recht auf Widerstand: Pflicht zum Widerstand: Der Fall “Wilhelm Tell”. *German Studies Review* 21, 3: 429–445.
- Höffe, Otfried. 2006. “Gerne dien ich den Freunden, doch tue ich es leider mit Neigung...”: Überwindet Schillers Gedanke der schönen Seele Kants Gegensatz von Pflicht und Neigung?. *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung*, 60, 1: 1–20.
- Höffe, Otfried. 2007. *Immanuel Kant*. München: Beck.
- Hofmann, Michael. 2003. *Schiller. Epoche – Werk – Wirkung*. München: Beck.
- Koopmann, Helmut. 1977. *Friedrich Schiller*. Sv. II: 1794–1805. Stuttgart: Metzler.
- Lukić, Vladimir. 2019. Edukacija ljupkosti i dostojanstva: etička egzaminacija estetskoga obrazovanja. *Časopis za odgojne i obrazovne znanosti Foo2rama* 3, 3: 67–76.
- Luserke-Jaqui, Matthias (ur.). 2015. *Schiller Handbuch. Leben – Werk – Wirkung*. Stuttgart – Weimar: Metzler.
- Matt, Peter von. 2006. *Die Intrige. Theorie und Praxis der Hinterlist*. München: Hanser.
- Menzer, Paul. 1956. Schiller und Kant. *Kant-Studien* 47, 1–4: 113–147.
- Oellers, Norbert (ur.). 2005. *Schiller-Handbuch*. Stuttgart: Metzler.

- Pieper, Hans-Joachim. 2010. Moralisches Handeln und ästhetische Erfahrung. Überlegungen zu Friedrich Schiller. U: *Was sich nicht sagen lässt: Das Nicht-Begriffliche in Wissenschaft, Kunst und Religion*: 369–390. Ur. Joachim Bromand i Guido Kreis. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Rohner, Melanie. 2018. "Lern Dieses Volk Der Hirten Kennen!". Verhandlungen des Barbarischen in Schillers Wilhelm Tell. *Monatshefte* 110: 1–12.
- Römer, Horst. 2015. Die Überwindung der Tragödie – Schillers Wilhelm Tell als "Schauspiel". *Jahrbuch der deutschen Schillergesellschaft* 59: 135–155.
- Safranski, Rüdiger. 2004. *Schiller oder die Erfindung des Deutschen Idealismus*. München: Carl Hanser.
- Stiening, Gideon. 2019. *Friedrich Schiller: Über die ästhetische Erziehung des Menschen in einer Reihe von Briefen*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Thalheim, Hans-Günther. 1956. Notwendigkeit und Rechtlichkeit der Selbsthilfe in Schillers Wilhelm Tell. *Goethe-Jahrbuch* 18: 216–257.
- Ueding, Gert. 1992. Wilhelm Tell. U: Hinderer, Walter (ur.). *Schillers Dramen. Interpretationen*: 385–425. Stuttgart: Reclam.
- van Herpen, Marcel. 1983. Schiller und Marx. Die unbekannte, erste Entfremdungstheorie von Marx. *Kant-Studien* 74, 3: 327–342.
- Waider, Heribert. 1968. Zur Lehre vom Widerstandsrecht des Volkes nach Schillers "Wilhelm Tell". *Zeitschrift für die gesamte Strafrechtswissenschaft* 80, 2: 389–408.
- Wesel, Uwe. 2006. *Geschichte des Rechts: Von den Frühformen bis zur Gegenwart*. München: C.H. Beck.

IZVORI S MREŽNIH STRANICA

- dhr/lmm. 2014. *Als es auf dem Flughafen Zürich tote gab*.
<https://www.20min.ch/story/als-es-auf-dem-flughafen-zuerich-tote-gab-120671792823>.
Pristupljeno 28. kolovoza 2024.

SUMMARY

SCHILLER'S PLAY WILHELM TELL IN THE LIGHT OF KANT'S AND ROUSSEAU'S THOUGHT

The works of Friedrich Schiller (1759–1805) and Johann Wolfgang Goethe (1749–1832) represent the pinnacle of literary production in the German-speaking world in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. This is the period of Weimar Classicism (1794–1805), whose theoretical framework was mainly formulated by Friedrich Schiller in the form of a program of aesthetic education of man. The paper examines the conceptual links of Schiller's play *Wilhelm Tell* with Rousseau's idea of the *good savage* and Kant's philosophy of morality in order to question, on the one hand, the rootedness of Schiller's dramatic text in the intellectual good of the aforementioned philosophers, and on the other hand, the moral foundation of the central problem of the play, Tell's murder of Gessler and the related understanding of the humanity of human existence.

Keywords: good savage, Friedrich Schiller, categorical imperative, self-love, *Wilhelm Tell*

Prevoditeljska poetika i praksa Voje Šindolića

Uvod. Pjesnički glas u prevoditeljskom dijalogu

Dubrovački pjesnik, prevoditelj, slikar i novinar Vojo Šindolić, sa svojih sedamdesetak knjiga prijevoda¹ suvremene američke književnosti i nizom prijevoda djela azijskih pisaca, jedan je od plodnijih hrvatskih prevoditelja. Njegova prijevodna djelatnost nesumnjivo predstavlja važan doprinos hrvatskoj književnoj kulturi, osobito u području pjesničkog prijevoda. Šindolić, koji je prije svega pjesnik, oblikovao je recepciju američke književnosti u hrvatskom kontekstu ponajviše prijevodima djela autora *beat*-generacije, poput Allena Ginsberga, Williama Sewarda Burroughsa, Jacka Kerouaca, Gregoryja Corsa, Michaela McClurea, Lawrencea Ferlinhettija i Garyja Snydera, djela autora usko povezanih s *beat*-generacijom i onih koji su *beat*-generaciju nadahnuli, poput Williama Carlosa Williamsa, Ralpha Walda Emersona, Charlesa Bukowskog, Jamesa Doulasa Morrisona, Patti Smith i Boba Dylana, a prevodio je s japanskog i kineskog jezika i azijske pisce kao što su Haruki Murakami, Mieko Kawakami, Ryunosuke Akutagawa, Natsuko Imamura i Bei Dao. Iako neke analize Šindolićeva književnog opusa u kontekstu hrvatske suvremene poezije već postoje, njegova uloga prevoditelja još uvijek nije sustavno obrađena u okviru traduktološke teorije.

U suvremenoj traduktologiji sve više pozornosti posvećuje se književnom prevođenju kao obliku kulturnog posredovanja, a osobito se problematizira prijevod poezije zbog njegove specifične jezične i estetske slojevitosti. Analiza prevoditeljske poetike Voje Šindolića može u tom kontekstu pružiti dragocjen uvid u način na koji prevoditelj pregovara između vlastitoga pjesničkog izraza, izvorne poetike i ciljanoga kulturnog okvira. Takav pristup aktualizira pitanje odnosa između autorskog i prevoditeljskog glasa u književnosti, osobito u kontekstu pjesničkog prevođenja. Naime, Šindolić, kako to u svojem tekstu naslovljenom “O poeziji Voja Šindolića” piše Predrag Lucić: “ne taji da je matična luka njegove poezije ona ista iz koje su krenuli njegovi učitelji Jack Kerouac, Allen Ginsberg, Gregory

¹ Nije naodmet ovdje spomenuti kako je Vojo Šindolić od 1982. suradnik Trećeg programa Hrvatskog radija, za koji je priredio preko šesto polusatnih emisija s prijevodima brojnih svjetskih pjesnika.

Corso, Michael McClure, Charles Bukowski i još mnogi drugi koje je svih ovih desetljeća prevodio i koje i dalje prevodi” (Lucić 2025: 65).

Šindolićeva dugogodišnja posvećenost prevodenju proze i pjesništva, kao i činjenica da se radi o iznimno aktivnom i utjecajnom kulturnom posredniku između jezika i poetika, potiče potrebu za analizom njegova rada iz traduktološke perspektive, s naglaskom upravo na njegovu prevodenju autora *beat*-generacije i na kontekstu doprinosa recepciji američke književnosti u Hrvatskoj. Istraživačka motivacija za bavljenje prevoditeljskim radom Voje Šindolića proizlazi iz bliskog poznavanja njegova opusa, ali i iz mogućnosti neposrednog kontakta s autorom, što otvara prostor za kombiniranje znanstvenih metoda kao što je komparativna analiza izvornika i prijevoda s uvidima dobivenim rukopisima iz privatne arhive. U kontekstu pjesničkog prevodenja, osobito kada je prevoditelj i sam pjesnik, čin prevodenja nerijetko prerasta u dijalog, ne samo s izvornim tekstom već i s njegovim autorom, jezikom, poetikom i čitateljskim očekivanjima. Upravo se tako i u Šindolićevim prijevodima oblikuje prostor susreta između dvaju pjesničkih glasova – originalnog i prevoditeljskog – u obliku suptilnog, no stvaralački ravnopravnog dijaloga. Osim toga, naše istraživanje potaknuto je i širim pitanjem: kako pristupiti pjesničkom prijevodu kada je prevoditelj istovremeno pjesnik, interpret i kulturni posrednik? U Šindolićevu slučaju to pitanje još je relevantnije jer njegovi prijevodi često uključuju i autorski predgovor, komentar ili pjesnički odgovor na original.

Glavni cilj ovoga rada jest analizirati prevoditeljsku poetiku Voje Šindolića kroz prizmu suvremenih teorija prevodenja, s posebnim naglaskom na prijevodu poezije.² Istraživanjem želimo identificirati osnovna načela Šindolićeva pristupa prevodenju poezije, ispitati odnos između izvornih i ciljnih tekstova s obzirom na stil, ritam i kulturne aluzije, kontekstualizirati njegov rad unutar normativnih i deskriptivnih teorijskih modela, interpretirati njegove prevoditeljske strategije u svjetlu teorija Antoineta Bermana, Umberta Eca, Andréa Lefeverea i drugih te, konačno, pokazati kako se u njegovim prijevodima isprepleću pjesnički i prevoditeljski glas. Cilj nam je otvoriti prostor za dijalog između prevoditeljske prakse i teorije, koristeći se konkretnim korpusom prijevoda i dodatnim uvidima dobivenim iz razgovora s autorom. U nastavku rada predstaviti ćemo teorijski okvir i

² Iako je Vojo Šindolić prevodio i prozu, ovaj rad odlučili smo usredotočiti prvenstveno na pjesnički aspekt njegova prevoditeljskog rada, uz ilustrativnu iznimku jedne prozne kratke priče koja će nam poslužiti tek za osvjetljavanje širine Šindolićeve prevoditeljske strategije. To nipošto nije rezultat zanemarivanja važnosti proznih prijevoda, već proizlazi iz dvaju ključnih razloga. Prvo, upravo se u prijevodima poezije najjasnije očituje specifičnost Šindolićeva pristupa, osobito kada se promatra u svjetlu njegovih osobnih refleksija, dokumentiranih u intervjuima, esejima i privatnoj korespondenciji s autorima koje je prevodio. Drugo, pjesnički prijevodi omogućuju slojevitiji uvid u njegovu stilsku, ritmičku i interpretativnu osjetljivost, a analizom konkretnih primjera, primjerice prijevoda Ginsberga, Bukowskog i Dylana, mogu se izravno pratiti prevoditeljske strategije koje odražavaju njegov vlastiti pjesnički glas. Time rad nastoji zadržati dubinsku analizu jednog aspekta prevoditeljske prakse, ne isključujući kako Šindolićevi prozni prijevodi zaslužuju zasebnu studiju.

metodologiju istraživanja, a zatim analizirati izabrane prijevode kako bismo istaknuli specifičnosti Šindolićeve prevoditeljske poetike.

Temeljni pristupi teoriji prevođenja

Prije nego što pristupimo analizi konkretnih prijevodnih rješenja, važno je ukratko predstaviti temeljne teorijske pristupe koji oblikuju suvremeno razumijevanje književnog prevođenja, osobito kada je riječ o poeziji. Iako teorija prevođenja obuhvaća širok raspon disciplina i metodologija, u nastavku ćemo se usredotočiti na odabrane normativne i deskriptivne pristupe kao ključne perspektive te ukazati na neke specifičnosti koje prevođenje poezije čine posebno zahtjevnim.

Normativni pristupi usmjereni su na propisivanje načina na koji bi se *trebalo* prevoditi. Temelje se na pretpostavci kako postoji određen ideal, kao što je vjernost izvorniku, prema kojemu se prijevod može procjenjivati. Među najutjecajnijim predstavnicima tog pristupa je Eugene Nida, koji razlikuje formalnu ekvivalenciju usmjerenu na strukturalnu i semantičku bliskost s izvornikom te dinamičku ekvivalenciju kojoj je cilj čitatelju prijevoda omogućiti iskustvo što je moguće sličnije onomu koje je imao izvorni čitatelj (Nida 1964). Sličan model nudi Peter Newmark razlikujući semantički prijevod usmjeren na značenje i stil izvornog teksta od komunikativnog prijevoda koji daje prednost razumljivosti i funkcionalnosti u ciljnom jeziku i u konačnici se prilagođava jezičnim i kulturološkim očekivanjima čitatelja (Newmark 1982). Newmark i Nida, iako se razlikuju u teorijskoj terminologiji, dijele osnovnu pretpostavku da se prijevod procjenjuje prema stupnju vjernosti originalu, ali i prema njegovu učinku na čitatelja u ciljnoj kulturi.

Umberto Eco pak, premda se ne uklapa u klasične modele normativne teorije, prihvaća ideju da prijevod, iako interpretativan, nije proizvoljan čin, već se temelji na promišljenim i obrazloživim prevoditeljskim odlukama. U knjizi *Otprilike isto* on odbacuje ideju o savršenoj ekvivalentnosti te umjesto toga uvodi pojam "reći otprilike isto" (Eco 2006: 10). Eco ističe kako značenja između jezika rijetko savršeno odgovaraju jedno drugom, češće se samo djelomično preklapaju. Prijevod je stoga moguć ne kroz potpunu ekvivalenciju, već kroz semantičku bliskost, preklapanje koje omogućuje rekonstruirati značenje u kontekstu ciljnog jezika i kulture. Time u središte stavlja interpretativni karakter prijevoda. Prijevod, prema tome, nije puko preslikavanje, već čin tumačenja. Prevoditelj ne prenosi značenje u doslovnom smislu, već ga iznova oblikuje u jeziku prijevoda, nastojeći pritom zadržati duh originala³ u novom jezičnom okruženju (*ibid.*). Takvim pristupom Eco povezuje normativnu težnju za smislom i svrhovitošću prijevoda s interpretativnim

³ To jest "stvoriti dvojnika tekstualnog sustava koji, s izvjesnom diskrecijom, može kod čitatelja proizvesti slične učinke" (Eco 2006: 16).

razumijevanjem prevođenja kao kreativnog tumačenja, što prirodno vodi prema suvremenim deskriptivnim teorijama.

Za razliku od normativnih, deskriptivni pristupi ne polaze od ideala, već od stvarne prevoditeljske prakse. Utemeljeni u djelima Gideona Touryja, Andréa Lefeverea i Antona Popoviča, ti pristupi prevoditeljski rad smatraju kulturološki uvjetovanim procesom. Gideon Toury smatra da se prijevod treba proučavati u okviru ciljne kulture i njezinih normi, a ne isključivo u odnosu na izvorni tekst. On uvodi pojam prijevodnih normi u vidu nepisanih pravila koja oblikuju očekivanja čitatelja i prakse prevoditelja u određenom vremenu i prostoru. Time primarno pitanje nije više “je li prijevod vjeran?”, već “koja je uloga prijevoda u kulturi?” (Toury 1995). Prevođenje s ideologijom i poetikom još eksplicitnije povezuje André Lefevere u *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*, kada tvrdi kako se prijevod uvijek odvija unutar mreže kulturnih i političkih čimbenika, a ne u neutralnom jezičnom prostoru. Za njega je prevođenje neodvojivo od prakse *preoblikovanja* jer oblikuje način na koji se autor i njegovo djelo predstavljaju u drugoj kulturi. Takvo preoblikovanje nikada nije ideološki neutralno, već neizbježno odražava poetiku i vrijednosne sustave konkretne kulture (Lefevere 1992). U predgovoru istom izdanju Susan Bassnett i Lefevere dodatno ističu da svi oblici preoblikovanja, uključujući i prijevod, manipuliraju književnim tekstovima kako bi oni mogli djelovati unutar specifičnog društvenog i kulturnog konteksta (Bassnett i Lefevere 1992). Svaki je prijevod intervencija i zadire u originalni tekst, oblikuje njegovu recepciju te doprinosi njegovu književnom statusu u novoj sredini.

Doprinos Antona Popoviča teoriji književnog prevođenja također je neraskidivo povezan s razvojem deskriptivne paradigme. Njegov ključni koncept *prijevodnih pomaka*⁴ omogućuje analizu razlika između izvornog i prevedenog teksta bez vrijednosne osude, kao sastavnog dijela komunikacijskog procesa. Popović razlikuje više tipova stilskih pomaka, poput nivelacije, pojačavanja intenziteta, transformacije i stilskog nadomještanja, koje prevoditelj ostvaruje u susretu s ograničenjima jezika ciljne kulture (Špirk 2009). Središnji pojam njegove teorije nepromjenjiva je semantička jezgra koja zapravo predstavlja strukturu značenja što se prenose kroz prijevod. No Popović ističe kako ona nije statična, već nastaje selektivnom interpretacijom, dok sam prijevod predstavlja metakomunikacijski čin koji spaja dvije kulturne sredine. Prevođenje za njega nije puka jezična transkripcija, već semiotički proces ukorijenjen u konkretnim kulturnim, estetskim i društvenim okolnostima (*ibid.*). U tom smislu, Popović jasno pozicionira prevođenje unutar recepcijskog sustava ciljne književnosti, gdje prevoditelj postaje aktivan posrednik i tvorac značenja. Tim pristupom Popović ne samo da nadopunjuje ranije autore poput Touryja već i utemeljuje istraživački okvir koji će snažno utjecati na razvoj deskriptivne translatologije i škole manipulacije (*ibid.*). Njegovo razumije-

⁴ Engl. *shifts of expressions*.

vanje prijevoda kao dinamičnog odnosa između teksta i konteksta značajno je pridonijelo oblikovanju suvremenih pristupa književnom prevodenju.

