

INTERAKCIJA LITERATURE IN TEORIJE OD ROMANTIKE DO MODERNE (S SKICAMI NADALJNJE INTERAKCIJE OB KONCU MILENIJA)

Vanesa Matajč

Univerza v Ljubljani

UDK 82.0:1

UDK111.852

V obdobju od romantike do fin de siècle se zaradi samodojemanja subjekta in zavesti časa (zgodovinskosti/modernosti) čedalje bolj prepletata teorija in literatura. Članek to prikaže na primerih F. Schlegla (»Gespräch über die Poesie«), E. T. A. Hoffmanna, Baudelaira in Nietzscheja. Nietzschejev »konec metafizike«, ki je s subjektivacijo diskurza omogočil interakcijo teorije in literature, se prenese v relativistično metodološko načelo novega historizma.

Ključne besede: teorija in literatura, romantika, moderna, konec metafizike, novi historizem

Teza tega spisa je, da prav novoveška ideja modernosti motivira čedalje bolj uzaveščeno interakcijo literature in teorije od romantike do moderne. Kako? Srednjeveški pomen »modernosti« (novo, drugačno) je odprl dvom o vsem, kar se je zdelo nespremenljivo in večno, in s tem vsak predmet refleksije postavil v historično spremenljivost, kar je pogoj za hibridizacije. Novoveški mentalitetni (romantični) prehod iz »estetike stalnosti« v »estetiko prehodnosti in imanence« (Calinescu 3) motivira implicitna časovna razsežnost Descartesovega razumevanja subjekta kot *cogito ergo sum*. Heidegger ga razlaga takole: »Vsak *ego cogito* je *cogito me cogitare*; [...] Vsako človeško pred-stavljanje je [...] 'sámo'-predstavljanje.« Novoveški subjekt torej »postane sam po sebi postavljeni temelj in mera za vsako gotovost in resnico« (*Evropski nihilizem* 146, 127). Nanašanje jaza na jaz kot svoj lasten objekt se dogaja v času, kot časovna distanca med predstavljaljočim in predstavljanim jazom, isto nanašanje pa je tudi izhodišče za subjektivacijo oziroma literarizacijo filozofskega/teoretskega diskurza.

Odločilno ga nadaljuje Kantova teza o *sodbi okusa*: »A sodba okusa sploh ne temelji na pojmi in ni v ničemer spoznavna sodba, pač pa je le

estetska sodba.« Njena paradoksalnost tiči v tem, da »je sicer le subjektivno veljavna, vendar pa se kljub temu obrača na vse subjekte, kot bi bilo to mogoče edino, če bi bila objektivna sodba, ki temelji na spoznavnih razlogih.« Kant iz tega sklepa: »Subjektivno načelo, se pravi nedoločno idejo nadčutnega v nas, je mogoče zgolj naznačiti« (*Kritika razsodne moči* 122–123, 125–126, 180–181). Estetski doživljaj, ki je zaradi svoje iracionalnosti izrazljiv *zgolj z naznačenjem* (torej z retorično sugestijo), postane temelj subjektive samogotovosti in njegove estetske artikulacije v Fichtejevem *Vedoslovju* (1798): »Vedoslovje« kot znanost se namreč utemeljuje v načelu, ki ga ni mogoče dokazati, vendar pa Fichte meni: »Vse, kar je gotovo, je gotovo, ker je *ta stavek* gotov; in nič ni gotovo, če *on* ni gotov«. »Prvi stavek« za temelj določa subjekt vedoslovja: »Kogar je volja, ta naj kar raziskuje, kaj bi vedel, če njegov jaz ne bi bil jaz, tj. če ne bi eksistiral, in če ne bi mogel razlikovati nobenega ne-jaza od *svojega* jaza« (*Izbrani spisi* 63, 76). S tem se subjekt vzpostavlja v diferenci do svojih objektov, zajetih v sistemu vednosti; hkrati pa po principu vedoslovja sam vzpostavlja sistem vednosti in je torej s svojimi objekti postavljen tudi v razmerje identitete. V aktu avtotranscendence ali estetskega samodoživljaja to svojo dvojno strukturo presega s (subjektivno) totaliteto. Fichtejevska samogotovost se torej vzpostavlja hkrati v ciklično in linearno razumljenem času; kot subjektov samodoživljaj je trenutek »večne sedanjosti«, ki pa se mora stalno ponavljati v različicah in se torej razkrivati v linearno razumljenem času, da lahko subjekt nenehno potrjuje svojo subjektiviteto, svojo različnost do svojih vedno novih in drugačnih objektov. Svojo identiteto ohranja skozi svojo nenehno modernizacijo-diferenciacijo. Tako se sčasoma ne more več »zatrditi« v semantično enovalentni spoznavni pojem, ki bi imenoval nove, dognanju primernejše »temelje«, marveč »se lahko obrne [le še] h giblivosti simbolnega« (Vattimo 31), tj. v estetsko-sugestivno artikulacijo estetskega doživljaja, ki jo Kant imenuje »naznačenje«, Fichte pa opiše kot identifikacijo forme in vsebine »prvega stavka«. Če naj bo slednji »neposredno in sam zaradi sebe gotov, to [... pomeni], da njegova vsebina določa njegovo formo, in obratno, da njegova forma določa njegovo vsebino« (*Izbrani spisi* 64).

Umberto Eco razloži opisano estetizacijo oziroma literarizacijo diskurza s semiotičnega vidika: pri znakovnih vrstah se v trenutku, ko je odkrit pomen označevalca, označevalec tako rekoč zavrže v korist pomenu. Pri romantično razumljenem simbolu pa dobi označevalec svoj polni pomen šele kot tak, skozi svojo fizično prezenco (Fichtejevo »formo«). To je posledica romantičnega identificiranja simbolične aktivnosti z estetsko funkcijo, v skladu s katero se sporočilo usmerja samo nase, tako da ni prevedljivo v drugačno znakovno »formo« (prim. Eco 209–212). Gadamer meni, da »v vsakem primeru počiva pomen *symbolona* na njegovi prezenci in reprezentacijsko funkcijo dobi šele z navzočnostjo v svoji pokazanosti ali izrečenosti.« Reprezentira pa ne »na podlagi konvencije in dogmatske fiksacije« (Gadamer 71, 72), marveč skozi estetski doživljaj, torej subjektivno (čustveno-domišljijско), zaradi česar je kljub svoji konkretnosti nenazoren in neskončno interpretabilen: med nivojema izraza in pomena se v sim-

bolnem modusu vzpostavljajo vedno nova, še nekodirana možna razmerja (prim. Eco 212). Vdor simbolnega v znanstveni jezik, kar se zgodi preko osamosvajanja in čedalje večjega gospostva subjekta nad objekti realnosti, omogoča literarizacijo filozofskega/teoretskega diskurza, kakor tudi teoretizacijo/esejizacijo literarnega diskurza. Slednje je izrazito razvidno v literaturi od vključno romantike naprej. Romantika lahko z opisanimi sistemi mišljenja, ki poudarjajo vrednost subjektivnosti – od Kantovega estetskega izkustva do Fichtejevega sistema vedoslovja – velja za moderno obdobje v tem smislu, da s subjektivizacijo mišljenja prenaša poudarek na subjekt, na subjektovo samodojemanje in zaznavo časa.¹ Zato velja za prvi moderni poseg v metafiziko subjekta po Descartesu in s tem tudi za obdobje, ko se ustvari podlaga za modernizacijo novoveške metafizike (Matajc 38, 45).

