SPACES OF INTERTEXTUALITY / THE INTERTEXTUALITY OF SPACE

Marko Juvan

Scientific Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy
of Sciences and Arts, Ljubljana, Slovenia

82.0

Literary discourse interpellates the reading subject to take positions in the imaginary. The subject's positions as structured by the text's spatial syntax can be undone by forces that produce transgressive spaces. Intertextuality transplants or evokes other literary and socio-cultural spaces. Because of the fundamental intertextuality of space, identities are in permanent hybridization.

Key words: textual world / space / intertextuality / transgression / boundary / cultural space / identity

The spatial in the intertextuality

The notion of intertextuality—the idea that each text produces meanings and structures by absorbing and transforming other texts, utterances, and sign systems—was one of those conceptions of the 20th century that in the wake of modernist art signalled a shift of imagination and reasoning from temporal dominants to spatial models.[1] It is, then, no surprise that intertextuality arrived on the scene of contemporary theory in the company of spatial metaphors. Let me mention some characteristic formulations of Julia Kristeva and Roland Barthes: "the volume of the social," "the space of the text," "text places itself in the history," "the society inscribes itself in the text," and "all the texts of the space that has been read by the writer function in the paragram of the text."[2] There are several contemporary and subsequent terms that could be added to the list, such as Derrida's "writing" and "trace" and Genette's "palimpsest" and "hypertext," the latter used extensively in internet culture as well. Even some older notions should be recalled that were used to explain, in the paradigms of classical rhetoric and 19th-century historicism, relationships between new texts or utterances and the tradition of the *déjà dit*. The first one is *topos* or commonplace. Detached from its source in some classical, authoritative, or sacred

texts topos transcended time and was preserved in spatial schemes of *memoria* (mnemonic art); thesauri of topics were a kind of repository of public good available to later poets and orators. The second one is imagery connected to the notion of influence (Juvan 2000b). In spite of its causal-temporal ground, the term "influence" shaped the discipline of comparative literature with geopolitical metaphors suggesting conquering and overwhelming another cultural territory by literary influxes, streams, and currents; their colonial and axiological subtext is not hard to decipher ("pure origins" vs. "unclean mixture," "defining power" vs. "constituted subject").

The stress on the spatial, so crucial for the idea of intertextuality, was provoked by the polemic against established notions of verbal interaction that represented communication as linear transmission of an information "package" from author to reader and backed by a monolithic common code. Intertextuality, with its spatial models, tried to put forward, in contradistinction to such views, at least two postulates. *First*, that each text is animated by an open dialogue generating a complex and ever changing network of inter-subjective relations and identity positions; *second*, that semantic and structural patterns of the text, like tips of icebergs, lie on an immense sea of the implicit, on several layers of codes, utterances, and cultural representations; for this reason the patterns are dynamic, indeterminable, and subject to heterogeneous regimes of ascribing sense to linguistic data.

However, the spatial aspects of intertextuality briefly outlined so far are more or less bound to theory and to metaphorical thinking, which cannot be avoided even when one tries to construct explanatory models. But how can we actually explain the relationship between the intertextuality and space represented in textual worlds?

The experience of the textual space and spatial segmentation

In literary discourse, imaginative spaces produced by linguistic signs in the text exert an effect of presence. A *phantasma* arises of being present in the world, a sense of real time and of lived experience (*espace vécu*) is created—*as if* the represented space, although unfinished and only partially determined, were beheld by the reader's "inward eye," similar to psychic images triggered by personal memories or phantasies. Presence is established mainly by perspectivizing the phantasmatic space from a series of textually established point-of-views—that is, from implicit subject-centres of semantic-axiological coordinates. A fictional point of view upon a fictional space interpellates, so to speak, the subject of reading and calls her/him to take a specific position in the imaginary. The interpellated reading subject is capable of activating cognitive schemes of viewing appropriate types of spatial structures; he/she tries, by way of inferring, to adjust memorized schemata, which are always semantic and value laden, to the flux of textual data.

