

PRESTOLNICA IN SREDIŠČA SLOVENSKE KNJIŽEVNOSTI

Geografske analize ugotavljajo raznovrstnost glavnih mest, njihovo premičnost in nestalnost. Za zgodovino slovenske književnosti je značilno ločeno obstajanje glavnega mesta države in glavnega mesta nacionalne književnosti, imenovano literarna prestolnica. Ta se je v zgodovini oblikovala počasi, zaradi družbenopolitičnih razmer pa so poleg nje nastala v drugih delno slovenskih ali popolnoma tujih mestih tudi manjša središča slovenske književnosti. Med prestolnico nacionalne književnosti in njenimi središči obstajajo različna literarna razmerja, ki so posledica političnih procesov.

Ključne besede: geografija, glavno mesto države, tipologija glavnih mest, prestolnica nacionalne književnosti, središče nacionalne književnosti, slovenska literarna zgodovina, Dunaj, Ljubljana, Celovec, Trst, Buenos Aires, Kirsch

1 Uvod

Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika razlaga besedo »prestolnica« kot »navadno ekspresivno« poimenovanje za »glavno mesto« in kot »publicistično« poimenovanje za »mesto, kraj, v katerem je središče kake dejavnosti«. Če pogledamo besedo po etimološki plati, pomeni kraj, v katerem oblastnik vlada s prestola prebivalcem tega kraja in okolice. Marsikateremu uporabniku jezika prihaja ob besedi »prestolnica« na misel še beseda »metropola«. Omenjeni slovar jo razlaga kot »navadno ekspresivno« poimenovanje »glavnega, najpomembnejšega mesta kake države, pokrajine«. V tem slovarju najdemo tudi razlago besede »mesto«. Njen prvi pomen: »naselje, ki je upravno, gospodarsko, kulturno središče širšega območja«; besedna zveza »glavno mesto države« pa pomeni naselje, »v katerem je sedež najvišjih državnih organov«. Beseda »središče« je med drugim razložena tudi kot »glavno mesto«, »kraj, prostor, kjer je osredotočena določena dejavnost«, »kraj, kjer se kaj pojavi v veliki meri in od koder se širi«, »kar je za kaj najvažnejše, najpomembnejše«.

(SSKJ 1997: 544, 548, 1022)

Navedene besede implicirajo pomene, ki se nanašajo na koncentracijo politične, vojaške, gospodarske in kulturne moči, podrejajočo si poleg osrednjega kraja te moči še njegovo okolico. Besedi »prestolnica« in »metropola« pa nista vrednostno nevtralni, temveč čustveni in miselni poimenovanji »glavnega mesta«.

Glede na ekspresivnost je uporaba obeh besed lahko pozitivna (če uporabnik z njo izraža naklonjeni ali slavlilni odnos do tega mesta) ali negativna (če z njo izraža podcenjevalni ali odklonilni odnos), to pa je razvidno šele iz govornega ali pisnega konteksta. Toda namen tega članka ni jezikoslovna primerjava navedenih besed, temveč opredelitev pomena, ki so si ga v zgodovini slovenske književnosti pridobili nekateri kraji kot njena glavna mesta, prestolnice, metropole ali središča; opis vzrokov, za-

kaj so ti kraji pridobili te funkcije in kakšna so bila njihova medsebojna razmerja v različnih zgodovinskih obdobjih. Zaradi literarnozgodovinske narave razpravljanja in njegove čim večje preglednosti je treba navesti še pomenska razmerja med temi besedami, ki jih slovarji ne vsebujejo, pač pa samo ta članek.

2 V članku pomeni nevtravno poimenovanje »glavno mesto« sedež politične, gospodarske in kulturne moči večje geografske celote, navadno države, dežele, pokrajine ali province. Sicer slovarsko ekspresivna sinonima za glavno mesto, »metropola« in »prestolnica«, pa imata v članku nekoliko spremenjen pomen. Avtor upošteva dejstvo, da »glavno mesto« kake države ni vedno tudi glavno mesto njene književnosti, sploh pa ne v primeru, v katerem gre za večnacionalno državo s književnostmi v različnih jezikih. Takrat je glavno mesto prvenstveno politično jedro države in književnosti večinskega naroda, glavna mesta drugih, manjših narodov in njihovih književnosti pa so manjša mesta, ki so sedeži manjše politične in gospodarske moči dežel, pokrajin ali provinc. Zaradi tega razločevanja bo odslej v tem članku »glavno mesto« pomenilo sedež države z ustreznimi političnimi, gospodarskimi in kulturnimi implikacijami; njegov sinonim pa ostaja beseda »metropola«, čeprav se odslej v članku ne bo več uporabljala, da ne bi bil po nepotrebnem preveč terminološko obtežen.

Beseda »prestolnica« pa bo pomenila mesto z največjo koncentracijo kulture in književnosti kakega naroda, tudi če ta ni politično samostojen in je zato njegovo glavno mesto v političnem smislu kje drugje. Obstajajo tudi primeri, da se glavno mesto države sklada s prestolnico kulture in književnosti. Pa tudi taki, v katerih obstaja poleg glavnega mesta in prestolnice še kak drug kraj z manjšo koncentracijo kulture in književnosti kakega naroda, vendar se po intenzivnosti ne more kosati s tisto v prestolnici nacionalne književnosti. Tak kraj z manjšo koncentracijo nacionalne književnosti se v tem članku imenuje »literarno središče«.

Temeljno razmerje med temi kraji nacionalne književnosti je zaradi njihove različne intenzitete hierarhično. Vrhovna pozicija pripada glavnemu mestu nacionalne države, kadar je to identično s prestolnico nacionalne književnosti, torej v primeru, ko je kak narod politično samostojen. Če ni, je lahko v glavnem mestu države zgolj eno od središč nacionalne književnosti, njena prestolnica pa je v drugem, navadno manjšem mestu, ki je sicer politično in posredno tudi kulturno-literarno podrejeno glavnemu mestu. Drugo oz. tretje mesto na hierarhični lestvici pripada literarnemu središču, ker je na nižji ravni kot literarna prestolnica oz. glavno mesto. Ta hierarhija mest v nacionalni književnosti in njihova medsebojna politično-literarna razmerja niso trajna, ampak se v zgodovini zaradi družbenopolitičnih sprememb spreminjajo. Poleg tega ima vsaka nacionalna književnost zaradi različnega političnega in kulturnega konteksta svoje geografske posebnosti.

Hierarhija teh treh vrst mest vzbuja vtis, da so glavna mesta njena najbolj stalna prvina, toda geografsko-zgodovinska dejstva kažejo, da je tudi položaj glavnega mesta lahko variabilen. Pariz in London imata večstoletni tradiciji francoskega in britanskega glavnega mesta, toda neprimerno starejši Rim, ki je bil od antike vedno glavno mesto kake države, je leta 1870 s težavo postal glavno mesto združene Italije. Pred dvesto leti Švica ni imela stalnega glavnega mesta, saj je »rotiralo«. Leta 1712

je car Peter I. Veliki prenesel rusko glavno mesto iz Moskve v Sankt Peterburg, kjer je ostalo približno dve stoletji, po oktobrski revoluciji pa so ga spet vrnili v Moskvo, kjer je še sedaj. Brazilija je leta 1960 prenesla glavno mesto iz Ria de Janeira v popolnoma novo mesto Brasilia, ki so ga zgradili, da bi pospešili razvoj osrednjega predela države. Bolivija ima dve ustavno določeni glavni mesti, Južnoafriška republika pa tri. Toda obstaja tudi presenetljiva izjema: Republika Nauru v Tihem oceanu je edina država na svetu, ki zaradi premajhne urbanizacije in nobene nacionalnodržavne tradicije nima uradnega glavnega mesta (KIRSCH 2005: 9, 18).

Posebnost je tudi nemško glavno mesto. Od srednjega veka naprej je vsaka nemška državnica imela svoje glavno mesto, npr. Prusija Berlin, Bavarska München. Po združitvi držav leta 1871 v enotno Nemčijo je postal njeno glavno mesto pruski Berlin. Toda zavest o pripadnosti posameznih dežel, nastalih večinoma iz nekdanjih držav, njihovim glavnim mestom se je ohranila in je opazna tudi v sedanji državni zvezni ureditvi. Po 2. svetovni vojni so zavezniki Nemčijo razdelili na dve državi z dvema glavnima mestoma: na Zvezno republiko Nemčijo (Zahodno Nemčijo) z Bonnom in Nemško demokratično republiko (Vzhodno Nemčijo) z Berlinom. Toda tudi tega so razdelili na dva ločena dela, ki sta pripadala zahodni in vzhodni državi. Položaj je zapletalo še dejstvo, da je bil Zahodni Berlin enklava v Vzhodni Nemčiji. Nemci so Bonn zaradi njegove majhnosti in prvenstveno upravne funkcije pogosto porogljivo imenovali »vladna vas«; finančno glavno mesto Zahodne Nemčije, Frankfurt ob Majni, pa, spet posmehljivo, »Bankfurt«; München je za mnoge veljal in še velja za »skrivno glavno mesto Nemčije«. Pisatelj Thomas Mann se leta 1891 ni preselil v Berlin, temveč v München, kjer je ostal do leta 1933, ko se je pred nacizmom umaknil v tujino. Izbira in trajanje njegovega bivanja že samo po sebi veliko povesta o kulturni ravni bavarskega glavnega mesta. Berlin je spet v celoti postal glavno mesto po združitvi obeh nemških držav leta 1991, čeprav so nekateri tej odločitvi zaradi njegove zgodovinsko-politične obremenjenosti oporekali.

Za potrditev dejstva, da ni vsako glavno mesto države vedno tudi prestolnica njene kulture in književnosti, naj zadostujeta samo dva primera. Sedanje švicarsko glavno mesto Bern je v primerjavi z Zürichom kulturno obrobje. Enako razmerje je tudi v Združenih državah Amerike med Washingtonom in New Yorkom. Zaradi vseh premikov, statusnih sprememb in medmestne tekmovalnosti ni o glavnih mestih slišati samo pritrdjevanj, odobravanj in pohval, temveč tudi pikra kritična mnenja. Za nekatere so »usoda, blagoslov ali poguba neke države«, za druge »samo še relikt, ki trapastim turistom vleče iz žepov denar« (KIRSCH 2005: 12).

3 Iz teh primerov je razvidno, da se glavna mesta po zgodovinski tradiciji, trajnosti, velikosti, gospodarski in kulturni razvitosti med seboj razlikujejo. Zato je leta 1972 nemški geograf Martin Schwind izoblikoval naslednjo hierarhično tipologijo glavnih mest: *svetovna metropola*, *večfunkcionalno glavno mesto*, *vladno mesto*, *glavno mesto z zavrtim razvojem in nerazvito glavno mesto* (SCHWIND v KIRSCH 2005: 12). Leta 2005 je nemški geograf Jens Kirsch Schwindovo tipologijo popravil. Izpustil je kategorijo nerazvito glavno mesto, ki je pred tremi desetletji veljala za glavna mesta novih afriških držav, ki so se odtlej povečala, in dodal kategorijo *nekdanje glavno mesto*. Prenovljena tipologija je takšna:

- *globalno vplivna metropola*: npr. Tokio, London, Pariz, Moskva;
- *nacionalno središče zelo razvite države*: npr. Washington, Bruselj, Seul, Berlin;
- *nacionalno središče malo razvitih držav*: npr. Adis Abeba, Damask, La Paz, Daka;
- *vladno mesto s sorazmerno majhnim gospodarskim, kulturnim in demografskim pomenom, ki je največkrat nastalo kot načrtovano mesto*: npr. Brasília, Canberra, Ottawa;
- *nekdanja glavna mesta*: Istanbul, St. Peterburg, Rio de Janeiro (KIRSCH 2005: 49).