Estetska artikulacija zaradi tega svojega izmikanja objektivističnim konvencijam spremeni teoretski diskurz, kar je razvidno iz fragmentov, ki jih je Friedrich Schlegel objavljaval v časopisu *Athenäum*, ter iz eseja »Gespräch über die Poesie«. Fragment je (pol)literarna forma, ki je osredinjena na trenutek izrekanja in že s svojo pojavnostjo zanika možnost v času obstojnega diskurzivnega sistema. Esejistična zvrst dialoga pa je izrazna struktura, ki ustreza fichtejevski dvojni strukturi romantičnega subjekta. Hkratnost identitete in difference, s katero se dialog vzpostavlja, Schlegel opiše z besedami: »Zato gre človek, gotov, da bo vedno znova našel sam sebe, vedno znova iz sebe, da bi v globini tujega bistva iskal in našel dopolnilo svojega lastnega najglobljega bistva« (»Pogovor o poeziji« 145). S tega vidika sta Schleglov polliterarni fragment in dialog simbolni strukturi. Njuna estetska forma je estetska vsebina romantične subjektivitete. Totaliteta, h kateri »neskončno napreduje« romantični subjekt in jo v svoji neskončni potencialnosti hkrati tudi nenehno uresničuje, pomeni tudi totaliteto artikulacije. Schlegel jo označi s pojmom mitologije, ki ima spoznavno funkcijo, a je hkrati »eno« s »poezijo«:

Kajti to je začetek vse poezije, da odpravi potek in zakone razumno mislečega razuma in nas znova prestavi v lepo zmedo fantazije, v izvirni kaos človeške narave, za katerega doslej še nisem našel lepšega simbola, kot je pisano vrvenje starih bogov. (F. Schlegel, »Pogovor o poeziji« 160)²

Romantična kognitivnost je torej nujno estetska, hkrati pa to estetskost poveže z združevanjem linearnega in cikličnega (mitskega) koncepta časa. Oboje določa romantični subjekt, tega pa ideja, ki je »nenehna samoproduktivajoča se menjava dveh prepirajočih se misli« (F. Schlegel, *Spisi* 29) – takšna ideja je torej statična v svoji dinamičnosti in torej z vidika časa paradokсна. S tem pa jenska romantična šola zavestno motivira teoretizacijo (esejiziranje) poetičnega diskurza in poetizacijo teoretskega diskurza.

Tej interakciji diskurzov se najbolj odpre (esejizirani, lirizirani) romantični roman, predvsem v opusu E. T. A. Hoffmanna. Hoffmannovo pripovedno dogajanje se ne more več racionalno zapreti v en sam smisel in objektivirajočo, »vsevedno« razlago, marveč avktorialni pripovedovalec zgolj še estetsko »obvladuje« nejasno naključje (*Življenjski nazori mačka Murra*), nejasno usodo (*Hudičevi napoji*, *Peskar*) ali nejasen iracionalni

doživljaj (*Hrestač*). Ta estetsko artikulirana nejasnost vzvratno vpliva na (psihoanalitsko) teorijo. Sigmund Freud ob Hoffmannovi pripovedi *Peskar* (*Der Sandmann*) razlaga pojem *das Unheimliche* kot to, kar je domače, a zaradi svoje nedoumljivosti tudi tuje, skrivnostno, nenavadno; za pojav tega »grozljivega« občutja je »potrebna negotovost sodbe, ali je [...] neverjetnost [nenavadno uresničenje želje, občutje zle sile, občutje, da se mrtvi vračajo] nemara vendarle realno možna« (Freud 34). To negotovost vzbuja sama protislovna struktura romantičnega subjekta oziroma sposobnost za odtujitev lastnega jaza. Iz takšnega samodoživljanja nastajata možnosti obstoja dveh svetov, racionalno razložljivega in nerazložljivega (ki učinkuje kot višja sila). Obe možnosti ostajata v smislu Todorova³ fantastično odprti v spoznavno negotovost, ne da bi v teku časa ena zmagala nad drugo. Hoffmannov avktorialni epski subjekt lahko torej obvladuje pripovedno realnost (fantazijsko-emocionalne vsebine romantične subjektivitete) samo tako, da jo estetsko artikulira, tj. predstavi v vsej njeni paradoksalnosti, kar pomeni, da jo zajame v strukturi arabeske. Ta Friedrichu Schleglu velja za »posredno mitologijo« (totaliteto filozofije in poezije), ker sta obe organizirani na isti način: struktura arabeske je eminentno simbolna, estetsko kognitivna struktura – »simetrija protislovij, ta čudovita večna menjava navdiha in ironije«, »izvirni kaos človeške narave« (»Pogovor« 160).

Krožna struktura orientalske arabeske sugerira neupodobljivo transcendentno, ki se nujno upodablja v simbolni prezenci ornamentov. Ti so avtonomni in hkrati postavljeni v vsestranska razmerja. V krožni strukturi medsebojnih razmerij se arabeski ornamenti predstavljajo kot čista sedanjost svoje hkratnosti ali skupne identitete celotne arabeske, obenem pa kot množstvo diferenc, ki se vzpostavljajo v medsebojnih razmerjih med ornamenti. Te difference, različnost razmerij, pa se razkrivajo druga za drugo, v teku časa. Gibanje estetske kognitivnosti, ki jo omogoča struktura arabeske, totalitetna vse-hkratnost in napredujoča zaporednost učinkov razmerij med njenimi ornamenti, je gibanje po krožnici. Ko Fichte opisuje samogotovost »prvega stavka«, se zaveda: »Tu je torej krog, iz katerega človeški duh nikoli ne more izstopiti« (*Izbrani spisi* 75). Hoffmannova literatura je s tem estetska artikulacija romantične filozofije/teorije estetskega subjekta *par excellence*, s čimer je vplivala na Charlesa Baudelaira, vendar s spremembo.

Baudelairov lirski/esejistični subjekt namreč eksplicitno artikulira transcendentnost časa. S krepitvijo zavesti o človeški/naravni minljivosti se je okrepila tudi transcendentna vrednost protipola, »večne« lepote (forme). S tem pa je tudi romantično *das Unheimliche* dobilo eksplicitnejši protipol: celoten doživljaj »numinoznega« (tj. po Rudolfru Ottu moderni doživljaj presežne realnosti) namreč ni samo »grozljiv«, ampak tudi fascinanten (*mysterium tremendum et fascinans*). Numinozno ni racionalno dojemljivo, tako da se izraža v semantično polivalentnih literarnih strukturah in te ohranjajo najvišjo spoznavno vrednost, toliko bolj, ker kot estetska forma same ustvarjajo oziroma priklicujejo transcendentno Lepoto. Njen sočasno fascinanten in grozljiv učinek (prim. Mihelj 67) pa se morda krepi tudi zato, ker razkriva svojo *relativno* transcendentnost. Baudelairovski estetski

