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General Preface

The general theme for the XVIth Congress of the International Comparative Literature Association (ICLA), held in Pretoria 13-19 August 2000, "Transitions and Transgressions in an Age of Multiculturalism", focuses on an increased and increasing interaction between numerous literatures and cultures from various parts of the world. While globalization yields almost instantaneous access to information relating to diverse literatures and cultures universally, it does not necessarily follow that traversing geographical boundaries, or transcending cultural limits and traditions, will result in meaningful and productive debate amongst present-day writers and literary scholars, about issues such as the (re)reading of older or deceased authors or the understanding of current writers hailing from divergent regions, countries or continents. Various questions could be raised in this regard: How does the communication revolution affect literary scholars and, in particular, how does it impact on comparative literary studies? Is the economically driven concept of "globalization" underscored by cultural unity; or is literary and cultural diversity perhaps re-establishing itself in reclaiming national identities? Has African literary scholarship been influenced by modernist methods or has its literature perhaps been left largely "uncontaminated" by global flows of people, money, ideas, information and technology? Or: Is transgression integral to literary interaction? If so, what challenge does it present to literary scholars? And what correctives could/should be put forward by (traditional) comparative studies in this regard?

These and other issues were addressed by some 500 delegates, from 42 countries across the globe, who attended the XVIth ICLA Congress. The present volumes contain selected proceedings from the seven main sections of the congress, each with parallel sessions, as well as from three workshops held during the congress:

• Volume 1, *Comparative Literature in an Age of Multiculturalism*, edited by Reingard Nethersole, focuses on Comparative Literature as a discipline in relation to national philologies and/or cultural studies.
It addresses questions concerning the function and value of Comparative Literature departments or programmes in education, as well as issues of institutionalization, didactics and general literary studies.

- Volume 2, *Transgressing and Traversing Continental Boundaries*, edited by John Noyes, interrogates the varying relationship and literary interaction between continents along the East-West and North-South trajectories, as these are captured in themes, styles, genres, forms of transmission and translations and prompted by issues pertaining to imperialism, colonialism and postcolonialism.

- Volume 3, *Transgressing Cultural and Ethnic Borders, Boundaries, Limits and Traditions*, edited by Ampie Coetzee, highlights encounters with the Other, foreigner, subaltern, etc. as enacted in literature and explores the nature of such encounters as either benevolent or malevolent. It poses questions such as: What guides our perception, what is the nature of the gaze with which we look at and seek to apprehend the unfamiliar? Do we desire, tolerate or resent the foreigner or that which presents itself as alien? How are the “hybrid” and the exile conceptualized in various literatures? Do we need to teach cultural literacy or literacies?

- Volume 4, *Temporal Transition: What was the Past; What will the Future Be?*, edited by Merle Williams, is devoted to the space and place of literature in society in the past, present and future. It investigates various issues pertaining to the status of reading, writing and literature as well as reflecting upon the value of literary theory and the nature of aesthetics.

- Volume 5 combines three themes in different subsections: *Transgressing Gendered Stereotypes*, edited by Gerrit Olivier, *Transgression and Transition of Genre and Media*, edited by Fanie Olivier, and *Transgression, Transition and Information Technology*, edited by Hein Viljoen. While the first of these explores various ways and means whereby traditional gender roles and interpolations are represented in literature, film and television, the second focuses on the very interrelatedness of film and television with traditional text formats and the consequences of the intermedial transformation.
of the literary text. The third, then, focuses more pertinently on the effect of information technology on literature and comparative literary studies.

• Volume 6, finally, contains the selected proceedings of three workshops held during the congress: Cultural Encounters: Conjunctions and Disjunctions, edited by Djelal Kadir; New Context Creation by Translations and Translators, edited by Ohsawa Yoshihiro; and Looking at Writing, edited by Lisa Block de Behar.

I would like to thank the editors of the various volumes for their invaluable contribution in considering papers read at the congress with a view to composing a volume of proceedings for a special theme or themes. The publication of the selected contributions would not have been possible, however, without the sterling assistance rendered by Sue Jubelius, Esté Oosthuizen and Ester van der Schyff, for the editing and proofreading of the English texts through various stages and Naomi Morgan and Eugene Visagie for the meticulous editing of the French texts. Tilly Kloppers was responsible for the electronic preparation of all texts and the submission of camera-ready copy to Unisa Press.

Local financial support for the congress and the proceedings was provided by the Department of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology, the City Council of Pretoria, the University of South Africa, the University of Pretoria and the National Research Foundation. International financial support was obtained from the International Comparative Literature Association (ICLA) as well as the International Federation for Modern Languages and Literatures (FILMM).

Throughout this project I was privileged to enjoy the exceptional financial, administrative and advisory support unstintingly provided by the University of South Africa. Finally, Unisa Press deserves our gratitude for undertaking the publication of the selected proceedings of the XVIth ICLA Congress—the first ever to have been held on the African continent.