Prevodenje poezije postavlja izazove koji nadilaze uobičajenu jezičnu transmisiju. Poezija se često oslanja na ritam, rimu, fonetsku strukturu, višeznačnost i intertekstualnost, što je teško, ako ne i nemoguće, u potpunosti prenijeti. Susan Bassnett raspravlja o poeziji kao izazovu za prevoditelje, naglašavajući kako je nemoguće u potpunosti prenijeti sve elemente izvornika, što zahtijeva odluke o prioritetima (Bassnett 2002). Postavlja se, naravno, i pitanje prevoditeljske vidljivosti. Nosi li prijevod autorski potpis prevoditelja? Kada je prevoditelj i sâm pjesnik, prijevod teži postati dijalog dvaju pjesničkih glasova, a u Šindolićevu slučaju i nadogradnja vlastitoga pjesništva. Ovdje više ne govorimo o pukoj reprodukciji, a Šindolićeva prevoditeljska praksa omogućuje ispitivanje upravo tih napetosti između vjernosti i kreativne transformacije.

Prijevod kao interpretacija

U prethodnom poglavlju prikazali smo temeljne normativne i deskriptivne pristupe prevodenju, no ako nam je cilj sagledati prevoditeljski glas Voje Šindolića, potrebno je osvrnuti se i na one teorije koje prijevod promatraju manje kao prijenos značenja, a više kao interpretativni čin. Sve je više teoretičara koji ističu kako prevoditelj nije tek tehnički posrednik između dvaju jezika, već svojevrsni tumač koji svjesno oblikuje jezični, stilski i kulturni prijenos. Na tom tragu, ovim poglavljem prikazat ćemo ključne doprinose Waltera Benjamina, Antoinea Bermana i Lawrencea Venutija koji, svaki na svoj način, naglašavaju da je prijevod dijalektički proces, uvijek smješten između jezika, značenja i interpretacije. Te uvide poslije ćemo nastojati povezati s konkretnim analizama Šindolićevih prijevodnih postupaka.

Walter Benjamin u eseju "The Task of the Translator" ne razmatra prevodenje kao tehnički zadatak prenošenja poruke, već kao filozofski čin otkrivanja međujezičnih odnosa u čijoj srži jest sam jezik. Za Benjamina uloga prijevoda nije prvenstveno u prenošenju značenja, nego u prenošenju jezika *samoga*, u otvaranju prostora za ono što naziva *čistim jezikom* koji stoji u temelju svih jezika. Prema tom stajalištu prijevod ne teži reproduciranju originala, već njegovu produhovljenju kroz jezik ciljne kulture, što u konačnici znači kako dobar prijevod i ne skriva svoju udaljenost od izvornika te upravo kroz taj odmak otkriva nove dimenzije značenja. Takav je prijevod stvaralački i *stran*, a kroz tu *stranost* ostvaruje vlastitu vrijednost. Prijevod je interpretativni čin koji ne pripada samo književnosti, već i jezičnoj povijesti,⁵ jer svaki prijevod ostavlja trag u jeziku na kojem je nastao (Benjamin 2002).

⁵ Njem. *Nachleben*, engl. *afterlife*, doslovno: *život nakon smrti*. To nas upućuje kako prijevod pripada jezičnoj povijesti jer je oblik novog postojanja teksta, u drugom jeziku i vremenu. To je oblik naknadne prisutnosti, život jezika nakon smrti originala (Benjamin 2002).

Jedan od važnijih glasova u suvremenom promišljanju prijevoda kao etičkog i kulturnog čina jest onaj francuskog teoretičara Antoinea Bermana koji tvrdi da svaki prijevod prolazi kroz *iskušenje stranoga*,⁶ a tek se analizom prevedenog teksta može utvrditi u kojoj mjeri jezik prijevoda dopušta strukturama izvornog, stranog teksta očitovati se unutar vlastitih jezičnih okvira (Venuti 2000). Promišljajući u svojem eseju "Translation and the Trials of the Foreign" dvostruko značenje *iskušenja stranoga* u prevođenju, Berman navodi kako prevođenje često podliježe sklonostima koje narušavaju stranost izvornog teksta, poput racionalizacije i eliminacije ritma ili idiomatskog izraza, čime se tekst pripitomljuje i gubi ono što ga čini drukčijim (Berman 2000). Nasuprot tomu, Bermanov etički pristup od prevoditelja zahtijeva svijest o vlastitim intervencijama i otpor nesvjesnom prilagođavanju. Dobar prijevod ne prikriva, već svjesno čuva i prenosi stranost izvornog djela, omogućujući njegovu jezičnom i kulturnom identitetu osjetiti se u jeziku prijevoda (Berman 1992).

Ideje Waltera Benjamina i Antoinea Bermana razvija i afirmira još jedan suvremeni teoretičar, Lawrence Venuti. U središtu njegova pristupa nalazi se kritika takozvanog nevidljivog prijevoda, prevoditeljske prakse koja nastoji ukloniti sve tragove jezične i kulturne posebnosti izvornika u korist glatkog, domaćem čitatelju prirodnog teksta. Takvu tečnost nastalu provođenjem prijevodne strategije Venuti naziva *podomaćivanje*⁷. Što se prijevod više uklapa u jezične i kulturne norme ciljne sredine, to uloga prevoditelja postaje sve manje primjetna, a Venuti to povezuje s marginalnim statusom prevoditelja u angloameričkoj kulturi (Pavlović 2015). Nasuprot tomu, on se zalaže za veću vidljivost prevoditelja, a jedan od načina njezina postizanja vidi u strategijama *defamilijarizacije*⁸ i *otpora*,⁹ koje smatra istoznačnima, a Nataša Pavlović prevodi ih kao "strategije otpora" (*ibid.*: 185), što je sasvim pogođen prijevod jer i sam Venuti govori o "prevođenju s otporom" (Venuti 2008: 248).

Riječ je o procesu u kojem prevoditelj ne uklanja strano, nego ga u tekstu čini prisutnim, što opet zahtijeva svijest o etičkoj dimenziji prevođenja i aktivan otpor asimilacijskim tendencijama ciljne kulture. Takav pristup, iako potencijalno rizičan u pogledu čitateljske recepcije, može proširiti horizonte recepcije i potaknuti promišljanja o vlastitoj kulturi (Venuti 2008). Strategija *prevođenja s otporom* potiče čitatelja doživjeti jezične i kulturne razlike prekidajući lanac razumijevanja, otvarajući prostor za kritičku svijest o drugosti u jeziku prijevoda, te ga tako može dovesti do oslobađajućeg iskustva kritičkog odmaka (Pavlović 2015). U tom

⁶ Fr. *l'épreuve de l'étranger*. Pojam koji Antoine Berman uvodi kako bi označio temeljni izazov prevođenja u smislu prihvaćanja i očuvanja stranoga u tekstu, nasuprot njegovu uklanjanju. Prijevod je prema tom shvaćanju i etički čin koji dopušta čitatelju iskusiti njegovu različitost (Berman 2000).

⁷ Engl. *domestication*.

⁸ Engl. *foreignization*, doslovniji oblik prijevoda bio bi *postranjivanje* (Pavlović 2015: 185).

⁹ Engl. *resistance*.

smislu, Venuti ne promatra prijevod samo kao jezičnu ili književnu praksu, već kao čin kulturne politike i mjesto gdje se oblikuju odnosi moći, identiteta i interpretacije.

Takvo poimanje prijevoda kao otpora normama i prevladavajućim diskursima, kakvo nudi Venuti, nadopunjuje i reinterpreтира традицију коју су у савременој теорији преводeња утемелили Walter Benjamin i Antoine Berman. Сва тројка, сваки на свој начин, naglašavaju da prijevod nije neutralan oblik tumačenja, već prostor dijaloga i višeznačnosti u potrazi za semantičkom dubinom. U tom svjetlu i Umberto Eco, iako skloniji interpretativnoj bliskosti nego očuvanju stranosti, određuje prevoditelja kao tumača, a ne kao pukog tehničkog posrednika. Time se potvrđuje naša temeljna misao kako je prijevod čin razumijevanja i autorske intervencije, kulturni susret u kojemu tekst poprima novi oblik i glas. Takvo teorijsko razumijevanje prijevoda kao interpretativnog i kreativnog čina ujedno otvara mogućnost njegove primjene na konkretnoj analizi prevoditeljskog rada Voje Šindolića, osobito u njegovu dijaloškom odnosu s originalom, ali i u ulozi pjesnika koji prevodom ispisuje i nadograđuje vlastiti pjesnički glas. Njegova prevoditeljska praksa omogućit će nam da testiramo te teorije odgovarajući na pitanje u kojoj se mjeri očuvanje stranosti, vidljivost prevoditelja i čin tumačenja isprepleću u njegovu radu.

Prema prevoditeljskoj praksi Voje Šindolića

Vojo Šindolić zauzima osobitu poziciju u suvremenom hrvatskom pjesništvu, teško uklopivu u ustaljene obrasce. Kao mladi pjesnik, sedamdesetih godina dvadesetog stoljeća, nadahnuće je nalazio u poetici francuskih simbolista (Marjanović 2013), a u tom razdoblju duboko ga je odredilo poznanstvo s Milanom Milišićem. I sâm pjesnik i prevoditelj, duboko prožet *bitničkim* slobodarskim duhom, Milišić je mladog pjesnika Šindolića uzeo pod svoje okrilje te u ulozi prijatelja i mentora *zapalio iskr*u koja će se u potpunosti rasplamsati nekoliko godina poslije: “Kao mnogo stariji i iskusniji pjesnik, Milan je nedvojbeno naslutio moju pjesničku nadarenost, ali bio je i strog kritičar” (Šindolić 2011a: 9). Druga presudna odrednica za Šindolića bila je suradnja u časopisu za *rock*-glazbu *Džuboks* od 1975. do 1979, u vrijeme kada je naklada dosezala stotinjak tisuća prodanih primjeraka. Kao član uredništva došao je u Ameriku kako bi intervjuirao Boba Dylana, no upoznao je Allena Ginsberga, preko njega i većinu pjesnika *beat*-generacije te umjesto planiranih desetak dana u Americi je ostao gotovo cijelu godinu. Tako je početkom osamdesetih godina, kako piše Bojan Marjanović, u Šindolićevoj poeziji došlo do pomaka prema *bitničkoj* poetici, ali i onoj njihovih uzora poput Williama Carlosa Williamsa (Marjanović 2013). Sam Šindolić svjestan je svojih književnih uzora te njihova utjecaja na vlastitu estetiku:

Zbog *beatnika* sam se i počeo baviti književnošću. Oni su svojim knjigama, ali i temama o anarhizmu, antifašizmu, pacifizmu, antirasizmu, rušenju seksualnih tabua, kao i interesom za budizam i istočne religije, uobličili moje poglede na svijet. (...) Ne smijemo zaboraviti preteče i učitelje *beatnika*: Walta Whitmana, Ezru Pounda i Williama Carlosa Williamsa. Ta tri velikana direktno su utjecali na autore *beat*-generacije (...). I u mom književnom odrastanju, sve do danas, ta su tri pjesnika najvažnija za moju poeziju. Walt Whitman zbog dugog ispovjednog stiha, Ezra Pound s njegovom suludom erudicijom – prije dvadesetak godina preveo sam *Pisanske Cantose* – te meni omiljeni William Carlos Williams sa svojim “kratkim stihom i kratkim dahom” i motom “nema ideja osim u stvarima”. (cit. prema Đurđević 2024: 32, 33)

Prvu knjigu pjesama objavio je Vojo Šindolić pod naslovom *Prelazni prizor* 1979, a uslijedile su *Svakodnevnica* (1985), *Sredozemna medvjedica* (1987) te nekoliko zbirki izabranih pjesama kao što su *Dekompresija* (1988), *Poziv na crninu* (2002), *Povijest bolesti: rane, neobjavljene i nove pjesme 1973–2008* (2010), *Smrt i druge ljubavi: izabrane pjesme* (2013). Do danas su mu objavljene 22 knjige poezije, uključujući izdanja objavljena u Srbiji (*Neuspjeli bjegunac*,¹⁰ 2013) i Crnoj Gori (*Točka otpora*, 2019). Izabrane pjesme objavljene su mu na engleskom (*Behind the Darkness*, 2005), japanskom (*Yami no Haigade*, 2008) i talijanskom (*Il Punto della Resistenza*, 2015) jeziku. Godine 2025, uoči pjesnikova sedamdesetog rođendana, objavljeno je i kapitalno djelo, sabrane pjesme na 415 stranica, naslovljene *Rezalište uspomena*.

Poezija Voje Šindolića autentičan je spoj *bitničkog* izričaja prožetog slikama i prizorima rodnoga grada koji pred pjesnikovim očima godinama nestaje pred “ispraznim folklorom kineskih suvenira s okusom Jadrana kakav je nekad bio” (Šindolić 2012: 127). Osjećaj prisilne otuđenosti u rodnom gradu, čini nam se, izvoriste je Šindolićeve poezije koja se na tim temeljima nadograđuje mjestima u kojima je živio poslije¹¹ i, još više, osobama koje je tijekom svojih putovanja upoznao, zavolio i koje su ga nadahnjivale. Duboka osjećajnost i privrženost prijateljima vidljiva je u velikom broju posvećenih pjesama, tolikom da je jednu knjigu poezije naslovio *poSvete (pjesme posvećene prijateljima, učiteljima, ljubavima...)* (2019). Upravo širok krug ljudi s kojima se Šindolić družio, koje je smatrao učiteljima, koji su mu nesumnjivo bili prijatelji i neiscrpan izvor nadahnuća¹²

¹⁰ Ovo je izdanje pravi kuriozitet, jer objavljeno je u Srbiji, ali na hrvatskom jeziku!

¹¹ Rođen i odrastao u Dubrovniku, od 1975. Vojo Šindolić naizmjenično je živio u Beogradu, San Franciscu, Veneciji, Trstu i Kopru. Godine 2008. vratio se u Dubrovnik, gdje živi kao slobodni umjetnik. Predrag Lucić piše: “Vojo je u svojim pjesmama spojio urođenu i odnjegovanu mediteransku melanholiju, tu radosnu tugu života, s buntovnom, oslobađajućom, lutalačkom energijom beat-poezije (...)” (Lucić 2025: 67).

¹² Nije riječ samo o *bitnicima* poput Allena Ginsberga, Michaela McClurea, Lawrencea Ferlinghettija, Garyja Snydera i Gregoryja Corsa, već i o njihovim prijateljima poput Charlesa Bukowskog te o svojevrsnim *rock*-sljedbenicima Bobu Dylanu, Patti Smith, Krisu Kristoffersonu i Robertu Hunteru, što je

omogućio je krajnju autentičnost Šindolićeva pjesničkog izričaja, te možemo reći kako u sustavu hrvatske književnosti Šindolić zauzima rubnu, ali itekako prepoznatljivu poziciju koja odolijeva strogoj sistematizaciji. Na neki način ostao je u hrvatskoj književnosti autsajder, no vrlo svestran i utjecajan autsajder *sa stavom*, ili kako je to sažeo Viktor Vresnik: “jedan od posljednjih autentičnih ekscentrika hrvatske literarne scene” (Vresnik 2025).

Takav višeslojno oblikovan pjesnički identitet neizbježno se pretače i u prevoditeljski rad, u kojem Šindolić ne pristupa tekstovima kao neutralan posrednik, već kao stvaratelj s jasno artikuliranom estetikom i svjetonazorom. Od autora koji su Šindolića nadahnjivali i s kojima je prijateljevao on nije prevodio samo one kojima prijevod nije bio potreban kako bi doprijeli do hrvatskih čitatelja. Sve ostale volio je toliko da ih je *morao* približiti svima. Jedinu način na koji je to mogao, osim dovoditi ih na čitanja poezije u Zagreb, Beograd, Strugu ili Dubrovnik, bio je prevoditi njihovu poeziju.

Prevoditi je Šindolić započeo istovremeno s pisanjem pjesama, pa je već 1979, iste godine kad mu je objavljena prva zbirka pjesama, objavio i prvu knjigu prijevoda. Bila je to antologija *Pjesnici beat generacije*. Još 21. listopada 1980. Allen Ginsberg u pismu Garyju Snyderu najavljuje kako će mu se “Vojo Šindolić javiti vezano uz prijevode njegove poezije” (cit. prema Morgan 2009: 226). Do 1991, kada je napravio jedinu dužu prevoditeljsku stanku, Šindolić je već objavio prijevode poezije Jamesa Douglasa “Jima” Morrisona (*Slavlje guštera*, 1980), Ferlinghettija (*Beskrajan život*, 1982), Snydera (*Pjesme s kornjačinog otoka*, 1983), Ginsberga (*Urluk uma*, 1983), McClurea (*Tirkizni revolver*, 1984) te izabrane pjesme i kratke priče Charlesa Bukowskog (*Kakva korist od naslova?*, 1986. i *Ispovijesti čovjeka*, 1991).

Autorski sušne godine za Šindolićevo pjesništvo bile su devedesete godine 20. stoljeća. U tom razdoblju gotovo da nije objavljivao poeziju, a velik utjecaj na tu stanku imala su ratna zbivanja u Hrvatskoj. Prva civilna žrtva agresorskog napada na Dubrovnik bio je upravo Milan Milišić, a granate su padale i u blizini Šindolićeve kuće u Starom gradu. Nakon smirivanja ratne situacije pak preminuo je 1997. Allen Ginsberg. No cijelo to vrijeme Šindolić je, ponajviše na poticaj Predraga Lucića i ostalih urednika *Feral Tribunea*, nastavio objavljivati prijevode u okvi-

nit koja se naposljetku protegnula i na Hrvatsku s imenima kao što su Predrag Lucić, Darko Rundek i Damir Šodan. Na Šindolića su duboko utjecali, osim već spomenutog Milana Milišića, i Danijel Dragojević te Danilo Kiš. Već površan pogled na ta imena odaje neizbježnu širinu svjetonazora i poetika, no svi oni dijele osobinu da su svojim pisanjem propitivali granice jezika i društva, izmicali estetskim i ideološkim normama te bili neskloni kompromisnim rješenjima i konvencijama. Ukazuju nam oni tako i na širinu Šindolića prije svega kao čovjeka otvorenih nazora, a potom i kao pjesnika, jer njegovo pjesništvo *jest* njegov život. Upravo na tom tragu Danijel Dragojević mu piše: “Prema tome, svaka je Vaša zbirka slična romanu, autobiografiji, i svaku od njih treba pročitati polako i pomno, s poštovanjem prema glavnom liku i događajima kroz koje je autor prošao, a kojih je bilo mnogo i nisu bili ni laki, ni na jednom mjestu (...)” (Dragojević 2025: 64).

ru *Feralove* biblioteke. Prevedeni su John Fante (*Zapitaj prah*, 1995), Jim Morrison (*Vizije*, 1996), Ferlinghetti (*Otvorenih očiju, otvorenog srca*, 2000), Patti Smith (*Rani radovi*, 2001) i Paul Polansky (*A gdje je moj život?*, 2004). Konačno, upravo *Feralova* biblioteka objavila je i prvu Šindolićevu zbirku pjesama nakon 1992, *Poziv na crninu* (2002).