doživljaj namreč za razliko od romantičnega opredeljuje v schleglovskem smislu »čutno« čustvo: »vzburljivost za to in ono«, »strast, ki nabrekne in znova uplahne« (»Pogovor« 160). Moderna lepota se realizira skozi minljivi estetski, ekscesni doživljaj, zato je njena transcendentnost le še relativna – je le »toliko idealna, kolikor je bežeča« (»si ideal si fugitive«). Ekscesni estetski doživljaj je trenutek večne sedanjosti, izstop iz zavesti ireverzibilnega časa, Baudelairovo racionalno refleksijo lepote pa vodi ravno ta zavest časa (»La Beauté«). Gre za 'idejo estetske modernosti', ki implicira značilnost avantgardnega in jo začne polno uresničevati Baudelairova umetnostna refleksija.⁴ Zaradi te svoje dvojne strukture Baudelaire v svoji esejistiki imenuje modernega človeka *homo duplex*. Baudelairovo dojemanje subjekta paradoksalno združuje stalno tenzijo progresivne časovne finalnosti (razpada, smrti v linearnem času organske stvarnosti) in duhovno lepoto čutno-čustvenega zanosa čiste sedanjosti, ki se ciklično vrača, s tolikšno doslednostjo, da gre očitno za prepoznavo paradoksa (relativno) absolutnega subjekta. To pa je tudi značilnost propada metafizičnih sistemov oziroma Nietzschejevega mišljenja; občutje modernosti, ko se »napredek [tudi če v smrt] čedalje bolj vzpostavlja kot vrednota sama na sebi. Paradoks tiči v tem, da je napredek napredek samo, ko vodi do novega stanja, od koder je mogoč nov napredek in nič drugega« (Vattimo 58–63). Nov napredek pa v smrti oziroma dojemanju linearnega časa ni mogoč, saj pomeni destrukcijo stabilnosti, nemožnost hkratne absolutnosti in finalnosti subjektivitete. Doživljaji fascinantno-tesnobne minljivosti se kopičijo kot zmeraj prehodne postaje. Baudelaire jih v liriki artikulira tako, da eksplicitno kažejo čezse na transcendenco časa/večnosti, in sicer prek alegorične strukture, kar je nov retorični poskus spajanja teoretske in literarne diktije. »Alegorija pripada izvorno sferi govorjenja, logosa, je torej retorična oziroma hermenevtična figura,« meni Gadamer (71); »namesto tega, kar se zares misli, je rečeno nekaj drugega, otipljivejšega, vendar tako, da to drugo kljub temu omogoča razumeti tisto prvo [...]. Alegorični postopek razlage in simbolični postopek spoznavanja imata isti temelj nujnosti: božjega ni mogoče spoznati drugače, kot izhajajoč iz čutnega.« Vendar »alegorija pravzaprav ne predpostavlja metafizične praserodnosti, kot si jo lasti simbol, temveč le sopripadnost na podlagi konvencionalne in dogmatske fiksacije« (Gadamer 72).

Alegorija ne more izražati romantične predstave o totaliteti. Zaradi svojega retoričnega statusa po de Manu »nakazuje razpor med načinom, kako se svet pojavlja v resničnosti, in načinom, kako se pojavlja v jeziku« (*Slepota in uvid* 188). Nakazuje torej diferenco med snovjo in njeno estetsko artikulacijo, s tem pa postane ustrezna izrazna struktura za poromantični subjekt, ki prepoznavo svojo razcepljenost v času, alegorični znak se mora nanašati na sebi predhoden znak:

Pomen, ki ga vzpostavlja alegorični znak, je potemtakem samo v *ponavljanju* [...] nekega zgodnejšega znaka, s katerim ne more nikoli sovpasti, saj je bistvo tega zgodnejšega znaka čista predhodnost [...]. Medtem ko simbol postavlja možnost istovetnosti oziroma poistovetenja, alegorija predvsem označuje distanco v razmerju do lastnega izvora. (de Man, *Slepota in uvid* 204)

Tako simbolna kot alegorična struktura sta torej »način zapolnjevanja distance med sedanostjo in preteklostjo, komentar, interpretacija, podvojitve« (Kernev Štrajn 98–99). Tako romantični subjekt kot moderni baudelairovski *homo duplex* se vzpostavljata v odnosu do časa, ki ga vodi novoveška ideja modernosti, vendar fichtejevski jaz poudarja identiteto jaza z nejazom in posledično zagovarja simbolno artikulacijo estetskega doživljanja, moderni *homo duplex* pa z alegorično artikulacijo poudarja njuno diferenco z alegorično-strukturno primerjavo (»comme«) dveh ločenih ravni, estetske artikulacije in njene snovi, večnosti in minljivosti. Vendar gre v obeh primerih za estetsko kognitivnost in s tem za estetsko artikulacijo človekovega razmerja do časa.

Najdoslednejšo izpeljavo paradoksalne samogotovosti romantičnega subjekta in z njo interakcije literarnega in filozofskega/teoretskega diskurza uteleša Nietzschejeva emfatična refleksija zloma metafizičnih sistemov in paradoksa ideje modernosti. »Nietzsche dožene, da zgodovini ni moč pobegniti, zato je na koncu primoran združiti dve nezdružljivi prvini, zgodovino in modernost [...] v paradoks, ki ga ni mogoče rešiti« (de Man, *Slepota* 150). Relativnost vzpostavlja struktura Nietzschejeve artikulacije: sopostavljeni fragmenti, katerih smisel se izključuje, tako da se pojma volja do moči in nadčlovek ne moreta zatrditi v enem samem pomenu – nista več temelja sistema. Heidegger ugotavlja:

Nietzschejeva metafizika [...] ima kot resnica o bivajočem v celoti voljo do moči za svoj 'objekt'. [...] Volja do moči pa je kot temeljna narava bivajočega v celoti obenem določitev bistva človeka. Kot taka določitev je volja do moči temelj metafizike, je [torej tudi] njen subiectum. (Heidegger 85–86)

Nietzschejev človek je torej subjekt in hkrati objekt volje do moči in s tem brezkončno izničuje to diferenco (in z njo identiteto). Po Urbančiču je »nadčlovek« (*Übermensch*), ki »biva kot prehod čez človeka in tako sam je ta prehod čez. Tako da tisto, kar zdaj biva – sebe – dviga čezse navzgor, se presega in s tem [...] kot prejšnji propada, saj ono 'obliko' prejšnjega sebe sedaj izgublja – ta prehaja, premineva« (Urbančič 402). Premineva pa z vidika modernosti, ki po Nietzscheju v ponavljajoči se novosti vselej implicira tudi svoje predhodno, a brez prepoznavnega temelja. Stem napoveduje lacanovsko drsenje označevalcev mimo označenca, ki (v teku časa) vzpostavlja retorični proces, v katerem se zgreši bistvo subjekta oziroma jezika,⁵ ne da bi se mogel slednji zatrditi v svoje bistvo in sistem. Nietzschejeva estetska artikulacija, ki se ne more zatrditi v diskurzivni pojmovni sistem, je polliterarna forma esejističnega fragmenta. Vrh doseže v delu *Tako je govoril Zaratustra*, ki z nizanjem odprtih zgodb in z vložnimi lirskimi pesmimi ni več samo interakcija, marveč že čista sinkretičnost filozofskega in literarnega diskurza: je nedoločljiv hibridni žanr modernosti.

Nietzschejev »odprt sistem« se kot metoda uveljavi šele v novem historizmu, zlasti v dveh njegovih načelih. Tako kot se Nietzsche pri dojemanju časa (modernost/zgodovina) in (spoznavajočega) subjekta (nadčlovek kot subjekt/objekt volje do moči) ne more izogniti metafiziki, se novi historizem zaveda, »da sleherno dejanje razkrinkanja, kritike in nasprotovanja

uporablja prav orodje, ki ga obsoja, in tvega, da postane plen dejavnosti, ki jih razgalja« in »da je obtok literarnih in neliterarnih tekstov neločljiv« (Veeseer xi). Po tem načelu se torej dokončno istovetno obravnava hkratnost teorije in literature: to je simptom konca modernosti, metafizike časa in subjekta, ki se ne more več razločiti na spoznavajoči in spoznavani subjekt.