What I want to call attention to are textually represented spaces' mutual relations and boundaries. Regardless whether those spaces are derived from chronotopes typical of specific literary genres (e.g., "realist," "imaginary," "allegoric," "fantastic," or "utopian" places), they normally presuppose discrete and structured delimitation and, within their boundaries, a coherent internal structure. This could be described as spatial syntax or, rather, as paratactic or hypotactic structures of inter-spatial relationships. The spatial syntax articulates and segments textually represented spaces and constitutes their hierarchy; for example, character A goes from a room to a garden, then sets out for shopping to the market place (parataxis); in the suburbs of a big city there is the house of a character B, who possesses a romantic painting representing a picturesque sea gulf; B is constantly dreaming about going there (hypotaxis). In these examples, the boundaries between larger and narrower areas or between different kinds of spaces ("material," "psychic," and "artistic") are well articulated and at least implicitly stable. Various and distinct spaces are assigned fixed positions within the constellation of the textual world: they can exist parallel to each other within the same ontology, they can be embedded in a larger whole within the same world, or they belong to different ontologies (represented in the text as material, psychic, medial, virtual, etc.).

Transgressive spaces

Forces that transgress the logic of spatial delimitation and hierarchy often invade discrete and delimited spaces structured by spatial syntax. These forces generate spaces of transgression—areas where different spaces dissolve, amalgamate, cover one another, or move over/through another. By these moves, spaces lose their presence and firmness and disclose their imaginary, phantasmatic, and mobile natures. Within the limits of this paper it is not possible to describe and classify all the kinds of transgressive forces that dissolve the logic of spatial syntax in literature. I will only mention four of them. The first one will be illustrated by Proust's novels, the other three by examples from poetry of Srečko Kosovel (1904–26), a modernist and transgressive poet recently labeled "the Slovenian Rimbaud":[3]

1. *Figural transgression.* The first kind of transgression is underpinned by a long tradition, yet it is significantly modified in modern writing. In the domain of metaphor, schemes of one cognitive-semiotic field are projected upon another field: boundaries between two different semiotic spaces are blurred, spatial structures interfere and by their interaction they generate a new field of sense and imagination.[4] This is characteristic of modern metaphor. For example, in Kosovel's lyrical poem *Po srebrni mesečini* ("In Silver Moonlight"), the original nocturnal maritime landscape begins to fork with the support of metaphors that open up other imaginative spaces, ones associated with the poet's body and psyche: "A dark boat floats / in silver moonlight, / from the green harbour / a boatman set sail, / from *the green crystal / of a silent heart. / From the heart*

of midnight."[5] The poetic space in this text with a symbolic touch is transgressive, oscillating between the representation of outward and inward worlds. As shown in this example from Kosovel, the traditional dual structure of semantic figures (direct vs. metaphoric meaning) that used to establish clear-cut spatial syntax (space compared vs. comparing space) in modern poetic discourse turns to spatial undecidability.

2. *Palimpsest transgression.* In contradistinction to figural transgression, the second way of creating transgressive spaces was first constituted by modern writing. In his study *Proust palimpseste*, Gérard Genette (1966: 59) pointed out that Proust's writing in *À la recherche du temps perdu* breaks the stability both of temporal sequence and spatial frames. Proust's narrator not only persistently compares isolated spaces using sophisticated and extended comparisons, metonymy, or metaphors (for example, by comparing Venice to native Combray, Venice becomes "another Combray, although *other* Combray: aquatic, precious, exotic"; Genette 1966: 46; italics original, translation mine), but also passes from one place to another, neglecting boundaries and leaving behind almost no traces of traditional tropes. Instead, he creates a narrative palimpsest that conjoins disparate places and moments by transposing fragmentary descriptions and attributes from one site to another: the conjoined places are active, connected to specific literary characters, and in the narrative they are being constantly "recalled, reintegrated, reinvested, always present together" (Genette 1966: 60). The fragments of specific places, either present simultaneously or, more characteristically, retrieved from memories and imagined, are superposed and/or blended. Their attributes coexist in a single narrative sequence, creating a unique though unbound transgressive sphere of psychic associations, perceptions, and reflections: fairy-tale figures projected from the magic lantern travel over the furniture and walls of the young Marcel's room, Combray emerges from a cup of tea, etc. (Proust 1969). The logic of delimitation between spaces is suspended, semantics and paradigmatic intra-textual relations predominate over syntax and syntagmatic axis of textual organization. As a result, in such kinds of modern writing the identities of spaces are hybridized. Proustian spaces could be described as floating (*espace flottants, navicules* – cf. Westphal 2000a: 14).