Ina Gräbe
Theory of Literature
University of South Africa, Pretoria

General Editor: Proceedings ICLA 2000 Pretoria
General Organizer: XVIth ICLA Congress Pretoria 2000
Préface générale

Le thème général du XVIème Congrès de l’Association Internationale de Littérature comparée (AILC), qui eut lieu à Pretoria du 13 au 19 août 2000, “Transitions et Transgressions à une époque de Multiculturalisme”, se concentra sur une interaction plus grande et croissante entre de nombreuses littératures et cultures provenant des différentes parties du monde. Alors que la mondialisation donne un accès presque instantané à l’information relative aux différentes littératures et cultures du monde entier, il ne s’ensuit pas nécessairement que la traversée des frontières géographiques, ou la transcendence des limites culturelles et des traditions, aboutisse à un débat positif et productif entre les écrivains et les spécialistes de littérature contemporains, sur des questions comme la lecture d’auteurs plus anciens ou décédés ou la compréhension des écrivains contemporains provenant de régions, pays ou continents divergents. On pourrait poser plusieurs questions à ce sujet:

Comment la révolution de la communication affecte-t-elle les spécialistes de littérature et, plus particulièrement, quel effet a-t-elle sur les études de littératures comparées? Est-ce que le concept de “mondialisation” imposé par l’économie est mis en évidence par l’unité culturelle; ou bien est-ce que la diversité littéraire et culturelle se rétablit en récupérant les identités nationales? Est-ce que le savoir africain littéraire fut influencé par les méthodes modernes ou est-ce que sa littérature ne fut peut-être pas du tout contaminée par les mouvements mondiaux de populations, par l’argent, les idées, l’information et la technologie? Ou bien: La transgression fait-elle partie intégrante de l’interaction littéraire? S’il en est ainsi, quel défi
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La préface générale présente-t-elle aux spécialistes de littérature? Et quels rectificatifs devraient être proposés à cet égard par les études comparées traditionnelles?

Ces questions et d'autres furent abordées par environ 500 délégués de 42 pays, qui assistèrent au XVIème Congrès de l’AILC. Ces ouvrages-ci contiennent des actes sélectionnés parmi les sept sections principales du Congrès, chacune avec ses sessions parallèles, ainsi que parmi les trois ateliers tenus pendant le congrès.

- Le premier volume, *Littérature comparée à une époque de multiculturalisme*, édité par Reingard Nethersole, se concentre sur la littérature comparée en tant que discipline par rapport aux philologies nationales et/ou aux études culturelles. Il aborde les questions relatives à la fonction et à la valeur des départements de littérature comparée ou des programmes d’éducation, ainsi que les problèmes d’institutionalisation, de didactique et d’études littéraires générales.

- Le deuxième volume, *Transgression et traversée des frontières continentales*, édité par John Noyes, interroge les différentes relations et l’interaction littéraire entre les continents le long des axes est-ouest et nord-sud, comme on les retrouve dans les thèmes, les styles, les genres, les formes de transmission et de traductions et comme elles sont encouragées par des questions ayant trait à l’impérialisme, à la colonisation et au postcolonialisme.

- Le troisième volume, *Transgression des frontières culturelles et ethniques, des limites et des traditions*, édité par Ampie Coetzee, met en relief les rencontres avec l’Autre, l’étranger, le subalterne, etc. comme elles se déroulent dans la littérature, et explore la nature de ces rencontres qui sont bienveillantes ou malveillantes. Il pose des questions telles que: Qu’est-ce qui guide notre perception, quelle est la nature du regard avec lequel nous voyons et cherchons à comprendre ce qui est étranger? Est-ce que nous désirons, tolérons ou avons du ressentiment pour l’étranger ou ce qui donne l’impression d’être étranger? Comment conceptualisons-nous “l’Hybride” et l’exilé dans les différentes littératures? Devons-nous enseigner l’alphabétisation culturelle ou les alphabétisations?
• Le quatrième volume, *Transition temporelle: comment était le passé; comment sera le futur?* édité par Merle Williams, se consacre à l'espace et à la place de la littérature dans la société du passé, du présent et du futur. Il examine les différentes questions ayant trait à la situation de la lecture, de l'écriture et de la littérature, et qui refléchissent à la valeur de la théorie littéraire et de la nature de l'esthétique.

• Le cinquième volume combine trois thèmes dans trois paragraphes différents: *Transgression des stéréotypes sexuels*, édité par Gerrit Olivier, *Transgression et transition des genres et des médias*, édité par Fanie Olivier et *Transgression, transition et informatique*, édité par Hein Viljoen. Alors que le premier article explore les différentes manières et moyens par lesquels les rôles des sexes traditionnels et les interpolations sont représentés dans la littérature, les films et la télévision, le second article se concentre sur l'interdépendance-même du film et de la télévision avec des formats de textes traditionnels, et sur les conséquences de la transformation intermédiaire du texte littéraire. Le troisième article, enfin, se concentre plus particulièrement sur l'effet de l'informatique sur la littérature et les études littéraires comparées.