OPOMBE

¹ Občutje časa kot nosilni občutek v epiki se prvič pojavi v Lessingovem spisu *Laokoon*, v delih znotraj predromantičnega sentimentalističnega toka pa pri Sternu in Fieldingu, ki napovedujejo romantično občutenje subjekta/modernosti. Prim. Wilpert 858.

² Brat August uveljavlja zavest zgodovinskosti ob vpeljavi srednjeveške mitologije, ki po njegovem mnenju nastane ob junaških epih in viteških romanah (prim. A. W. Schlegel 102–143).

³ « Dans le fantastique, l'événement étrange ou surnaturel était perçu sur le fond de ce qui est jugé normal et naturel » (Todorov 181).

⁴ Gautier v članku « Plastique et civilisation – Du beau antique et du beau moderne » (1948) opisuje estetiko grdega (Calinescu 45, 46): grdo modernega industrijskega in urbanega življenja se preoblikuje v umetniško lepoto. Tako si prisvoji romantično, Hoffmannovo (s stališča absolutno estetskega subjekta) subjektiviranje objektivne stvarnosti s postopkom groteskizacije.

⁵ »Gotovo je ravno razlika med izjavljanjem in izjavo tista, ki povzroči, da se nam ta *mislim* vselej lahko izmuzne.[...] Temu *cogito* daje njegovo gotovost to, da se postavi na svoje mesto na ravni izjavljanja. [...] Do razlike v statusu subjekta, ki nastopi z razsežnostjo, odkrito s freudovskim nezavednim, pride zaradi želje, ki jo je treba umestiti na raven tega *cogito*. Želja prežema in razvema sleherno izjavljanje, o njej govori sleherno izjavljanje« (Lacan 130).

LITERATURA

- Baudelaire, Charles. *Oeuvres complètes*. Ur. Y. G. le Dantec – C. Pichois. Paris: Gallimard, 1961.
- Calinescu, Matei. *Five Faces of Modernity*. Durham: Duke University Press., 1987.
- De Man, Paul. *Allegories of Reading*. New Haven – London: Yale University Press, 1979.
- — —. *Slepota in uvid*. Prev. J. Kernev Štrajn. Ljubljana: LUD Literatura, 1997.
- Eco, Umberto. *Semiotik und Philosophie der Sprache*. Prev. C. Trabant Rommel – J. Trabant. München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1985.
- Fichte, Johann Gotlieb. »O pojmu vedoslovja ali tako imenovani filozofiji.« Prev. D. Debenjak. *Izbrani spisi*. Ljubljana: Slovenska matica, 1984.
- Freud, Sigmund. *Das Unheimliche*. Prevedla D. Debenjak. Ljubljana: Analecta, 1994.
- Gadamer, Hans Georg. *Resnica in metoda*. Prevedel T. Virk. Ljubljana: LUD Literatura, 2001.

- Heidegger, Martin. *Evropski nihilizem*. Prevedel I. Urbančič. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba, 1971.
- Inwood, Michael. *A Hegel Dictionary*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1992.
- Johnson, Barbara, ur. *Freedom and Interpretation*. New York: Basic Books, 1993.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Kritika razsodne moči*. Prev. R. Riha. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC, 1999.
- Kernev Štrajn, Jelka. »Problem razmerja med simbolom in alegorijo znotraj narativne razsežnosti Krsta pri Savici«. *Romantična pesnitev*. Ur. M. Juvan. Ljubljana: FF, 2002. (Obdobja 19) 95–105.
- Kos, Matevž. *Poskusi z Nietzschejem*. Ljubljana: Slovenska matica, 2000.
- Kristeva, Julia. »The Speaking Subject is Not Innocent«. *Freedom and Interpretation*. Ur. B. Johnson. New York: Basic Books, 1993. 147–174.
- Lacan, Jacques. *Štirje temeljni koncepti psihoanalize*. Prev. R. Močnik, Z. Skušek, S. Žižek. Ljubljana: Analecta, 1996.
- Matajč, Vanesa. *Duhovnogodovinska podlaga modernosti v slovenski književnosti 1898-1941*. Doktorska disertacija (Univerza v Ljubljani). Mentor L. Kralj. Ljubljana, 2002.
- Mihelj, Sabina. »Izrekanje numinoznega pri utemeljiteljih simbolistične lirike.« *Primerjalna književnost* 23.2 (2000): 59–84.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Gesammelte Werke*. Ur. K. Schlechta. München, 1954.
- . *Volja do moči*. Prevedel J. Moder. Ljubljana: Slovenska matica, 1991.
- Otto, Rudolf. *Sveto: O iracionalnem v ideji božjega in njegovem razmerju do racionalnega*. Prev. T. Virk. Ljubljana: Nova revija, 1993.
- Schlegel, August Wilhelm. »Geschichte der romantischen Literatur.« *Kritische Schriften und Briefe*. Zv. IV. Ur. E. Lohner. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer Verlag, 1965.
- Schlegel, Friedrich. »Pogovor o poeziji.« *Spisi o literaturi*. Prev. T. Virk. Ljubljana: LUD Literatura, 1998.
- Todorov, Tzvetan. *Introduction à la littérature fantastique*. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1970.
- Urbančič, Ivan. »Spremna beseda«. Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Tako je govoril Zaratustra*. Ljubljana: Slovenska matica, 1999. 377–454.
- Vattimo, Gianni. *Konec moderne*. Prev. S. Kutoš. Ljubljana: LUD Literatura, 1997.
- Veaser, Harold Aram, ur. *New Historicism*. London in New York: Routledge, 1989.
- Wilpert, Gero von. *Sachwörterbuch der Literatur*. Stuttgart: Kröner Verlag, 1969.

THE INTERACTION BETWEEN LITERATURE AND THEORY FROM ROMANTICISM TO THE FIN DE SIÈCLE WITH SKETCHES OF CONTINUED INTERACTION AT THE END OF THE MILLENNIUM

.....

Vanesa Matajc

University of Ljubljana

UDK 82.0:1

UDK111.852

In the period between Romanticism and the fin de siècle, as a result of the self-conception of the subject and the consciousness of time (historical vs. modern), theory and literature became much more interwoven. This interweaving is shown in the article on the basis of examples from Friedrich Schlegel ("Gespräch über die Poesie") and E. T. A. Hoffmann, as well as through examples from Charles Baudelaire and Friedrich Nietzsche's "end of metaphysics," which, with the subjectification of discourse, enabled interaction between theory and literature, and led to the relativistic methodological principles of New Historicism.

Keywords: theory and literature, romanticism, fin de siècle, end of metaphysics, New Historicism

The thesis of this article is that the increasingly conscious interaction between literature and theory from Romanticism to the fin de siècle was motivated by the modern idea of modernity. The process developed along the following lines.