Od 2003. do danas traje Šindolićevo najproduktivnije razdoblje u kojem je objavio 53 knjige prijevoda s engleskog, japanskog i kineskog jezika, te možemo reći kako je danas jedan od najplodnijih prevoditelja u Hrvatskoj. Među značajnije prijevode ovog razdoblja ubrajamo romane Jacka Kerouaca (*Tristessa*, 2004, *Satori u Parizu*, 2005, *Dharmine skitnice*, 2019), *Pisanske Cantose* Ezre Pounda (2005), izabrane pjesme svih važnijih predstavnika *beat*-generacije,¹³ nekoliko radova Charlesa Bukowskog,¹⁴ eseje *O prirodi* Raplha Walda Emersona (2013), izbor iz dnevnika i poezije Thomasa Mertona (*Nepoćudni Merton*, 2019), *Izabrane pjesme* Williama Carlosa Williamsa (2020), izabrane pjesme Marka Stranda *Vjetar i njegov dvojnik* (2024) te nekoliko antologija pjesama *beat*-generacije, od kojih se izdvaja *Jazz: Beat, antologija pjesama i teorijskih tekstova o utjecaju jazz na književnike Beat generacije* (2018). Važno je spomenuti kako je s japanskog jezika, uz ostale prije nabrojene autore, preveo sedam eseja i romana Harukija Murakamija te s kineskog jezika dvije zbirke pjesama Bei Daoa. No možda najvažnije izdanje u kulturnom prostoru ponešto širem od hrvatskoga predstavlja najnoviji Šindolićev prevoditeljski pothvat. To su *Sabrane pjesme 1961. – 2020*. Boba Dylana, objavljene 2025. godine.

Osnovna značajka Šindolićevih prijevoda jest da su, kad god je to bilo moguće, nastajali u suradnji s autorima, a kada to nije bilo moguće, s članovima njihovih obitelji ili suradnicima. Tu činjenicu sam Šindolić, kojega ionako krasi duboko poštovanje prema autorima koje prevodi, često naglašava, uvijek nastojeći objasniti i čitatelju približiti svoju prevoditeljsku metodiku. Naznaku da je i Šindolićeva vlastita poezija neodvojiva od prevoditeljskog rada nalazimo u stihovima njegove pjesme “Struga”, nastale 1986, koji glase: “(...) svojim prijevodima slavio Zlatni vijenac umne / poezije sjedobradog *beatnika* Allena Ginsberga” (Šindolić 2019: 33). Charles Bukowski pak piše:

Ne sjećam se više kako sam došao u kontakt s Vojom Šindolićem, bilo je to prije prilično godina. Ali nekako smo uspostavili vezu. Čini mi se da je on prethodno bio pročitao neke moje rane zbirke pjesama i priča, pa mi je pisao. Potom smo se počeli dopisivati, a ubrzo i vidati, kad bi on došao na Zapadnu obalu. Bilo mi je drago što

¹³ Lawrence Ferlinghetti: *Krajolici živih i mrtvih* (2015), Gary Snyder: *Prašina u vjetru* (2016), Allen Ginsberg: *Kozmopolitski pozdravi* (2017), Gregory Corso: *Mile vile i njihove sile* (2018), Michael McClure: *Predsoblje noći* (2019), William S. Burroughs: *Mačka iznutra* (2021).

¹⁴ Priče i eseji *Kapetan je izišao na ručak a mornari su preuzeli brod* (2006), *Ispovijesti starog pokvarenjaka* (2010), *Misli* (2019), izabrane pjesme *Sretan slučaj* (2022).

je netko tko živi tako daleko, u sasvim drugom dijelu svijeta, prepoznao moje djelo i tako srčano ga cijenio i ustrajno prevodio. (Bukowski 2022: 9)

Vidimo kako Vojo Šindolić nije bio tek prevoditelj *bitničke* poezije na hrvatski jezik, već njezin sugovornik i tumač, pjesnik koji je svojim prijevodima gradio mostove između jezika i kultura, ali i između vlastitog unutarnjeg svijeta i svijeta autora koje je volio. Njegova prevoditeljska praksa, duboko prožeta osobnim i estetskim uvjerenjima, otkriva se kao nastavak njegova pjesništva. U sljedećem poglavlju analizirat ćemo stoga neke od njegovih prijevoda i strategija ne samo radi komparativne usporedbe s izvornikom već kako bismo razumjeli na koji se način pjesnički glas Voje Šindolića prelama i iznova oblikuje činom prevođenja.

Prijevod kao susret s autorom

Prethodna poglavlja pokazala su kako se prijevod može promatrati ne samo kao prijenos značenja već i kao čin interpretacije, dijaloga i kulturnog preoblikovanja. U završnom, analitičkom dijelu rada pozornost ćemo usmjeriti na konkretne primjere prijevodnog opusa Voje Šindolića, koji otkriva prepoznatljive prevoditeljske strategije, duboko povezane s njegovim pjesničkim senzibilitetom i estetikom. Oslanjajući se na Šindolićeve vlastite refleksije zabilježene u intervjuima, pismima i osobnim razgovorima, analizirat ćemo nekoliko slučajeva u kojima se jasno očituju njegovi stavovi prema jeziku, kulturnom prijenosu i odgovornosti prevoditelja. Posebnu ćemo pažnju posvetiti njegovu prevođenju Allena Ginsberga, Charlesa Bukowskog i Boba Dylana, s naglaskom na njegovim svjesnim odlukama o načinu tumačenja prenesenih značenja, a osvrnut ćemo se i na kritiku nekih postojećih prijevoda i naslova. Takav pristup omogućit će nam u potpunosti sagledati Šindolićev prevoditeljski glas koji, kao i njegova poezija, izmiče normi te ostaje autentičan, osoban i neodvojiv od šireg konteksta književnog i kulturnog dijaloga.

Još krajem osamdesetih godina 20. stoljeća, baš u vrijeme kad je Predrag Lucić napisao da je Šindolić “najplodniji prevodilac *beat* literature na jeziku kojim govorimo, a ne znamo kako se taj jezik zapravo zove” (cit. prema Marjanović 2013: 9), on je već otvoreno kritizirao postojeće prijevode bliskih mu autora, pokazujući gorljivu spremnost da prevoditeljskom intervencijom uvijek zaštiti njihovu autentičnost i stil, što ostaje temeljnom niti vodiljom i u svim njegovim kasnijim prijevodima. Objašnjavajući zašto se prihvatio prevođenja Charlesa Bukowskog, Šindolić se osvrće na njegovu kratku priču “Trouble with Battery” te otvoreno iznosi primjere loših prijevoda¹⁵ pokazujući kako se jednostavan stil Bukowskog

¹⁵ Šindolić, ističući nekoliko primjera stilistički promašenih prijevoda, između ostalog piše: “(...) zar se rečenica: ‘The kid really drank at the wine.’ prevodi sa: ‘Mladić je mogao vraški potegnuti. Pio je kao spužva!’” (Šindolić 1991: 180). Takvo rješenje, premda točno u značenju, odražava generičku frazeo-

sustavno pretvara u pretenciozan, lokalno žargoniziran diskurs (Šindolić 1991). Čini nam se kako Šindolić ovdje ne iznosi tek osobni dojam. Ističući vjernost izvornom tekstu u smislu očuvanja stila i govornog registra te stvarnosnog, neizmijenjenog izričaja izvornog autora, on oblikuje temelje vlastite prevoditeljske poetike. Njegova odluka ponovno prevoditi autora čiji je stil u domaćim izdanjima bio iskrivljen ujedno otkriva etičku i autorsku odgovornost koju pridaje prijevodu. Ta pozicija, već nagoviještena njegovim pjesničkim uvjerenjima, u središte stavlja prijevod kao autorski čin, dijalog i interpretaciju u kojoj prevoditelj ne ispravlja original, već ispravlja sliku koju o originalu stvara loš prijevod. Takav stav poslužiti će nam kao ključ za daljnju analizu prijevoda u kojima je Šindolić ostavio autentičan trag, poput prijevoda pjesama Charlesa Bukowskog, Allena Ginsberga i Boba Dylana.

Iz refleksija samog Šindolića, koje je zapisivao u predgovorima, bilješkama i popratnim tekstovima svojih knjiga prijevoda, jasno se ocrtava njegov odnos prema izvornom tekstu, autorima koje prevodi te jeziku na kojemu piše, ali i temeljna uvjerenja o prirodi samog prevođenja. One su dragocjene za razumijevanje njegove prevoditeljske etike, koja nalaže prije svega vrhunsku informiranost o izvornom tekstu i njegovu autoru. U opsežnim "Pojašnjenjima" prijevoda *Pisanskih Cantosa* Ezre Pounda prevoditelj tako zahvaljuje Poundovoj kćeri Mary de Rachewiltz bez čije bi pomoći "mnoga nejasna mjesta ostala nerazjašnjena (...) i zbog pojedinih riječi koje Pound često pogrešno piše, ili im daje neko novo značenje povezujući ih sa značenjem susjednih riječi ili ih jednostavno prepravlja prema zvučnosti" (Šindolić 2005: 204). Također piše: "Pound često koristi citate koji su prijevod prijevoda (pa tako s latinskog prevodi na engleski ili čak talijanski ono što je već prevedeno s grčkog)" (*ibid.*: 145). Napomene i objašnjenja prevoditelja karakteristična su za sve Šindolićeve prevode, a posebno se ističu u izborima poezije u okviru *Beatblioteke* u izdanju Hrvatskog društva pisaca. Ferlinghettijeve izabrane pjesme *Krajolici živih i mrtvih* (2015) sadrže "Napomene & objašnjenja" koje su "nastajale za vrijeme višegodišnjeg rada na prijevodu (...), uglavnom u suradnji s Lawrenceom Ferlinghettijem osobno, koji mi je prilikom naših druženja u njegovu domu u San Franciscu, povremenih susreta u Veneciji i drugdje u Italiji, ili u svojim pismima pružio prijeko potrebne informacije i brojna objašnjenja za pojedine cita-

logiju i ne prenosi atmosferu originala. Šindolićev prijevod, slikovit i ritmički snažniji, više se uklapa u sirov, no istovremeno vrlo jednostavan stil Bukowskog: "Mali je sisao vino k'o lud" (Bukowski 1991: 123). Takav prijevod odražava Šindolićevu sklonost izbjegavanju književno neutralnih izraza u korist govornog jezika urbanog, opuštenog i često ironičnog tona. Upotrebom frazema "sisao vino" i ekspresivnog dodatka "k'o lud" prijevod prenosi ne samo činjenicu da je riječ o prekomjernom konzumiranju alkohola već i stav pripovjedača i emocionalni naboj. Šindolićeva praksa ovdje je u skladu s interpretativnim pristupom prevođenju, u kojemu prevoditelj nije samo tehnički posrednik, već autor drugog teksta koji preuzima odgovornost za ritam, ton i kulturološki učinak riječi. U teorijskom smislu, takva odluka u skladu je s Venutijevim modelom "rezistentnog prijevoda" (engl. *foreignizing translation*, Pavlović 2015: 185), zbog upisivanja stranog govora u domaći jezik na način koji zadržava emocionalnu i stilsku napetost originala.

te, ličnosti i sjećanja (...)” (Šindolić 2015: 179). Na sličan način Šindolić je prevodio i zbirke ostalih *bitničkih* autora te njihovih sljedbenika. Kad god je to bilo moguće, surađivao je s izvornim autorima i sve nejasnoće otklanjao izravno s njima. Posebno je to zanimljivo kada je riječ o poslovično enigmatičnom, samozatajnom i nepristupačnom Bobu Dylanu i njegovim *Sabranim pjesmama 1961. – 2020.*, što je prvi prijevod njegovih pjesama objavljen u Hrvatskoj. Riječ je o svojevrsnom prevoditeljskom pothvatu¹⁶ na koncu kojega je Šindolić ponovno čitatelju ponudio vrlo opsežne “Napomene i objašnjenja” koja su:

nastajala tijekom višegodišnjeg rada na prijevodu sabranih pjesama, tj. *lirike*¹⁷ (kako Dylan voli zvati svoju pjevanu poeziju), najčešće u suradnji sa samim Bobom Dylanom koji mi je prilikom naših susreta ili u svojim e-porukama sustavno i neumorno pružao podršku i pomagao, dajući mi prijeko potrebne informacije i brojna objašnjenja (...), razjašnjavajući mi određene teško odgonetljive stihove ili nepoznate mi i brojne citate drugih pjesnika itd. Dylanova objašnjenja bila su mi od neprocjenjive pomoći i odigrala su značajnu ulogu jer bez njih bi ozbiljno prevođenje velikog broja nepoznanica iz njegova života, svijeta rock-glazbe, američkog žargona ili njegovih duhovitih umotvorina (katkada teško shvatljiva smisla) bilo gotovo nemoguće. (Šindolić 2025a: 701)

Pogled na prijevod Dylanovih sabranih pjesama pruža nam uvid u odliku koja prožima sve Šindolićeve prevode. To je njegova sklonost prenošenju prenesenog značenja izravno u preneseno značenje, bez oslanjanja na doslovne varijante ili fusnote. Tu sklonost Šindolić nam je još prije osobno dao naslutiti u razgovoru o prijevodima književnih naslova¹⁸ gdje je isticao važnost prenošenja duhovnog i

¹⁶ Prevođenje autora poput Pounda i Dylana s pravom se može nazvati pothvatom. Nije slučajnost da se baš ovom prilikom Šindolić osvrnuo upravo na *prevoditeljske muke* s kojima se moraju suočiti prevoditelji tih autora: “(...) evo i nekoliko natuknica o prevođenju ili, prije će biti, o mogućnostima prevođenja Dylanovih stihova. Jer, poput Ezre Pounda, i Dylan se doista može smatrati revolucionarom moderne poezije. Iznimno je teško prevoditi Dylanovu poeziju (...). Kad je posrijedi samo prevođenje, osobitu poteškoću predstavlja unutrašnji ritam svakog pojedinog stiha, katkad čak i besmislena rima koja u izvorniku djeluje iznimno zvonko i uvjerljivo (...). Uopćeno govoreći, sam čin prevođenja Dylanovih pjesama (Baš kao i *Cantosa* Ezre Pounda) pravo je mučenje, kriptografsko dešifriranje pjesnikovih misli” (Šindolić 2025b: 699).

¹⁷ Dylan ovdje zapravo pokazuje kako je svjestan uobičajenog razgraničenja koje je u engleskom jeziku jasno, za razliku od hrvatskog. Naime, riječ je o poeziji u užem smislu (engl. *poetry*), nasuprot tekstovima popularne glazbe (engl. *lyrics*), iako ovaj potonji pojam može obuhvaćati i tradicionalno poimanje poezije.

¹⁸ Još u jednoj od naših ranijih prepiski Šindolić se osvrnuo na “jednu stvar o kojoj nikad nisam želio javno pisati (da ne ispadne da kritiziram kolege) a zapravo sam trebao. (...) radi se o katastrofalno pogrešnim prijevodima NASLOVA (o tekstu i da ne govorim) dva najpoznatija *beatnička* romana: *On the Road* i *Naked Lunch*” (Šindolić 2011b). Šindolić naslove *Na cesti* i *Goli ručak* naziva “čistom besmislicom” te nastavlja: “jedini mogući ispravan prijevod može biti *Goli obrok*, jer nema veze niti s ručkom, niti s doručkom, niti s večerom, nego samo s potrebom obroka fiksiranja. Isto tako, prijevod *Na cesti* je doslovan. Kako se ne radi samo o cesti kojom protagonisti putuju, već mnogo više o DUHOVNOM PUTOVANJU, jedini mogući prijevod jest *Na putu*” (*ibid.*).

kulturološkog značenja nad doslovnim. U nastavku ćemo se na tu praksu osvrnuti analizom prijevoda Dylanove pjesme “Wallflower”, u kojoj se ta načelna pozicija vrlo konkretno potvrđuje na razini stila i značenja. U toj pjesmi idiomatski izraz iz naslova nije razložen ni preveden doslovno, već je transponiran u kulturno i semantički ekvivalentnu sliku unutar hrvatskog jezika: “Djevojka bez plesača”. Tako se Šindolić odlučuje za izraz koji u hrvatskom jeziku i kontekstu prenosi značenje u potpunosti sukladno značenju u originalu. To je povučena djevojka koja na plesnjaku stoji uza zid i čeka da je netko pozove na ples te postaje metaforom osamljenosti, stidljivosti, ali i potencijalnog susreta. Takvo rješenje podupire Šindolićev stav, koji je više puta iznio i u osobnoj komunikaciji,¹⁹ da je prevoditeljeva dužnost prenijeti funkciju izraza, a ne nužno njegovu formu.