Je voudrais remercier les éditeurs des différents ouvrages pour leur précieuse contribution en voulant bien considérer les communiqués présentés au congrès afin de composer un recueil des actes sur un thème ou des thèmes spéciaux. Cependant, la publication des contributions choisies n’aurait pas été possible sans l’assistance remarquable rendue par Sue Jubelius, Esté Oosthuizen et Esther van der Schyff, pour l’édition et la correction des épreuves des textes anglais au cours des différentes phases et par Naomi Morgan et Eugene Visagie pour l’édition méticuleuse des textes.
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français. Tilly Kloppers fut responsable de la préparation électronique de tous les textes et de la soumission d’un document prêt pour la photogravure à Unisa Press.

L’aide financière locale pour le congrès et les actes fut fournie par le Département des Arts, de la Culture, des Sciences et de la Technologie, le Conseil municipal de Pretoria, l’Université d’Afrique du Sud, l’université de Pretoria et la Fondation de Recherche nationale. L’aide financière internationale fut reçue de l’Association internationale de littérature comparée (AILC) et de la Federation internationale des langues et littératures modernes (FILMM).

Tout au long de ce projet j’ai eu le privilège de profiter du soutien financier, administratif et consultatif exceptionnel fourni généreusement par UNISA. Pour finir, Unisa Press mérite notre gratitude pour avoir entrepris la publication d’un choix d’actes du XVIème Congrès de l’AILC—le premier a être tenu sur le continent africain.

Ina Gräbe
Théorie de la littérature
UNISA, Pretoria

Editeur principal: Actes de XVI ème Congrès Pretoria 2000
Organisateur principal: XVI ème AILC Congrès Pretoria 2000
Comparative Literature in an Age of Multiculturalism

Of all the "disciplines", "subjects", or fields of study in the Humanities there seems hardly another that is traversed by reflexion to quite the same extent as that of Comparative Literature. Since its epistolary emergence from intellectual exchanges between French and German writers in the early 19th century—evidenced in this volume in contributions by Hendrik Birus and Bernard Franco—Comparative Literature has always engaged in critical self-examination. Numerous publications by colleagues the world over, as well as the "Bernheimer Report", entitled *Comparative Literature in the Age of Multiculturalism*, that succeeded similar earlier

---

1 The "Report" is of interest for at least two reasons: first, by reprinting "The Levin Report, 1965" (pp.21-27), "The Greene Report, 1975" (pp.28-38) and the actual "Bernheimer Report, 1993" (pp.39-48), together with "Responses" by K. Anthony Appiah (pp.51-57), Mary Louise Pratt (pp.58-65), Michael Riffaterre (pp.66-73), and "Position Papers" such as "The Function of Criticism at the Present Time: The Promise of Comparative Literature" by Ed Ahearn and Arnold Weinstein (pp.77-86), "Comparative Exile: Competing Margins in the History of Comparative Literature" by Emily Apter (pp.86-96), "Must We Apologize?" by Peter Brooks (pp.97-106), "In the Name of Comparative Literature" by Rey Chow (pp.107-116), "Comparative Literature, at Last!" by Jonathan Culler (pp.117-121), "Literary Study in an Elliptical Age" by David Damrosch (pp.122-132), "Between Elitism and Populism: Wither Comparative Literature?" (pp.134-142), "Their Generation" by Roland Greene (pp.143-154), "Comparative Literature on the Feminist Edge" by Margaret R. Higonnet (pp.155-164), "Spaces of Comparison" by Françoise Lionnet (pp.165-174), "Literature in the Expanded Field" by Marjorie Perloff (pp.175-186), "Telling Tales out of School: Comparative Literature and Disciplinary Recession" by Mary Russo (pp.187-194) and "Sincerely Yours" by Tobin Siebers (pp.195-203), the "Report" maps the evolution of Comparative Literature in the US during the second half of the 20th century. The US, due to its sheer size and number of tertiary institutions is, after all, the country with most Comparatists, albeit often "hyphenated" as for example: professor of French and Comparative Literature, etc. The US, despite different and even conflicting voices speaking for the "discipline" produced a distinct tradition quite separate from the so-called French tradition that also dominates much
ones in the United States, attest to an apparent need to delimit Comparative Literature as both an object and a method of study and research.