The medieval meaning of the "modern" (i.e., "new" or "different") raised doubts about everything that had seemed unchangeable and eternal. Thus every object of reflection came to be seen as prone to historical changes, which is a prerequisite for hybridization. The modern (Romantic) shift in mentality from an "esthetics of permanence" to an "esthetics of transitoriness and immanence" (Calinescu 3) is motivated by the temporal dimension implied in Descartes' perception of the subject,¹ in his sentence "cogito, ergo sum" ("I think, therefore I am"). According to Heidegger's interpretation, "every *ego cogito*, 'I think', is *cogito me cogitare*, 'I think myself thinking' Every human act of representing is ... a representation of oneself" (Heidegger 135).² The modern subject thus "himself becomes the basis and measure of all certainty and truth" (Heidegger 118).³ The

Ego's reference to the Ego as its object occurs in time, as a temporal distance between the representing and represented Ego, and forms the starting-point for the subjectivization or "literarization" of philosophical and theoretical discourse.

Crucial to its subsequent development is Kant's thesis about the *judgment of taste*: "The judgment of taste has no concept as its determining ground and is in no way a cognitive judgment, but an esthetic one."⁴ The paradox of this judgment lies in the fact that "despite its merely subjective validity, it addresses itself to *every* subject, as would be possible only if it were an objective judgment grounded on cognitive reasons."⁵ From this, Kant concludes: "The subjective principle – that is, the vague idea of the supersensible residing in us – can be merely indicated" (Kant 375, 379, 446).⁶ The esthetic experience – which, due to its irrationality, can only be expressed through *indication*; that is, rhetorical suggestion – becomes the basis of the subject's self-certainty, as well as of his esthetic articulation, in Fichte's *Über den Begriff der Wissenschaftslehre* (1798). The "science of knowledge" as a science is grounded on a principle that is impossible to prove, but, according to Fichte, "all that is certain is such because *this sentence* is certain; and, conversely, nothing is certain if this sentence is not" (21).⁷ In this "first sentence," the basis is identified with the subject of the science of knowledge: "Anyone that has a mind to it is free to investigate what he would know if his Ego were not an Ego; that is, if it did not exist, or if he could not distinguish any non-Ego from his own Ego" (Fichte 40).⁸ Thus the subject establishes himself as different from his objects, which are encompassed in the system of knowledge. However, by the principle stated above, he also establishes the system of knowledge himself, and is thus in a way identical with his objects. In the act of self-transcendence or esthetic self-experience, he transcends this double structure, reaching a (subjective) totality. The Fichtean self-certainty thus establishes itself in both the cyclic and the linear concepts of time. As the subject's self-experience, it is a moment of "eternal present." However, if the subject is to again and again reaffirm his subjectivity, his difference from his ever-changing objects, this moment has to repeat itself in countless variants and thus reveal itself in the linear concept of time. It preserves its identity through constant modernization – that is, differentiation. As a result, it can no longer "settle" into a semantically monovalent cognitive concept and name a new "basis," one that would be more appropriate to its findings. It can only "take us . . . toward the mobility of the symbolic" (Vattimo 28); that is, to an esthetic and suggestive articulation of the esthetic experience. This articulation is labeled by Kant as "indication," whereas Fichte describes it as an identification of the form and content of the "first sentence": if the latter is to be "certain directly and in itself, this [. . . means] that its form is determined by its content, and vice versa: that its content is determined by its form" (Fichte 22).⁹

Umberto Eco explains this esthetization or "literarization" of discourse semiotically: in the domain of sign types, the signifier is practically discarded in favor of its meaning as soon as the latter is revealed. In the Romantic conception of the symbol, in contrast, the signifier only acquires its full

meaning as such; that is, through its physical presence (what Fichte calls the “form”). This is a result of the Romantic identification of symbolic activity with esthetic function: the message is directed at itself, so that it defies translation into any other sign “form” (cf. Eco 209–212). Gadamer maintains that “in every case the meaning of the *symbolon* depends on its physical presence and acquires its representative function only through the fact of its being shown or spoken.” However, it does not represent on the basis of “convention and dogmatic agreement” (Gadamer 65, 67), but through the esthetic experience; that is, subjectively (emotionally and imaginatively). For all its concreteness, it is thus not evident but infinitely interpretable: in the symbolic mode, one finds ever new and hitherto uncoded possible relations establishing themselves between the levels of expression and meaning (cf. Eco 212). The incursion of the symbolic into scientific language that occurs through the self-assertion and the far greater power of the subject over objective reality enable both the literarization of philosophical and theoretical discourse and the theorization and essayization of literary discourse. This latter phenomenon has been markedly expressed in literature since the dawn of Romanticism. Romanticism – with its descriptive systems of thinking that emphasize the value of subjectivity, from Kant’s esthetic experience to Fichte’s system of the science of knowledge – can be regarded as belonging to the modern period in the sense that, with the subjectification of thinking, it places an emphasis on the subject, on the subject’s self-conception and on the subject’s reception of time.¹⁰ It thus counts as the first modern incursion into the metaphysics of the subject from Descartes onwards, and with this it is also the period in which the basis for the modernization of new age metaphysics was created (Matajc 38, 45).

In eluding objectivist conventions, esthetic articulation accordingly brings about a change in the theoretical discourse. This is evident from the fragments published by Friedrich Schlegel in the journal *Athenäum*, as well as from his essay “Gespräch über die Poesie” (Dialogue on Poetry, 1799). The fragment is a (semi)literary form centered on the moment of utterance, so that its very nature denies the possibility of an enduring discursive system. The essayist genre of the dialogue, on the other hand, is a structure of expression well suited to the Fichtean double structure of the Romantic subject. Its characteristic simultaneity of identity and difference is described by Schlegel as follows: “Certain of finding himself again, man keeps going out of himself, so that he might seek and find, in the depths of an extraneous being, a complement to his own innermost being” (Schlegel 280).¹¹ Viewed from this aspect, Schlegel’s semiliterary fragments (“Gespräch über die Poesie” is written in the form of a dialogue, a conversation among literary figures, while the text as a whole assumes the form of a semiliterary essay) are symbolic structures: their esthetic form is the esthetic content of Romantic subjectivity. The totality towards which the Romantic subject “makes infinite progress,” and that he realizes again and again in his infinite potentiality also represents a totality of articulation: Schlegel describes this with the concept of mythology,¹² which has a cognitive function but is at the same time “one” with “poetry”:

For this is the beginning of all poetry, to lift [*aufheben*] the progression and laws of all rationally thinking reason and to place us anew into the beautiful confusion of imagination, into the original chaos of human nature, for which I know as of yet no more beautiful symbol than the confusing throng of the old gods. (Schlegel 305)¹³

Romantic cognitiveness is thus necessarily an esthetic one, and at the same time this estheticity connects through bringing together the linear and cyclical (mythic) concept of time. The romantic subject determines both, and the subject is determined by the idea – that is, the “constant self-generating exchange of two opposing thoughts” (*stets sich selbst erzeugende Wechsel zwei streitenden Gedanken*) – and it is thus static in its dynamicity and paradoxical from the viewpoint of time (Schlegel 38). With this notion, the Jena Romantic School¹⁴ consciously motivates the theorization (essayization) of poetic discourse and the poetization of theoretical discourse.