Isti geograf je določil tudi štiri tipe izbire kakega kraja za glavno mesto:

- Če je nova država ustanovljena na ozemlju brez naselja, ki bi v preteklosti imelo tako funkcijo, potem ustanovijo popolnoma novo glavno mesto.
- Če je nova država ustanovljena na ozemlju, kjer obstaja mesto, ki je že imelo funkcijo glavnega mesta, potem mu to funkcijo obnovijo.
- Če hoče nova država preseči prejšnjo politično ureditev na tem ozemlju, potem opusti prejšnje glavno mesto in si izbere novo.
- Država ne prestavi glavnega mesta vedno iz simbolnega vzroka, temveč tudi iz pragmatično prostorskega. (prav tam: 17–18)

Poleg tega vplivajo na določanje glavnega mesta tudi tile dejavniki: »demografske oz. ekonomske prostorske strukture, zgodovinska simbolika, vojaška strategija, prostorsko načrtovanje« in »osebne preference odločevalca« (prav tam: 51). Toda isti geograf upravičeno poudarja, da za opredelitev glavnega mesta niso bistvene lastnosti niti njegova starost, velikost, razvitost niti druge posebnosti, temveč »funkcija nacionalnega simbola«, ki vedno »zastopa tudi preteklo ali sedanje razmerje moči ter kulturne ali politične dosežke države. Samo to končno razločuje glavna mesta od neglavnih« (prav tam: 12).

V luči geografskih ugotovitev o variabilnosti političnega glavnega mesta je treba shematično pregledati, kako so nastajali slovensko politično glavno mesto, slovenska literarna prestolnica in slovenska literarna središča.

4 Po naselitvi prednikov današnjih Slovencev v alpskem prostoru je bila v začetku 9. stoletja središčna pokrajina takratnega naselitvenega prostora današnja »Koroška, ki je bila že v antiki močnejše kultivirana« (POGAČNIK 1968: 10), zato je tam nastala tudi slovanska država Karantanija. Toda izguba politične samostojnosti je preprečila nastajanje predslovenskega glavnega mesta. Pokristjanjevanje iz Salzburga in Ogleja pa priča o tujih sosednjih mestih, ki so že postala politična in verska središča ter so si začela podrejati Slovence. Zato tudi poglobitna besedila začetne, slovstvene faze slovenske književnosti niso nastala v enem slovenskem naselju. Najstarejše ohranjeno slovensko slovstveno besedilo, Brižinski spomeniki, so bili okrog leta 1000 najbrž zapisani na Koroškem za potrebe freisinškega škofa, ki jih je potreboval za delovanje med tamkajšnjimi slovenskimi verniki. Toda hranili so jih v bavarskem Freisingu, kjer je bil sedež škofije, ki je imela svoje posesti na Koroškem, v Kanalski dolini in

Škofji Loki (prim. Zbornik *Brižinski spomeniki* 1996). Rokopis molitev iz zgornje Savske doline okrog Rateč iz druge polovice 14. stoletja, ki se po kraju najdbe imenuje tudi Celovski rokopis, spet priča o cerkvenoupravni pripadnosti zgornje Savske doline eni izmed koroških župnij in posredno večjemu verskemu središču zunaj današnje Slovenije. Stiški rokopis iz prve polovice 15. stoletja pa je bil zapisan v samostanu Stična; to priča o srednjeveškem dolenskem verskem in kulturnem središču.

Domnevati je mogoče, da bi Celjski grofje, ki so v 14. in 15. stoletju združili pod svojo oblastjo velik del slovenskega ozemlja, svojo ekspanzijo nadaljevali in posledično najbrž v Celju izoblikovali ne samo politično, ampak tudi kulturno središče. To bi morda pozitivno vplivalo na slovensko slovstvo oz. književnost, vendar so grofje izumrli. S tem bi morda Celje onemogočilo ali upočasnilo uveljavitev Ljubljane. Posest Celjanov je prešla v roke Habsburžanov, ki so večini Slovencev, razdeljenih na več dežel, vladali z Dunaja. Ta je bil več stoletij glavno mesto Avstrije in Slovencev, ki so večinoma živeli do konca habsburške monarhije leta 1918 v več njenih deželah.

Uveljavljanje Ljubljane kot slovenskega političnega in kulturnega kohezijskega mesta je pospešila šele njena pridobitev dveh upravnih funkcij, posvetne in cerkvene, ki sta jo povzdignili na raven lokalnega političnega in verskega središča. V 13. stoletju je postala glavno mesto dežele Kranjske, ki je v naslednjem stoletju prešla pod habsburško oblast; leta 1461 pa sedež ljubljanske škofije. Ta se je večala s postopnim pridruževanjem župnij iz drugih cerkvenih upravnih enot in tako pridobivala vedno večji pomen. Njen vpliv na emancipacijo slovenstva se je v naslednjih stoletjih večal, ker je bila Kranjska edina dežela, v kateri je bilo večinsko prebivalstvo slovensko. Zato je bilo naravno, da se je v 16. stoletju prav v Ljubljani najbolj intenzivno pojavila verska reformacija, ki je s tiskanimi slovenskimi knjigami postavila temelj slovenskega knjižnega jezika in s tem podlago za poznejši razvoj slovenske književnosti kot posebnega posvetnega estetskega pojava.

Do prelomne izločitve književnosti iz verskega slovstva je v mestu prišlo šele v razsvetljenstvu z literarnim almanahom *Pisanice*. Ta je prvi dokaz, da je Ljubljana postala slovenska literarna prestolnica. Zgledovanje pri dunajskih almanahih pa priča o vplivu enega od takratnih središč nemške književnosti na novo slovensko literarno prestolnico, ki je bila glede na Dunaj kot glavno mesto države zgolj provincialno upravno mesto. Takšno temeljno razmerje med Ljubljano in Dunajem se je kljub poznejši slovenski politični krepitvi ter količinski in kakovostni rasti slovenske književnosti ohranilo še v dvajseta leta 20. stoletja, ko je večina Slovencev že živela v Kraljevini Jugoslaviji. Primer: Slavko Grum ni šel po 1. svetovni vojni študirat niti v Ljubljano niti Zagreb ali Beograd, ampak na Dunaj, kjer je dobil zglede za modernizacijo slovenske drame.

Razsvetljenstvo ni pomembno samo zaradi nastanka slovenske literarne prestolnice, temveč tudi zato, ker se je v tem obdobju položaj Ljubljane kot upravnega mesta okrepil, saj so jo Francozi izbrali za glavno mesto Ilirskih provinc (1809–1813). To je preseglo njen dotedanji položaj deželnega glavnega mesta in pomenilo napredovanje proti položaju glavnega mesta večje državne enote, kot je dežela. Poleg tega sta si Zois in Kopitar s svojimi političnimi vplivi prizadevala doseči ustanovitev Ilirskega kraljestva kot države Slovencev in drugih južnoslovanskih narodov v okviru Avstri-

je. To je bilo res ustanovljeno, vendar samo formalno in deloma, saj so ostale veljavne nekdanje deželne meje. Ljubljana ni postala glavno mesto tega kraljestva v Avstriji, pač pa le ljubljanskega gubernija (VIDMAR 2010: 276–288). Toda zamisel tega kraljestva že vsebuje zamisel o Zedinjeni Sloveniji, ki je kot slovenski politični projekt postala aktualna od sredine 19. stoletja naprej. Oba projekta sta pomembni stopnji na poti k slovenski državnosti, ki se je uresničila šele z ustanovitvijo Republike Slovenije leta 1991. Kako zelo je bila Ljubljana odvisna od Dunaja tudi v literarnem smislu, priča dejstvo, da je almanah *Kranjska čbelica* moral tudi v dunajsko cenzuro. Toda ne h kakemu Nemcu, ampak k Slovincu Jerneju Kopitarju, ki almanahu ni bil naklonjen, zato ga je oviral. Primer, da politično vplivni Slovenec zavira slovensko književnost kot kak nerazumevajoči in nenaklonjeni tujec, pa v zgodovini slovenske književnosti ni osamljen. Vrhunec je dosegel zlasti v drugi polovici 20. stoletja, v komunističnem režimu.

V 19. stoletju se je položaj Ljubljane kot nacionalne literarne prestolnice sicer čedalje bolj krepil, vendar ni bila za vse slovenske književnike niti sprejemljiv kraj prebivanja niti objavljanja literarnih del. Vzpona njene upravno-politične in literarne moči niso slabila samo nasprotja med nemškim in večinskim slovenskim prebivalstvom, temveč tudi zmeraj večja ideološka in strankarska razcepljenost Slovencev. Poleg tega so ljubljanski upravni ukrepi segali samo do meja dežele Kranjske, ne pa v druge dežele (Goriško, Koroško, Štajersko), še najmanj pa v ogrski del dualistične habsburške države (današnje Prekmurje). V teh deželah so bili Slovenci manjšina, zato so bili bolj kot na Kranjskem izpostavljeni pritiskom večinskega prebivalstva. Nekatera neresena vprašanja slovenskega knjižnega jezika, njegovega črkopisa, razlike med slovenskimi narečji, iz katerih so prihajali slovenski književniki, in hrvaški unitarizem kot ilirizem so majali položaj Ljubljane kot slovenske literarne prestolnice in od nje odvrčali nekatere književnike, ki niso bili doma na Kranjskem. Primer je štajerski pesnik Stanko Vraz, ki se je po omahovanju med Ljubljano in Zagrebom odločil za prestop v hrvaško književnost in se preselil v Zagreb.

Obstajale so tudi nasprotne tendence. Ljubljana je postala vabljiva literarna prestolnica za nekatere slovenske književnike, ki niso živeli na Kranjskem. Po težavah na Štajerskem se je vanjo preselil pesnik Anton Aškerc, pesnik Simon Gregorčič z Goriškega pa se kljub načrtom ni preselil, vendar se je z Ljubljano povezal, saj ga je v njej literarno in politično podpiral takratni slovenski liberalni tabor.

V 19. stoletju je v Celovcu, glavnem mestu dežele Koroške, nastalo ob nemškem središču tudi središče slovenske književnosti, ki je z nekaterimi institucijami prekašalo Ljubljano na Kranjskem. Začetna spodbuda so bili tečaji slovenščine za bogoslovce v celovškem semenišču leta 1830, ki jih je vodil poznejši lavantinski škof Anton Martin Slomšek, glavna pa ustanovitev Društva sv. Mohorja, iz katere je nastala največja vseslovenska založba Mohorjeva družba s knjižnim programom, ki je bil namenjen najširšemu krogu bralcev. Tudi njen pobudnik je bil Slomšek, ki je pravilno sklepal, da se bo slovenska književnost okrepila, če bo obstajala uspešna založba s knjižnim programom, ki bo upošteval literarne potrebe takratnega večinskega kmečkega prebivalstva in ga polagoma vzgajal z zabavno, vzgojno in poljudno strokovno knjigo v zahtevnejše bralce. Naklade so rasle, zbirka Slovenske večernice, ki izhaja še danes, pa je izoblikovala t. i. večerniško povest. Ta je kljub pomislekom

in občasnemu podcenjevanju literarnih kritikov in pisateljev, privržencev elitistične književnosti, postala posebna zvrst slovenskega pripovedništva, mimo katere nista šla niti Jurčič niti Cankar, ki je bil za denar pripravljen pozabiti svoja visoka literarna načela.