Neither the “object” Literature, nor the method entailed in the notion of “comparing” appear sufficient in order to confine a “discipline” that, on the one hand, hovers between the study of national languages/literatures, and, on the other, encourages frequent forays into other domains of the Humanities such as linguistics, philosophy, the visual arts, music, and history. Even crossings into the social sciences like sociology, psychology, linguistics, cultural/social anthropology and ethnography are not infrequent. If the very notion of “comparing” always already means establishing relations between two entities, that is of what they have in common as regards their attributive sameness while establishing in the act of comparison also differences between qualities, then Comparative Literature is a field characterised by communion and communicability. Quality here is to be understood in the philosophical sense of an attribute attached to a “substance”. And communion and communicability refer to the “putting-into-relation” of two different entities with the help of that vexed tertium comparationis that in the act of comparing requires ever new and ever repeated delineation. However tenuous the process of establishing relations and however indeterminate—or even imperilled according to Remak—the object that is Literature with capital L (by which we designate, if not a canon then at least a body, of fictional or creative writing), Comparative Literature possesses, despite its lack of disciplinary containment, positional qualities that structure its field of study and research along both temporal and spatial co-ordinates.

Considering the emergence of the “discipline” as part of the birth of the Human Sciences in Western Europe, its temporal position locates Comparative Literature at the threshold of an organisation of knowledge governed by generalisable thought that engages questions of universal sameness, and thought that, at the beginning of the 19th century, fervently encouraged particular differences. Put differently, the “discipline” holds

German Comparative Literature, especially in departments established under French occupation after World War II.—Secondly: the “Report” provided the topic for the Pretoria Congress in order to both accommodate delegates’ manifold contribution and to reflect on and to take stock of the fast changing research and institutional scene.—Now ten years old the “Report” will be succeeded in the US by new reflection on the state of the discipline in an American Comparative Literature Association meeting in the Spring of 2005.
itself suspended between the world and that which is generalisable within it and the particularity or uniqueness of the nation. Its very name in French: littérature générale et comparée and in German: Allgemeine und vergleichende Literaturwissenschaft point to this double that in English is somewhat poorly expressed in Comparative Literature’s close association with “theory”. By purposely investigating literary phenomena in general, besides comparing individual examples across linguistic barriers, “theory” remains deeply enfolded in Comparative Literature. Thus having been born at a time of transition from (European) Universal thought that held that “poetry”, albeit in different tongues, exists worldwide and might, as expression of the human, share a common morphology, Comparative Literature always also engaged national particularity with its attendant claim to unique poetic (literary) manifestations. And it is Comparative Literature that emphasised international exchange of thought and writing when the nation-state preferred creative literature in its ruling language to be strictly closed in upon itself.

Despite difference in lineage, locally constructed traditions and differing emphases that characterise the historical unfolding of the discipline, in accordance with each nation-state’s individual

---

2 By “theory” I do not merely refer to the sense that the term acquired in the English-speaking world. Rather, “theory” far from being some elitist, “totalising” preoccupation refers to the way(s) in which creative writing is thought about, accommodated within a cycle of production, reproduction, reception, and “criticism”. As the littérature générale or allgemeine Literaturwissenschaft aspect of the “discipline”, Comparative Literature’s privileging of “theory”—theory that recalls “Paul de Man’s powerful statement” of being “theory of ideology and nothing more”, in the words of Mihăilescu’s contribution—links the “discipline” with, among others, speculative or Continental Philosophy from Walter Benjamin’s Der Begriff der Kunstkritik in der deutschen Romantik (The Concept of Art [Literary] Criticism in German Romanticism) to Derrida’s deconstruction and beyond.—To be sure, theory has often appeared in an undeniable Hegelian formalist guise where theory is articulated as a self-sufficient body of knowledge inasmuch as its relation to its examples remains purely external. Example texts here merely illustrate an always already appropriated knowledge as truth. Although the various -isms that quite legitimately inform methods of reading in the waxing and waning of fashion have proven useful in textual work, literary theory proper will consider its emergence from numerous tributaries like linguistics, psychology, ethnology, Phenomenology, Critical Theory, Hermeneutics etc.; tributaries that combined to form the protean appellation “post-structuralism”.—On the need for “theory” today see also Nethersole (2003)—Note especially the excellent series of “theory books”: “Theory and History of Literature”, edited by Wlad Godzich and Jochen Schulte-Sasse and published jointly by Manchester University Press and the University of Minnesota Press—a series reflecting the consequential work of some 100 international critics and theorists before the series was discontinued.
institutionalisation of the “discipline”, concomitant with differing
developments of tertiary educational institutions during the last 150 years,
Comparative Literature’s positional quality with respect to space is—and
always has been—defined by the *in between*. No matter if the Comparatist
“compares”, “connects”, or “contrasts” texts, s/he finds her-/himsel in a
borderline zone *between* the boundaries of, at least, two or more “national
philologies”, philosophy and literature, or literature and the “sister arts”,
etc.. Irrespective of the, sometimes disparately, delimited fields from which
the indeterminable figure of the comparatist’s solicit communication, s/he
finds her-/himsel at an invisible edge-line that borders her/his no-man’s
land on either side. Both the older (the national literature/language
departments, philosophy, art history) and newly established “disciplines”
gender studies, post-colonial studies, cultural studies) surreptitiously guard
their boundaries, so that Comparative Literature is identified frequently as a
site of *Grenzüberschreitungen*, of boundary crossings *par excellence*. As
Ross Shideler points out in his exposition of the establishment of an
undergraduate major in Comparative Literature at the University of
California at Los Angeles (UCLA), language/literature departments initially
objected to what they perceived to be an encroachment on their turf. Thus
only after credentials have been checked and found acceptable can *inter-
disciplinary* crossing commence, usually to the benefit of another discipline.
Such disciplinary cross-over has, of course, spawned Comparative
Literature’s distinct domain of “inter-arts comparisons” that are mentioned
in the contributions by Henry H. H. Remak and Ho-Byeong Yoon. In
addition, it is from the domain of (North American) Comparative Literature
that post-colonial studies emerged at the hands of the late Edward Said,
Gayatri Spivak, and Homi Bhabha, to name but a few colleagues, who
changed Commonwealth Literature, the once humble appendage to English
studies, into the independent and prestigious site of “post-colonialism” (with
or without hyphen).