The form that opens most readily to this interaction of discourses is the (essayized, lyricized) Romantic novel, particularly as written by E. T. A. Hoffmann. Hoffmann’s narrative action can no longer close itself rationally into a single sense and an objectifying, “omniscient” explanation. Instead, all that is left to the “authorial” narrator is a mere esthetic “control” over unclear chance events (*Die Lebensansichten des Katers Murr*, 1820), unclear fate (*Die Elixiere des Teufels*, 1816; *Der Sandmann*, 1819), or unclear irrational experience (*Nusscracker und Mausekönig*, 1819). This esthetically articulated ambiguity in its turn exerts an influence on theory, namely on psychoanalysis: Sigmund Freud uses Hoffmann’s tale *Der Sandmann* to explain the concept of *das Unheimliche* (the uncanny) as something familiar yet at the same time strange, mysterious, and unusual in its unfathomability. According to Freud, the arousal of this “uncanny” feeling “requires an intellectual uncertainty whether ... the improbability [i.e., the extraordinary fulfillment of a wish, the sense of an evil power, the sense that the dead return] may not be possible after all” (Freud 272).¹⁵ This uncertainty is evoked by the contradictory structure of the Romantic subject, by the ability to alienate one’s own Ego. Such self-experience gives rise to the possibility that there may be two worlds existing side by side, one that admits a rational explanation and one that does not (i.e., one that functions as a higher power). Both possibilities remain fantastically open (in Todorov’s sense of the “fantastic”), maintaining a cognitive uncertainty without one emerging the stronger in the course of time. Hoffmann’s authorial epic subject can thus control the narrative reality (the imaginative and emotional contents of Romantic subjectivity) only by giving it an esthetic articulation; that is, by presenting it in all its paradox, in the structure of the arabesque. The arabesque is perceived by Schlegel as an “indirect mythology” (a totality of philosophy and poetry) because it reveals the same organization: the structure of the arabesque is an eminently symbolic, esthetically cognitive one – a “symmetry of contradictions, this wonderfully perennial alternation of enthusiasm and irony,” “the original chaos of human nature” (Schlegel 305).¹⁶

The circular structure of the Oriental arabesque suggests a transcendence that defies pictorial representation and can only be conveyed through

the symbolic presence of ornaments. Each ornament is autonomous, yet at the same time placed in a relationship with all others. In the circular structure of mutual relationships, the arabesque ornaments thus convey a double impression. On the one hand, they appear as the pure present moment of their simultaneity, of the identity of the arabesque as a whole. On the other hand, they appear as a multitude of differences that are established in the mutual relationships and revealed, one after the other, in the course of time. The structure of the arabesque – the simultaneous effect of the totality and the progressive, consecutive effects of these relationships – makes possible an esthetic cognitiveness whose movement is a circular one. Describing the self-certainty of the “first sentence,” Fichte was aware of this: “Here, then, is a circle that the human mind can never leave” (39).¹⁷ Hoffmann’s literature is therefore an esthetic articulation of the Romantic philosophy and theory of the esthetic subject *par excellence*.

As such it influenced Charles Baudelaire, but with a certain modification: the subject in Baudelaire’s lyric poetry and essays explicitly articulates the transcendence of time. The growing awareness of human and natural transience also heightened the transcendent value of its opposite, “eternal” beauty (i.e., form). With this process, the Romantic *das Unheimliche* likewise acquired a more explicit opposite – the entire experience of “the numinous” (the modern experience of transcendent reality, according to Rudolf Otto) is not merely “terrifying,” but fascinating as well (*mysterium tremendum et fascinans*). The numinous cannot be rationally apprehended; therefore it finds expression in literary structures that are semantically polyvalent. These preserve the highest cognitive value – all the more so because, being esthetic forms, they create or evoke the transcendence of Beauty themselves. On the other hand, the simultaneously fascinating and terrifying effect of Beauty (cf. Mihelj 67) is perhaps also heightened because Beauty reveals its *relative* transcendence.

In contrast to the Romantic concept, the Baudelairean esthetic experience is defined by a “sensuous” feeling in Schlegel’s sense of the word; that is, as “an ability to be excited by something,” “a passion that swells and abates again” (*Reizbarkeit für dieses und jenes; Leidenschaft, die schwillt und wieder sinket*; Schlegel 304). Because modern beauty is realized through a transient, excessive esthetic experience, its transcendence is only a relative one – “as ideal as it is fleeting” (*si idéal si fugitive*).¹⁸ The excessive esthetic experience is a moment of eternal present, an exit from the awareness of irreversible time. However, on the other hand, it is precisely the awareness of time that informs Baudelaire’s rational reflection on beauty (*La Beauté*). The “idea of the aesthetics of modernity” implies characteristics of the avant-garde and is completely realized in Baudelaire’s artistic reflection (Matajc 18, Calinescu 41).¹⁹ Due to this double structure, Baudelaire labels modern man as *homo duplex* in his essays: Baudelaire’s conception of the subject paradoxically brings together the constant tension between progressive temporal finality (decline, decay, and death in linear time of an organic reality) and spiritual beauty of a sensory-emotional pure presentness, which returns cyclically with such logicity that it is clearly a matter

of a recognizable paradox of the (relatively) absolute subject.²⁰ This is also a characteristic of the collapse of metaphysical systems and Nietzsche's thinking: the feeling of modernity, in which progress, even in death, is all the more established as a value of its own; the paradox lies in the fact that an advancement is only an advancement when it leads to a new situation, one from which only a new advancement is possible (Vattimo 58–63). The new advancement in death and the comprehension of linear time is not possible because it means the destruction of stability, the impossibility of the simultaneous absoluteness and finality of subjectivity. Experiences of a fascinating yet anxiety-inducing transience accumulate like never-ending transit stops (*Une Charogne*). In Baudelaire's lyric poetry, they are made to point explicitly beyond themselves to a transcendence of time and eternity; that is, they are articulated through an allegorical structure, which is a new rhetorical attempt to link theoretical and literary diction. Allegory is characterized by Gadamer:

Allegory originally belonged to the sphere of talk, of the logos, and is therefore a rhetorical or hermeneutical figure. Instead of what is actually meant, something else, more tangible is said, but in such a way as to suggest the other ... The allegorical procedure of interpretation and the symbolical procedure of knowledge have the same justification: it is not possible to know the divine in any other way than by starting from the world of the senses. Nevertheless, allegory does not assume an original metaphysical relationship, such as a symbol claims but, rather, a connection created by convention and dogmatic agreement. (Gadamer 65–67)

Allegory is incapable of expressing the Romantic notion of totality; due to its rhetorical status, "it suggests a disjunction between the way in which the world appears in reality and the way it appears in language" (de Man, *Blindness* 191). In other words, it points to the difference between subject matter and its esthetic articulation. This makes it an appropriate structure of expression for the post-Romantic subject, who recognizes his division in time – the allegorical sign must refer to a sign anterior to itself:

The meaning constituted by the allegorical sign can then consist only in the *repetition* ... of a previous sign with which it can never coincide, since it is of the essence of this previous sign to be pure anteriority ... Whereas the symbol postulates the possibility of an identity or identification, allegory designates primarily a distance in relation to its own origin. (de Man, *Blindness* 207)

Both the symbolic and allegorical structures are thus "a way of filling out the distance between the past and present – a commentary, interpretation, doubling" (Kernev Štrajn 98–99). For Nietzsche, "language is rhetoric, because it desires to convey only a *doxa* (opinion), not an *episteme* (knowledge)" (Nietzsche 107). To de Man "it seems as if Nietzsche had turned away from the problems of language to questions of the self and to the assertion of a philosophy rooted in the unmediated sense of existential pathos" (*Allegories* 106). Both the Romantic subject and the modern

Baudelairian *homo duplex* establish themselves in their relation to time, a relation informed by the modern-period idea of modernity. They do diverge on one point. The Fichtean Ego stresses the identity of the Ego with the non-Ego, consequently advocating a symbolic articulation of the esthetic experience; the modern *homo duplex*, by contrast, stresses their difference, employing an allegorical articulation for the purpose. Through the allegorical structure, he compares (*comme*) two separate levels, the levels of esthetic articulation and of its subject-matter, of eternity and transience. Still, both approaches are concerned with esthetic cognitiveness and thus the esthetic articulation of man's relation to time.