Ljubljana je bila Celovcu zaradi uspešnosti zavistna, zato mu je pogosto nagajala; to je očitno tudi iz Slomškovih besed v pismu leta 1853: »[P]ozabiti ne smete, da smo tudi mi Slovenci, in ne terjajte, da bi vselej vaša obveljala« (*Arhiv za zgodovinsko narodopisje* 1930–1932: 316). Besede vzorčno dokazujejo eno izmed temeljnih zakonitosti razmerja med literarno prestolnico in literarnim središčem: prva dopušča drugo, dokler je obrobno, ko pa s kako literarno zadevo preseže prestolnico, jo na različne načine onemogoča. Takrat prestolnica »pozabi« na nacionalne, vseslovenske interese, saj upošteva samo parcialne, zasebne, strankarske, politične, idejne ali ideološke. Ti navadno ne škodujejo samo literarnim, ampak tudi nacionalnim interesom, česar se prestolnični akterji zaradi enostranske zaslepljenosti ne zavedajo. Negativnost takšnih primerov se je posebno izrazito pokazala v 20. stoletju.

Toda Celovec ni Ljubljane prekašal samo z največjo in najbolj uspešno slovensko založbo, ampak tudi z literarno revijo *Slovenski glasnik* (1858–1868), ki jo je urejal Anton Janežič, in z nekaterimi literarnimi deli »kranjskih« književnikov uveljavil višje standarde estetsko zahtevne slovenske književnosti, kot jih je takrat premogla Ljubljana. Ta je revijo podobne zahtevnostne ravni dobila šele leta 1881 z ustanovitvijo *Ljubljanskega zvona*, ki ji celovška revija *Kres* (1881–1886) ni mogla dolgo konkurirati. Medtem se je namreč večina najboljšega slovenskega literarnega potenciala iz Kranjske in tudi sosednjih dežel (Aškerc, Gregorčič) že preusmerila in objavljala svoja dela v glavnem mestu Kranjske. Katoliško usmerjeni književniki iz vseh slovenskih dežel so leta 1888 dobili revijo *Dom in svet*. Obe reviji sta do 2. svetovne vojne oz. do njenega konca ostali glavni slovenski literarni glasili in zaradi uvajanja različnih literarnih tokov podlaga razvoja celotne slovenske književnosti. Revija *Zvon*, ki jo je v letu 1870 ter med letoma 1876 in 1880 na Dunaju izdajal Josip Stritar in ki je najboljše zapolnjevala revijalno praznino med *Slovenskim glasnikom* in *Ljubljanskim zvonom*, pa priča o težavnem uveljavljanju Ljubljane kot literarne prestolnice, saj do leta 1881 ni zmogla izdajati konkurenčnega osrednjega slovenskega literarnega glasila, ki bi konkuriralo drugim slovenskim glasilom.

V začetku 20. stoletja se je temeljno literarno razmerje med Dunajem in Ljubljano nekoliko spremenilo zaradi Ivana Cankarja. Mnogi slovenski književniki so namreč na Dunaju zaradi študija na tamkajšnji univerzi prebivali samo nekaj let, po dokončanem študiju pa so se vrnili v Ljubljano ali druge slovenske kraje in od tam s svojimi literarnimi deli sodelovali z Ljubljano kot literarno prestolnico. Cankar pa se je kljub neuspešnemu študiju na Dunaju za več let naselil in z močno literarno ustvarjalnostjo iz avstrijskega glavnega mesta določeval nove literarne standarde v nacionalni literarni prestolnici, čeprav ga je pogosto zavračala, saj je imela nižje standarde. Cankarju je dunajsko bivanje omogočalo spoznavanje tujih literarnih smeri, kulturne in boemske plati velemesta, ki ga na slovenskem etničnem ozemlju ni bilo. Z Dunaja je imel distančni pogled na ruralno-trško naravo kranjske prestolnice, provincialnost prestolnice slovenske književnosti in slovenske razmere, iz česar je nastajal njegov ambivalentni odnos do slovenstva, ki ga najbolj slikovito izražata njegovi sintagmi:

»domovina« kot »zdravje« in »domovina« kot »vlačuga« (CANKAR 1974: 253–256, 413; CANKAR 1969: 92).

Cankarja je treba omeniti tudi zato, ker spada v kategorijo književnikov, ki so prostovoljno živeli zunaj prostora svoje nacionalne književnosti, pogosto tudi v obrobem mestu kake druge nacionalne književnosti (Joyce v Trstu, Pound v Rapallu), v enklavi sredi druge nacionalne književnosti (Kafka v Pragi) ali pa so se selili po različnih krajih različnih književnosti (Rilke v Prago, München, Berlin, Pariz, Devin in v Švico).

5 Velik preobrat v razmerju med mesti slovenske književnosti je nastal po 1. svetovni vojni. Avstro-Ogrska je razpadla, Slovenci so bili prešibak politični subjekt, da bi realizirali koncept Zedinjene Slovenije, zato so ostali razdeljeni med Jugoslavijo, Avstrijo, Italijo in Madžarsko. Tudi prva država, v katero je večina Slovencev vstopila z velikimi iluzijami, jih je zaradi srbskega unitarizma, politične diktature ter razlik med srednjeevropsko in balkansko mentaliteto kmalu razočarala. Nova podrejenost se je navzven pokazala tudi v tem, da se njihovo ozemlje v Jugoslaviji upravno ni nikoli imenovalo Slovenija, ampak po različnih poimenovanjih od leta 1929 do začetka 2. svetovne vojne Dravska banovina; Ljubljana je bila njeno upravno glavno mesto in še naprej prestolnica slovenske književnosti. Načrt o avtonomni banovini Sloveniji iz leta 1939 je zaradi izbruha 2. svetovne vojne ostal neuresničen (ŠMID 1994). Med obema svetovnim vojnama je nekdanje slovensko literarno središče v Celovcu ugasnilo; Mohorjeva družba se je morala umakniti najprej na Prevalje, potem pa v Celje. Zaradi italijanskega fašizma je zamrlo tudi slovensko kulturno življenje v Gorici in Trstu. Ta je v začetku 20. stoletja kljub večnacionalnosti postajal zaradi nekaterih slovenskih časopisov in organizacij eno od slovenskih literarnih središč, kar potrjujejo tudi tamkajšnja Cankarjeva predavanja. Po 1. svetovni vojni so Slovenci, živeči v kraljevini Jugoslaviji, dobili novo glavno mesto Beograd, toda to ni nikoli pridobilo za slovensko književnost takšnega vplivnega položaja, kakršnega je imel Dunaj. Med obema svetovnim vojnama se je kljub povečani politični moči Slovencev, ki pa ni postala tolikšna, kakor so pričakovali pred vstopom v kraljevino Jugoslavijo, prostor slovenske književnosti zaradi političnih razmer v Avstriji in Italiji skrčil na slovensko ozemlje v Jugoslaviji. Kljub srbskemu unitarizmu, ki je nadomestil germanizacijo, se je Ljubljana v primerjavi s položajem v Avstro-Ogrski kulturno okrepila, saj je pridobila nepopolno univerzo in še nekatere institucije.

2. svetovna vojna, ki je na slovenskem etničnem ozemlju potekala hkrati kot tuja okupacija, protiokupatorski odpor, komunistična revolucija in državljanska vojna, je ogrozila obstoj slovenskega naroda, njegove književnosti in njene prestolnice. Ta je zaradi okupacije in cenzure delovala okrnjeno samo v t. i. Ljubljanski pokrajini, saj je izgubila zaledje na Gorenjskem in Štajerskem. Presenetljiv pa je poskus majhne skupine književnikov, ki se je znašla na okupiranem Dunaju in tam kljub vojni zasnovala ilegalno središče slovenske književnosti. Začeli so izdajati literarno glasilo *Dunajske domače vaje*, katerega urednik je bil Janez Remic, glavni pesnik pa Ivan Hribovšek (PIBERNIK 1991). Vojna je preprečila nadaljevanje, toda ohranjeno gradivo priča o trdoživosti slovenske literature in ohranjanju slovenske visoke, elitne književnosti, na začetku katere stoji Prešeren, v neugodnih družbenopolitičnih razmerah.

Na slovenskem etničnem ozemlju pa je vzporedno, v partizanskih enotah in ozemlju, ki so ga nadzirale (npr. Bela krajina), potekal neprimerno večji in intenzivnejši diametralno nasprotni proces, ki se je navzven manj opazno začel s predvojnimi sporom na literarni levici (JENŠTERLE 1985): načrtna degradacija slovenske književnosti v propagandno sredstvo. Ta proces je bil zakamufliran v protiokupatorski odpor in hkratno komunistično revolucijo (DOLGAN 1988: 34–46; 1990: 100–119, 244–246; 1993: 60–69). Med 2. svetovno vojno je mnogo slovenskih književnikov podprlo protiokupatorski odpor in v njem sodelovalo z utopičnim prepričanjem, da bodo pomagali vzpostaviti absolutno družbeno in politično »svobodo« in najbolj »napredni« politični sistem na svetu, ki bo tudi slovenski književnosti omogočil največjo ustvarjalno »svobodo«. Dejansko se je po koncu 2. svetovne vojne nadnje zgrnilo največje in najhujše politično nasilje v njeni zgodovini, ki je trajalo do konca komunističnega sistema (*Temna stran meseca* 1998; GABRIČ 1995).

Po 2. svetovni vojni je večina slovenskega ozemlja pripadla »drugi« Jugoslaviji. Ljubljana ni bila več glavno mesto banovine, temveč »Ljudske«, pozneje pa »Socialistične republike Slovenije«, toda glavno mesto države je ostal Beograd. Ta se kljub novi politični doktrini in ponavljanju floskule »bratstvo in enotnost naših narodov« še vedno ni otrešel srbskega unitarizma, ampak ga je na različne načine ohranjal (npr. med vojno je smel biti v partizanskih enotah poveljevalni jezik slovenščina, po vojni pa je postala obvezna za vse vojaške enote po Jugoslaviji »srbohrvaščina«; v slovenskih osnovnih šolah je postala obvezna »srbohrvaščina«, v drugih republikah pa slovenščina ni postala učni predmet; v 80. letih se je pojavil načrt »skupnih jeder« šolskega pouka za vso Jugoslavijo). Tudi ta unitarizem je kot ilirizem v 19. stoletju, novi ilirizem v začetku 20. stoletja in predvojni unitarizem varianta konstantnega poskusa enega od bližnjih južnoslovanskih narodov, da bi si Slovence podredil ne samo politično, temveč da bi jih tudi nacionalno eliminiral. Zaradi politične naivnosti Slovencev je njihova politična podreditve v obeh južnoslovanskih političnih tvorbah v 20. stoletju dobro uspevala, ovire pa so ostajale njihov jezik, kultura in književnost, zato je politično dominantni narod v obeh političnih tvorbah obakrat poskušal izvesti tudi kulturno asimilacijo Slovencev. Ta je v bistvu identična s poskusi germanizacije, italijanizacije in madžarizacije Slovencev, samo geografska smer, od koder je prihajala južnoslovanska asimilacija, se je spremenila. Ob tem je mogoče opazovati, kako se slovenska moč ni mogla enakovredno kosati niti z medvojnimi okupatorjem niti z drugimi tujimi povojnimi političnimi subjekti, zato se je preoblikovala v introvertirano agresivnost, nacionalni sadomazohizem in nacionalno samodestrukcijo.