The uneasy *in between* existence of the “discipline-without-
discipline” in so far as a “discipline” requires a bounded field, a specific
object and an intelligibility in common, makes for Comparative Literature’s

---

3 Peter Brooks (1995:97-98) describes rather well this figure and the “anxiety” felt by Comparatists when
asked as to what s/he actually “does” after the demise of “the study of sources, influences, literary
schools, and ‘movements’”.
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weakness within an institutionalised context; yet its experience of an *in between* status coupled with “theory” as font that delivers the template for work done in its name, make for its strength. Part of this strength lies in its incessant questioning, as for instance in “complit is what?”, as demonstrated by Călin-Andrei Mihăilescu. Un-predicated and un-founded, Comparative Literature appears to him in the geographical figure of the “archipelago”, the “grounding figure at the time of globalization”. This archipelago is not so much a description of one “pre-established environment” among others but rather a spacing and a “task imposed by the fact that the ground of compleit is the ground of difference itself”. Being indeterminably “grounded” thus, makes for Comparative Literature’s strength not only in an “age of multiculturalism” and “inter-disciplinarity” but also at a time when the Humanities within the “University in Ruins” are losing ground to ever more forceful economic imperatives.

The notion of a “University in Ruins”, referred to by Ulrike Kistner in this volume, derives from the late Bill Readings’s (1996) assessment of the “idea of the university” that governed these institutions (in the West) in the name of “reason”, “culture” and “excellence” at different stages from the 18th century to the present. For Readings the “University of Excellence”, despite its appeal to an idea, namely excellence, marks “the fact that there is no longer any idea of the University, or rather that the idea has now lost all content” (Readings 1996:39). Such an institution of higher learning—or what is left of the traditional academy in form of “ruins”  

---

4 The figurative notion of “ruin” here echoes Walter Benjamin’s fascination with “ruins”. For instance, in “Der Erzähler: Betrachtungen zum Werk Nikolai Lesskows” (“The Storyteller: Reflections on the Works of Nicolai Leskov”) Benjamin suggests that various generic narrative formations belonging to periods past like myth, fairy tales, stories and the novel preserve, unlike the currently popular genre of “information”, traces of specific experiences. These are experiences that relate to particular conjunctive constellations of meaning and life in the shape of ruins once those constellations are no longer part of contemporary experience. The storyteller and his tale furnish a demonstrative example; and as Benjamin deduces with reference to the artisan-like relation between the storyteller and his raw material: lived experience, it is the proverb, seen as an ideogram of a tale, which marks the ruined place of stories: “Proverbs, one could say, are the ruins which stand at the site of old stories around which, like ivy twining around a wall, a moral intertwines a *Gestus*” (Benjamin 1980a: 464, 108), that is a fragmented corporal significatory relation, attached to a situation out of which is born a behaviour (gesturing), is covered by an indexical message (moral). In contemporary terms: the ruin represents the trace in the erasure (of the particular constellation), but the intertwined “ivy” functions as signifier of the erasure of that trace. With respect to Readings’s assessment of universities at the end of the millennium one might say that in the “University in Ruins” past “ideas” of the “University of Reason” (18th century) and the
positivism of statistically calculable productivity that rules a highly competitive global market economy, by training, or rather “skilling”, “learners” almost exclusively for an immediate application of knowledge to a particular work-place.