3. *Textual explosion.* In modern writing, this force obliterates textual coherence and erases linguistic links in the spatial syntax; because of this move, the relations and boundaries between the represented spaces as well as their internal structures become ambiguous and indeterminate. Thus the point of view is displaced and the subject-position deterritorialised (cf. Deleuze – Guattari 1980). See, for example, Kosovel's avantgarde construction ("kons") entitled *Pogovor v somraku* ("Talk at Twilight"). This text is actually a collage of immediate, flowing perceptions of the poet's intimate, private spaces and of fragmentary images of places cut off from public discourse, scholarship, art, and newspapers: "Our windows are barred. / White barricades. / The American Indians know nothing / of gravity. / But dynamite explodes / in Novaja Zemlja, too. / You, Sir, in the astrakhan cap! / There is no arithmetic mean / between the old and the

new worlds. / One is either old or young. / A golden boat on the horizon. /.../ People swinging hanged / from telegraph poles. / Entrance: one dinar. / It is raining. / Man talks to the cosmos. / A barn outside the window."[6] The local and the global, the intimate and the universal are juxtaposed in Kosovel's poem; no explicit designation of the spatial syntax is supplied by the author.

4. *Intertextuality.* By its very definition, intertexuality cannot be held to be transgressive. The first advocates of intertextuality have perhaps exaggerated in this respect. Consider, for example, a historical novel that faithfully follows the topography of its historic sources, embedded quotes of lyrical texts in narratives, or a play-within-a play. Nonetheless, intertextuality no doubt remains one of the most powerful means of spatial transgression. It deserves to be discussed more thoroughly, especially in response to a proposal by Bertrand Westphal, who in his brilliant apologia of geocriticism notices how productive the effort of disfiguring the metaphor of "space as a book" may be if deciphered in terms of intertextuality: "Ne conviendrait-il pas d'explorer la métaphore ville-livre, voire espace-livre, et, allant du livre à l'espace, d'appliquer à ce dernier les principes de l'intertextualité?" (Westphal 2000a: 17).

Spaces of intertextuality

In this context, I see intertextuality as the practice of transposing, juxtaposing, and blending heterogeneous semiotic spaces, not only those represented in the textual world but also those evoked by linguistic and genre forms on the textual surface. It seems reasonable to me to distinguish two types of semiotic spaces which are relayed by intertextual reference and derivations: intra- and extratextual spaces.[7]

By the provisional term "intratextual space" I understand virtual, phantasmatic space constructed and perspectivised in the reader's consciousness by linguistic signs of the text and processes of inference; i.e., the fictional, poetic, imaginary, or possible world. As we know from seminal explorations by Bakhtin (his notion of the chronotope) and Lotman, the textual representation of the space, with its horizontal/ vertical segmentation and delimitation, is interwoven with acts, horizons, and perspectives of different agencies. As such, it plays a crucial role in building the semantic and axiological structures of the text. Intratextual space also makes up a significant part of the imaginary, because it is often attached to recurrent poetic images that carry archetypal values that organize the subject's consciousness and unconscious (cf. Bachelard 1974: 1–21). The notion "extratextual space," however, refers to spatial conditions and zones in the actual world that exert certain impact upon discourses and their structuring. Pragmatics, sociolinguistics, cultural semiotics, comparative studies, and geocriticism termed them with more precision. Extratextual spaces could be ranged from very specific, contingent situations/contexts of uttering, through socio-geographically and historically determined places, localities/territories, to maximally extensive space, occupied and

regulated by a whole culture (semiosphere), or floating and border zones of inter- and transcultural exchange.[8] I distinguish two possible means of intertextual spatial transgression, both intra- and extratextual:

1. *Intertextual transpositions of other text's space.* Quotations, allusions, borrowings, collages, parodies, imitations and other intertextual figures/genres implant semiotic foreign bodies in textual organisms; they transpose "intratextual spaces" or fragments thereof from other texts, textual series, and intertexts. Being able to break the norms of spatial syntax, alien spaces double the central space of the text, they open it up, interfere with it and generate spaces of transgression.

2. *Intertextual evocations of other extratextual space.* On the other hand, intertextual forms, such as stylisation or imitation of genre patterns, evoke "extratextual spaces" only indirectly, by use of connotation. These intertextual devices are not representations (i.e., fictional picturing of places). In this case, quoting or imitating alien discourse only recalls impressions of certain places, of their ideological atmosphere, of registers and voices that are usually found there. In other words, by transposing segments of alien discourse, intertextual practice indicates the traces of communicative context or socio-geographical, cultural space in which this discourse originally functioned.

Kosovel employed both ways of intertextual transgression in many of his modernist texts. *Blizu polnoči* (Close to Midnight), a fairly laconic poem, is assembled of divergent points of view, panoramas and close-ups of Trieste and its surroundings: "Close to midnight. / Flies dying in a glass. / The fire has died out. / *Fair Vida, there is / sorrow in your memory.* / Stravinsky in a car. / The roaring of the sea. / Oh, to be alone for 5 minutes. / The heart-Trieste is ill. / That is why Trieste is beautiful. / Pain blossoms in beauty."[9] The text puts together miniature perceptions, flowing emotions and subtle reflections of solitude. Among fragmented spatial impressions, an allusion to the folkloric motif of Lepa Vida (Fair Vida) attracts one's attention: a figure of a woman standing at the Adriatic coast is an intertextual analogue to one of several wandering subjective standpoints of Kosovel's text. The Fair Vida motif has acquired in the Slovene literary tradition since France Prešeren (in the mid-19th century) archetypal, mythic value precisely by its inherent ambivalence and transgressiveness of desire: the ballad narrative is about how the subject's desire to free herself from the primordial, patriarchal bonds of homeland is, after she is taken abroad, transmuted into yearning for her lost home. Allusion to the Fair Vida intertext interferes with the cut-up textual space of Kosovel's poetic construction; intertextual transposition of ballad space into a pluri-perspectival and contingent modern writing creates an impression of a double, of a palimpsest: an archetypal layer of semantic and spatial organization shines through the chaotic experience of modernity.

Kosovel evokes not only literary pre-texts and spaces represented by them but various social settings as well. He does this by imitating and/or quoting utterances, sociolects, and discourses that are generally associated with specific geo-physical places, contexts. In *Kons: XY* (Cons: XY), for example, the initial transgressive space where "inner" poetic

subjectivity is blended with the "outer" scene of a circus is further trans-gressed by interventions of other extratextual places indirectly invoked by the connotative power of stylistically and semantically contrasting phrases. They are imitated from lyrical, almost romantic discourse on the one hand, and quoted from prosaic police and court records on the other hand: "Across my heart a huge elephant slops. / Circus Kludsky; 5 dinars to see. / Don't shout your sorrow from the house-tops! / She is smiling: ring a ring ree. / Human hearts are small and prisons big, / through human hearts I'd like to sail. / *Do you belong to this or that clique? / A thousand dinars or 7 days in jail.* / The flowers in my heart cry no more /...*"[10]