Nasilje nad slovensko književnostjo se je kazalo v različnih oblikah: v seznamu prepovedanih knjig takoj po vojni, obveznem socialističnem realizmu po sovjetskem vzoru, mitologizaciji partizanstva in revolucije, prepovedanih, tabujskih temah in preganjanju zahodnoevropskih »buržoaznih« in »dekadentnih« literarnih smeri. Po letu 1948 je sicer prišlo do politične prekinitev s Sovjetsko zvezo, toda oblast je v skladu s svojo totalitarno naravo (JESSE 1999; BENOIST 2001) posegala v književnost s stalinističnimi ukrepi skoraj do konca političnega sistema leta 1991: zapirala je književnike in oporečnike, ukinjala literarne revije, vodila dve gonji proti Kocbeku, več let ni dovolila objavljanja njegovih del, mu prisluškovala, nadzirala ideološko sporne

književnike, ovirala izhajanje spornih knjig in skrbela, da so bili na vodstvenih položajih kulturnih in literarnih zavodov preverjeni kadri.

6 Nasilje se je napovedovalo že pred koncem vojne, zato je več tisoč Slovencev, ki niso odobravalı komunizma, ob koncu vojne leta 1945 emigriralo v tujino. Med njimi je bilo tudi veliko književnikov iz Ljubljane (POGAČNIK 1972a; 1972b; *Slovenska izseljenska književnost* 1999). Približno 7000 Slovencev se je naselilo v Argentini, v Buenos Airesu, kjer je nastalo dobro organizirano središče slovenske književnosti z ustrezno infrastrukturo: osnovne šole, dopolnilna srednja šola in nekaj časa celo slovenski oddelek v okviru ukrajinske univerze; kulturni domovi; založbe; več časnikov in časopisov; med njimi literarna revija *Meddobje*, ustanovljena leta 1954. V njej so sodelovali slovenski književniki z različnih koncev sveta, razen iz Slovenije, saj bi te komunistična oblast kaznovala. Izjema je bil Stanko Majcen, ki si je kljub temu drznil objavljati v Argentini pod psevdonimom.

Za argentinsko slovensko literarno središče je značilno, da ni obnovilo modela domačijske sentimentalne književnosti, ki bi ga pričakovali zaradi politično-emigrantskega položaja tega središča, ampak je nadaljevalo model estetsko visoke književnosti. To se kaže v prevajanju takšnih pesnikov, kakršna sta Valéry in T. S. Eliot, v ponatiskovanju Balantičevih pesmi, ki so bile v »Ljudski« oz. »Socialistični republiki Sloveniji« prepovedane, v odkritju in natisu drugega vrhunskega pesnika iz 2. svetovne vojne Ivana Hribovška (Kos 2005/2007: 178–184), v pripovedništvu Zorka Simčiča, ki motivno, idejno in oblikovno prekaša sočasno raven pripovedništva v Sloveniji, posebno z romanom *Človek na obeh straneh stene* (1957). Enako velja za roman Rude Jurčeca *Ljubljanski triptih*, ki je istega leta prav tako izšel v Buenos Airesu. Takratne literarne standarde v Sloveniji presega zaradi večperspektivne pripovedi in prve obdelave povojnih ljubljanskih stalinističnih (»dachauskih«) procesov v slovenski književnosti. Ti so bili desetletja ena izmed tabujskih tem, o katerih se v Sloveniji ni smelo javno govoriti niti literarno upodabljati.

Vse argentinske slovenske publikacije so bile v Sloveniji prepovedane, vendar so jih posamezniki tihotapili iz zamejskih knjigarn. Pisatelja in dramatika Draga Jančarja so zaradi takšnega »delikta« zaprli. Narodna in univerzitetna knjižnica v Ljubljani je te publikacije sicer prejemale, vendar jih je hranila v posebnem fondu »D«, ki ni bil dostopen javnosti, ampak redkim posameznikom.

Mnogi književniki slovenske literarne prestolnice zasebno niso nasprotovali dejavnosti buenosaireskega literarnega središča, saj so se zavedali neprijetnih ideoloških delitev Slovencev in njihovih povojnih posledic. Pač pa mu je nasprotovalo slovensko politično središče v Ljubljani. To se je v skladu z doktrino permanentne revolucije in zaradi paranoičnega strahu pred vsako opozicijo še vedno bojevalo proti nekdanjim ideološkim in vojaškim nasprotnikom. Ti so z dokumentarno-spominski mi objavami demitologizirali vojno preteklost vladajoče slovenske politične garniture, ki jo je lakirala, in razkrivali njene vojne in povojne maščevalne poboje. Zato ni čudno, da je leta 1975 druga politična gonja proti Kocbeku zaradi teh pobojev segla čez meje Slovenije in odmevala tudi v tujini; vanjo je posegel tudi nemški pisatelj Heinrich Böll (Bibliografija takratnih nemških odmevov je objavljena v zborniku *Jugoslawien-Österreich* 1986: 210–211).

Drugo pomembno slovensko literarno središče je po 2. svetovni vojni nastalo v Trstu, kjer se je tudi s pomočjo emigrantov iz Ljubljane obnovilo politično, kulturno in literarno delovanje tamkajšnjih Slovencev. Hkrati sta zaradi njihove politične opredelitve in povojnega italijanskega strankarskega pluralizma nastala desni in levi politično-kulturni blok. V njiju niso diametralno gravitirale samo nekatere slovenske institucije (npr. slovenski Radio Trst A v prvega in slovensko tržaško gledališče v drugega), temveč tudi založbe in časopisje. Slovenska komunistična oblast je finančno in ideološko podpirala levi blok, ki ga je favorizirala v matici, desnega pa je onemogočala. Sodelovanje matičnih književnikov je bilo dovoljeno v tržaškem slovenskem levem bloku, v desnem pa ne. Pisatelj Vladimir Bartol je bil v desetletju po 2. svetovni vojni v Trstu predsednik jugoslovansko usmerjene Slovensko-hrvaške zveze in je v Ljubljani pogosto obiskoval svojo družino. Pisatelja Marjana Rožanca pa so čez dobro desetletje kot ljubljanskega sourednika in publicista tržaške revije *Most* v Ljubljani sodno preganjali.

Tržaško središče slovenske književnosti premore tudi pisatelja Borisa Pahorja in Alojza Rebulo, ki ju oblast v Sloveniji ni marala in ju je nadzirala, ker nista bila na njeni ideološki liniji, predvsem pa sta prijateljevala s Kocbekom. Pahorju je ljubljanska oblast ob drugi politični gonji proti Kocbeku za nekaj časa celo prepovedala vstop v Slovenijo. Kocbeka je med 2. svetovno vojno odporiško gibanje pri svojem vzponu toleriralo kot koristnega zaveznika in vabo za pridobivanje katoličanov, po vojni pa ga je oblast kot odvečno in motečo politično osebo zavrгла, mu več let onemogočala objavljane ter ga kot potencialnega nasprotnika nadzirala prav do smrti, vendar se je hinavsko slavno pokazala na njegovem pogrebu (OMERZA 2010).

Tretje, najmanjše slovensko literarno središče je po 2. svetovni vojni nastalo v Celovcu, kjer se je obnovilo delovanje Mohorjeve družbe, toda njene knjige niso smele prihajati v komunistično Slovenijo. Založba je namreč pripadala koroškemu slovenskemu desnemu bloku in gojila stike z buenosaireskim središčem in desnim tržaškim slovenskim blokom. Tudi na Koroškem je ljubljanska oblast podpirala slovenski levi politični in kulturni blok. Največje koroško literarno ime, ki se je uveljavilo na obeh straneh meje, je pisatelj Florjan Lipuš. Proti koncu Jugoslavije se je sicer pojavljala ideja o potrebnosti uresničevanja »enotnega slovenskega kulturnega prostora«, toda ljubljanska oblast je kljub temu še naprej nadzirala svoje nasprotnike in bila bolj naklonjena svojim ideološkim privržencem ne glede na to, za katero državno mejo so delovali.

Tako je bilo do leta 1991, ko je bilo konec komunističnega režima v Sloveniji in je nastala samostojna država s političnim pluralizmom. Zaradi tega so se nekdanje meje odprle, literarni pretok med prestolnico in tremi literarnimi središči se je sprostil. Ljubljana ni več samo literarna prestolnica, ampak je postala tudi glavno mesto slovenske države. Stoletni proces vzporednega, toda neenakomernega literarnega in političnega vzpona slovenstva se je končno združil v istem mestu. Kakor zgled po meri Heglove filozofije, saj je v tem mestu slovenski »duh« dosegel najvišjo uresničitve najprej v kulturnem in literarnem ter nazadnje tudi v političnem smislu. Po zgodnjem Heglu je »najvišja pojavna oblika duha« država (VORLÄNDER 1997: 79).

7 Če na Ljubljano pogledamo s Kirschevimi geografskimi merili, potem je postala glavno mesto nove nacionalne države, ker je bila že pred njenim nastankom sedež nižjih politično-upravnih enot, ker je približno v središču sedanjega slovenskega etničnega ozemlja in ker vsem Slovencem pomeni kulturno in literarno središče, torej tudi iz simbolnih razlogov. Pri uporabi Kirschevih meril za uvrstitev Ljubljane v njegovo hierarhično tipologijo glavnih mest pa nastaja težava. Nekateri slovenski kulturniki so sicer v preteklosti domnevali, da bo Ljubljana postala »nove Atene«, vendar so bile to bolj pretenciozne blodnje. Kajti tudi sedaj, ko je Ljubljana glavno mesto Republike Slovenije, samostojne države in članice Evropske unije, nima takšnega kulturnega pomena v svetu, da bi si zaslužila ta metaforični vzdevek. Prav tako se je bolje odpovedati sodobni varianti nekdanje megalomanije, in sicer morebitnemu poudarjanju, naj Ljubljana postane globalno pomembna, kajti slovensko glavno mesto najbrž ne bo nikoli doseglo te ravni, čeprav ta treznost ne pomeni, naj se ne trudi presegati provincialnosti. Slovenci sicer menijo, da živijo v sorazmerno gospodarsko razviti državi, toda Ljubljano je, glede na našeta tuja glavna mesta druge Kirscheve kategorije, težko uvrstiti vanjo. Ljubljana najverjetneje pripada vmesni, nedefinirani stopnji med drugo in tretjo kategorijo, torej med kategoriji »nacionalno središče zelo razvite države« in »nacionalno središče malo razvitih držav«. Pri tem se je treba zavedati, da gre za tipologijo, ki kot vsaka upošteva le poglobitve značilnosti pojavov, preostale pa pušča v nemar, zato nastajajo poenostavitve. Pač pa je koristno pogledati položaj slovenskega mesta v luči drugega dejstva.

Ljubljana se po političnem, gospodarskem in kulturnem potencialu res ne more kosati s tujimi večmilijonskimi glavnimi mesti. Toda v primerjavi z narodi, ki so številčno večji kot Slovenci, pa nimajo svoje države, je njen položaj glavnega mesta nacionalne države za slovensko književnost ugoden. Produkcija, distribucija in recepcija vsake nacionalne književnosti so v nacionalni državi načelno optimalne, čeprav niso in ne bodo nikoli idealne. Politična samostojnost nekega naroda v obliki nacionalne države samodejno povzroča nastajanje upravnih institucij, ki vzporedno pospešujejo koncentracijo izobraževalnih in kulturnih zavodov ter tako posredno ali neposredno pospešujejo razvoj književnosti. V Ljubljani živi največ slovenskih književnikov, v njej je tudi sedež njihovega nacionalnega stanovskega društva (Društvo slovenskih pisateljev) in slovenski sedež mednarodne zveze PEN; v njej izhaja največ literarnih revij, deluje največ slovenskih založb in največ gledališč, ki izdajajo in uprizarjajo tudi dela slovenskih dramatikov. V njej deluje največ knjižnic z osrednjo nacionalno knjižnico, ki ima največji fond in največjo zbirko rokopisov slovenskih književnikov. V njej deluje največ šolskih zavodov in tri institucije, ki najdlje in najbolj intenzivno raziskujejo slovensko književnost (slovenistika in komparativistika ljubljanske Filozofske fakultete ter ustrezní inštitut Znanstvenoraziskovalnega centra Slovenske akademije znanosti in umetnosti). Brez natančnejšega opisovanja naštetih dejstev in brez navajanja drugih podatkov je nesporno, da je Ljubljana prestolnica slovenske književnosti, in to v pozitivnem ekspresivnem smislu. Glavno mesto slovenske države je končno postalo identično s prestolnico slovenske književnosti. Druga središča slovenske književnosti sprejema kot legitimno stanje slovenske književnosti.