Na navedenom primjeru moguće je razmotriti kako takva praksa funkcionira u konkretnom tekstu te na koji način prevoditelj interpretira i prenosi emocionalnu strukturu pjesme. U samom tekstu te jednostavne *country*-minijature iz 1971, temeljene na glazbenoj tradiciji *honky-tonk* balade, nakon što je naslovom prenio osnovni kontekstualni smisao i emocionalnu poziciju subjekta pjesme, Šindolić, iako je žrtvovao ritam, čuva formu i melodičnost originala te nastoji prenijeti suštinu. Gubitak simboličkog izraza *wallflower* nadoknađen je preciznim opisom situacije: “Djevojko bez plesača, djevojko bez plesača / Zar nećeš plesati sa mnom? / I ja sam tužan i jednako osamljen”²⁰ (Dylan 2025: 280). U stihovima: “Take a chance on me / Please let me ride you home” (Dylan 2016: 272) Šindolić se odlučuje za: “Pruži mi priliku / I dopusti mi da te otpratim kući” (Dylan 2025: 280), što je prijevod kojim umanjuje mogućnost dvosmislenosti originalnog izraza *ride you home*, koji u engleskom kolokvijalnom govoru može imati i seksualnu konotaciju. Njegov je prijevod stoga dobar primjer interpretativnog izbora kojim čuva emocionalni ton pjesme i središnju blagu, melankoličnu gestu poziva. Šindolićev prijevod pjesme “Wallflower” nije tek prijenos značenja, već autorska intervencija koja potvrđuje ključne teze razrađene u prethodnim poglavljima rada.

Šindolićeva odluka da engleski idiom *wallflower* prevede kao *djevojka bez plesača* primjer je svjesne izravne interpretacije prenesenog značenja, bez pribjegavanja doslovnosti, bilješkama ili metatekstualnim objašnjenjima. U tome se očituje prijevod na tragu Umberta Eca koji inzistira na interpretativnoj vjernosti, a ne na formalnoj podudarnosti. Šindolićeva odluka zadržati emocionalni ton pjesme, istovremeno je uklapajući u kontekst hrvatskog jezika i kulturnih izraza, podsjeća i na Bermanov zahtjev da prijevod afirmira *iskustvo stranoga* umjesto da ga prilagodbama prikriva. Ovdje prevoditelj traži način stranost izraziti domaćim jezikom, čime se nadovezuje na prije spomenute Bermanove ideje. U tom smislu,

¹⁹ Posljednji put u lipnju 2025. tijekom sudjelovanja na festivalu Stih u regiji.

²⁰ Engl. “Wallflower, wallflower / Won’t you dance with me? / I’m sad and lonely too” (Dylan 2016: 272).

Šindolićev prijevod pokazuje i otpor normativnim očekivanjima, što se pak može dovesti u vezu s Venutijevim konceptom *prevođenja s otporom*. On ne neutralizira idiom, već ga rekontekstualizira, dopuštajući ciljnom jeziku primiti strano pod vlastitim uvjetima. *Djevojka bez plesača* nije doslovan pandan, već izraz koji čuva poziciju marginalnosti i emocionalnu nijansu izvornika, no u potpunosti funkcionira u jeziku ciljne kulture. Na kraju, takva prevoditeljska gesta odražava i Benjaminovu ideju o prijevodu kao nastavku života izvornika u drugom jeziku, gdje smisao nije zatvoren, već otvoren novom tumačenju i izrazu. Prijevod se ovdje potvrđuje kao prostor susreta, a ne podudarnosti. Može se reći i kako Šindolić zapravo ne prevodi, već, u estetskom i interpretativnom smislu, piše iznova, u duhu izvornika.

Među svojima. Pisma i posvete

Dosadašnjim osvrtom istaknuta je Šindolićeva spremnost na autorsku intervenciju kako bi se prenijelo ono bitno, pri čemu on postaje Venutijev *vidljivi prevoditelj*, onaj koji preuzima odgovornost kao supotpisnik teksta. Takva pozicija zahtijeva čvrst autoritet i veliko samopouzdanje, što su osobine koje je Šindolić kao prevoditelj stekao ustrajnim dugogodišnjim prevoditeljskim radom koji je, važno je istaknuti, bio dvosmjernan te samim time i transparentan, i prema čitateljima i prema autorima izvornih tekstova. Stoga taj autoritet izvire iz uzajamnog odnosa s autorima, što se očituje u posvetama, pismima i rukopisima koje su Šindoliću upućivali pjesnici *beat*-generacije. Ti dokumenti, osim što nude biografski kontekst, otkrivaju razinu povjerenja, poštovanja i suradništva koje su autori gajili prema Šindoliću kao prevoditelju i kulturnom posredniku. U tom smislu, materijali koje ćemo predstaviti u ovom završnom poglavlju čine jedinstven paratekstualni korpus koji omogućuje dublje razumijevanje Šindolićeve uloge. Ti materijali, koji obuhvaćaju formalne izraze zahvale, neformalna razmišljanja o poeziji, jeziku i samom činu prevođenja, zajedno s posvećenim pjesmama i neobjavljenim prijevodima, koje je Šindolić priređivao ponekad i bez nužnog očekivanja objave, potvrđuju Šindolića kao aktivnog sudionika u dijalogu s autorima čija je djela prenosio. Osvrnut ćemo se ovdje upravo na te, često rubne, ali izrazito znakovite tragove²¹. To su pisma i posvete u raznim izdanjima knjiga, pjesme koje su mu bile posvećene, rukopisi koji su mu povjeravani prije objave, kao i bilješke koje svjedoče o međusobnom uvažavanju i intelektualnom savezništvu.

²¹ Ovakvi tragovi odgovaraju onomu što Gérard Genette naziva nedefiniranim zonama u smislu rubnih, ali značenjski važnih slojeva teksta koje čine primjerice posvete i bilješke, te su u "službi boljeg prihvaćanja teksta i njegova smislenijeg čitanja" (Genette 1997: 2), a u našem slučaju utječu na autoritet prevoditelja u kulturnom lancu posredovanja.

Posebno korespondencija s Allenom Ginsbergom odražava Šindolićevu potrebu prilikom prevođenja razumjeti i širi kontekst poput kulturnih referenci, i to ne samo kad je riječ o Ginsbergovim tekstovima već i kada prevodi autore poput Kerouaca, kojega nije imao priliku upoznati, ali i Burroughsa, čije književne metode i jezik sadrže obilje antropoloških, psiholoških i sociolingvističkih elemenata. Ta pisma istovremeno su konkretna ilustracija dijaloga između autora i prevoditelja, koji više nisu u hijerarhijskom odnosu, nego u ravnopravnom, suradničkom. U središtu pisma iz svibnja 1987. tako je fraza iz Kerouacova romana *Podzemnici* (*The Subterraneans*, 1958) “when the chips are down”, koju Ginsberg Šindoliću razjašnjava kao idiom preuzet iz jezika kocke, s konotacijama odlučujućeg trenutka ili konačne prosudbe. Ginsberg, svjestan da preneseno značenje može biti neprenosivo ako se doslovno prevede, ne samo da daje objašnjenje već i ilustrira primjenu fraze u ozbiljnom geopolitičkom kontekstu: “When the chips are down, everybody will be afraid to push the H-bomb button” (Ginsberg 1987, pismo Voji Šindoliću). Time pokazuje da se od prevoditelja očekuje sposobnost prepoznati dublje značenje i prenijeti ga u ciljnom jeziku tako da zadrži temeljnu misao. U drugom dijelu pisma Ginsberg objašnjava značenje izraza “LATAH”, pozivajući se na Burroughsa koji ga je upotrebljavao u kontekstu automatiziranog, refleksnog ponašanja izazvanog podražajima izvana, gotovo kao simptom kulturne sugestibilnosti (*ibid.*). Ovdje prepoznamo ono što Antoine Berman naziva *iskušenjem stranoga*, trenutak kada prevoditelj mora odlučiti hoće li idiom pripitomiti ciljnom jeziku ili će, svjestan njegovih kulturnih slojeva, pokušati očuvati njegovu stranost u novom jezičnom kontekstu. Šindolić se pritom koristi svime što mu je na raspolaganju kako bi pronašao način očuvati tu stranost. U pismu iz 1992, u kojemu se Ginsberg osvrće na vlastite književne aktivnosti, piše o završavanju rukopisa, predgovorima, uređivanju zbirki, o svojim planiranim putovanjima u Italiju, Rusiju, Francusku, Indiju i na Bali, ali i o situaciji u bivšoj Jugoslaviji i na Kosovu (Ginsberg 1992), vidljivo je već kako Šindoliću piše kao dugogodišnjem kolegi i suradniku, potvrđujući time njegovu važnost u američkom književnom kontekstu ne samo kao prevoditelja već i kao osobe uključene u međunarodnu kulturnu razmjenu.

No osobito Ginsbergove posvete Šindoliću, koje mu je ostavljao u brojnim izdanjima svojih knjiga, pružaju autentičnu potvrdu autorskog povjerenja i vrijedan uvid u način na koji su sami autori *beat*-generacije percipirali i valorizirali Šindolićev prevoditeljski rad. Posveta u knjizi *Reality Sandwiches* (1963): “for Vojo Šindolić in hope that his translations observe the delicacy of humor of arrangements of words or wobbles in natural C[ity] slang + speech order” (Ginsberg 1980, posveta Voji Šindoliću) osim što se odnosi na prijevode i njihovu stilsku zahtjevnost, izravna je referenca na temeljna načela *bitničke* poezije i eksplicitna potvrda prevoditeljske slobode. Ginsberg izražava nadu, ali i povjerenje, da će Šindolićevi prijevodi zadržati ključna obilježja izvornog teksta. No njegove prevoditeljske kompetencije uvijek su, važno je naglasiti, bile i ostale

nezavisne. Potvrdu nalazimo u nedatiranoj posveti iz knjige *Poems All Over the Place* (1978), koja jasno ukazuje na to da je Šindolić samoinicijativno prevodio Ginsberga i prije nego što su se upoznali: “with thanks for his initiative and cheerfulness in translating my texts on his own before we met – much gratitude!” (Ginsberg, b. d., posveta Voji Šindoliću). Ako ih promatramo kroz prizmu *paratekstualnih elemenata*²² Gérarda Genettea (Genette 1997), pisma i posvete poput tih zaokružuju izvorno djelo i doprinose njegovu tumačenju, djeluju kao autorski komentari koji eksplicitno uključuju Šindolića u kreativni proces te nisu samo izrazi zahvalnosti, već i priznanje njegove autorske prisutnosti u jeziku prijevoda. Stoga Ginsbergova pisma i posvete Šindoliću vidimo kao značajan paratekstualni prostor u kojem se prevoditelj afirmirao i postao sastavni dio pjesničke komunikacije. Konačno, i ovdje Šindolićev rad možemo promatrati i kroz prizmu Lawrencea Venutija koji inzistira na vidljivosti prevoditelja. Ovdje je ona ne samo priznata nego i simbolički potvrđena pjesničkim posvetama koje djeluju poput supotpisa na zajedničkom pjesničkom ostvarenju.

Govoreći o rukopisnim posvetama i bilješkama u različitim izdanjima, mogli smo vidjeti kako su one funkcionirale kao intimni paratekstualni tragovi autorova priznanja i povjerenja prema Šindoliću. No u njegovu slučaju granica između posvete i samostalnog književnog teksta dodatno se briše u trenucima kada *bitnički* pjesnici ciljano pišu pjesme posvećene upravo njemu. Riječ je o jedinstvenim primjerima u kojima Šindolić ne djeluje samo kao primatelj posvete, već i kao prevoditelj koji te tekstove prenosi u hrvatski jezični i kulturni prostor. Osvrnut ćemo se na kraju ovog poglavlja na dvije takve pjesme koje, kasnijim uvrštenjem u Šindolićeve zbirke pjesama, predstavljaju dvostruku gestu, pjesničku i prevoditeljsku, koja svjedoči o njegovoj poziciji unutar međunarodnog pjesničkog dijaloga. To su “Cityscape (for Vojo)” Michaela McClurea i “And the Sun... (for Vojo)” Lawrencea Ferlinghettija.

Pjesma “Cityscape” iz siječnja 1982, s posvetom Voji Šindoliću, ne samo da svjedoči o njihovu prijateljstvu već utjelovljuje i simbolički čin predaje teksta u ruke prevoditelju. U pratećoj bilješci²³ McClure objašnjava značenje dvaju ključnih pojmova, čime istovremeno potvrđuje važnost prevoditelja kao tumača, ali i kao tvorca novog teksta. McClure u komentaru objašnjava riječ *Cityscape* i pojam *Tinkertoys*, što je izravna autorska intervencija u pomoć prevođenju, u čemu vidimo svojevrсни mikroprevoditeljski paratekst. Slanjem “dovršene pjesme” (McClure 1982, rukopis) i osobne poruke pjesnik kao da simbolično predaje djelo

²² Posvete, prema Genetteovoj podjeli u odnosu na mjesto gdje se nalaze, svrstavamo u peritekst jer se nalaze *unutar* knjige (Genette 1997: 4), a pisma kao “udaljen element u obliku privatne korespondencije smješten izvan knjige” (*ibid.*: 5) smatramo epiteksom.

²³ “I think the poem is complete now, so I send it to you. Cityscape is an invented word – like landscape but city. Tinkertoys are children’s construction toys – dowels and cylinders from which mechanical constructions are made. All the very best, Michael” (McClure 1982, rukopis).

u ruke prevoditelju. To je upravo odličan primjer naše teze o prijevodu kao susretu autora.

U prijevodu koji je Šindolić uvrstio u svoju zbirku pjesama *Neuspjeli bjegunac* osobita pažnja posvećena je prijenosu ritma i značenjske gustoće izvornika, pri čemu se prevoditelj koristi resursima hrvatskog jezika kako bi sačuvao dinamiku McClureova glasa. Već u uvodnoj izjavi “MI SMO PRIMATI KOJI MOGU VIDJETI KROZ ZIDOVE!”²⁴ (McClure 2013: 219) Šindolić jasno prenosi snažan identitetski i egzistencijalni ton originala, uz zadržavanje velikih slova i ritmičke fragmentacije rečenice. Tipografski raspored, stanke i naglaske prevoditelj dosljedno prenosi kroz cijelu pjesmu, nastojeći pritom zadržati energiju izvornika. Osobito je zanimljiv prijevod izraza “not just these Tinkertoys!” (McClure 1982, rukopis), koji u izvorniku nosi pejorativnu konotaciju redukcije ljudske kompleksnosti na mehaničke konstrukcije. Šindolić ga prevodi kao: “ne samo mehaničke igračke!” (McClure 2013: 219), pri čemu sažima objašnjenje koje mu je McClure dao u bilješci, no zadržava metaforičku funkciju izraza. Time se ponovno pokazuje kako prevoditelj nije sklon posegnuti za fusnotama ili dodatnim objašnjenjima, već autorovu namjeru integrira u sam tekst. U cjelini, prijevod pjesme “Cityscape” pokazuje visoku razinu osjetljivosti na ritam, semantiku i kontekst izvornika. McClureova gesta darivanja pjesme Šindoliću i prateće bilješke čine ono što Gérard Genette naziva “distanciranim epiteksom” (Genette 1997: 5), a što je ulaskom u zbirku pjesama hrvatskog autora preoblikovano u peritekst nove knjige. Time se stvara hibridna forma pjesme koja pripada i McClureu i Šindoliću, anglofonij i hrvatskoj kulturi, autoru i prevoditelju. Riječ je o *dvostrukoj autorskoj gesti* koju prepoznajemo kao osobitost Šindolićeva prevoditeljskog rada.

Osim pjesme “Cityscape” još jednu intimnu posvetu predstavlja “And the Sun...” koju je Šindoliću u svibnju 2001. osobno posvetio Lawrence Ferlinghetti, i to rukom pisanu. Ta pjesma, neobjavljena u engleskom izvorniku, poslije također uključena u Šindolićevu zbirku *Neuspjeli bjegunac*, zaokružuje osobni i pjesnički krug komunikacije između pjesnika i prevoditelja. Čini nam se stoga prikladnim, zatvarajući ovo poglavlje koje je donijelo uvid u pisma i posvete u prijevodnom kontekstu, osvrnuti se na pjesmu koja već svojim oblikom i namjenom može poslužiti kao završna poruka autora i prevoditelja. Njezino uvrštavanje u vlastitu zbirku, kao i u prijašnjem slučaju, nije više tek prijateljska gesta, nego i čin kulturne medijacije koji potvrđuje Šindolića kao ključnu osobu recepcije *bitničke* književnosti u Hrvatskoj. On još jednom seli tekst iz prostora privatnog epiteksta u objavljen književni peritekst, dok prijevod postaje ključna postavka recepcije. Ta pjesma, višeznačna unatoč svojoj sažetosti, nudi ujedno i krajnje sažet test prevoditeljske osjetljivosti.

²⁴ Engl. “WE ARE THE PRIMATE WHO CAN SEE THROUGH WALLS!” (McClure 1982, rukopis).

U pjesmi “And the Sun...” sumrak postaje prostor ispovijedi, ali i vrlo blage ironije. Sunce “ni danas nije uspjelo / spaliti ovaj svijet”²⁵ (Ferlinghetti 2013: 217). U tom slikovitom odustajanju očituje se autorova nemoć pred trajnošću ljubavi, a Šindolićev prijevod: “I sunce na zalasku / jadikuje”²⁶ (*ibid.*: 217) uspijeva zadržati ton jadikovke i ritam pjesme. U izrazu “vatrostalna oprema” (*ibid.*: 217), koji odgovara engleskom “fireproofing”, osjeća se i trag prevoditeljske kreativnosti. To je ona sloboda koja, prema Umberto Ecu, ipak ne narušava vjernost, nego je redefinira. Šindolić se uklapa u ritam, zadržava igru riječi te pruža čitatelju iskustvo koje je *otprilike isto* kao ono u izvornom tekstu, opet na tragu onoga što Berman vidi kao čin prevođenja koji ne izbjegava stranost, već joj dopušta da se izrazi u jeziku domaćina. Time ta pjesma i njezin prijevod pružaju dobar primjer osjetljive ravnoteže između vjernosti i slobode, što je otprilike i ravnoteža koju Šindolić gradi kao temelj vlastite prevoditeljske poetike u kojoj se značenje prenosi ne objašnjenjima, nego usvajanjem osjećaja, stila i glasa, uvijek vodeći računa o prirodnosti izraza u hrvatskom jeziku.