The paradoxical self-certainty of the Romantic subject, and with it the interaction between literary and philosophical and theoretical discourse, is developed most consistently in Nietzsche's emphatic reflection on the collapse of metaphysical systems and on the paradox of the idea of modernity: "Nietzsche finds it impossible to escape from history, and he finally has to bring the two incompatibles, history and modernity ... together in a paradox that cannot be resolved" (de Man, *Blindness* 150).

Relativity is established through the structure of Nietzsche's articulation: through a juxtaposition of fragments whose meanings are mutually exclusive.²¹ Due to this technique, the concepts of the "will to power" and "superman" cannot be reduced to single meanings – they are no longer the foundations of a system. In this respect, Heidegger wrote about Nietzsche:

As a truth about entities as a whole, Nietzsche's metaphysics has the will to power as its "object" ... However, since the will to power represents the fundamental nature of entities as a whole, it also determines the essence of man. As this determining factor, the will to power is the foundation of metaphysics, [therefore also] its *subiectum*. (Heidegger 78)²²

Nietzsche's man is thus both the subject and object of the will to power, eternally annihilating this difference and, with it, his identity. He is a "superman" (*Übermensch*), who "exists as a transition beyond man and is thus himself this transition. He raises what is now in existence – himself – beyond himself, transcends himself. As his former self, he is always in the process of disintegration because he is losing the 'form' of that self – the form is changing, passing" (Urbančič 402).

It is passing from the viewpoint of modernity, whose recurring newness, according to Nietzsche, always implies what has preceded it, but without a recognizable foundation. Thus it presages Lacan's rhetorical process²³ in which the essence of subject or language is missed: gliding of signifiers past the signified, a process that does establish the subject (in the course of time) but prevents him from settling into an essence or system.²⁴ Nietzsche's esthetic articulation, which is likewise incapable of settling into a discursive conceptual system, is the semi-literary form of the essayist fragment. This form reaches its peak in his *Also Sprach Zarathusthra*. A string of open-ended stories, interspersed with lyric poems, this work is no longer mere interaction, but a pure syncretism of philosophical and literary discourse: an indefinable hybrid genre of modernity. Nietzsche's "open system" was

put into force as a method only with New Historicism and, specifically, two of its principles: just as Nietzsche in the comprehension of time (i.e., history and modernity) and the (recognizing) subject (the superman as the subject and object of the will to power) finds himself requiring metaphysics, so, too, are the new historicists aware “that every act of unmasking, critique and opposition uses the tools it condemns and risks falling prey to the practice it exposes” and “that literary and non-literary texts circulate inseparably” (Veeser xi). With this principle there is finally an identical handling of texts that are theoretical and literary at the same time: a symptom of the end of modernity, of the metaphysics of time, and the subject that can no longer differentiate between the recognizing and the recognized subject.

Translated by Nada Grošelj and Jason Blake

NOTES

¹ The term *subject* is used here in its (one of its possible) philosophical senses; namely, in the sense of a recognizing subject as being different from the recognized object. The expression stems from the 16th century and is derived from the Latin word *subjectum*, the past participle of *subicere* ‘to throw under’, meaning the theme of the sentence (cf. Inwood 280).

² Author’s translation. German original: »Jedes ego cogito ist cogito *me* cogitare ... Jedes menschliche Vor-stellen ist nach einer leicht missdeutbaren Redeweise ein Sich-vorstellen.«

³ The original: »... wird zu dem von ihm selbst gesetzten Grund und Mass für alle Gewissheit und Wahrheit.«

⁴ Author’s translation. German original: »... das Geschmacksurteil aber gründet sich gar nicht auf Begriff, und ist überall nicht Erkenntnis, sondern nur ein ästhetisches Urteil.«

⁵ »... ob es gleich bloß subjective Gültigkeit hat, es dennoch alle Subjekte so in Anspruch nimmt, als es nur immer geschehen könnte, wenn es ein objektives Urteil wäre.«

⁶ »Das subjektive Prinzip, nämlich die unbestimmte Idee des Übersinnlichen in uns, kann nur ... angezeigt ... werden.«

⁷ Author’s translation. German original: »Alles was gewiß ist, ist gewiß, weil *er* [i.e., der erster Satz] gewiß ist; und es ist nichts gewiß, wenn *er* nicht gewiß ist.«

⁸ »Wer Lust dazu hat, mag immer untersuchen, was er wissen würde, wenn sein Ich nicht Ich wäre, d. i., wenn er nicht existierte, und kein Nicht-Ich von seinem Ich unterscheiden könnte.«

⁹ »... soll unmittelbar und durch sich selbst gewiß sein, und das kann nicht anders heißen, als daß der Gehalt desselben seine Form, und umgekehrt die Form desselben seinen Gehalt bestimme.«

¹⁰ The perception of time as a major sensation in an epic first appears in Lessing’s *Laokoon* as well as in works within the pre-Romantic sentimental movement, in Sterne and Fielding, who forecast the romantic perception of the subject and of modernity. Cf. von Wilpert (858).

¹¹ Author’s translation. German original: »Darum geht der Mensch, sicher sich selbst immer wieder zu finden, immer von neuem aus sich heraus, um die Ergänzung seines innersten Wesens in der Tiefe eines fremden zu suchen und zu finden.«

¹² »Die Philosophie gelangte in wenigen kühnen Schritten dahin, sich selbst und den Geist des Menschen zu verstehen, in dessen Tiefe sie den Urquell der Phantasie und das Ideal der Schönheit entdecken und so die Poesie deutlich anerkennen mußte, deren Wesen und Dasein sie bisher auch nicht geahndet hatte ... Aber die höchste Schönheit, ja die höchste Ordnung ist denn doch nur die des Chaos, nämlich eines solchen, welches nur auf die Berührung der Liebe wartet, um sich zu einer harmonischen Welt zu entfalten, eines solchen wie es auch die alte Mythologie und Poesie war. Denn Mythologie und Poesie, beide sind eins und unzertrennlich... Die Mythologie ist ein solches Kunstwerk der Natur. In ihrem Gewebe ist das Höchste wirklich gebildet; alles ist Beziehung und Verwandlung, angebildet und umgebildet, und dieses Anbilden und Umbilden eben ihr eigentümliches Verfahren, ihr inneres Leben« (Schlegel 295, 301–02, 305).

¹³ »Denn das ist der Anfang aller Poesie, den Gang und die Gesetze der vernünftig denkenden Vernunft aufzuheben und uns wieder in die schöne Verwirrung der Phantasie, in das ursprüngliche Chaos der menschlicher Natur zu versetzen, für das ich kein schöneres Symbol bis jetzt kenne, als das bunte Gewimmel der alten Götter.«

¹⁴ The early Romantic movement congregated around the journal *Athenäum* (1798–1800) and included the literary theorists and historians August Wilhelm and Friedrich Schlegel (the latter was also a writer), the poet and writer Friedrich von Hardenberg Novalis, the writer and translator Ludwig Tieck, and the philosophers Johann Gottlieb Fichte, Schelling, and Schleiermacher.