Sodobna slovenska književnost je torej enoprestolnična, ni pa enosrediščna, temveč večsrediščna in hkrati hierarhična, saj vsebuje prostorsko dominantno, ki

po literarni moči presega tri prostorsko dislocirane enote in vpliva nanje. Toda hierarhičnost ni ne toga ne zaprta ne enosmerna, kajti na slovenska središča ne vpliva samo slovenska prestolnica, ampak pogostejše močnejše literarna središča in prestolnice tujih nacionalnih književnosti (italijanske, avstrijsko-nemške, argentinsko-španske). Tudi slovenska literarna prestolnica ni samozadostna, saj sprejema vplive velikih tujih literarnih prestolnic (npr. Pariza in Londona). Hierarhije vplivov med posameznimi prostorskimi enotam različnih književnosti torej obstajajo na več ravneh:

- med prestolnicami nacionalnih književnosti (npr. med Parizom in Londonom),
- med prestolnico nacionalne književnosti (npr. med Ljubljano) in njenimi manjšimi središči (npr. Trstom, Celovcem in Buenos Airesom),
- med središči dveh različnih nacionalnih književnosti, še posebno kadar dislocirano središče ene nacionalne književnosti obstaja v središču druge nacionalne književnosti (npr. v Trstu na slovensko središče vpliva tamkajšnje italijansko ali kako drugo središče italijanske književnosti, recimo Milano, ali posredno po njiju kaka prestolnica druge tuje književnosti, recimo Pariz);
- med središčem ene nacionalne književnosti in prestolnico druge nacionalne književnosti, če obstajata v istem geografskem prostoru (npr. slovensko središče v Buenos Airesu, ki je prestolnica argentinske književnosti).

Odgovor na vprašanje, ali je potrebno, da ima številčno tako majhna književnost, kakršna je slovenska, poleg literarne prestolnice še več središč, je načeloma nikalen. Vendar je analiza pokazala, da prostorsko-geografski položaj slovenske književnosti ni samo posledica njenega imanentnega razvoja, temveč tudi zunanjega, družbenopolitičnega dogajanja. Prav temu se je slovenska književnost v zgodovini na različne načine prilagajala, da si je zagotovila obstoj in razvoj. Cena, ki jo je za to plačala, ni bila majhna. Toda to je že lahko predmet novega razpravljanja.

VIRI IN LITERATURA

- Alain de BENOIST, 2001: *Totalitarismus: Kommunismus und Nationalsozialismus – die andere Moderne: 1917–1989*. Berlin: Junge Freiheit Verlag.
- Arhiv za zgodovinsko narodopisje 1930–1932: Knjiga I. Uredil Fran Kovačič. Maribor: Zgodovinsko društvo.
- Ivan CANKAR 1974: *Zbrano delo XVII*. Ur. in opombe napisal France Bernik. Ljubljana: DZS.
- , 1969: *Zbrano delo IV*. Ur. in opombe napisal Dušan Moravec. Ljubljana: DZS.
- Marjan DOLGAN, 1988: Logotehnika partizanskega tiska. France Bernik, Marjan Dolgan: *Slovenska vojna proza*. Ljubljana: SM.
- , 1990: *Slovenski literarni programi in manifesti: Fanfare in tihotapci*. Ljubljana: MK (Kondor, 256).

- , 1993: Kako pisati ideološki kič in pri tem uživati. *Vitomil Zupan*. Ur. Aleš Berger. Ljubljana: Nova revija (Interpretacije, 3).
- Aleš GABRIČ, 1995: *Socialistična kulturna revolucija: Slovenska kulturna politika 1953–1962*. Ljubljana: CZ.
- Marko JENŠTERLE, 1985: *Skeptična levica*. Maribor. Obzorja (Znamenja, 81).
- Jugoslawien – Österreich*, 1986: *Literarische Nachbarschaft*. Ur. Johann Holzner in Wolfgang Wiesmüller. Innsbruck: Institut für Germanistik (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft, Germanistische Reihe, 28).
- Jens KIRSCH, 2005: *Hauptstadt: Zum Wesen und Wandel eines nationalen Symbols*. Berlin: LIT Verlag.
- Janko Kos, 2005/2007: Hribovškova poezija včeraj in danes. *Glasnik Slovenske matic* 29–31/1–3. 178–184.
- Igor OMERZA, 2010: *Edvard Kocbek – osebni dosje št. 584*. Ljubljana: Karantanija.
- France PIBERNIK, 1991: *Slovenski dunajski krog 1941–1945*. Ljubljana: CZ.
- Jože POGAČNIK, 1968: *Zgodovina slovenskega slovstva I*. Maribor: Obzorja.
- , 1972a: *Zgodovina slovenskega slovstva VIII*. Maribor: Obzorja.
- , 1972b: *Slovensko zamejsko in zdomsko slovstvo: Oris izhodišč in ocena vrednosti*. Trst: Zaliv.
- Slovenska izseljenska književnost 1–3*: 1999. Več avtorjev. Ur. Janja Žitnik s sodelovanjem Helge Glušič. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC, Rokus.
- Gašper ŠMID, 1994: Osnutek uredbe o banovini Sloveniji iz leta 1939. *Arhivi* 17 1 /2. 118–119.
- Temna stran meseca*, 1998: *Kratka zgodovina totalitarizma v Sloveniji 1945–1990: Zbornik člankov in dokumentov*. Ur. Drago Jančar. Ljubljana: Nova revija.
- Totalitarismus im 20. Jahrhundert: Eine Bilanz der internationalen Forschung*, 1999. Ur. Eckhard Jesse. Bonn, Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft.
- Luka VIDMAR, 2010: *Zoisova literarna republika*. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC (Studia litteraria).
- Karl VORLÄNDER, 1977: *Zgodovina filozofije III/Prvi del*. Ljubljana: SM.
- Zbornik Brižinski spomeniki*, 1996. Ljubljana: ZRC SAZU, Inštitut za slovensko literaturo in literarne vede.

THE CAPITAL AND CENTERS OF SLOVENE LITERATURE

Geographical analyses reveal the diversity of capital cities, their mobility, and impermanence. Of significance to Slovene literary history is the existence of separate political and literary capitals. The latter, the seat of literature, gradually came into being in the course of history as a function of socio-political conditions. In addition, smaller centers of Slovene literature were formed in partially Slovene or completely foreign cities. Differing literary relations between the seat of literature and literary centers are the consequence of political processes.

Key words: geography, state capital, typology of political capitals, seat of national literature, Slovene literary history, Dunaj – Vienna, Ljubljana, Celovec – Klagenfurt, Trst – Trieste, Buenos Aires, Kirsch

1 Introduction

The *Slovar slovenskega literarnega jezika* [*Dictionary of the Slovene literary language*] defines the word »capital« as »stylistically unmarked« name for a »capital city« and as a »journalistic« designation for »city or town that is the center of some activity«. Etymologically, it means a town where an enthroned ruler governs citizens of the town and vicinity. Many speakers of the language associate the word »capital« with the word »metropolis«. The *Slovar slovenskega literarnega jezika* defines it as a »stylistically unmarked« designation for »the main, principal town of a state or region«. In the same dictionary, »town« is defined as »a population center that is the administrative, economic, and cultural center of a wider area«. The phrase »the capital of a state« further means a population center in which »the headquarters of the highest state bodies are located«. One of the definitions for word »center« is »capital city, town, or place where a certain activity is centered«, »place where something emerges, is concentrated, and from which it further spreads«, »whatever is the most significant, the most important for something«. (SSKJ 1997: 544, 548, 1022)

The words cited bear meanings that pertain to a concentration of political, military, economic, and cultural power that subordinate the main town and its surrounding area. The words »seat« and »metropolis« are therefore not value neutral, but are emotional and reflective designations for a »capital city«.

Regarding their expressiveness, the use of both words can be either positive (favorable or approving) or negative (critical or disapproving). The tone is only evident from the spoken or written context. However, the goal of this article is not a linguistic comparison of these terms. The aim is to define the importance of certain towns and cities that became political capitals, seats, metropolises, or centers in Slovene literary history; to describe the reasons some towns gained such a status; and to describe their mutual relationships in different historical eras. For utmost clarity, this article

on literary history also addresses conceptual relationships between words not found in the dictionary.

2 In this article, by the stylistically unmarked name »capital« is meant the headquarters of political, economic, and cultural power of a larger geographical entity, normally a state, country, region, or province. Whereas the dictionary terms »seat« and »metropolis« are normally defined as synonyms, they are used in this article with slightly different meanings. I consider the fact that the »capital city« of a given country is not always necessarily the literary capital. This is even truer for multinational states with literatures in different languages. In these cases, the capital is primarily the political center of the state and a center of literature for the national majority. The seats of national minorities and their literatures are smaller towns within the state, which at the same time are seats of provincial, regional, or county political, and economic authority. Because of this differentiation, the term »capital city« will be from here on used for the headquarters of the state with the attendant political, economic, and cultural implications. The term »metropolis« is a synonym for »capital city«, but will not be used further in order to avoid its terminological complexity.

Term »seat« will be used for a city with a nation's highest cultural and literary concentration, even when this nation is not politically independent and has a separate political capital. There are examples of political capitals doubling as cultural and literary seats, as well as cases where besides a political capital and seat of culture there also exists a smaller town with less concentrated culture and literature. In this article, the term »literary center« refers to such a town.

The fundamental relationship between sites of national literature is hierarchical due to the differences in cultural intensity. The political capital of a nation state that is at the same time the seat of a national literature occupies the highest position. In this case, the nation is politically independent. When a nation is politically dependent, the political capital may be only one of the nation's literary centers. Usually its literary seat is in a smaller town that is politically and indirectly also culturally—and in terms of literature—subordinate to the political capital. In second or third place in the hierarchy is a literary center, which is by definition on a lower level than literary seat or political capital city. This hierarchy of towns in national literature and mutual political-literary relationships is not permanent, but changes through the history as a function of socio-political changes. In addition national literatures tend also to have geographical specificities, which result from different political and cultural contexts.

This presentation of the three types of towns gives the impression that capital cities are the most permanent element in the hierarchy; however, historico-geographical facts show that the status of a capital city can vary. Paris and London have several centuries' long traditions as capital cities. Rome, which is considerably older, was the capital of a state since antiquity; however, it became the capital of Italy in 1870 only with difficulty. Two hundred years ago Switzerland had a rotating system for the capital. Peter the Great moved the capital in 1712 from Moscow to Saint Petersburg, which then remained the capital for about two hundred years. After the October revolution, Moscow again became the capital and has retained this function. Brazil's

national capital was moved in 1960 from Rio de Janeiro to the newly founded city of Brasilia, which was built to accelerate the development of the country's central region. Bolivia has two constitutionally defined capital cities. The Republic of South Africa has three capital cities. A surprising exception is The Republic of Nauru in the Pacific, the only country in the world that has no official capital city because of lack of urbanization and no nation-state tradition (KIRSCH 2005: 9, 18).