The intertextuality of space

Identities and social relations are constituted by the conjunctions of spaces and discourses. As a recent work on urban theory notes: "People's lives, networks, and identities were patterned geographically and dis-cursively [...] across different sites of activity (work, home, community); [...] these different sites were contexts that transformed the meaning of actor's identities" (Tajbakhsh 2001: XIII). Geo-physical space is divided, ordered, and semioticised by cultural practices and their products (building houses, living in settlements, moving with traffic, developing technologies of communication), and above all by mental categories used in discourse. In this way the discursive interpretation and regulation of real space establishes or reshapes social relationships and hierarchies, and constantly shifts subject positions (cf. Keating 2001). Every space is related to the human subject, who delimits it with her/his words; human spaces are therefore permanently de- and recomposed by language and words (Grassin 2000: I–II).[11] Differences in the nature of spaces (e.g., natural – cultural, static – dynamic, rural – urban, private – public, sacred – profane, central – peripheral) imply different patterns of behavior and social interaction, distinct registers and speech performances. Some places —especially those burdened with sediments of formulaic or ritualized practices—determine style or genre rather predictably (e.g., a church → prayers and preaching, a courtroom → testimony and verdict, a classroom → lecturing, a marketplace → bargaining); other places, however, do not condition linguo-pragmatic choices so strongly (e.g., a restaurant → amorous whispering, business or intellectual conversation etc., but not loud professing of political ideas).

Even volumes containing the material vehicles of communication (e.g., volumes of books, pages of a newspaper, TV or computer screens, adver-tising posters, etc.) have a place on the continuum of "extratextual," phy-sical space. Based on McLuhan's dictum that the "medium is a message," it is understandable that the spatial dimension of media largely determines how contexts of utterances are marked. Patterns transposed or imitated from other linguistic varieties or discursive genres and grafted into a literary text may color their new environment with connotations evoking their original medium, including its spatial aspect. A literary text in which

fragments of journalism, old-fashioned ode, or internet site are inter-textually transposed can consequently, on the basis of contiguity, smell of newspaper or dusty old books, or give an impression of the light coming from a computer screen; even more, a text may recall person-types, conventional actions, and behavioral relations associated with those media.

Before concluding, let me summarize my main points. When speaking about spaces of intertextuality we have in mind the play and interference of heterogeneous semiotic spaces transposed in the text from elsewhere, either from other spatial representations (textual or visual worlds) or by evoking culturally characteristic locations, where specific languages, dialects, sociolects, registers, and genres circulate. Intertextuality produces transgressive spaces by doubling, splitting, and opening up central intra-textual space and by deterritorialising the point of view.

The relation between space and intertextuality may be explained the other way around, too. Seen from this angle, "intratextual spaces" (fictional or factual) are able to invade, organize, and interpret "extratextual space," making it intertextual. Spaces of our life-worlds are intertextual not only because our perceptions of living environment are structured through cognitive and axiological nets produced by existant texts, discourses and collective memories. From the views of Deleuze, Lotman and others it follows that intertextuality is inscribed in "extratextual space" (territory, semiosphere, etc.) due to the very "essence" of the space: it is always multiple, it exists only as a co-presence of disparate acts, gestures, messa-ges, and symbolic forms (Westphal 2000a: 14–15). Life-worlds through which we pass are semioticised by cultural products, practices, and forms that stem from distant times, pertain to different communities and classes, and that have been in contact with thousands of individual life trajectories. We are comparable to Benjamin's figure of the *flâneur* who reads (i.e., contextualizes and interprets) a modern city as a multitemporal texture of memory sites and traces, as a constellation of "allusions and intersections, of inscriptions, of the extension and transcriptions of texts" (Bettine Menke, qtd. in Frisby 1999: 108–110). Temporal stratification of human space as displayed in cities like Lisbon works intertextually: it brings together several, often contrary fragments or layers of historical and social rhythms, meanings, symbols, and forms (cf. Westphal 2000a: 24–26). Or, as Crossberg (1999: 28) puts it: "The space of a whole life is a fractured and contradictory space of multiple contexts and competing ways of life and struggle. Such a space – what I have called a context – is a complex articulation of discourses, everyday life and formations or technologies of power." When we are moving through the space, crossing its boundaries, travelling from one location to another (say, from the intimacy of home to a global site at an airport), we are addressed by a multitude of overlapping texts (oral, written, visual, musical, gestual) that try to place us within their areas of sense; but, on the other hand, when we are moving through them we are also carrying with us memories and projections of other lived or imaginary places, cultural contexts, and social environments. This makes spatial boundaries fluid; under apparently static and well-delimited territories a structure of floating space is hidden