Zaključak

Ovim radom nastojali smo sagledati prevoditeljsku poetiku Voje Šindolića kroz prizmu suvremenih teorija prevođenja, s naglaskom na specifičnostima pjesničkog prijevoda. Polazište istraživanja bilo je pitanje kako se u njegovim prijevodima prelamaju autorski i prevoditeljski glasovi te na koji način prijevod funkcionira kao prostor dijaloga, interpretacije i kulturnog posredovanja. Analizom odabranih primjera pokazali smo da Šindolićev prijevodni opus, premda proizišao iz duboke ukorijenjenosti u *bitničku* poetiku i vlastito pjesništvo, otvara šire pitanje odnosa između pjesnika i prevoditelja u književnom polju.

Teorijski okvir rada, utemeljen u razlikovanju normativnih i deskriptivnih modela, dopunili smo uvidima Benjamina, Bermana, Venutija i Eca koji prijevod promatraju kao interpretativni čin. Upravo Šindolićevim odlukama potvrđuje se Bermanovo *iskušenje stranoga*, trenutak u kojem prevoditelj mora odlučiti hoće li idiom pripitomiti ili očuvati njegovu stranost. Njegova praksa potvrđuje i Venutijev zahtjev za vidljivošću prevoditelja, osobito kroz posvete i pjesme namijenjene njemu osobno, u kojima se pojavljuje kao supotpisnik i svojevrсни sugovornik autora. U Šindolićevim prijevodima očituje se i Benjaminova ideja da prijevod produžuje život teksta u drugom jeziku, kao i Ecova misao o prevođenju kao nastojanju da se *otprilike isto* ostvari traženjem funkcionalne, a ne formalne podudarnosti.

²⁵ Engl. “Again I have not succeeded / in burning down the world” (Ferlinghetti 2001, rukopis).

²⁶ Engl. “And the sun at sunset / crying out” (Ferlinghetti 2001, rukopis).

Primjeri korespondencije i prijevoda Bukowskog, Ginsberga, Pounda, Dylana, McClurea i Ferlinghettija pokazali su kako Šindolić nije bio tek prenositelj značenja, nego i interpret, kulturni posrednik i pjesnik koji u prijevodu prepoznaje vlastiti stvaralački izazov. Njegov rad potvrđuje da se prijevod može shvatiti kao autorski susret, kao prostor u kojemu tekst ne samo mijenja jezik nego i poprima novo značenje i novu književnu sudbinu. U tom smislu, Šindolićeva prevoditeljska praksa istodobno je doista nastavak i proširenje njegova pjesničkog djela. Ferlinghettijeva pjesma "And the Sun...", posvećena upravo Šindoliću i prevedena njegovim *glasom*, možda je najbolji simbol toga dijaloga. Prevoditelj i pjesnik susreću se u tekstu, a prijevod se potvrđuje kao čin istančanosti, povjerenja i stvaralačke vjernosti.

LITERATURA

- Bassnett, Susan. 2002. *Translation Studies. Third edition*. London – New York: Routledge.
- Bassnett, Susan i André Lefevere. 1992. General editors' preface. U: *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*: vii–viii. Ur. André Lefevere. London – New York: Routledge.
- Benjamin, Walter. 2002. The Task of the Translator. U: *Selected writings*: 253–263. Ur. Marcus Bullock i Michael W. Jennings. Cambridge – London: Harvard University Press.
- Berman, Antoine. 1992. *The Experience of the Foreign*. Albany: State University of New York.
- Berman, Antoine. 2000. Translation and the Trials of the Foreign. U: *The Translation Studies Reader*: 284–297. Ur. Lawrence Venuti. London – New York: Routledge.
- Bukowski, Charles. 1991. *Ispovijesti čovjeka*. Zemun: Arion.
- Bukowski, Charles. 2022. *Sretan slučaj*. Zagreb: Bodoni.
- Dylan, Bob. 2016. *The Lyrics 1961-2020*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Dylan, Bob. 2025. *Sabrane pjesme 1961. – 2020*. Zagreb: Bodoni.
- Dragojević, Danijel. 2025. O poeziji Voja Šindolića. U: *Ožiljno tkivo*: 64. Aut. Vojo Šindolić. Dubrovnik: Društvo dubrovačkih pisaca.
- Đurđević, Miloš. 2024. Takozvana demokracija počela je jesti samu sebe. *Novosti* 1283: 32–34.
- Eco, Umberto. 2006. *Otprilike isto. Iskustva prevođenja*. Zagreb: Algoritam.
- Ferlinghetti, Lawrence. 2001. And the Sun. Rukopis. Privatna arhiva Voje Šindolića.
- Ferlinghetti, Lawrence. 2013. I Sunce... U: *Neuspjeli bjegunac*: 217. Aut. Vojo Šindolić. Beograd: Levo krilo.
- Genette, Gérard. 1997. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Ur. Richard Macksey i Michael Sprinker. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ginsberg, Allen. 1980. Posveta Voji Šindoliću. U: *Reality Sandwiches*. Rukopis. Privatna arhiva Voje Šindolića.
- Ginsberg, Allen. 1987. Pismo Voji Šindoliću. Rukopis. Privatna arhiva Voje Šindolića.
- Ginsberg, Allen. 1992. Pismo Voji Šindoliću. Rukopis. Privatna arhiva Voje Šindolića.
- Ginsberg, Allen. Bez datuma. Posveta Voji Šindoliću. U: *Poems All Over the Place, Mostly 'Seventies*. Rukopis. Privatna arhiva Voje Šindolića.
- Lefevere, André. 1992. *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London – New York: Routledge.

- Lucić, Predrag. 2025. O poeziji Voja Šindolića. U: *Ožiljno tkivo*: 65–67. Aut. Vojo Šindolić. Dubrovnik: Društvo dubrovačkih pisaca.
- Marjanović, Bojan. 2013. Mozaik jedne karijere. U: *Neuspjeli bjegunac*: 9–18. Aut. Vojo Šindolić. Beograd: Levo krilo.
- McClure, Michael. 2013. Gradski krajolik. U: *Neuspjeli bjegunac*: 219. Aut. Vojo Šindolić. Beograd: Levo krilo.
- McClure, Michael. Bez datuma. Cityscape. Rukopis. Privatna arhiva Voje Šindolića.
- Morgan, Bill (ur.). 2009. *The Selected Letters of Allen Ginsberg and Gary Snyder*. Berkeley: Counterpoint.
- Newmark, Peter. 1982. *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Nida, Eugene. 1964. *Toward a Science of Translating: With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Pavlović, Nataša. 2015. *Uvod u teorije prevodenja*. Zagreb: Leykam international.
- Šindolić, Vojo. 1991. Napomene i objašnjenja. U: *Ispovijesti čovjeka*: 179–181. Aut. Charles Bukowski. Zemun: Arion.
- Šindolić, Vojo. 2005. Pojašnjenja. U: *Pisanski Cantosi*: 145–205. Aut. Ezra Pound. Zagreb: Litteris.
- Šindolić, Vojo. 2011a. *Ulica koja će se zvati tvojim imenom. U spomen na Milana Milišića*. Dubrovnik: Društvo dubrovačkih pisaca.
- Šindolić, Vojo. 2011b. Još od Voje. E-mail poruka autoru, 13. rujna 2011. Neobjavljeno.
- Šindolić, Vojo. 2012. *Lakih nogu naokolo. Pjesme iz Dubrovnika & o Dubrovniku*. Dubrovnik: Društvo dubrovačkih pisaca.
- Šindolić, Vojo. 2013. *Neuspjeli bjegunac*. Beograd: Levo krilo.
- Šindolić, Vojo. 2015. Napomene & pojašnjenja. U: *Krajolici živih i mrtvih*: 179–187. Aut. Lawrence Ferlinghetti. Zagreb: Hrvatsko društvo pisaca.
- Šindolić, Vojo. 2019. *poSvete*. Dubrovnik: Društvo dubrovačkih pisaca.
- Šindolić, Vojo. 2025a. Napomene i objašnjenja. U: *Sabrane pjesme 1961. – 2020.*: 701–741. Aut. Bob Dylan. Zagreb: Bodoni.
- Šindolić, Vojo. 2025b. Riječ prevoditelja. U: *Sabrane pjesme 1961. – 2020.*: 699. Aut. Bob Dylan. Zagreb: Bodoni.
- Špirk, Jaroslav. 2009. Anton Popović's Contribution to Translation Studies. *Target* 21, 1: 3–29.
- Toury, Gideon. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 2008. *The Translator's Invisibility. A history of translation*. London – New York: Routledge.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 2000. *The Translation Studies Reader*. London – New York: Routledge.
- Vresnik, Viktor. 2025. Ekscentrik iz Dubrovnika. *Jutarnji list*. <https://www.jutarnji.hr/kultura/knjizevnost/ekscentrik-iz-dubrovnika-cija-biografija-nalikuje-dylanovim-stihovima-preveo-je-njegov-sav-opus-no-je-li-dobro-preveo-blowing-in-the-wind-15589537>. Pristupljeno 14. kolovoza 2025.

SUMMARY

THE TRANSLATIONAL POETICS AND PRACTICE OF VOJO ŠINDOLIĆ

The focus of this paper is the analysis of the translation poetics of Dubrovnik-born poet and translator Vojo Šindolić, whose oeuvre of more than seventy volumes of translations of contemporary American, Japanese, and Chinese literature is among the most extensive in Croatian culture. Despite this, his work as a translator has not yet been systematically examined within the framework of translation theory. The basis of this research is the question of how translation, poetic translation particularly, functions as a space of dialogue between author and translator, and how the poetic and translational voices intertwine in Šindolić's work. The theoretical section of the paper considers normative and descriptive models of translation (Nida, Newmark, Toury, Lefevere, Popović), followed by approaches that define translation as an interpretative act (Benjamin, Berman, Venuti, Eco). The analysis has shown that Šindolić's work is best understood within the latter, interpretative framework. This involves understanding translation as an encounter with the author and an act of cultural mediation. His translational choices, from his critique of existing translations of Bukowski, through extensive annotations to Pound and Ferlinghetti, to the transposed meanings in Dylan's lyrics, testify to an ethical and aesthetic responsibility that goes beyond literalness. Special attention is given to dedications and letters by the Beat authors to Šindolić, which can be read as paratextual traces of his visibility and recognition in the international literary context. Ultimately, Šindolić's translational oeuvre represents an authentic creative contribution. His translations reveal a refined sense for rhythm, language, and cultural context, in line with Berman's trial of the foreign and Eco's concept of saying almost the same thing. The dedications and manuscripts of the Beat authors, as well as poems dedicated specifically to Šindolić, attest to his status as cultural mediator and interlocutor.

Keywords: Beat Generation/beat-culture, poetry translation, Vojo Šindolić, translation poetics, cultural mediation

Od književnosti do filma: dodirne točke između književnog i filmskog stvaralaštva u esejima Piera Paola Pasolinija

Pasolini je tijekom svog života pisao o raznim temama, a njegov opus proteže se od pjesama, pripovijetki, romana, teorijskih tekstova, eseja, kritika i scenarija pa sve do filmova.¹ Njegovi pokušaji stvaranja semiotike filma počinju 1965. godine i traju deset godina, sve do njegove smrti, i rezultat su dugogodišnjeg pisanja i promišljanja o književnosti i drugim umjetničkim formama. Pasolinijevi odabrani tekstovi o književnosti i filmu okupljeni su u najvažnijoj zbirci njegovih teorijskih eseja *Empirismo eretico* (*Heretički empirizam* [1972] 2000). Počeci Pasolinijeva filmskog stvaralaštva tematski se nadovezuju na njegov književni opus iz 50-ih godina, što je vidljivo iz usporedbe njegovih prvih dvaju filmova, *Accattone* (1961) i *Mamma Roma* (1962), s romanima *Ragazzi di vita* (*Uličari*, 1955) i *Una vita violenta* (*Žestok život*, 1959), koji se bave ljudima s društvene margine. Teme kojima se Pasolini bavio u romanima preslikane su na navedena dva filma odabirom likova, priče i lokacije snimanja. Usto su i romani i filmovi prožeti istom marksističkom filozofijom, doduše, u filmovima ne toliko eksplicitno kao u romanima, premda je u svim Pasolinijevim djelima vidljiva opreka između lumpenproletarijata i vrijednosti buržoazije koju je i sam autor prezirao. I Pasolini je povukao paralele između navedena dva filma i romana tvrdeći da je film *Accattone*, s marksističkog stajališta, korak unatrag u odnosu na roman *Una vita violenta* i da je ideološki bliži romanu *Ragazzi di vita*. Lik *Mamma Roma* puno više sliči

¹ Kao kritičar surađivao je s književnim časopisima *Fiera letteraria* i *Nuovi argomenti* (koji je od 1966. uređivao zajedno s Albertom Moravijom), a od 1948. do 1958. pisao je književnoteorijske tekstove i kritike, koje je najčešće objavljivao kao eseje u časopisu *Officina*. Godine 1960. objavio je odabrane eseje u knjizi *Passione e ideologia* (*Strast i ideologija*). Od 1965. počinje pisati za filmološke časopise *Filmcritica*, *Bianco e nero*, *Cinema nuovo* i *Cinema e film*, a naročito je bio aktivan u organizaciji seminara i javnih predavanja o semiotici filma u sklopu filmskog festivala u Pesaru (Mostra Internazionale del Nuovo Cinema). Osim za književne i filmološke časopise pisao je i za dnevne novine (*Tempo*, *Il corriere della sera*), naročito tijekom politički turbulentnih 70-ih godina, a u svojim se kolumnama osvrtao na tadašnje političke i društvene promjene i fenomene u Italiji.

Tommasinu, glavnom liku romana *Una vita violenta*, nego Accattoneu, jer u tom filmu postoji etička problematika koja se postupno razvija (cit. prema Magrelli 1977: 28–44). Oba filma mogu se shvatiti kao kritika i osuda suvremenog talijanskog društva te kao stvaranje mita o lumpenproletarijatu kao jedinom obliku otpora modernom industrijaliziranom društvu i neokapitalizmu. U svojim prvim filmovima Pasolini ne progovara toliko očito o problemima proletarijata kroz prizmu klasne borbe, već, naprotiv, teži mitologizaciji i sakralizaciji lumpenproletarijata. Za razliku od romana, prvi su filmovi manje politički angažirani, što se vidi i u poetskom udaljavanju od neorealizma. Kao i u romanima, Pasolini se i u filmovima kritički odnosi prema lošim uvjetima života lumpenproletarijata, ali s druge strane taj lumpenproletarijat uzdiže na razinu svetog jer se suprotstavlja vrijednostima buržoaske klase.

Projekt “narodne” umjetnosti u književnosti i filmu

Utjecaj književnosti na Pasolinijevo filmsko stvaralaštvo vidljiv je ne samo u tematskoj povezanosti romana i prvih filmova već i u esejima o filmu kroz koje se provlače dvije osnovne ideje: pitanje filmskog stila i jezika te razlike između filma i književnosti. Odnos između umjetnosti i društva te uloga intelektualca u društvu također je jedno od ključnih pitanja u Pasolinijevim esejima i člancima o književnosti i filmu. Počeci Pasolinijeve redateljske karijere nastavak su većeg kulturno-ideološkog projekta inspiriranog Gramscijevim konceptom nacionalne-narodne umjetnosti razumljive širokim masama, odnosno Pasolini se izravno nadovezuje na Gramscijevo poimanje književnosti i njezine funkcije u društvu te borbe za novu kulturu. Pasolini je od Gramscija preuzeo ideju da nova kultura rađa novu vrstu umjetnosti, što uvjetuje stvaranje novih društveno-ekonomskih obrazaca. Za Gramscija² pisac nije privilegirano biće odvojeno od povijesti i kulture, već je, kao i svi drugi, određen društvenim, ekonomskim i kulturnim kontekstom koji se neizbježno reflektira u njegovim djelima. U skladu s time Gramsci smatra da je zadaća književnih kritičara ne da kritiziraju umjetničko djelo, nego da otkrivaju njegovu “skrivenu ideologiju”, tj. političke i povijesne tendencije koje se odnose na pisca i na čitatelje (usp. Gramsci [1950] 1977: 25–26). U tom se svjetlu književna kritika percipira kao ključna u kulturnom i umjetničkom osvještavanju naroda. Međutim, Pasolini se djelomično odmiče od Gramscijeva poimanja književnosti kao političkog čina i od njegove ideje da je glavni cilj pisca prikaz društvenih odnosa.

² Razvoj Gramscijeve filozofske misli treba promatrati u dijalogu s filozofijom Benedetto Crocea, čiji je opus također utjecao na Pasolinijevo promišljanje filma. U jednom od svojih pisama Gramsci priznaje da je zajedno s intelektualcima tog vremena sudjelovao u “moralnoj i intelektualnoj reformi koju je u Italiji pokrenuo Benedetto Croce, čija je prva postavka bila da moderan čovjek može i mora živjeti bez otkrivene mitološke ili bilo koje druge religije” (1968: 466).

Gramscijeva društveno-povijesna analiza pisaca i književnih pravaca inspirirat će Pasolinija za njegove kritičke osvrte na prethodne književne pravce (naročito na neorealizam), koje je objavljivao u časopisu *Officina*, a u konačnici će ga navesti da postavi temeljno egzistencijalno i ideološko pitanje koji su stil i jezik najprikladniji za suvremenog, društveno angažiranog redatelja, kakvim se i sam smatrao, koji je primoran odbaciti obrasce prethodnih književnih pravaca.

Pasolini je odbacivao neorealizam jer je smatrao da su neorealistička djela napisana jezikom iza kojeg stoji “buržoaska ideologija” (usp. Pasolini 1960: 326–225; 482–484). Za razliku od zagovornika realizma, Pasolini se zalagao za nove kritičke i ideološke pristupe. Velik dio njegova esejističkog opusa iz 50-ih godina bavi se upravo odnosom između stila i ideologije, a s vremenom će se i sam distancirati od marksističke doktrine i približiti se egzistencijalizmu. Za Pasolinija pitanje realizma postaje pitanje jezika već u fazi književnog stvaralaštva, a pitanje jezika ujedno je i pitanje ideologije. Jezik za Pasolinija nije samo sredstvo komunikacije, već kompleksno sredstvo ideološke klasne borbe. Pasolinijev odmak od marksističkog poimanja književnosti i umjetnosti u društvu vidi se u njegovu kritičkom odnosu spram nacionalno-narodnoga jezika za koji se zalagao Gramsci. Pasolini ne slijedi slijepo marksističku doktrinu, već naglašava kontradiktornost u marksističkoj borbi s buržujskom ideologijom u kojoj se marksisti, s jedne strane iz komfora, a s druge iz nužnosti, koriste protivnikovim oružjem: instrumentalno i literarno elaboriranim jezikom buržoazije u posljednjih nekoliko desetljeća” (*ibid.*: 414). Međutim, Pasolini se 60-ih godina – najviše pod utjecajem strukturalista i semiotičara – odmiče od jednostavnog tumačenja jezika prema kojem on samo opisuje ili eventualno ideologizira stvarnost i eksperimentira s načinima prikaza stvarnosti. Stoga u svojim esejima o književnosti govori o “lingvističkom eksperimentalizmu”,³ što će mu poslije poslužiti kao temelj za promišljanje o filmskom jeziku.