Another exception is the German capital. Each of Germany's lands had, since Medieval times, its own capital—for example, Berlin of Prussia and Munich of Bavaria. After these lands joined, in 1871, a unified federal Germany, Prussian Berlin became the German capital; however, the awareness of belonging to individual lands that were formed from past princedoms, and of their capitals persists even in current federation. After WW II, Germany was divided into two states, each with its own capital. Bonn was the capital of the Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany), and Berlin was the capital of the Democratic Republic of Germany (East Germany). However, Berlin was yet again partitioned, with one side belonging to the East and the other to the West. This situation was further complicated by the fact that West Berlin was an enclave inside East Germany. Due to its small size and primarily administrative function, Germans often referred to Bonn sarcastically as a »governmental village«, Frankfurt-am-Main, the financial capital of West Germany, was scornfully called »Bankfurt«. Munich has often been perceived as »Germany's secret capital city«. The writer Thomas Mann moved not to Berlin but to Munich in 1891, where he lived until 1933, when he moved abroad to escape the Nazis. His preference for Munich itself testifies to the level of culture in the Bavarian capital city. Berlin regained its full status capital city after the union of East and West Germany in 1991, despite some resistance due to the city's historico-political baggage.

Two examples will suffice to show that not every capital city is necessarily the cultural and literary seat of the country. The current Swiss capital, Bern, is on the cultural periphery in comparison to Zürich. A similar relationship exists between Washington and New York in the United States. Migrations, status changes, and inter-city rivalries explain why capital cities are affirmed, approved, and praised, just as they are the objects of biting criticism. For some people they are »a destiny, a blessing, or the death of the country«; others see them as »just a remnant that is a cash cow for silly tourists« (KIRSCH 2005: 12).

3 These examples demonstrate that political capitals are differentiated with respect to historical tradition, permanence, size, and their economic and cultural development. This led the German geographer Martin Schwind in 1972 to cast the following hierarchical typography of capital cities: *world metropolis*, *multifunctional capital city*, *governmental town*, *capital city with stunted development*, *undeveloped capital city* (SCHWIND in KIRSCH 2005: 12). Schwind's typology was improved upon in 2005 by another German geographer, Jens Kirsch. He omitted the category *undeveloped capital city*, which three decades ago applied to capitals of new African states that have since developed. He also added the category *former capital city*. The revised typology is:

- *Globally influential metropolis* (e.g., Tokyo, London, Paris, Moscow);
- *National center of a highly developed country* (e.g., Washington, Brussels, Seoul, Berlin);
- *National center of a less developed country*, (e.g., Addis Ababa, Damask, La Paz, Dhaka);
- *Government city of relatively low economic, cultural, and demographic importance* (e.g., Brasilia, Canberra, Ottawa);
- *Former capital city* (e.g., Istanbul, Saint Petersburg, Rio de Janeiro). (KIRSCH 2005: 49)

The same geographer also defined four ways of selecting a political capital:

- When a new state is formed on a territory without a city that previously functioned a capital, then an entirely new capital city is established.
- When a state is formed on a territory with a city that had once functioned as a capital, then its function is renewed.
- When a new state is trying to overcome a former political system on a certain territory, then the previous capital city is replaced with a new one.
- A political capital is moved not only for symbolic reasons, but also for practical, spatial ones. (ibid.: 17-18)

There are several other factors that affect the selection of a capital city: »demographic or economic spatial structures, historical symbolism, military strategy, spatial planning«, and »the personal preferences of the decision maker« (ibid.: 12). Yet the same geographer rightly emphasizes that age, size, development, and other characteristics are not essential for choosing a political capital; its »national symbolic function« is important, »persisting through past and present power relations and the country's cultural or political achievements. This is what in the end differentiates capital and non-capital cities« (ibid.: 12).

It is necessary to examine how the Slovene political capital, Slovene seat of literature, and Slovene literary centers came into being in light of geographic findings on the variability of political capitals.

4 After the ancestors of today's Slovenes settled in the Alpine region at the beginning of ninth century, the central territory of the settled space was »Carinthia, which was already in ancient times highly cultivated« (Pogačnik 1968: 10), and so it was there that the Slovene state of Karantanija was established. However, the loss of its political independence prevented formation of a pre-Slovene political capital. The Christianization of the Slovenes from the foreign cities of Salzburg and Aquileia shows that these were at the time political and religious centers, ones that began subjugating the Slovenes. Consequently, the two principal manuscripts of the initial phase of Slovene literature were not written in one area. The oldest preserved Slovene literary manuscript is the »Brižinski spomeniki« [Freising Manuscripts], written around the year 1000. Most likely it was written in Carinthia for the bishop of Freising, who required it for work with the local Slovene believers. However, the Freising Manuscripts was kept in the diocesan seat, Bavarian Freising, which controlled

estates in Carinthia, the Canale Valley, and Škofja Loka (*Brižinski spomeniki* 1996). The second, a manuscript of prayers from the vicinity of Rateče in the upper Sava valley, was written in the fourteenth century, and is also known as the »Celovški rokopiš« (Celovec/Klagenfurt Manuscript) after the place where it was found. It testifies that the ecclesiastic administration of the upper Sava valley was in one of the Carinthian dioceses and, indirectly, in a larger religious center outside of what is today Slovenia. Yet another manuscript, the Stična Manuscript, written in the fifteenth century at the Stična Monastery, indicates the existence of a Medieval religious and cultural center in the Dolenjska region.

It is possible to assume that the Celje counts, who had conquered a significant amount of Slovene land in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, would have continued expanding their territory and founded not only a political, but a cultural center as well. This would have positively impacted Slovene literature, but the counts' line ended. Celje would probably have prevented or slowed Ljubljana's rise. The Celje estates passed to the Habsburgs, who reigned over most of the Slovenes, divided among several provinces, from Vienna, which was for several centuries, until the end of the Habsburg monarchy in 1918, the capital city of Austria and of the Slovenes living in the Austrian provinces.

Ljubljana advanced as a unifying political and cultural force in Slovenia after acquiring two administrative functions, secular and ecclesiastic, elevating the city to the level of a local political and religious center. In the thirteenth century, Ljubljana became the political capital of the Carniolan province, which in the following century came under Habsburg rule. In 1461, it became the seat of the Ljubljana diocese, which was gaining in importance by gradually incorporating parishes from other ecclesiastic administrative units. Carinthia was the only province at the time with a majority of Slovene population; therefore, it played an important role in the emancipation of Slovendom over the following centuries. It was somehow natural that the most intense manifestation of the sixteenth-century Reformation was precisely in Ljubljana. The printing of Slovene books during the Reformation set the foundation for the future development of Slovene literature as a special secular and aesthetic phenomenon.

An important turning point in literature was the separation of secular from religious literature with the release of the literary almanac *Pisanice* in the Enlightenment period. This is the first evidence that Ljubljana was the seat of Slovene literature. The modeling on Viennese almanacs evidenced the influence of one of the centers of German literature on the seat of Slovene literature, which, compared to Vienna, the political capital of a state, was only a provincial administrative city. Despite later Slovene political gains and the qualitative and quantitative development of Slovene literature, this basic relationship between Ljubljana and Vienna persisted into the 1920s, when most Slovenes lived in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. For instance, after WW I, the playwright Slavko Grum did not attend a university in Ljubljana, Zagreb, or Belgrade but went to Vienna, where he found models for modernizing Slovene drama.

The Enlightenment was important not only because of the establishment of a seat of Slovene literature, but also because it strengthened Ljubljana's administrative role, as seen in the decision of the French to make it the political capital of the Illyr-

ian Provinces (1809–1813). Ljubljana was promoted from its position of provincial capital city and advanced towards the status of political capital of a larger state entity. Further, Zois and Kopitar attempted to exert political influence to form an Illyrian Kingdom of, which was to be a state of the Slovenes and other South Slavic peoples in Austria. The state was in fact founded, but only formally and partially, since it preserved former provincial borders. Ljubljana only became the capital of the Ljubljana district, not of a kingdom within Austria (VIDMAR 2010: 276–288). Yet the concept of the Kingdom of Illyria contained the kernel of the idea of a United Slovenia, which from the mid-nineteenth century on became the Slovene political project. Both the project of the Kingdom of Illyria and United Slovenia project were important stages towards Slovene statehood, which became a reality in 1991, when the Republic of Slovenia was founded. Beside administrative dependence, Ljubljana maintained its strong dependence on Vienna in literary sphere. Slovene dependency on Vienna, including in literature, is seen in censorship of the almanac *Krajnska čbelica*, which went to the censor in Vienna. The almanac was censored not by some German, but by the Slovene Jernej Kopitar. He was not disposed to it and so impeded publication. This was not an isolated instance of a politically influential Slovene acting non-supportively and adversely affecting Slovene literature. These kinds of actions reached their climax under the communist regime in the late twentieth century.

Although Ljubljana gained ground as the national seat of literature throughout the nineteenth century, it was not a favorable place to live and publish for all Slovene literati. The rise of its administrative, political, and literary power was weakened by the German and majority Slovene populations' colliding views, as well as by ideological and party divisions among the Slovenes. In addition, administrative moves in Ljubljana applied only to the region inside the borders of Carniola and did not extend to other lands, like Gorizia, Carinthia, and Styria. Hence they had absolutely no validity in the Hungarian part of the dual Habsburg state (current Prekmurje). Slovenes were a minority in these regions and were therefore, in comparison to Carniola, much more exposed to pressures from the majority populations. The status of Ljubljana as the seat of Slovene literature was further threatened by certain unresolved questions regarding the Slovene literary language, its alphabet, and differences between Slovene dialects that were native to Slovene writer, as well as by Croatian unitarism and Illyrianism. This caused some writers who were not originally from Carniola to reject Ljubljana. For instance, Stanko Vraz weighed Ljubljana versus Zagreb and finally decided for Croatian literature and moved to Zagreb.

Opposite tendencies were present as well, since Ljubljana was appealing as a seat of literature for some Slovene writers who were not originally from Carniola. Anton Askerc moved there after having difficulties in Styria. Even though he planned to, the poet Simon Gregorčič did not move to Ljubljana from the Gorizia region; however he was attached to Ljubljana by political support from the Slovene liberal camp.

In the nineteenth century, Celovec, the capital city of Carinthia, concurrently developed as a German and Slovene literary center. Some of the institutions there surpassed those in Ljubljana. The initial motivators were Slovene language courses for seminarians taught by Anton Martin Slomšek, later bishop of the Lavantall Diocese. The most important was the founding of the St. Hermagoras Society (»Društvo

sv. Mohorja«, later »Mohorjeva družba«), the largest Pan-Slovene publisher, which published books for wide range of readers. The initiator of this idea was Slomšek as well, who correctly anticipated that Slovene literature would be strengthened by a successful Slovene house with a program that would serve the literary needs of the predominately rural population, gradually advancing readers with entertaining, educational, and popular technical literature. Publication runs grew. The collection *Slovenske večernice* [Slovene evening tales], still published today, led to a new genre, the so-called evening tale. Even though literary critics, writers, and supporters of elite literature were hesitant and sometimes dismissed its value, the evening tale became an important genre. It was even practiced by writers like Jurčič and Cankar, the latter of whom was prepared to overlook his high literary principles for money.

Ljubljana envied Klagenfurt for its success and often caused it problems. This is evident from Slomšek's letter of 1853: »You cannot forget that we are Slovenes as well, and so do not claim always to have the last word« (*Arhiv za zgodovinsko narodopisje* 1930–1932: 316). His words demonstrate one of the fundamental laws of the relationship between the seat of literature and a literary center: the first is tolerant so long as the second is peripheral. However as soon as the seat is outshone in some literary matter, it starts hampering the other in different ways. At that point, the seat forgets about national, pan-Slovene interests, because it respects only partial, private, party, political, conceptual, or ideological interests. This has harmful effects on literary as well as national interests, which those at the seat of literature do not recognize because of their partisan blindness. The negativity in such cases has been marked in the twentieth century.