Anxiety about the job market and redemptive assurances of employability of Comparative Literature graduates as noted by Kathleen L. Komar and her colleague from California, for instance, are real enough concerns, given the dual trend of prominence accorded to vocational training in the “University of Excellence” and a shrinking labour market. But the increasing commodification of knowledge (mentioned by Li Xia as occurring also in Australia), and attendant refusal on the part of the state to fund the “liberal arts” or the Humanities in a manner taken for granted not so long ago, need to be seen as a result of “the declining role of the nation-state”. As Ulrike Kistner argues on the basis of Readings’s and Lyotard’s observations, “the notion of culture at the base of the university loses its relevance” once the nation-state’s “privileged hold on the production of knowledge, and on judging what is true and just” ceases before a horizon of a globalising economy. Inasmuch as “excellence” and economic profitability become the “benchmarks” by which work is measured, “the end” dawns “of the synthesis of knowledge and culture, of politics and ethics, of teaching and research within the University”.

Put differently: there where the official imprimatur of the (nation-) state no longer stamps the Humanities as central to the education of its citizens, Literature and its study wither. Neither departments of national languages/literatures nor Comparative Literature escapes the shift from an organisation of knowledge that compelled a subject-agent “to decipher himself” (Foucault 1988:17) to an organisation of knowledge that obliges a managed subject-for-testing to endlessly consume the forever new. In Readings’s historical typology it is the “University of Reason” and the “University of Culture” that configure thought essentially as reflexion in form of interpretation and critique. Interpretation seeks to elucidate that which is silent in language and attempts to restore to speech that which is mute. This used to be, in part, the task of the national philologies. Critique, of which, sadly, criticism is often a mere domesticated derivative, looks for

“University of Culture” (19th and part of 20th century) left traces that the “University of Excellence” is about to erase.
the limits of thought in order to push thinking beyond the borders of an already thought. “[T]he illumination of the element of darkness that cuts man off from himself, the reanimation of the inert” (Foucault 1970:328) define the task of post-Enlightenment modern thought and delineate its ethical horizon, both of which the “University of Reason” and the “University of Culture” produce and reproduce as knowledge, a knowledge which came to be associated with the Humanities.

That not everything is well with the Humanities can be read off at least four symptoms: First, “meaning” and moral guidance are sought not from reading “great books” or doing moral philosophy but more and more from specialised courses in hyphenated ethics like “business-ethics”, “medical-ethics”, “research-ethics”, etc. Secondly, funding for study and research in the Humanities, at least in South Africa, is significantly less than in the Natural Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. Thirdly, proliferation of short specialised courses on graduate level that range from “Tourism” and “Heritage” to “Media Management”, “Culture Studies”, “European Literature”, “Modern Literature and Contemporary Literature”, “Arts and Culture Studies” and “Biography and Society”, to name but a few offered by the University of the Witwatersrand (once the first and only South African University with a Comparative Literature Department), have made scholarly masters and doctoral research a rarity. And fourthly, lively debates, at least in the US,5 on the question of a liberal arts education and its validity for today’s world driven by economic rationality, signal a malady that as yet has to find its remedy.

No doubt the “University of Excellence” has to adapt to pragmatic and utilitarian demands of the late-modern, post-colonial, post-industrial, and post-historical world, a world shaped increasingly by globalisation, driven by entrepreneurial spirit and made possible by techno-scientific advances during the last forty years.6 In the market-dominated information

5 See in this regard for instance the work of Martha Nussbaum (1997).

6 For the way in which technological advances in the sixties made possible what is now referred to as globalisation, see the admirable, exhaustive 3-volume work of the sociologist Manuel Castells, Vol. I, The Rise of the Network Society, which deals with technical globalisation whereas Vol. II is devoted to The Power of Identity together with an analysis of profound cultural changes, and Vol. III, End of Millennium examines economic and social consequences of globalised commerce.
society, digitalisation defies delimited space and transforms the physical place of transmission (e.g. printed text, face-to-face teaching) that used to connect addresser and addressee into virtual space, thus challenging us to (re)think the difference between interpersonal (and primarily spatial communication) and intergenerational (and primarily historical transmission). Digitalisation flattens historical, or vertical time into simultaneous, horizontal and global “real time”, creating infinite surfaces in the place of “depth”, thus erasing a locus in which we thought meaning to reside. Digitalisation multiplies information, makes speed into an arbiter of production, and permeates the border of nation-states whose economies are becoming increasingly interdependent. Thus faced by techno-scientific potential and economic hegemony (emanating from the so-called developed world), the university is rethinking its role as custodian and transmitter of national tradition (e.g. Germany, South Africa) and republican culture (e.g. United States), enshrined in literary studies. Moreover, in a fast globalising world where the specificity of a national philology is being increasingly curtailed, if not erased, by Cultural Studies because the production of a national subject/citizen seems to be no longer a priority at a time when political power exercised by state government is eclipsed by managerial and (economic) purchasing power, “the centrality of the traditional humanistic disciplines to the life of the University” withers as Readings observes (1996:3).