Premda je Pasolini težio “narodnoj umjetnosti” još kao književnik, film mu se činio adekvatnijim i izravnijim medijem za komunikaciju s masama. Za razumijevanje Pasolinijeva poimanja filma ključan je način na koji je namjeravao približiti svoju umjetnosti širokoj publici. Naime, uspio je spojiti nespojivo, a originalnost njegova pristupa “sastoji se u pokušaju da približi koncept ‘narodnog’ i ‘antinarodnu’ estetiku: braneći ideje naroda i kolektiva, ali istovremeno pripisujući umjetničkoj *mediju* negativnu funkcionalnost, više razornu nego konstruktivnu” (Vighi 2001: 231). U prvoj fazi filmskog stvaralaštva, baš kao i dok je pisao spomenuta dva romana, Pasolini je podržavao marksističku ideologiju, ali je isto-

³ O jezičnom eksperimentalizmu Pasolini je počeo pisati u časopisu *Officina*, a kao dva najvažnija eseja o toj temi izdvajaju se *Il neo-sperimentalismo* (*Novi eksperimentalizam*, 1956; Pasolini 1960) i *La libertà stilistica* (*Stilska sloboda*, 1957; Pasolini 1960) u kojima se bavi pitanjima realizma, ideologije i jezika u poeziji i prozi.

vremeno isticao važnost književnosti i filma u kritičkoj interpretaciji marksističke doktrine, što je podrazumijevalo preispitivanje racionalističkih postulata na kojima je ta doktrina počivala. Po njegovu mišljenju, filmovi bi kontradiktornim slikama trebali isprovocirati široke mase kako bi preispitale buržoaski sistem vrijednosti utemeljen na racionalnosti, a koji je Pasolini osuđivao i raskrinkavao tijekom cijele svoje karijere. Cilj njegova filma, i umjetnosti općenito, ne podudara se u potpunosti s komunističkim progresivnim idejama buđenja klasne svijesti, nego je više didaktički i usmjeren na podizanje razine svijesti kod gledatelja te na razvijanje kritičkog mišljenja kod radničke klase, naročito o jeziku u književnosti, a poslije i o filmskom prikazu.

Film kao “pisani jezik zbilje”

Pasolini je isprva mislio da prelazak iz književnosti u film podrazumijeva promjenu tehnike, ali ubrzo je shvatio da film ide onkraj književnih tehnika pripovijedanja i da je riječ o zasebnom jeziku. Tu ideju razvijat će poslije u člancima i esejima sintagmom film-poezija.

Nekoliko sam puta tvrdio da prelazak iz književnosti u film na primjer nije ništa drugo do promjena tehnike. Međutim, malo-pomalo počeo sam razlikovati književne i filmske tehnike. Književni jezik kojim se književnik koristi kako bi napisao pjesmu, roman ili esej jest konvencionalni simbolički sustav: štoviše, svaki pisani ili govorni jezik definiran je nizom povijesnih, geopolitičkih ili, ako vam je draže, nacionalnih (regionalnih) granica... S druge strane, film je sustav ne-simboličkih znakova, živih znakova, znakova-objekata... Filmski jezik, dakle, ne prikazuje zbilju nizom lingvističkih simbola, nego samom stvarnošću. (cit. prema Duflot 1994: 13)

Pasolinijev prelazak iz svijeta književnosti u svijet filma bio je postupan, a prije nego što se okušao kao redatelj, radio je kao scenarist. Stoga ne čudi što se u jednom od svojih prvih eseja o filmu, *La sceneggiatura come “struttura che vuol essere altra struttura”* (Scenarij kao “struktura koja želi biti druga struktura”, 1965), bavi odnosom književnosti i filma analizirajući funkciju i obilježja scenarija kao prijelazne vrste između književnog djela i filma. Pritom ga je naročito zanimalo “trenutak u kojem se scenarij može smatrati autonomnom ‘tehnikom’, cjelovitim i po sebi završenim djelom”, zbog čega ga treba analizirati onako kako “se analiziraju književna djela, a naročito nove književne ‘vrste’” (Pasolini 2000: 188). Već krajem 60-ih godina Pasolini postaje svjestan da je prelazak iz književnosti u film kompleksno teorijsko pitanje. U intervju koji je dao Jonu Hallidayu 1969. godine izjavio je da je filmski jezik transnacionalni i transklasni jezik, da, za razliku od pisanog ili govornog jezika, nije simboličan i konvencionalan, te da ne prikazuje zbilju simbolima, nego samom zbiljom, što bi značilo da u filmu stvar-

nost nije filtrirana kroz simbole i konvencije kao što je to slučaj u književnosti⁴ (cit. prema Panella 2009: 34). Pasolini je smatrao da film omogućava izravan i neposredan odnos prema zbilji, što će poslije detaljnije razraditi u esejima govoreći o filmu kao “zbilji prikazanoj zbiljom” te kao “pisanom jeziku zbilje”.

Teoriju o filmu kao “pisanom jeziku zbilje”, kojom se počeo baviti sredinom 60-ih godina u polemici s francuskim teoretičarom filma Christianom Metzom, Pasolini razvija u periodu od 1965. do 1971. godine, ali je u to vrijeme ostala pomalo nezamijećena u semiotičkim krugovima. Jedan od važnih doprinosa polemici bila je Metzova kategorizacija osnovne sintagmatske strukture filmskog jezika iznesena u eseju *Le cinéma: langue ou langage? (Film: jezik ili jezična djelatnost)*, 1964), na koji Pasolini odgovara svojim esejom *La lingua scritta della realtà (Pisani jezik zbilje)*, 1966), objavljenim dvije godine poslije, u kojem iznosi svoju teoriju filmskog jezika. Glavna je razlika između te dvojice autora u tome što je Metz smatrao da film može biti – Saussureovim terminima – samo *langage* (jezična djelatnost), nikako *langue* (jezik), jer u filmu ne postoji dvostruka artikulacija, što je jedan od osnovnih preduvjeta Martinetove definicije jezika kao mentalnog sustava znakova koji se može raščlaniti na niz razlikovnih jedinica (Metz u Barthes i dr. 1969: 205–225). Dok Metz smatra da se filmska slika ne može podijeliti na manje dijelove usporedive s fonemima ili monemima, Pasolini, naprotiv, tvrdi da je film jezik te u prilog svojoj teoriji uvodi termin *cinéma* ili *im-segno* (slika-znak) – najmanju jedinicu od koje se sastoji filmska slika – kao ekvivalent fonemu i dokaz postojanja druge artikulacije u filmskom jeziku. Temeljno je obilježje termina *cinéma* njegova ikoničnost: “Osnovno je obilježje fonema to da su neprevodivi: to je njihova prirodna surovost i indiferentnost. Jednako je tako stvarni objekt kao što je *cinéma* sam po sebi neprevodiv, to je grubi komadić stvarnosti” (*La lingua scritta della realtà*, Pasolini 2000: 203). Pasolini se djelomično slagao s Metzom u dvije ključne tvrdnje: za razliku od pisanog jezika, filmski jezik ne može se kodificirati npr. rječnikom ili gramatikom, a veza između vanjskog referenta i njegova filmskog prikaza nije arbitrarna kao kod pisanog jezika.⁵ Međutim, Pasolini u svojem eseju-polemici naglašava bitnu razliku između njihovih teorija: “Metz spominje ‘dojam stvarnosti’ kao karakteristiku filmske komunikacije. Ja ne bih rekao da se radi o ‘dojmu stvarnosti’, nego o čistoj i jedno-

⁴ “Ovo je vjerojatno glavna razlika između književnog i filmskog djela (ako ih je bitno usporediti). Lingvistički ili gramatički ustroj kod filmaša se sastoji od slika, a slike su uvijek konkretne, nikad apstraktne” (*Il “cinema di poesia”*, Pasolini 2000: 172).

⁵ Razlikom između pisanog i filmskog jezika Pasolini se bavio u svom najvažnijem eseju *Il “cinema di poesia” (Film-poezija)*, 1965) u kojem tvrdi: “Ne postoji rječnik slika. Ne postoji nijedna katalogizirana slika spremna za uporabu. Kad bismo kojim slučajem htjeli zamisliti *beskonačni rječnik*, imali bismo jedino beskonačni rječnik *moгуćih riječi*” (Pasolini 2000: 169). Za razliku od književnika, redatelj ima na raspolaganju neograničene mogućnosti slika. Stoga Pasolini zaključuje da je “čin pisca estetski izum, a čin redatelja prvo je lingvistički, a potom estetski” (*ibid.*: 170–171).

stavnoj ‘stvarnosti’” (*ibid.*: 201). U eseju *Battute sul cinema (Zabilješke o filmu, 1966/1967)* Pasolini objašnjava da mu je prijelaz iz književnosti u film otvorio nove spoznajne horizonte i promijenio način poimanja stvarnosti.

Sve one revolucionarne promjene koje je pisani jezik donio u odnosu na govorni jezik donijet će i film u odnosu na stvarnost. Jezik stvarnosti, dok god je bio prirodan, bio je izvan naše svijesti: sada kada je “zapisan” putem filma, ne može da ne zauzme mjesto u našoj svijesti. Pisani jezik zbilje pomoći će nam, prije svega, da spoznamo što je jezik zbilje, a u konačnici će promijeniti naše poimanje zbilje pretvarajući naše fizičke odnose spram stvarnosti u kulturološke. (Pasolini 1966/1967: 235)

Pasolini se u svojoj teoriji filma pokušao barem djelomično ograditi od pukog preslikavanja Saussureova lingvističkog modela na film uvodeći termin *im-segno* (*immagine-segno*, slika-znak) i naglašavajući njegovu ikoničnost i indeksnost u osloncu na Pierceovu teoriju znakova. Umjesto da svoju teoriju filma pokuša ukalupiti u lingvističke modele govornog i pisanog jezika, Pasolini širi definiciju jezika tvrdeći da:

Film je jezik [...] koji nas prisiljava da proširimo spoznaje o jeziku. Ne radi se o simboličkom, arbitrarnom i konvencionalnom sustavu. [...] Film ne evocira stvarnost kao književni jezik; ne kopira stvarnost kao slikarstvo; ne imitira stvarnost kao kazalište. Film *reproducira* stvarnost: sliku i zvuk! Što radi film reproducirajući stvarnost? Prikazuje stvarnost putem stvarnosti. (*La fine dell'avanguardia / Kraj avangarde*, Pasolini 2000: 135)

Za Pasolinija je film “jezik koji prikazuje stvarnost putem stvarnosti. Dakle, postavlja se pitanje: kakva je razlika između filma i stvarnosti? Praktički nikakva” (cit. prema Panella 2009: 34). Pojam stvarnosti nije fiksna ontološka kategorija, već podrazumijeva društveni i komunikacijski aspekt. U eseju iz 1966. *La lingua scritta della realtà* (Pasolini 2000: 206) Pasolini piše o filmu i stvarnosti kao međusobno povezanim načinima komunikacije, naglašavajući da je film temeljni ljudski jezik te da svi mi svojim životima stvaramo film. Za Pasolinija zbilja postaje prostor kulturne proizvodnje i društvena praksa, mjesto interakcije društvenog tkiva i filmskog jezika. Kao što tvrdi Giuliana Bruno: “Za Pasolinija poanta nije u stvaranju teorije realističkog filma ili u gledanju na film kao na reprodukciju zbilje, već u tome da se preokrenu postavke klasičnog realizma. Pasolini vidi zbilju kao ‘diskurs o stvarima’ koje film prepričava. Filmski znak postaje metalingvistički znak, oruđe, interpretator drugog znaka” (1991: 32). Tu novu vrstu epistemo-loške spoznaje detaljno je objasnio u kratkom članku *Il non verbale come un'altra verbalità* (*Neverbalno kao drugo verbalno*, 1971):

Zapravo ne postoji “označeno”, jer je i označeno također znak. [...] Zapravo, “znakovi” govornih jezika ne rade ništa drugo nego prevode “znakove” neverbalnih jezika: ili konkretno, znakovi pisanih/govornih jezika ne rade ništa drugo nego

prevode znakove Jezika Zbilje. [...] Neverbalno je, dakle, drugo verbalno: Jezik Zbilje. (Pasolini 2000: 264)

Film kao “pisani jezik zbilje” zapravo ne teži tomu da bude puka preslika stvarnosti putem filmskog jezika, već se i sama “zbilja” smatra jednom vrstom jezika, što će poslije objasniti u eseju *Res sunt nomina* (1971).⁶ U eseju *La lingua scritta della realtà* Pasolini tvrdi ne samo da je zbilja kodificirani jezik već i da film treba promatrati kao čin pisanja, tj. konstrukciju zbilje filmskim jezikom, čime anticipira pojam *écriture* koji će se poslije pojaviti kod Derride.⁷

Prema semiotici filma

Gradeći dalje strukturu filmskog jezika, Pasolini razlikuje pojmove *cinema* i *film* te razlike između njih uspoređuje s klasičnom Saussureovom oprekom između jezika (*langue*) i govora (*parole*). *Cinema* je opisan kao gotovo metafizička i apstraktna kategorija, a opisujući razliku između ta dva poimanja filma, opet se poziva na lingvističke teorije i na govorni jezik. *Cinema* je kao jezik, nešto što spoznajemo preko pojedinih filmova, što se može shvatiti kao serija neprekidnih kadrova-sekvenci koja nalikuje na kontinuitet stvarnosti, dok je *film* termin koji se upotrebljava za pojedinačne filmove u kojima je prirodni tijek vremena i prostora rascjepkan i promijenjen konvencijama filmskog jezika, a najviše montažom. Pasolini tvrdi da je *cinema* apstraktna, metafizička, sveobuhvatna kategorija i jedna vrsta arhetipskog jezika, dok je *film* empirijska, antinaturalistička kategorija (*Battute sul cinema*, Pasolini 2000: 229–231). *Film* je ono što gledamo u kinima, a *cinema* je reprodukcija kontinuiteta stvarnosti prije montaže. “*Cinema* je, dakle, primordijalna i arhetipska ideja, kontinuiran i neprekidan kadar-sekvenca” (*ibid.*: 229). Pasolinijev koncept *cinema* alternativa je arbitrarnom sistemu govornih znakova (*lin-segni*), a upravo je u filmu kao mediju vidio izravnije sredstvo za prikaz zbilje bez posredovanja verbalnih znakova ili pisanog jezika koji se upotrebljava u književnosti. Njegovo inzistiranje na kontinuitetu prikaza kroz duge kadrove pokušaj je da se pronađe način reprezentacije koji bi bio u stanju uhvatiti neposrednost same zbilje. Stoga mu se film činio puno izravnijim medijem od književnosti, što je i sam objasnio u eseju *Battute sul cinema*: “Izražavajući se filmskim jezikom –

⁶ U ovom eseju Pasolini tvrdi da je stvarnost *language* (jezična djelatnost), pragmatični dijalog između nas i stvari. Čak i stvarnost ima svoje odnose podudarnosti i sličnosti koje stvaraju promjene značenja objekata od kojih se sastoji. (usp. *Res sunt nomina*, Pasolini 2000: 260–261).

⁷ Pasolini je i u ranijim esejima tvrdio da film nije puka preslika zbilje i naglašavao je utjecaj montaže u procesu “pisanja zbilje”, navodeći je kao primjer “stilizacije” i “sintetiziranja” stvarnosti (*Battute sul cinema*, Pasolini 2000: 234). Iz njegova eseja *Il “cinema di poesia”* vidljivo je da je odnos filma i zbilje za Pasolinija puno kompleksniji od jednostavne definicije filma kao onog koji prikazuje “zbilju zbiljom”.

koji, ponavljam, nije ništa drugo do ispisani trenutak jezika zbilje – ostajem uvijek u domeni stvarnosti: ne prekidam njezin kontinuitet prihvaćanjem simboličkog i arbitrarnog sustava kao što je *lin-segni*” (Pasolini 2000: 229). Međutim, analizirajući američke avangardne filmove koji traju po nekoliko sati, Pasolini postaje svjestan ograničenja svog koncepta *cinema*. Naime, filmovi predstavnika američke avangarde temeljili su se na kadrovima-sekvencama o ljudima koji spavaju, jedu ili obavljaju druge svakodnevne aktivnosti, što je za Pasolinija bio dosadan i besmislen slijed beznačajnih stvari (*Essere é naturale? / Je li biti prirodno?*, 1967, Pasolini 2000: 244–245), te je shvatio kako bi njegov *cinema*, temeljen na kadru-sekvenci, izgledao kad bi se pretvorio u pravi film. Za Pasolinija američki eksperimentalni filmovi nisu ostvarili nijednu od funkcija koje je zamislio da bi njegov *cinema* trebao ostvariti i zapravo ih je ocijenio kao prilično dosadne. Pasolinijeva usporedba filma (*cinema*) sa zbiljom njegov je utopijski pokušaj da filmom obuhvati stvarnost i da je preslika bez posredovanja umjetnika, da uđe što dublje u bit stvari i da pokuša premostiti jaz između zbilje i filmskog prikaza, čega i sam postaje svjestan nešto poslije.