However, Celovec surpassed Ljubljana not only by having the largest and most successful Slovene publishing house, but also with its literary journal, *Slovenski glasnik* (1858–1868), edited by Anton Janežič, who used some literary works by »Carniolan« authors to enforce higher aesthetic standards for Slovene literature of the kind Ljubljana did not enforce. A journal of comparable significance was published in Ljubljana no earlier than in 1881, when *Ljubljanski zvon* was opened. The Celovec journal *Kres* (1881–1886) was not able to compete with it. By that time the majority of the best Slovene literary talents in Carniola and neighboring lands, like Aškerc and Gregorčič, had oriented themselves to the capital city of Carniola. In 1888, Catholic-oriented writers from all Slovene regions received their own journal, *Dom in svet*. Both journals continued to be the main Slovene literary channels until the end of WW II. Because they introduced various literary trends, they were also the foundation for the development of all Slovene literature. The journal *Zvon*, published in Vienna by Josip Stritar in 1870 and again between 1876 and 1880, filling a void between *Slovenski glasnik* and *Ljubljanski zvon*, indicates how difficult it was for Ljubljana to win recognition as the seat of literature, since it was incapable of bringing out a major Slovene literary periodical until 1881, one that could compete with Slovene literary journals published elsewhere.

In the beginning of the twentieth century, Ivan Cankar changed the fundamental literary relationship between Ljubljana and Vienna. At that time, many Slovene writers lived for only a few years in Vienna, while at the university. After graduation most of them returned to Ljubljana or other Slovene towns, where they continued

their literary activities and collaborated with Ljubljana, the seat of literature. Despite his unsuccessful university studies in Vienna, Cankar stayed there for many years, using his formidable literary creativeness to define new literary standards for the national seat of literature. He was often rejected in Ljubljana, which had lower literary criteria. During his stay in Vienna, Cankar was exposed to foreign literary trends, as well as the cultural and bohemian perspectives of a metropolis such as did not exist on Slovene ethnic territory. From Vienna he had an external view of the Carniola capital's rural market nature, the provincialism of the Slovene seat of literature, and Slovene conditions. This influenced the development of his ambivalent attitude towards Slovendom, which is most picturesquely presented in his syntagma: »homeland« as »health« and »homeland« as a »prostitute« (CANKAR 1974: 253–256, 413; CANKAR 1969: 92).

Cankar must also be mentioned because he belongs to the group of writers who voluntarily lived outside of their national literary space. Frequently they chose a peripheral city of some other national literature (Joyce in Trst, Pound in Rapallo), an enclave in the middle of other national literature (Kafka in Prague), or they moved around to cities of various literatures (Rilke to Prague, Munich, Berlin, Paris, Devin/Duino and Switzerland).

5 A great reversal in relationships between Slovene literary cities occurred after WW I. The Austro-Hungarian Empire had broken apart, and Slovenes were politically too weak to realize the concept of United Slovenia, and so they were divided between Yugoslavia, Austria, Italy, and Hungary. Most Slovenes entered into their first state, Yugoslavia, with great illusions. They were soon disappointed because of Serbian unitarism, political dictatorship, and differences between Central European and Balkan mentalities. Their new subordinate position was flagged by the fact that the Slovene territory in Yugoslavia never received the administrative name »Slovenia«. After having various names, it was designated as the Drava Banate from 1929 until the beginning of WW II, with Ljubljana as its administrative capital city and seat of Slovene literature. The 1939 plan for an autonomous Banate of Slovenia was never realized because of the outbreak of WW II (ŠMID 1994). The former Slovene literary center in Celovec faded between the two wars. The Mohorjeva družba moved first to Prevalje, and later to Celje. Slovene cultural life in Gorica and Trst also wained under Italian fascism. Despite its multinational character, at the beginning of twentieth century Trst was becoming one of the Slovene literary centers thanks to certain Slovene journals and organizations, as Cankar's lectures there attest. After WW I, Belgrade became the political capital for Slovenes living in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. However, Belgrade never became as influential in Slovene literature as Vienna had been. Due to the political conditions in Austria and Italy between the wars, the Slovene literary space was reduced to the Slovene territory in Yugoslavia. This happened despite the increased political power of Slovenes, which was not actually as significant as expected before they joined the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. Despite Serbian unitarism, which replaced Germanization, Ljubljana, with the help of newly established institutions, including a partial (incomplete) university, strengthened its cultural status in comparison to the one it had in the Austrian-Hungarian Empire.

WW II threatened the existence of Slovene nation, its literature, and its seat of literature. War activities in ethnically Slovene territories were simultaneously a foreign occupation, anti-occupation resistance, communist revolution, and civil war. Because of the occupation and censorship, the seat of literature had limited functions and only in the Ljubljana district, having lost its bases in Gorenjska and Štajerska. An unforeseen development was the formation of underground center of Slovene literature in Vienna, which was established by a small group of Slovene writers that found themselves in occupied Vienna. They started publishing a literary periodical, *Dunajske domače vaje*, edited by Janez Remic. The main poet in the group was Ivan Hribovšek (PIBERNIK 1991). The war and unfavorable socio-political conditions prevented continuation of the periodical; however, it is evident from the materials that have been preserved how persistent Slovene writers were in trying to maintain the high quality, elite Slovene literature pioneered by Prešeren.

In the meantime, in ethnically Slovene territories, an incomparably greater, intensive, and diametrically opposed process was taking place in partisan units and the areas they controlled (e.g., Bela Krajina). It had appeared less noticeably in the pre-war debate on the literary left (JENŠTERLE 1985): the planned degradation of Slovene literature into a propaganda instrument. This process was camouflaged as counter-occupation resistance and communist revolution (DOLGAN 1988: 34–46; 1990: 100–119, 244–246; 1993: 60–69). Many Slovene writers supported the resistance against the occupation during the WW II. They cooperated in the utopian belief that they were helping to establish absolute social and political »freedom« and the most »progressive« political system in the world, which would in turn furnish maximum creative »freedom« for Slovene literature. In fact, after WW II the maximum, worst political violence in the literature's history befell it, lasting until the end of the communist system (*Temna stran meseca – The Dark Side of the Moon* 1998; GABRIČ 1995).

The majority of Slovene territory came under the »second« Yugoslavia after WW II. Ljubljana was no longer the capital city of a banate, but the capital of first the »People's« and later the »Socialistic Republic of Slovenia«; however, Belgrade remained the political capital of the state. Despite a new political doctrine and repetition of the cliché about »brotherhood and unity of our nations«, Belgrade did not shed Serbian unitarism, but preserved it in different ways. For example, Slovene was to be used for communications in partisan units during the war; after the war, the »Serbo-Croatian« language was mandatory in all Yugoslav military units; »Serbo-Croatian« was mandatory in Slovene elementary schools, but Slovene was not a subject in the schools of other Yugoslav republics; in the 1980s, a plan appeared for a »common core« curriculum for all Yugoslavia. Like nineteenth-century Illyrianism, the new Illyrianism at the beginning of the twentieth century, and pre-war unitarism, these unitaristic actions were variants of a constant attempt of a neighboring Yugoslav nation not only politically to subjugate, but also to eliminate Slovenes as a nation. Due to Slovenes' political naiveness, both twentieth-century political formations were successful in politically overpowering them. The obstacles to complete subjugation were the Slovene language, culture, and literature; therefore, the dominant nations in both political formations tried to achieve cultural assimilation of the Slovenes. The attempt was actually the same as Germanization, Italianization, and Magyarization,

only it came from a different geographical direction. Slovene power was no equal for WW II occupiers or other foreign political agents after the war, and thus was eventually transformed into introverted aggressiveness, national sadomasochism and national self-destruction.

Violence against Slovene literature took different forms: a list of forbidden books immediately after the war; following the Soviet pattern, socialist realism was mandatory; mythologization of the partisan movement and revolution; forbidden, taboo topics and persecution of Western European »bourgeois« and »decadent« literary movements. Though political ties with the Soviet Union were sundered in 1948, the government, in line with its totalitarian nature (JESSE 1999; BENOIST 2001), interfered with literature by applying Stalinist measures. This continued almost until the end of the political system in 1991, with actions like arrests of writers and dissidents and closings of literary journals. The government carried out two campaigns against Kocbek, prohibiting publication of his works for years and eavesdropping on him. It also watched ideologically questionable writers, hindering publication of controversial books and appointing trusted personnel to leading positions at cultural and literary institutions.

6 Even before the end of the war it was already possible to predict the forthcoming violence against Slovenes who disagreed with communism. Thus several thousand of them emigrated abroad after the war ended in 1945. Among them were several writers from Ljubljana (POGAČNIK 1972a; 1972b; *Slovenska izseljenska književnost* 1999). About 7,000 Slovenes settled in Buenos Aires, Argentina, where a well organized center of Slovene literature appeared with adequate infrastructure: primary schools, secondary high schools, and for some time even a Slovene studies department within the Ukrainian university; cultural clubs, publishing houses, and several newspapers and magazines, among which was the literary journal *Meddobje*, founded in 1954. Contributors to this journal were Slovene writers from all around the world, except from Slovenia, because contributing would have been punished by the communist regime. An exception was Stanko Majcen, who nonetheless dared to publish in Argentina under a pseudonym.

It is significant that the Slovene literary center in Argentina, as one would expect due to its political emigre status, did not revive the model of sentimental literature about the homeland, but continued the model of aesthetically high literature. This is seen in the translations of poets like Valéry and T. S. Eliot; in reprints of Balantič's poems that were forbidden in the »People's« or »Socialistic Republic of Slovenia«; in discovering and printing the second best WW II poet, Ivan Hribovšek (Kos 2005/2007: 178–184); in the narratives of Zorko Simčič, whose motifs, ideas, and style outshone contemporaneous narratives in Slovenia. This is especially noticeable in his novel *Človek na obeh straneh stene* [*The man on both sides of the wall* 1957]. The same is true of the novel *Ljubljanski triptih*, by Ruda Jurčec, which was published in Buenos Aires the same year. With a multi-perspective narration and the first literary discussion of post-war Stalinist »Dachau« trials in Slovene literature, this work exceeded prevailing literary standards in Slovenia. For several decades these trials were a taboo topic in Slovenia and were not to be discussed in public or in literature.

All Argentine-Slovene publications were forbidden in Slovenia, but individuals were smuggling them from foreign bookstores. Writer and dramatist Drago Jančar was arrested for such an »indiscretion«. The national and university libraries in Ljubljana received these publications, but they were kept in a special vault »D«, which was not accessible to the public but only to rare individuals.

A great many Slovene writers from the seat of literature personally did not oppose the activities of the Buenos Aires literary center, since they were aware of the unpleasant divisions between Slovenes and the post-war consequences. However, the Slovene political center in Ljubljana acted against it in accordance with the doctrine of permanent revolution and paranoid fear of any opposition, fighting against former ideological and military opponents. The latter used documentary and memoir publications to demythologize the varnished war past of the governing Slovene leadership and to reveal its pre- and post-war executions. Therefore it is not surprising that the second political campaign against Kocbek, because of his writings about these massacres, resonated beyond Slovenia's borders and attracted attention abroad. The German writer Heinrich Böll also became involved (A bibliography of German responses at the time was published in the collection *Jugoslawien-Österreich* 1986: 210–11).