The dreaded “swallowing” of Comparative Literature by Cultural Studies mentioned by Mihăilescu, observed by Wang Ning as an American phenomenon, and feared by Tomo Virk, befalls also the national language/literature departments that, according to Readings (1996:16-17), used to occupy the ground now claimed by Cultural Studies. Readings’s explanation of the rise of Cultural Studies (pp.87-89) together with his critique of its refusal of, and resistance to, theory (pp.89-118), resonate with Mihăilescu’s condemnation:

Cultural studies finds its legitimacy in this emancipatory thrust that leads to the “culturalization” of everything, filtering what Jameson rightly found to be “yet untheorised”. It displays a still vibrant willingness (an intermediary stage between enthusiasm and cynical calculation) to reduce previous cultural construct(ion)s to the demo-same via castratingly and politically correct fictions. In this sense, cultural studies presents the immediate contemporary
challenge to comparative literature: it symbolises itself as the larger fish ready to swallow complit.

Despite the very real danger posed by the monolingual “larger fish” that prefers to investigate representation rather than the means of representation, thus being oblivious to what Wlad Godzich (1994:14) calls: “[...] interpretation and other critical functions in relation to language”, Comparative Literature, I suggest, is the site from which, in the shadow of the waning Humanities, accordance of language, thought, and world can best be taught and researched.

The collection of papers in this volume exposes the manifold ways in which one might go about thinking and “doing” Comparative Literature. Thus Xu Zhixiao, convinced that great poetry shares common themes, compares the Chinese poetic imaginary of the traveller in unearthly spaces with examples from Italian, English and German Literature.

Coming from a very different geographical realm Tommy Matshakayile-Ndlovu explores creative fiction written in the major indigenous languages of Zimbabwe, Ndebele and Shona, in order to assess the extent to which they “succeed or fail in dealing with issues that concern the whole nation”. One of these issues seems to be the effect of censorship that, under colonial rule in particular, curtailed political aspirations and erased any reference to socioeconomic hardship induced by colonialism. Concluding that texts in either language fail because they do not give room to the fact that the two indigenous linguistic cultures constantly intermingle outside the rural village, Matshakayile-Ndlovu questions their “relevance” in light of Literature’s task: That is to be “a tool for social and economic development”, particularly “in the third world or developing countries”. For him Literature remains a source for guidance produced by a writer who, ideally, is also a politician.

In contrast, Chang-Whan Cho suggests implicitly that poetry in particular might be more akin to meditation, despite the critical edge that he detects in contemporary Korean lyrics that have erased the distinction between classic, traditional and learned diction and “low-brow” everyday speech. Chang-Whan Cho’s contribution is enriched with textual examples; and it is the minutely rendered recipe for a “Hamburger”, in its anti-aesthetic
more akin to the genre of the cookbook, that illuminates the injury to the spiritual inflicted by mass culture. Rendering the vacuity of US homogenising culture almost palpable in this and a further poem, inspired by American-type advertising, the author of this paper reminds his readers of the effects produced by a global imaginary constituted by powerful trans-continental mass-marketing. Yet, the silence, audible between the lines of the lyrical montage, expresses profound resistance to such forceful “influence”.

This raises the question of the much talked-about (economic-financial and cultural) globalisation unfolding incessantly before our very eyes, due to technical innovations mentioned earlier. Lest this term remains empty in relation to the discussion here and elsewhere in this volume, I like to mention the following: “Globalisation”, introduced first in the sixties to describe international economic flows, emphasises subjectivity and culture as central factors in what is an accelerated process of modernisation which, according to sociologist Anthony Giddens (1990), establishes three critical processes: time-space distanciation, disembedding and reflexivity, each of which implies universalising tendencies that render social relations ever more inclusive and non-localised. “Globalisation”, in the words of Malcolm Waters (1994:229), “breaks down the nexus between nation, state, societal community and territory” in the following ways:

- Globalisation is in a general sense a differentiating as well as a homogenising process. It pluralises the world by recognising the value of cultural niches and local abilities.

- Importantly it weakens the putative nexus between nation and state releasing absorbed ethnic minorities and allowing the reconstruction of nations across former state boundaries. This is especially important in the context of states that are confederations of minorities.

- It brings the centre to the periphery. In so far as globalisation is sourced in Western Modernity it introduces possibilities for new ethnic identities to cultures on the periphery. The vehicles for this cultural flow are electronic images and affluent tourism.
It also brings the periphery to the centre. An obvious vehicle is the flow of economic migrants from relatively disadvantaged sectors of the globe to relatively advantaged ones. (This applies even to South Africa which has to cope with several millions of its Northern African neighbours who, as mostly illegal immigrants, seek work in an already exhausted labour market.) It is accomplished also in so far as the mass media engage in a search for the exotic to titillate audiences in search of variety. Previously homogeneous nation-states have, as a consequence, moved in the direction of multiculturalism.