U kasnijim teorijskim djelima Pasolini je shvatio da je za takav tip filma bolji termin *film*, a ne *cinema* koji se temelji na kadru-sekvenci. Razliku između ta dva termina najbolje je objasnio u eseju *Osservazioni sul piano-sequenza* (*Ogledi o kadru-sekvenci*, 1967) koji počinje analizom 16-milimetarske snimke ubojstva američkog predsjednika Johna Kennedyja koju je snimio slučajni promatrač u okupljenoj gomili. Pasolini ističe tu snimku kao primjer subjektivnog kadra-sekvence te poziva čitatelje da zamisle da je taj događaj snimljen iz različitih kutova i točki gledišta koje bismo istovremeno gledali na više ekrana u prostoriji. To je polazna točka od koje Pasolini razvija teoriju o zbilji tvrdeći da “nije moguće ‘vidjeti i čuti’ zbilju u nastajanju *osim iz jedne točke gledišta*, a to je uvijek točka gledišta subjekta koji vidi i čuje” (*Osservazioni sul piano-sequenza*, Pasolini 2000: 237). Međutim, zaključuje da nas takva serija snimaka ne bi dovela do smislene spoznaje stvarnog događaja jer bismo je percipirali kao seriju nerazumljivih i nepotpunih informacija. Stoga naglašava važnost montaže i pripovjedača koji bi koordinirao audio-vizualne materijale o Kennedyjevom ubojstvu i od njih napravio film.

Drugim riječima, radi se o montaži. Nakon odabira i koordinacije različite točke gledišta bi se stopile, a egzistencijalna subjektivnost ustupila bi mjesto objektivnosti; ne bi više bilo bezvrijednih parova očiju-ušiju (ili kamera-magnetofona) koji bi uhvatili i reproducirali neuhvatljivu i prozračnu zbilju, već bi na njihovu mjestu bio pripovjedač. Taj pripovjedač pretvara sadašnjost u prošlost. (*ibid.*: 240)

Pasolini nije detaljno objasnio kako vidi figuru pripovjedača u filmu, ali vjerojatno bi se radilo o sveznajućem pripovjedaču koji bi doslovno preuzeo kontrolu nad gomilom nepovezanog materijala i od njega stvorio smislenu i koherentnu narativnu cjelinu. Prijelaz ka strukturiranom filmskom tekstu uz pomoć pripovjedača vidljiv je i u njegovim kasnijim teorijskim tekstovima o filmu, što nas navodi na

pretpostavku da se Pasolini, preispitivanjem uloge pripovjedača i montaže u stvaranju koherentnog filmskog teksta, nije slučajno vratio formalnim pitanjima prikaza kojima se bavio u romanima.

Pasolini je težio stvaranju filmskog jezika koji bi vodio do *film-parole*, a ne samo do *film-langue* i u tom je procesu naglašavao važnost montaže, koja prekida tijekom sadašnjeg vremena i pretvara film u smislenu cjelinu u procesu koji Pasolini uspoređuje sa smrću, pozivajući se na Sartreovu tezu da samo u trenutku smrti možemo vrednovati svoj život (*Osservazioni sul piano-sequenza*, Pasolini 2000: 241). Dok god živimo, smatra Pasolini, ne možemo pojmiti smisao našeg života, on se sastoji od mnogobrojnih mogućnosti, odnosa i relacija koji traju, a smrt je identična montaži upravo zato što odabire značajne trenutke i od naše sadašnjosti stvara jasnu i zaokruženu prošlost. U *Osservazioni sul piano-sequenza* Pasolini tvrdi da je montaža objektivnija od kadra-sekvence jer “sa snimljenim filmskim zapisom radi isto ono što smrt čini životu” (*ibid.*). Tek nakon što su događaji koji tvore filmsku naraciju završili, od njih se može načiniti smisljena cjelina, a tu bi ključnu ulogu trebao imati pripovjedač koji pretvara sadašnjost filmskog prikaza u prošlost, pa stoga i film u konačnici postaje historijski prezent (*ibid.*: 240). U trenutku kad pripovjedač uz pomoć montaže stvara narativnu strukturu, on prekida događaje koji se odvijaju u sadašnjosti i pretvara ih u prošle događaje zaustavljajući njihov kontinuitet i sva moguća buduća značenja, pretvarajući na taj način *cinema* u *film*. Premda se Pasolini ne referira izravno na Bazinovu teoriju filma, ipak se može iščitati utjecaj Bazinovih teza u njegovu esaju *Osservazioni sul piano-sequenza*. Pasolinijeva definicija montaže ne razlikuje se bitno od Bazinove. Pasolini je definira kao odabir “istinski značajnih trenutaka” koji se uređuju logičkim slijedom kako bi im se dalo jasno značenje (*ibid.*: 241), dok je za Bazina montaža “davanje značenja slikama koje one objektivno ne sadrže” (*L'evoluzione del linguaggio cinematografico / Evolucija filmskog jezika*, 1958, Bazin 2005: 77). Za Bazina je montaža stvaranje smisla ili značenja koje nije svojstveno samim slikama, već proizlazi iz njihova suprotstavljanja, što bi značilo da je montaža subjektivan čin stvaranja značenja koji nužno podriva realistične i objektivne kvalitete svojstvene fotografskom zapisu. Za Pasolinija je montaža vezana za ulogu pripovjedača, što se djelomično poklapa s Bazinovom idejom da “gledatelj prirodno dijeli s redateljem točku gledišta koju mu on predlaže” (*ibid.*: 76). I Bazin i Pasolini zastupali su vrlo slične stavove o ontologiji filmske slike. Obojica u svojim teorijama filma spominju smrt:

Ja ne mogu ponoviti nijedan trenutak svog života, ali svaki od tih trenutaka može se ponoviti u filmu nebrojeno puta. Dakle, ako je istina da nijedan trenutak nije identičan drugome, postoji jedan u kojem se ta temeljna diferencijacija spaja: to je smrt. Smrt je jedinstven trenutak bivstovanja. U odnosu na taj trenutak retroaktivno se definira kvaliteta života. On označava granicu svjesnog trajanja i objektivnog vremena stvari. (*Morte ogni pomeriggio / Smrt svako poslijepodne*, 1958, Bazin 2005: 31–32)

Bazin smatra da jedino film može prekršiti jedinstvenost trenutka kao što je smrt prikazujući ga nekoliko puta, dok Pasolini u odnosu filma i smrti naglašava zaokruženost i konačan sud o životu pojedinca koji smrt daje isto kao i montaža koja trenutačni slijed događaja zabilježen na filmu odabirom najvažnijih trenutaka pretvara u zaokruženu jedinicu prošlosti. Ono po čemu se Pasolini i Bazin razlikuju jest shvaćanje načina stvaranja objektivnog i neutralnog filmskog prikaza. Za Bazina montaža je manipulativna i stoga ne može biti objektivna. Dok je Bazin smatrao da je fotografija mehanička reprodukcija zbilje bez intervencije čovjeka, Pasolini naglašava upravo ljudski faktor iza kamere. Za Pasolinija je montaža sredstvo alternacije subjektivnog pogleda pripovjedača i njegovih likova: uz pomoć montaže subjektivno se pretvara u objektivno. Pasolinijev koncept objektivne montaže temelji se na promjenjivoj fokalizaciji i izmjeni subjektivnih kadrova likova, čime film postaje "objektivniji" jer redateljeva točka gledišta više nije dominantna, već je u relaciji s točkom gledišta likova. Kao što primjećuje Christopher Orr, problem s Pasolinijevom teorijom montaže jest to što on zapravo ne razlikuje svoju teoriju od holivudske *mainstream* kinematografije, a malo je vjerojatno da bi ikad prihvatio holivudski tip montaže kao progresivni (1991: 41). Usto, Pasolini nije nikad detaljno objasnio za kakvu se točno vrstu montaže zalaže.

Pasolini je bio svjestan i ontološkog osakaćivanja koje taj proces sa sobom nosi, s obzirom na to da pripovjedač nameće vlastitu formu i interpretaciju stvarnosti. Naracija interpretira zbilju u skladu s našim očekivanjima i viđenjem svijeta. Upravo taj proces naglašava kontradiktornost u Pasolinijevim promišljanjima filma kao neposrednijeg i izravnijeg medija za prikaz zbilje od književnosti. Kao što naglašava Ward (1994: 138), te tvrdnje kose se s prijašnjim tvrdnjama vezanima za njegov prelazak iz književnosti u film. Glavni poticaj za bavljenje filmom bilo je Pasolinijevo uvjerenje da postoji razlika između lingvističkog znaka (*lin-segno*) i slikovnog znaka (*im-segno*). Za razliku od lingvističkih znakova koji su određeni konvencijama, slikovni su znakovi neposredni i otvaraju nove puteve izražavanja. Narativno ustrojavanje verbalnih i slikovnih znakova jednako je ograničavajuće, ali i nužno ako želimo spoznati svijet, a to zapravo dovodi u pitanje Pasolinijeve početne razlikovne postavke između arbitrarnog lingvističkog znaka i filmskog znaka za koji je utopijski vjerovao da omogućava vjerodostojniji i neposredniji prikaz zbilje. Štoviše, u svoju teoriju filmskog jezika uvodi i pojam nesvjesnog i iracionalnog, tvrdeći da filmski znakovi nisu utemeljeni na logičkom i racionalnom diskursu, već su slični snovima i sjećanju, zbog čega i sam filmski jezik opisuje kao primordijalan, "pred-gramatički" i "pred-morfološki". Iz toga proizlazi da je i "lingvistički instrument na kojem se temelji film iracionalan, što objašnjava duboku oniričku prirodu filma" (*Il "cinema di poesia"*, Pasolini 2000:

⁸ P. Adams Sitney (2015: 15) navodi nekoliko radnih verzija eseja o filmu-poeziji pod različitim naslovima: strojopis *Di un possibile discorso libero indiretto nel cinema* (*O mogućem slobodnom*

169). Upravo ta dva elementa osnovne su postavke Pasolinijeve teorije o filmu-poeziji koju je razradio u eseju *Il "cinema di poesia"* ("Film-poezija", 1965).⁸

Film-poezija

Već 1961. godine u eseju objavljenom uz scenarij za film *Accattone* Pasolini naglašava neposrednost filma i njegovu sličnost s poezijom, što će nekoliko godina poslije elaborirati u eseju o filmu-poeziji. Razmatrajući prisutnost poetskih stilskih sredstava – primjerice anafore – u filmu, Pasolini tvrdi da "film može sličiti naraciji, ali prije svega glazbenoj naraciji, što pokazuje da, u usporedbi s književnosti, posjeduje iracionalne, arhaične i fantastične elemente" (Pasolini 1961: 18). Nadalje, odabir slika uspoređuje s vrstom leksikona, a pokrete kamere i vrste kadrova sa sintaksom, te tako već na počecima svog promišljanja o filmu uspoređuje pisani i filmski jezik. Termini koji se spominju u navedenom eseju ("iracionalno", "poezija", "znak") postat će temeljne odrednice njegove teorije filmskog jezika u esejima iz druge polovice 60-ih godina. Sama priroda filmskog znaka bitno razlikuje proces stvaranja redatelja i književnika. Budući da ne postoji rječnik slika, redatelj, za razliku od književnika, ima dvostruku ulogu: mora izvući *im-segno* iz kaosa, iz nesvjesnog, i tek onda mu može dati svoje osobno umjetničko značenje (*ibid.*: 170). U eseju o filmu-poeziji Pasolini kombinira elemente estetike Benedetto Crocea s tadašnjim semiotičkim teorijama. Croce suprotstavlja intuitivnu i logičku spoznaju; od intuitivne ili estetske spoznaje dolazi se do spoznaje individualnog, a od logičke se spoznaje putem intelekta dolazi do spoznaje univerzalnog, te zaključuje da se intelektualna spoznaja temelji na intuitivnoj. Međutim, Croce jasno razdvaja intuiciju od percepcije: intuicija je aktivnost koja daje formu sirovom sadržaju koji percipiramo. Croce je vezu između intuitivne spoznaje (ekspresije) i intelektualne (konceptualne) spoznaje, tj. između umjetnosti i znanosti, poezije i proze objasnio kao odnos na dvije razine. "Prva je razina ekspresija, a druga je konceptualna: prva može postojati bez druge, a druga ne može postojati bez prve. Postoji poezija bez proze, ali nema proze bez poezije" (Croce 1997: 28). Intuicija je za Crocea pred-racionalna te kao takva prethodi stvaranju konceptata, dok je poezija čista forma. Poezija je rezultat pred-racionalne intuicije konkretnog objekta, a ta je intuicija i temelj jezika općenito. Pasolinijeva teorija o filmu-poeziji temelji se na istoj pretpostavci s jednim važnim odmakom; u njegovu poimanju filma-poezije redatelj se služi slikama koje su uvijek konkretne, a ne apstraktne, i na temelju kojih nastaje poezija. Za Pasolinija film stvara značenje od

neupravnom diskursu u filmu), govor na filmskom festivalu u Pesaru *La mimesi dello sguardo* (Mimeza pogleda) te naposljetku objavljeni esej *Il "cinema di poesia"* ("Film-poezija") u časopisu *Filmcritica*.

postojećih znakova (*im-segni*) koji su elementarni, iracionalni i nesvjesni, on kao “pisani jezik zbilje” prikazuje taj iracionalni jezik zbilje. Pasolini je i sam bio svjestan kontradiktorne prirode filmskog jezika koji je istovremeno konkretan i iracionalan te stalno oscilira između subjektivnog i objektivnog (*Il “cinema di poesia”*, Pasolini 2000: 172).

Il “cinema di poesia” ujedno je Pasolinijev osvrt na tendencije *art*-filma iz 60-ih godina, naročito filma *Deserto rosso* (*Crvena pustinja*, Michelangelo Antonioni, 1964), te se, uz prethodno analizirani esej o kadru-sekvenci, smatra ključnim u Pasolinijevu poimanju prirode filma. Osim što se bavi prirodom filmskog znaka i filmom-poezijom, Pasolini u tom eseju razvija teoriju o slobodnom neupravnom govoru na filmu, oslanjajući se prvenstveno na književnu teoriju pripovjedne strukture, te objašnjava razliku između slobodnog upravnog i neupravnog govora polazeći od pitanja je li uopće moguće primijeniti jezik poezije na film. Za Pasolinijevu teoriju o filmu-poeziji ključno je bilo poznavanje književne teorije. Kao što navodi Naomi Green (1990: 110–111), dva eseja posebno su utjecala na teoriju o filmu-poeziji: *Problemi filmske stilistike* Borisa Ejhenbauma, koji uspoređuje filmski jezik s vrstom unutarnjeg monologa, te *Pjesništvo i proza u filmu* Viktora Šklovskog o razlici između filmske proze i poezije.⁹ P. Adams Sitney začetke Pasolinijeve ideje o slobodnom neupravnom govoru pronalazi u recenziji knjige Giulija Herczega *Lo stile indiretto libero in italiano*, objavljenoj u književnom časopisu *Paragone* netom prije Pasolinijeva prvog usmenog izlaganja o filmu-poeziji na filmskom festivalu u Pesaru 1965. Nekoliko temeljnih Pasolinijevih ideja o slobodnom neupravnom govoru iznesenih u toj recenziji pojavit će se poslije u njegovu eseju o filmu-poeziji. Osim što ističe važnost klasnih i društvenih aspekata koji se povezuju s autorovom upotrebom slobodnog neupravnog govora kojim neizravno interpretira svijet kroz lik, Pasolini uzima čitave romane kao primjere slobodnog neupravnog govora, navodeći da je u njima prisutna “potpuna identifikacija autora i nekog lika, odnosno ili su likovi pseudoobjektivizacija autora, ili su oruđe za izražavanje autorovih ideja sličnim jezikom, ili, u konačnici, nesvjesno na identičan način žive u istom društvenom i ideološkom svijetu kao i autor (*Intervento sul Discorso Libero Indiretto*, Pasolini 2000: 93). U recenziji spominje i “jezik poezije” kao mjesto na kojem se “stapaju duša autora i duša lika” (*ibid.*: 91). Kao što Sitney primjećuje, Pasolini u toj recenziji zanemaruje stilske specifičnosti upotrebe slobodnog neupravnog govora, miješajući ga s unutarnjim monologom ili pripovijedanjem u prvom licu (2015: 17–18).