The other important post-WW II Slovene literary center was established in Trst, where previous Slovene political, cultural, and literary activities were renewed with the help of emigres from Ljubljana. At the same time, because of their political affiliation and party pluralism in Italy after the war, right and left political-cultural blocs formed. Some Slovene institutions, publishers and newspapers gravitated diametrically to both sides, like the Slovene Radio Trst A to the right, and the Slovene theater in Trst to the left. The Slovene communist government was financially and ideologically supporting the left bloc, which was favored by the homeland, while it was obstructing the right bloc. Writers, poets, essayists, and other artists from the homeland were allowed to cooperate with the Slovene left bloc in Trst, but not with the right. The writer Vladimir Bartol was during the first decade after the WW II the president of Yugoslav-oriented Slovene-Croatian Union in Trst and often visited his family in Ljubljana. However, the Ljubljana-based Marjan Rožanc, who was co-editor and journalist for the Trst journal *Most*, was prosecuted a decade later.

The writers Boris Pahor and Alojz Rebula, too, were members of the Slovene literary center in Trst. They both were disliked by the government in Ljubljana and were spied upon because of their ideological beliefs and friendship with Kocbek. During the second campaign against Kocbek, Pahor was even forbidden for some time to enter Slovenia. The resistance movement during its rise in WW II had tolerated Kocbek as a valuable ally and used him to attract Catholics. However, after the war the government discarded him as a needless and disruptive political character. He was prevented from publishing and viewed as a potential opponent to the government, which spied on him until his death, but then hypocritically celebrated him at his funeral (OMERZA 2010).

The third and smallest post-war Slovene literary center was established in Celovec with the restoration of the St. Hermagoras Society; however, it was not allowed to supply communistic Slovenia with their publications. The reason was that

the publisher was a part of the Carinthian Slovene right bloc that fostered contacts with the center in Buenos Aires and with the Slovene right bloc in Trst. The government in Ljubljana supported the Carinthian Slovene leftist political and cultural bloc. The most prominent Carinthian literary name on both sides of the Slovene border is the writer Florjan Lipuš. The idea of realizing a »unified Slovene cultural space« arose towards the end of Yugoslavia. However, the government in Ljubljana continued to watch their opponents and to favor their ideological supporters, regardless over which border.

It was so until 1991, when the communist regime in Slovenia ended and a new, politically pluralistic, independent state was created. This resulted in the opening of borders and facilitated the flow of literature between the seat of literature and the three literary centers abroad. Ljubljana is no longer only the seat of literature, but has become the political capital of the Slovene state. The century-long process of the parallel but unbalanced literary and political rise of Slovendom finally ended in one place. Just as in the Hegelian model, the Slovene »spirit« reached its highest fulfillment in culture and literature, and then in the political sense as well. To cite the young Hegel, the state is "the highest manifestation of spirit" (VORLÄNDER 1997: 79).

7 When viewed from the perspective of Kirsch's geographical measures, Ljubljana has become the political capital of a new state because, even before it was so in actuality, it had already been the headquarters of lower political and administrative units; it is almost in the center of the current Slovene ethnic territory; and is for all Slovenes the cultural and literary center as well, and therefore has symbolic meaning. A problem arises when trying to categorize Ljubljana in a hierarchical typology of capital cities by using Kirsch's measures. Some Slovene cultural workers anticipated that Ljubljana might become a »new Athens«; however, this turned out to be but a pretentious illusion. Even though Ljubljana is now the capital city of the independent state of the Republic of Slovenia, a member of the European Union, it still has not gained enough cultural importance to garner this metaphoric epithet. In addition, it is best to avoid emphasizing Ljubljana's possible global importance—something that can be viewed as a contemporary version of megalomania—because the Slovene capital city will probably never attain to this level. However, this prudent opinion does not imply that Ljubljana should stop trying to outgrow provincialism. Slovenes perceive that they live in a relatively well-developed state, yet Ljubljana's status is hard to compare to that of cities listed in the second of Kirsch's categories. Therefore, Ljubljana ought to be categorized in an undefined class between the second and third category, between »national center of a highly developed country« and »national center of a less developed country«. Still, we need to take into account that as with any typology, this one, too, takes into account only the main characteristics of the phenomena being examined. Details are neglected, which leads to simplifications. Nonetheless, it is beneficial to view the status of the Slovene city from the other perspective.

With respect to political, economic, and cultural potential, Ljubljana is not able to compete with foreign metropolises. However, when Slovenia is compared to other, larger nations that do not have their own state, Ljubljana as a capital of an independ-

ent state is, with respect to Slovene literature, in a favorable position. In general, production, distribution, and reception of the national literature are optimal within a nation state; however, they are not and never will be ideal. A people's political independence in the form of a nation state is reason in itself for forming governmental institutions. These simultaneously stimulate concentration of educational and cultural institutions and directly or indirectly accelerate the development of literature. Most Slovene writers live in Ljubljana, where the seat of their national professional society, the Društvo slovenskh pisateljev [Slovene Writers' Society] is located, and the seat of the international association PEN. It is also the place where most of the Slovene literary journals are published, and it has the most active publishers and theaters that stage Slovene playwrights' works. There are also the majority of libraries, including the central national library, which has the largest collection of books and of Slovene writers' manuscripts. The majority of educational institutions are there, as well as three of the most active research institutions for Slovene literature (Slovene Studies and Comparative Literature at Ljubljana University's Filozofska fakulteta, and several departments at the Research Center of the Slovene Academy of Sciences and Arts). Even without a detailed listing of facts and other data, it is obvious that Ljubljana is the seat of Slovene literature. The capital city of the Slovene state has finally become the identified with the seat of Slovene literature. It accepts other Slovene literary centers as legitimate.

Contemporary Slovene literature has, therefore, a single seat but also several centers, which makes it hierarchical. It contains a spatial dominant, which in terms of literary potential surpasses and influences the other three, spatially dislocated centers. However, this is not a rigid, closed, or one-way hierarchy, since Slovene literary centers are not influenced only by the Slovene capital, but often even more by literary centers and capitals of other foreign national literatures (e.g., Italian, Austrian-German, Argentine-Spanish). The Slovene literary seat is not self-sufficient, but is rather influenced by larger foreign literary seats, like Paris and London. Hierarchy of influences between individual spatial units of different literatures is therefore present on several levels:

- between seats of national literatures (e.g., between Paris and London);
- between a national literary seat (e.g., Ljubljana) and its smaller centers (e.g., Trst, Celovec, and Buenos Aires);
- between centers of two different national literatures, especially when a dislocated center of one literature resides within the center of a different national literature (e.g., the Slovene center in Trst is influenced by local Italian literature or some other Italian literary centers, like Milan, or indirectly by some other foreign literary center like Paris);
- between centers of one national literature and a seat of a different national literature when existing in the same geographical space (e.g., the Slovene center in Buenos Aires, which is also the seat of Argentine literature).

In general, the answer to the question of whether a small (numerically) literature like Slovene needs several centers besides the seat of literature is negative. However, this analysis showed that spati--geographical status of Slovene literature is not only a

consequence of its immanent development, but also of foreign, socio-political events. Slovene literature has taken different approaches to adapt to foreign influences, and so secured its existence and development. The price it paid was not small, but that is the subject of another article.

WORKS CITED

- Alain de BENOIST, 2001: *Totalitarismus: Kommunismus und Nationalsozialismus – die andere Moderne: 1917–1989*. Berlin: Junge Freiheit Verlag.
- Arhiv za zgodovinsko narodopisje 1930–1932 [Archive of national history]*: Book I. Ed. Fran Kovačič. Maribor: Zgodovinsko društvo.
- Ivan CANKAR 1974: *Zbrano delo XVII [Collected works, vol. 17]*. Ed. and commentary by France Bernik. Ljubljana: DZS.
- , 1969: *Zbrano delo IV [Collected works, vol. 4]*. Ed. and commentary by Dušan Moravec. Ljubljana: DZS.
- Marjan DOLGAN, 1988: Logotehnika partizanskega tiska [Obligatory regulations of the partisan press]. France Bernik, Marjan Dolgan: *Slovenska vojna proza*. Ljubljana: SM.
- , 1990: *Slovenski literarni programi in manifesti: Fanfare in tihotapci [Slovene literary programs and manifestos]*. Ljubljana: MK (Kondor, 256).
- , 1993: Kako pisati ideološki kič in pri tem uživati [How to write ideological kitsch and live on it]. *Vitomil Zupan*. Ed. Aleš Berger. Ljubljana: Nova revija (Interpretacije, 3).
- Aleš GABRIČ, 1995: *Socialistična kulturna revolucija: Slovenska kulturna politika 1953–1962 [The socialist cultural revolution: Slovene cultural politics 1953–1962]*. Ljubljana: CZ.
- Marko JENŠTERLE, 1985: *Skeptična levica [The skeptical left]*. Maribor. Obzorja (Znamenja, 81).
- Jugoslawien – Österreich*, 1986: Literarische Nachbarschaft. Ed. Johann Holzner and Wolfgang Wiesmüller. Innsbruck: Institut für Germanistik (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft, Germanistische Reihe, Band 28).
- Jens KIRSCH, 2005: *Hauptstadt: Zum Wesen und Wandel eines nationalen Symbols*. Berlin: LIT Verlag.
- Janko KOS, 2005/2007: Hribovškova poezija včeraj in danes [Hribovšek's poetry today and yesterday]. *Glasnik Slovenske matice* 29–31/1–3. 178–184.
- Igor OMERZA, 2010: *Edvard Kocbek – osebni dosje št. 584 [Edvard Kocbek – personal dossier no. 584]*. Ljubljana: Karantanija.
- France PIBERNIK, 1991: *Slovenski dunajski krog 1941–1945 [The Slovene Vienna circle 1941–1945]*. Ljubljana: CZ.

- Jože POGAČNIK, 1968: *Zgodovina slovenskega slovstva I* [*A history of Slovene literature*, vol. 1]. Maribor: Obzorja.
- , 1972a: *Zgodovina slovenskega slovstva VIII* [*A history of Slovene literature*, vol. 7]. Maribor: Obzorja.
- , 1972b: *Slovensko zamejsko in zdonsko slovstvo: Oris izhodišč in ocena vrednosti* [*The Slovene abroad and domestic literature: An outline and consideration of values*]. Trst: Zaliv.
- Slovenska izseljenska književnost 1–3* [*Slovene emigrant literature*, vols. 1–3]: 1999. Several authors. Ed. by Janja Žitnik in collaboration with Helga Glušič. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC, Rokus.
- Gašper ŠMID, 1994: Osnutek uredbe o banovini Sloveniji iz leta 1939 [A summary of the organization of the Slovene Banate from 1939]. *Arhivi* 17 1 /2. 118–119.
- Temna stran meseca*, 1998: *Kratka zgodovina totalitarizma v Sloveniji 1945–1990: Zbornik člankov in dokumentov* [*A short history of totalitarianism in Slovenia 1945–1990: A collection of articles and documents*]. Ed. Drago Jančar. Ljubljana: Nova revija.
- Totalitarismus im 20. Jahrhundert: Eine Bilanz der internationalen Forschung*, 1999. Ed. Eckhard Jesse. Bonn, Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft.
- Luka VIDMAR, 2010: *Zoisova literarna republika* [*Zois's literary republic*]. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC (Studia litteraria).
- Karl VORLÄNDER, 1977: *Zgodovina filozofije III/Prvi del* [*The history of philosophy*, vol. 3, part 1]. Ljubljana: SM.
- Zbornik Brižinski spomeniki* [*The Freising manuscripts*], 1996. Ljubljana: ZRC SAZU, Inštitut za slovensko literaturo in literarne vede.