¹⁵ Author's translation. German original: »... ist der Urteilsstreit erforderlich, ob das überwundene Unglaubliche nicht doch real möglich ist.«

¹⁶ »Symmetrie von Widersprüchen, dieser wunderbare ewige Wechsel von Enthusiasmus und Ironie,« »das ursprüngliche Chaos der menschlichen Natur.«

¹⁷ »Also ist hier ein Zirkel, aus dem der menschliche Geist nie herausgehen kann.«

¹⁸ More specifically: "Modernity is the transitory, the fugitive ... the half of art, of which the other half is the eternal and the immutable" (Baudelaire 296; translated by Calinescu 48).

¹⁹ In the 1848 article « *Plastique et Civilisation – Du beau Antique et du Beau Moderne* » Gautier describes the esthetics of the ugly (Calinescu 45, 46): the ugliness of modern industry and urban life is transformed into artistic beauty. Thus, there is an appropriating of the Romantic, Hoffmannesque (from the viewpoint of the absolute esthetic subject) subjectivizing of objective reality by means of the grotesque.

²⁰ "Baudelaire's *modernité*, both as defined theoretically and as applied to the works of Constantin Guys (*The Painter of Modern Life*; 1863), embodies the paradoxes of a time awareness so strikingly new and so rich and refined, that it can be judged a qualitative turning point in the history of modernity as an idea" (Calinescu 49).

²¹ For example: "man is above the beasts and below them" (Nietzsche 559). The will to power is "man's will as a subject that is primarily the subject of the will to power and simultaneously – and for that very reason – a self-exceeding subject" (Kos 49). As a superman he lives as a surpassing of man and such that he is that very surpassing (Urbančič 402).

²² »Die Metaphysik Nietzsches ist einmal jene, die als Wahrheit über das Seiende im Ganzen den Willen zum Macht zu ihrem 'Objekt' hat... Als diese liegt er der menschlichen Prägung der Wahrheit über das Seiende im Ganzen, d.h. der Metaphysik, zum Grunde, ist ihr subiectum.«

²³ »Reportons sur ce schéma le *je pense* cartésien. Assurément la distinction de l'énonciation à l'énoncé est ce qui en fait le glissement toujours possible, et si

l'on peut dire le point d'achoppement éventuel Disons que c'est de prendre sa place au niveau de l'énonciation qui donne sa certitude au *cogito* ... La différence du statut que donne au sujet la dimension découverte de l'inconscient freudien tient au désir, qui est à situer au niveau du *cogito*. Tout ce qui anime, ce dont parle toute énonciation, c'est du désir » (Lacan 157).

²⁴ "This modality of significance we call *semiotic*, in order to convey ..., the distinctive mark, the trace, the index, the premonitory sign, the proof, the incised mark, the imprint, in short, a *distinctiveness*. This distinctiveness is capable of an uncertain and indeterminate articulation, as with children it does not yet refer, and in psychotic discourse it no longer refers to a signified object for a thetic consciousness... The term *semiotic* makes it sufficiently clear that it is a modality avowedly heterogeneous to meaning, but always aspiring to, negating, or exceeding meaning... When we turn to a *signifying practice* – that is, to a socially communicable discourse such as poetic language – this semiotic heterogeneity remains, of course, inseparable from the *symbolic* function of significance. Symbolic is here understood in opposition to semiotic as referring to the inevitability of meaning, sign, and signified object for the transcendental ego. Language as a social practice always presupposes these two modalities, and the ways in which they combine constitute different *types of discourse* or signifying practices. For example, scientific discourse, which aspires to the status of a metalanguage, tends to minimize the semiotic element" (Kristeva 156).

WORKS CITED

- Baudelaire, Charles. *Oeuvres complètes*. Eds. Y. G. le Dantec and C. Pichois. Paris: Gallimard, 1961.
- Calinescu, Matei. *Five Faces of Modernity*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1987.
- De Man, Paul. *Allegories of Reading*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1979.
- — — *Blindness and Insight*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995.
- Eco, Umberto. *Semiotik und Philosophie der Sprache*. Trans. C. Trabant Rommel and J. Trabant. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1985.
- Fichte, Johann Gottlieb. *Über den Begriff der Wissenschaftslehre oder der sogenannten Philosophie*. Jena and Leipzig: Ch. E. Gabler, 1798.
- Freud, Sigmund. »Das Unheimliche.« *Psychologische Schriften. Studienausgabe*. Vol. 4. Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer Verlag, 1970.
- Gadamer, Hans Georg. *Truth and Method*. Trans. W. Glen-Doepel. London: Sheed and Ward, 1981.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Nietzsche*. Vol. 2. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1997.
- Inwood, Michael. *A Hegel Dictionary*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1992.
- Johnson, Barbara, ed. *Freedom and Interpretation*. New York: Basic Books, 1993.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Kritik der Urteilskraft und Schriften zur Naturphilosophie. Werke in sechs Bänden*. Vol. 5. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1998.
- Kernev Štrajn, Jelka. »Problem razmerja med simbolom in alegorijo znotraj narativne razsežnosti Krsta pri Savici« [On the relation between the symbol and allegory in the narrative dimensions of the *Baptism on the Savica*]. *Romantična pesnitev*. Ed. M. Juvan. Ljubljana: FF, 2002. (Obdobja 19) 95–105.
- Kos, Matevž. *Poskusi z Nietzschejem* [Experiments with Nietzsche]. Ljubljana: Slovenska matica, 2000.

- Kristeva, Julia. "The Speaking Subject Is Not Innocent." *Freedom and Interpretation*. Ed. B. Johnson. New York: Basic Books, 1993. 147–174.
- Lacan, Jacques. « Le séminaire » Livre 11. *Quatre concepts fondamentaux de la psychanalyse*. Paris: Seuil, 1973.
- Matajc, Vanesa. »Duhovnozgodovinska podlaga modernosti v slovenski književnosti 1898–1941« [The Intellectual Historical Foundation of Modernity in Slovenian Literature 1898–1941]. Diss. U of Ljubljana. Advisor: Lado Kralj, 2002.
- Mihelj, Sabina. »Izrekanje numinoznega pri utemeljiteljih simbolistične lirike.« [The Pronouncement of the Numinous in Founders of Symbolist Lyrics] *Primerjalna književnost* 23.2 (2000): 59–84.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. "Lecture Notes on Rhetoric." Trans. C. Blair. *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 16 (1983): 94–129.
- Otto, Rudolf. *Das Heilige: über das Irrationale in der Idee des Göttlichen und sein Verhältnis zum Rationalen*. Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck, 1971.
- Schlegel, August Wilhelm. »Geschichte der romantischen Literatur.« *Kritische Schriften und Briefe*. Vol. 4. Ed. E. Lohner. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer Verlag, 1965.
- Schlegel, Friedrich. »Gespräch über die Poesie.« *Schriften zur Literatur*. Ed. W. Rasch. Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 1985.
- Todorov, Tzvetan. *Introduction à la littérature fantastique*. Paris: Seuil, 1970.
- Urbančič, Ivan. »Spremna beseda« [Foreword]. Friedrich Nietzsche: *Tako je govoril Zaratustra*. Ljubljana: Slovenska matica, 1999. 377–454.
- Vattimo, Gianni. *The End of Modernity*. Trans. J. R. Snyder. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1994.
- Veeser, Harold Aram, ed. *New Historicism*. London, New York: Routledge, 1989.
- Wilpert, Gero Von. *Sachwörterbuch der Literatur*. Stuttgart: Kröner Verlag, 1969.