(cf. Westphal 2000a: 14, 18). I cannot but agree with Mouffe (1999: 50), Westphal (2000a: 18), and Welsh (1999: 224, 233) that because of unstable spatial boundaries and due to the fundamental intertextuality of space, our identities are in permanent hybridization and mobility; they are volatile, flexible, and constituted as a transcultural patchwork. Tajbakhsh (2001: 8) puts this succinctly: "Individual and community identities are structured across multiple, sometimes contradictory spaces in complex patterns of imaginary representations and memory that suggest the need for a reconceptualization of identity and consiousness as fully constituted within fixed boundaries." It is from transformation of texts, dispersed in time and space, that the elusive text of our lives is constantly being formed and reformed.

NOTES

[1] Characteristic response to this shift is the introduction to volume 5 of the *Proceedings of the XIIth Congress of the International Comparative Literature Association* (Space and Boundaries in Literary Theory and Criticism), entitled "The Shift of the Paradigm: From Time to Space? Introduction." The author detects the change of theoretical paradigm in poststructuralism and deconstructivism and, within this turn, stresses the role of intertextuality: "In the *theory of inter-textuality*, the relations between time and space occupy the center of discussion" (Fischer-Lichte 1990: 15; italics in the original). Similarly, in the same volume Reingard Nethersole in his paper, "From Temporality to Spatiality: Changing Concepts in Literary Criticism," writes: "Briefly, today's critical questioning is aimed at three important positions in the humanities, all constituted in their present stronghold in the eighteenth century: *Historicism*, the sovereign or trans-cendental *Subject* and *Meaning*. Each of these is erased by transforming tempo-rality into spatiality. Thus, Foucault's rereading of Nietzsche produced genealogy in the place of Historicism, Lacan's rereading of Freud produced the notion of an ever split subject, and Derrida's critique of the linguistic model (de Saussure, Peirce, and followers) produced *différance*, indeterminacy, and constant deferral of signification." According to Nethersole, the ordering of the world in twentieth-century arts and theory (philosophy) seems to be governed by topological rather than geometrical spatiality (Nethersole 1990: 63, italics in the original).

[2] On the genesis and development of the concept of "intertextualiy," especially regarding Kristeva and Barthes, see Juvan 2000a: 92–138.

[3] For basic information on Kosovel and English translations of his poetry see the website *Slovenia – Poetry International Web* (http://slovenia.poetryinternational. org/cwolk/view/18507#1). Kosovel was transgressive in many respects. He remains an elusive poetic icon not easily encoded in the narrative of literary history, because he simultaneously wrote in different styles and established his modernist poetic identity by crossing the boundaries of several currents and hybridizing them. In his short life Kosovel was exposed to border anxiety (his native Karst came under government of fascist Italy, which set out to erase ethnic signs of Slovenes from the territory) and he was constantly moving from this rural region to Ljubljana, the urban center of Slovenes in the Yugoslav kingdom. Kosovel's political and aesthetic stance was constituted by very different, even contradictory currents (e.g., Christianity, utopian socialism, communism, liberal humanism, niet-zscheanism, neo-romanticism, and avant-garde). Textual spaces, represented in his

poetry either by harmonic lyric writing or by heteroglossia of the modernist type, are also transgressive and dynamic: the textual subject often shifts from lyrical (rural, natural, intimate) places in the Karst to urban, global, and even cosmic spaces.

[4] I am referring to interactive and cognitive theories of metaphor (Black 1981, 1995; Lakoff 1995).

[5] Transl. by Nike Kocijančič Pokorn. Italics added. "Po srebrni mesečini / plava temni čoln, / iz zelenega pristana / je čolnar odplul, / iz zelenega kristala / tihega srca. / Iz srca polnoči" (Kosovel 1974: 162).