Unutarnji monolog (koji Pasolini u eseju o filmu-poeziji ipak razlikuje od slobodnog neupravnog govora) stvorio je autor za lik koji se ideološki, ekonomski i klasno podudara s autorom, te je stoga jezik autora i lika identičan. Slobodni ne-

⁹ Oba eseja prevedena su na talijanski jezik u okviru antologije o ruskim formalistima *I formalisti russi nel cinema*. 1971. Milano: Garzanti, a kao dio serije knjiga o kritici koje je uređivao Pasolini.

upravni govor je prirodniji jer je to zapravo upravni govor bez navodnih znakova, pa ga preferira i sam Pasolini jer smatra da je to govor svojstven liku, a ne autoru (*Il "cinema di poesia"*, Pasolini 2000: 176, 178). Ideje iznesene u tom eseju izravno se nadovezuju na Pasolinijeve ranije književne eseje u kojima se također zalaže za slobodni neupravni govor u kojem se jezik lika razlikuje od jezika autora/pripovjedača. Slobodni upravni govor iz književnosti, smatra Pasolini, odgovara subjektivnom kadru u filmu, ali u filmu je moguć i slobodni neupravni govor, koji Pasolini naziva "slobodni neupravni subjektivni kadar" (*ibid.*: 177). Problem s Pasolinijevom upotrebom književnih termina u filmskoj teoriji jest što i slobodni upravni i slobodni neupravni govor opisuju načine na koje pripovjedač prikazuje misli ili unutarnji govor likova u književnim djelima, dok u filmu fokus nije samo na tome tko govori ili na načinu na koji su misli nekog lika prikazane, već je fokus i na točki gledišta. Subjektivni kadar mogao bi se usporediti s unutarnjom fokalizacijom u književnom tekstu, a kadar-sekvenca s vanjskom fokalizacijom, jer je prikazan s redateljeve točke gledišta. Za razliku od književnika koji mogu ući u jezik i psihologiju svojih likova, redatelji ne barataju apstraktnim jezikom, već konkretnim slikama, a filmu nedostaje sugestivno-evokativni element koji je prisutan u književnom djelu. Štoviše, u filmu ne postoji pravi "unutarnji monolog" kao u književnosti jer film "nema mogućnost interiorizacije i apstrakcije koju ima riječ" (*ibid.*: 177), pa stoga nijedan "slobodni neupravni subjektivni kadar" ne odgovara u potpunosti onome što se u književnosti naziva unutarnji monolog. Redatelj ne može koristiti jezik likova na isti način na koji to može pisac.¹⁰ "Psihološka i objektivna karakterizacija likova nije pitanje jezika, nego stila" (*ibid.*: 176). To je ujedno i temelj Pasolinijeve teorije o slobodnom neupravnom subjektivnom kadru koji se može koristiti suprotstavljanjem istih slika prikazanih s različitim točki gledišta uz manje promjene u rakursu, fokusu i sl., što je vidljivo u filmu *Crvena pustinja*. Kamera je u tom filmu i subjektivna i objektivna jer planom i kontraplanom razmjenjuje točke gledišta likova, ali se ne identificira ni s jednim od njih. Upravo na primjeru tog filma Pasolini razvija teoriju o filmu-poeziji uspoređujući ga s klasičnim filmovima, za koje tvrdi da su nisu bili film-poezija, nego film-pripovijetka: "klasični film bio je i ostao narativan: njegov jezik je jezik proze" (*ibid.*: 185). Stvaranje jezika filma-poezije pretpostavlja pripovijedanje jezi-

¹⁰ Moderni i suvremeni filmovi puno su bliži Pasolinijevu poimanju filma, primjerice Godardovi filmovi te filmovi Andreja Tarkovskog, Ingmara Bergmana i Krzysztofa Kieślowskog. Međutim, pojam slobodnog neupravnog govora i subjektivnog kadra ne obuhvaća npr. autobiografske Fellinijeve filmove gdje su likovi kao što je onaj kojeg tumači Marcello Mastroianni u filmu *8½* (1963) preslika redateljevih misli. Nekolicina filmologa razrađuje poetiku *art*-filma oslanjajući se na Pasolinijeve ideje o filmu-poeziji. Tako P. Adams Sitney svoju knjigu *The Cinema of Poetry* (2015) otvara poglavljem o Pasolinijevoj semiotici filma, naglašavajući njezinu važnost za povijest filma i povlačeći paralele između Pasolinijevih ideja i filmova Bergmana, Tarkovskog i američkih avangardista. John Orr pak tragove Pasolinijeve misli nalazi u modernom i suvremenom filmu (Tarkovski, Kieślowski, Bergman, Antonioni, Altman, Scorsese i dr.) (usp. Orr 1998; 2000: 133–141).

kom poezije, što podrazumijeva i upotrebu slobodnog neupravnog subjektivnog kadra. Međutim, u Pasolinijevu eseju razlika između slobodnog neupravnog subjektivnog kadra i onog što se tradicionalno naziva subjektivnim kadrom ostaje prilično nedorečena. Upravo taj aspekt Pasolinijeva eseja naglašava John David Rhodes, nazivajući Pasolinijevo poimanje subjektivnosti i objektivnosti u filmu-poeziji pokušajem adresiranja modernističkih tendencija u *art*-filmu iz 60-ih godina te sljubljuvanja modernizma i realizma. “‘Film-poezija’ pokušaj je da se teoretizira stremljenje formalnom eksperimentu i društvenoj referencijalnosti ili realizmu” (Rhodes 2010: 152). U detaljnoj analizi Pasolinijeva eseja o filmu-poeziji Rhodes navodi stil, subjektivnost i klasnu svijest kao tri glavne okosnice filma-poezije koje ne mogu postojati jedna bez druge.

Upotreba slobodnog neupravnog govora za Pasolinija podrazumijeva i svijest autora o društvenim i klasnim razlikama između njega i njegovih likova. Esej o kadru-sekvenci nadovezuje se na esej o filmu-poeziji jer u njemu Pasolini odbacuje kadar-sekvencu kao instrument subjektivnog autorova kadra koji podrazumijeva i buržoaski svjetonazor koji autor kroz svoju točku gledišta izražava, što se kosilo s Pasolinijevom idejom nacionalno-narodne književnosti i filma koji bi se približili širokim masama, a ne samo višim slojevima društva. Za Pasolinija kadar-sekvencu naglašava autorovu subjektivnost, stav i točku gledišta onoga koji upravlja kamerom. Pasolini je smatrao da je ta subjektivnost preslika buržoaske ideologije i prikaza društva, a on se zalagao za ne-građanski i ne-buržoaski film. To je vidljivo i u njegovim ranim filmovima kao što su *Accattone* (1961), *Mamma Roma* (1962), *Il Vangelo secondo Matteo* (*Evangelje po Mateju*, 1964) u kojima bira glumce iz lumpenproletarijata kako bi prikazao klasnu razliku u percepciji svijeta između njega kao samoprozvanog buržoaskog, ali istovremeno i marksističkog redatelja i njegovih likova, a tome prilagođava i kadrove i montažu kako se njegovo viđenje ne bi nužno poklapalo sa stavovima likova u filmu, vjerujući da se tako odmiče od buržoaske neorealističke kinematografije. U *Evangelju po Mateju* vidimo upotrebu slobodnog neupravnog govora koja bi se Genetteovim terminima mogla opisati kao promjenjiva unutarnja fokalizacija, jer se već u prvim minutama filma izmjenjuju subjektivni kadrovi likova čime se, po Pasolinijevu uvjerenju, jamči prikaz “objektivniji” od redateljeva subjektivnog kadra. Film *Accattone* (1961) priča je o sitnom kriminalcu i svodniku. S obzirom na klasni milje, stvarne lokacije na kojima je film sniman, rimski dijalekt i naturščike, film je blizak neorealizmu, ali zapravo je Pasolinijeva kritička reakcija na talijanski filmski neorealizam koji je u više navrata okarakterizirao kao buržoasku kinematografiju, a to se najbolje vidi po tehničkim aspektima filma, kojima se djelomično estetski udaljava od neorealizma. U filmu potpuno nedostaje osjećaj solidarnosti i nade u bolje sutra, što je okosnica gotovo svih Rossellinijevih neorealističkih filmova.

U neorealističkim filmovima upotrebljavaju se uglavnom dugi kadrovi, totali i srednji planovi. Pasolini, naprotiv, preferira krupne planove i duge vožnje, a umjesto nade u bolju budućnost, u filmu su vidljivi očaj i razočaranje likova. U jed-

nom intervju iznosi primjedbu na neorealističku kinematografiju uspoređujući je s verističkom tradicijom u književnosti u kojoj je svakodnevni život likova prikazan s distance (cit. prema Orr 1995: 54–55). Pod utjecajem Gramscijeve teorije društvene hegemonije Pasolini ulazi u svijet filma sa željom da se odmakne od naturalizma u talijanskom filmu i stvori novu formu. Prvo što odudara od neorealističke poetike jest sakralizacija lumpenproletarijata i stvaranje mita o čistoći i nevinosti njegova života na margini, daleko od vrijednosti i ideologije kapitalističkog i industrijaliziranog društva. Subverzivnom upotrebom religijskih elemenata u tom filmu Pasolini stvara mit o “prehistorijskoj” kulturi za koju je osjećao da nepovratno nestaje u suvremenom društvu. Međutim, upečatljivije je u njegovim filmovima to što ne pokušava prikazati tu kulturu s pozicije dominantne kulture. Iz Pasolinijevih eseja i filmova vidljivo je da je kod njega intelektualno, umjetničko i teorijsko neodvojivo od političkog. Za Pasolinija su i teorijski tekstovi i snimanje filmova jedna vrsta političkog angažmana. Politička i ideološka dimenzija sastavni je dio gotovo svih njegovih eseja i filmova i utkana je u samu prikazivačku “politiku”, a njegova semiotika prepoznaje i pridaje važnost kulturnim procesima vezanima za pitanja moći, stvaranja značenja i reprezentacije. Pitanje točke gledišta i koncept slobodnog neupravnog govora, tj. slobodnog neupravnog subjektivnog kadra ključno je jer naglašava povezanost narativne strukture, prikaza i društveno-političkog diskursa tog vremena. Kako bi naglasio odmak od neokapitalističke ideologije i buržoaskog puritanizma, Pasolini se u prvoj fazi svog filmskog stvaralaštva odriče heroja – likova iz buržoaske književne tradicije – i fokus premješta na klasno pitanje i prikaz lumpenproletarijata.

Zaključak

Pasolinijeve teorije o filmu djelomično se nastavljaju na problematiku kojom se bavio u književnim esejima 50-ih godina i u njima su vidljivi utjecaji književne teorije, lingvistike, politike i semiotike. Njegovi ogledi o filmu i pokušaj stvaranja semiotike filma često su bili kontradiktorni ili nedorečeni, što je primijetilo nekoliko eminentnih teoretičara i filozofa.¹¹ Uspoređujući njegove eseje o filmu, vidljivo je da je upotrebljavao razne termine za opisivanje filma, primjerice film-proza, film-poezija, *film*, *cinema*, a zbog te su ga nedosljednosti u uporabi terminologije često kritizirali drugi teoretičari iz tog vremena. Pasolinijevi pokušaji stvaranja semiotike filma nisu se podudarali s glavnim teorijskim strujama 60-ih godina, kada kritičari i teoretičari, inspirirani najprije strukturalizmom, a poslije semioti-

¹¹ Semiotičari Umberto Eco ([1968] 2002) i Gianfranco Bettetini (1973: 8–9, 54–57) optužili su Pasolinija za semiotičku naivnost, dok su drugi teoretičari tvrdili da je on prije svega pjesnik te da mu teorije nisu znanstveno utemeljene.

kom, pokušavaju stvoriti rigidan sustav filmskog jezika preslikavanjem postojećih lingvističkih modela. Šezdesetih i sedamdesetih godina prošlog stoljeća semiotika filma temeljila se na pokušajima da se pronađu analogije između filmskih i književnih modela pripovijedanja te na primjeni analitičkih paradigmi preuzetih iz lingvistike, a rana semiotika bavila se strukturiranjem, kategoriziranjem i sistematizacijom diskursa, stvarajući rigidan jezik koji se nije poklapao s Pasolinijevim pristupom.¹² Pasolinijev pokušaj da u semiotiku uključi aspekt iracionalnog odvijao se u trenutku kad su semiotičari pokušavali etablirati svoju disciplinu kao znanost, te su im se njegove ideje činile nespojivima s njihovim nastojanjima.

Gledano iz današnje perspektive, Pasolinijeve teorije o odnosu zbilje i filmskog prikaza najbližnje su tezama Andréa Bazina, Kracauera i “realističke škole”. Međutim, kod Pasolinija se ideja filma kao “pisanog jezika zbilje” temelji na promatranju filma unutar šireg društveno-povijesnog konteksta te je i sam naglašavao slojevitost značenja što ih prikaz zbilje ima u filmovima. Većina kritika upućenih njegovoj semiotici filma odnosila se na njegove teze o odnosu filma i zbilje i na njegovu tvrdnju da film prikazuje zbilju zbiljom. Premda Pasolinijeve teorije o filmu nisu bile prihvaćene u vrijeme kad ih je objavio, danas se neka njegova razmišljanja itekako mogu povezati s recentnim teorijama.¹³ Također, Pasolinijevo inzistiranje na subjektivnim elementima u filmu, bilo da se radi o vrsti kadrova, pripovjedaču ili jeziku likova, u skladu je s današnjim teorijama koje veliku važnost pridaju upravo subjektivnom te kulturološkim normama koje utječu na interpretaciju filmskog djela. Nekoliko navedenih teoretičara koji su se izravno ili neizravno bavili Pasolinijevim esejima o prirodi filmskog jezika dokaz su dugoročnog odjeka njegovih teorija, premda ponekad ambivalentnih i kontradiktornih, u europskoj i američkoj filmologiji, a njegove ideje o filmu-poeziji i danas se mogu prepoznati u *art*-filmu.

¹² Pasolini se i sam uhvatio ukoštac s tadašnjim “strahom od stvarnosti” u svom kratkom članku *La paura del naturalismo* (*Strah od naturalizma*, 1967, Pasolini 2000: 248–249).

¹³ Kao što tvrdi Giuliana Bruno (1991), Pasolini je u svojim esejima anticipirao neke od osnovnih postavki poststrukturalističke teorije uvodeći termine kao što su diskurs, proces, *écriture*. Teresa De Lauretis (1981) jedna je od prvih teoretičarki koja je ponudila interpretacije Pasolinijevih eseja u svjetlu suvremenih teorija, posebno naglašavajući elemente iracionalnog i sna u stvaranju značenja, što će se poslije pojavljivati kao važna ideja u primjeni psihoanalitičkih teorija na umjetnost kao i teorija recepcije i uloge gledatelja. Gilles Deleuze se najozbiljnije pozabavio Pasolinijevim tezama (*L'image-mouvement*, 1983. i *L'image-temps*, 1985) i ponudio je detaljno čitanje njegovih osnovnih teorijskih postavki. Posebno se osvrnuo na Pasolinijeve definicije filmskog jezika kao argument svojoj tezi o potrebi stvaranja novog načina proučavanja slika i znakova koji ne mora počivati na već poznatim sustavima te je stvorio svoju teoriju o slobodnom neupravnom govoru referirajući se, između ostalog, i na Pasolinija (usp. Shwartz 2005).

LITERATURA

- Barthes, Roland i dr. 1969. *L'analisi del racconto*. Milano: Bompiani.
- Bazin, André. 2005. *Che cosa è il cinema?* Ur. i prev. Adriano Aprà. Milano: Garzanti.
- Bazzocchi, Marco Antonio. 2007. *I burattini filosofi: Pasolini dalla letteratura al cinema*. Milano: Bruno Mondadori.
- Bettetini, Gianfranco. 1973. *The Language and Technique of the Film*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Bruno, Giuliana. 1991. The Body of Pasolini's Semiotics. *Cinema Journal* 30, 3: 29–42.
- Croce, Benedetto. 1997. *The Aesthetics as the Science of Expression and the Linguistic in General*. Prev. Collin Lyas. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- De Lauretis, Teresa. 1981. Language, Representation, Practice: Re-reading Pasolini's Essays on Cinema. *Italian Quarterly* 82/83: 159–166.
- De Lauretis, Teresa. 1984. *Alice Doesn't: Feminism, Semiotics, Cinema*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Dufлот, Jean (ur.). 1994. *Il sogno del centauro*. Roma: Editori Riuniti.
- Eco, Umberto. 1962. *L'Opera aperta*. Milano: Bompiani.
- Eco, Umberto. [1968] 2002. *La struttura assente: la ricerca semiotica e il metodo strutturale*. Milano: Bompiani.
- Gramsci, Antonio. [1950] 1977. *Letteratura e vita nazionale*. Roma: Riuniti.
- Gramsci, Antonio. 1968. *Lettere dal carcere*. Torino: Einaudi.
- Green, Naomi. 1990. *Pier Paolo Pasolini: Cinema as Heresy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- La Porta, Filippo. 2002. *Pasolini: uno gnostico innamorato della realtà*. Firenze: Le Lettere.
- Magrelli, Enrico (ur.). 1977. *Con Pier Paolo Pasolini*. Roma: Bulzoni.
- Metz, Christian. 1964. Le cinéma: langue ou langage?. *Communications* 4: 52–90.
- Orr, Christopher. 1991. Observations on Pasolini's Theory and Practice. *Film Criticism* 15, 2: 38–46.
- Orr, Christopher. 1995. "Accattone" or Naturalism and Its Discontents. *Film Criticism* 19, 3: 54–66.
- Orr, John. 1998. *Contemporary Cinema*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Orr, John. 2000. A Cinema of Poetry. U: *Post-War Cinema and Modernity*: 133–141. Ur. John Orr i Olga Taxidou. New York: New York University Press.
- Panella, Giuseppe. 2009. *Pier Paolo Pasolini: il cinema come forma della letteratura*. Firenze: Editrice Clinamen.
- Pasolini, Pier Paolo. 1960. *Passione e ideologia*. Milano: Garzanti.
- Pasolini, Pier Paolo. 1961. *Accattone*. Roma: Edizioni FM.
- Pasolini, Pier Paolo. [1972] 2000. *Empirismo eretico*. Milano: Garzanti editore.
- Rhodes, John David. 2010. Pasolini's Exquisite Flowers: The "Cinema of Poetry" as a Theory of Art Cinema. U: *Global Art Cinema*: 142–163. Ur. Rosalind Galt i Karl Schoonover. Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press.
- Shwartz, Louis-Georges. 2005. Free Indirect Discourse in Deleuze's "Cinema". *SubStance* 34, 3: 107–135.
- Sitney, Adams P. 2015. *The Cinema of Poetry*. Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press.
- Stack, Oswald. 1969. *Pasolini on Pasolini*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Vighi, Fabio. 2001. *Le ragioni dell'altro: la formazione intellettuale di Pasolini tra saggistica, letteratura e cinema*. Ravenna: Longo editore.
- Ward, David. 1994. A Genial Analytic Mind: "Film" and "Cinema" in Pier Paolo Pasolini's Film Theory. U: *Pier Paolo Pasolini: Contemporary Perspectives*: 127–151. Ur. Patrick Rumble i Bart Testa. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

SUMMARY

FROM LITERATURE TO CINEMA: CONVERGENCE OF LITERARY AND CINEMATIC WORKS IN THE ESSAYS OF PIER PAOLO PASOLINI

Il "cinema di poesia" and *Osservazioni sul piano-sequenza* are Pasolini's most important essays on cinematic language. Alongside these two texts, Pasolini published a variety of shorter essays and articles in an effort to develop a coherent semiotics of cinema. In his writings, he frequently compares literary and cinematic language, exploring their structural and expressive affinities. Although his theories were not taken seriously during his lifetime, recent reappraisals of his work in the context of contemporary film theory have revealed significant connections between his ideas and later theoretical developments. This article examines the links between Pasolini's essays on cinema and literature, as well as their impact on subsequent film scholars and semioticians. The continuity of key concerns in his work—such as language and the representation of reality—can be traced from his early literary criticism to his later essays on cinema. Although he eventually privileged cinema over literature, which he considered a more suitable medium for realizing his artistic ambitions, Pasolini continued to employ a comparative approach to cinematic and written language. Moreover, in the early stages of his filmmaking career, he frequently drew on his own novels as source material.

Keywords: Pasolini's cinema, film-poetry, semiotics of cinema, literature and cinema, national-popular cinema