[6] Transl. by Nike Kocijančič Pokorn. "Naša okna so zamrežena. / Bele barikade. / Indijanci ne vedo nič / o gravitaciji. / A dinamit eksplodira / tudi v Novaji Zemlji. / Gospod z astrahanko ! / Ni aritmetične sredine / med starim in novim svetom. / Človek je lahko star ali mlad. / Zlati čoln na obzorju. / .../ Obešenci nihajo / ob brzojavnih drogovih. / Vstopnina: en dinar. / Dež pada. / Človek se pogovarja z vesoljstvom. / Skedenj pred oknom" (Kosovel 1974: 38).

[7] Geocriticism (*géocritique*) as a subject-bound, post-hermeneutic, critical, interdisciplinary, and constructivist postmodern science of the literary space (Grassin 2000: I–VI) usually distinguishes poetic, imaginary space of literary works from socio-geographic space, where literature operates, but it also stresses their inter-dependencies. Grassin, for example, speaks of *l'espace poétique/imaginaire* and *l'espace géographique/des littératures*—the latter is characteristic of the fragmentation of literatures along national, regional, religious, racial, linguistic, or geo-cultural lines; establishing centers and peripheries, building inter-literary communities, etc. Westphal promotes geocriticism precisely as a poetics of the "*interactions* between human spaces and literature"; it explores the role of interaction between the imaginary and geo-social spaces in determining cultural identities; there are, for example, many writers who created imaginary representations of cities or landscapes that influenced collective memory and perceptions of the actual spaces—Dostoyevsky's St. Petersburg, Kafka's Prague, Joyce's Dublin (Westphal 2000: 17, 22; italics original, my translation). I would add at least one more example: Kosovel's Karst.

[8] Yuri Lotman defines semiosphere as "the semiotic space necessary for the existence and functioning of languages"; it is "the whole semiotic space of culture in question" and is "marked by its *heterogeneity*"; i.e., by relations between diverse languages, sociolects, dialects, registers, etc. that are used in a certain cultural area (Lotman 1990: 123, 125). Semiosphere is the precondition for establishing culturally significant units (that is to say, cognitive and communicative elements) on the basis of entities and practices of the actual world and for building cognitive and axiological models (cf. Lotman 1990: 131–134). Following Lotman, Jacques Fontanille claims that "the semiosphere is [...] the space of semiotic competence" (Fontanille 2000: 116–118; my translation). Daniel-Henry Pageaux, in his discussion of geocriticism, holds that culture occupies and organizes space—not only real, geographical space (countries, states, zones, areas, center, periphery, capitals, etc.) but also imaginary space (Pageaux 2000: 126, 128, 135).

[9] Transl. by Katarina Jerin. »Blizu polnoči. / Muhe v čaši umirajo. / Ogenj je ugasnil. / Lepa Vida, bridkost je / v tvojem spominu. / Stravinski v avtomobilu. / Bučanje morja. / O biti 5 minut sam. / Srce-Trst je bolno. / Zato je Trst lep. / Bolečina cvete v lepoti« (Kosovel 1974: 55; italics added).

[10] Transl. by Nike Kocijančič Pokorn. "Skozi moje srce stopa veliki slon. / Cirkus Kludsky, vstopnina 5 din. / Ne obesi bolesti na veliki zvon! / Ona se smehlja: cin cin cin. // Srca ljudi so majhna in ječe velike, / rad bi šel skozi srca ljudi. / Si pristaš te ali one stranke? / Tisoč dinarjev ali zaprt 7 dni. // Rože v mojem srcu ne jočejo nikdar. / ..." (Kosovel 1974: 34; italics added.)

[11] In literature, too, certain forms are more likely to be allied to certain spatial elements of the outer reality (Pageaux 2000: 138–39).

LITERATURE

Gaston BACHELARD (1974): *La poétique de l'espace*. Paris: PUF.
Max BLACK (1981): Metaphor. In: *Models and Metaphors*. Ithaca: Cornell univ. press. 25–47.
– – – (1995): More about Metaphor. In: A. Orthony (ed.): *Metaphor and Thought*. Second edition. Cambridge: Cambridge univ. press. 19–41.
Lawrence CROSSBERG (1999): Globalization and the "Economization" of Cultural Studies. In: *The Contemporary Study of Culture*. Ed. by Bundesministerium für Wissenschaft und Verkehr und Internationales Forschungszentrum Kulturwissenschafte. Wien: Turia + Kant. 23–46.
Gilles DELEUZE – Felix GUATTARI (1980): *Mille plateaux*. Paris: Editions de minuit.
Erika FISHER-LICHTE (1990): The Shift of the Paradigm: From Time to Space? Introduction. In: *Proceedings of the XIIth Congress of the ICLA*. Ed. by R. Bauer et alii. München: Iudicium. 15–18.
Jacques FONTANILLE (2000): Formes tensives et passionnelles du dialogue des sémiosphères. In: Westphal, ed. 2000. 115–124.
David FRISBY (1999): Culture, Memory and Metropolitan Modernity. In: *The Contemporary Study of Culture*. Ed. by Bundesministerium für Wissenschaft und Verkehr und Internationales Forschungszentrum Kulturwissenschafte. Wien: Turia + Kant. 101–115.
Gérard GENETTE (1966): Proust palimpseste. In: *Figures*. Paris: Seuil. 39–67.
Jean-Marie GRASSIN (2000): Pour une science des espaces littéraires. In: Westphal, ed. 2000. I–XIII.
Marko JUVAN (2000a): *Intertekstualnost*. Ljubljana: DZS.
– – – (2000b): Medbesedilnost – detronizacija ali retorizacija vpliva? [Intertextuality: Dethronement or Rhetorization of Influence?]. In: *Vezi besedila* [Textual Ties]. Ljubljana: LUD Literatura. 89–109.
Elizabeth KEATING (2001): Space. In: *Key Terms in Language and Culture*. Ed. by Alessandro Duranti. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers. 231–234.
Srečko KOSOVEL (1974): *Zbrano delo* 2 [Collected Works]. Ed. by A. Ocvirk. Ljubljana: DZS.
George LAKOFF (1995): The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor. In: A. Orthony (ed.): *Metaphor and Thought*. Second edition. Cambridge: Cambridge univ. press. 202–251.
Yuri LOTMAN (1990): The Semiosphere. *Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture*. Trans. A. Shukman. Bloomington: Indiana univ. press. 123–214.
Chantal MOUFFE (1999): Hegemony, Power and the Political Dimension of Culture. In: *The Contemporary Study of Culture*. Ed. by Bundesministerium für Wissenschaft und Verkehr und Internationales Forschungszentrum Kulturwissenschafte. Wien: Turia + Kant. 47–52.
Reingard NETHERSOLE (1990): From Temporality to Spatiality: Changing Concepts in Literary Criticism. In: *Proceedings of the XIIth Congress of the ICLA*. Ed. by R. Bauer et alii. München: Iudicium. 59–63.
Daniel-Henri PAGEAUX (2000): De la géocritique à la géosymbolique. Regards sur un champ interdisciplinaire: littérature générale et comparée et géographie. In: Westphal, ed. 2000. 125–160.
Marcel PROUST (1969): *Du côté de chez Swann*. Paris: Gallimard.
Kian TAJBAKHSH (2001): *The Promise of the City: Space, Identity, and Politics in Contemporary Social Thought*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: Univ. of California press.
Wolfgang WELSCH (1999): Transculturality: The Changing Form of Cultures Today. In: *The Contemporary Study of Culture*. Ed. by Bundesministerium

für Wissenschaft und Verkehr und Internationales Forschungszentrum Kultur-
wissenschafte. Wien: Turia + Kant. 217–244.

Bertrand WESTPHAL, ed. (2000): *La géocritique: Mode d'emploi*. Limoges:
PULIM.

– – – (2000a): Pour une approche géocritique des textes, esquisse. In: Westphal,
ed. 2000. 9–39.