Hall (1992) drawing on Robins, identifies two possible adaptive responses on the part of ethnic groups to these globalising trends: translation and tradition. Translation is a syncretistic response in which groups that inhabit more than one culture seek to develop new forms of expression that are entirely separate from their origins. Tradition is ethnic fundamentalism, an attempt to rediscover the untainted origins of an ethnic group in its history. Tradition involves a search for the certainties of the past in a postmodern world where identity is associated with lifestyle and taste and is therefore constantly shifting and changeable. “Paradoxically the search for tradition can contribute to this postmodern ambience by mixing the symbolic contents of the past into the present as everyday life becomes an historical and ethnic Disneyland” (Hall quoted by Waters 1994:232). I hold that current and expanding interest in notions like multiculturalism, cross-culturalism—post-colonialism—hybridisation, intercultural and intra-cultural dialogue, testifies to these globalising processes.

Before the unfolding panorama of planetary change, I suggest, like Jean Wilson who reports on multi-disciplinary work undertaken in a newly created Institute on “Globalization and the Human Condition” at McMaster University (Canada) in 1998, that it is of vital importance for Comparative Literature to connect to these “strategic” initiatives. Wilson gives three reasons as to why comparatists need to join political scientists, historians and sociologists in their investigation into “contemporary globalising processes and to examine their impact on human lives and social relationships”. These are, at first, the lamentable ignorance on part of the
social sciences concerning ways in which language actually structures our various worlds. Hence, a project without a language requirement like that described by Wilson, remains blinded by the tacit assumption that English as the “the lingua franca of the TNC [transnational corporation] era”, would be sufficient to critique the very excesses of trans-national trade expansion, effects of which are described by Chang-Whan Cho, for instance. Secondly, taking her lead form the Nobel-address by Günter Grass and the theoretical work of her compatriot, Northrop Frye, Wilson alerts her readers to the fact that creative fiction “deals with the very foundations of human existence” (Grass), and that it is “literature, with its fundamental impulse toward ‘more abundant life’ [Frye]” which becomes “particularly significant in an age of globalisation”. Thus assuming generalisable (universal) attributes inherent in writing, Wilson demonstrates, thirdly, the critical act of reading and interpretation with which frighteningly persuasive images generated by a dominating and domineering mass and media culture (of the US) prompt a suburban family (today’s very cliché of “normalcy”) to subject itself to a ridiculous, near fatal experiment of “survival”.

“Globalisation” and its corollary, “multi-culturalism” are certainly overarching (universal?) terms occupying the public imagination on a planetary scale. However, the former has to be re-thought historiographically as not merely a Western phenomenon that “started with Columbus’s discovery of the New World”, as Wang Ning states. Instead we need to remember that globalisation processes must be traced back to the silk route with its starting point in China and its point of destination in the West. The “value”, of this east-west “communication between Chinese and Western culture”, based on trade, “has not yet been fully recognised”, Wang claims, because—I argue—the cultural capital (Bourdieu 1993, 1996) of a

---

7 The late Bourdieu, examining definitive, historically constituted procedures in the cultural domain (from a sociological perspective) is interested in the (nationally applicable) “rules” created for conducting the organisation and exchange of cultural goods (literature, visual arts, music, etc., including natural sciences) in particular societies. Bourdieu usually refers to his own country, France. These are situated within a relative autonomous field in complex societies, where cultural production is sufficiently diversified, no longer merely ritualistic, and subject to theoretical (“objective” as opposed to practical) knowledge. Cultural production can, for Bourdieu, be seen within the template of economic production whereby, in the case of the literary field for example, “cultural capital” accrues because of recognition and consecration; which is to say, a text and/or author are/is either recognised or not, and, due to socially (institutionally) mediated recognition the text/s is/are consecrated according to a system of belief, of which canonisation, for instance, is an example.
country with “long-standing poverty” allowed “Eurocentrists” to “deliberately” overlook “Chinese cultural value and literary achievements”. This omission, the author hopes, will be rectified by current globalisation processes that “encourage our culture to communicate more effectively with the international community”. Although lacking literary valency, we in the West might remember that the road travelled eastwards by the “Hamburger” was once travelled westwards (cf. the Venetian Marco Polo in the 13th century) and brought us that, supposedly, quintessential Italian dish: “pasta”.

This unpretentious reminder of trade routes travelled and crossed ought to make us attentive to Goethe’s “newly coined word **Weltliteratur**”, a concept that for many resides at the very heart of Comparative Literature, and that, according to Birus, could be seen as having signalled a “discursive event” (Foucault). For “the term **Weltliteratur**”, first coined by Christoph Martin Wieland “as an ad hoc substitute for ‘erudition, the widely read, and politeness’, combined with ‘knowledge of the world’”, together with “Goethe’s usage of **world literature**” squarely refers to the extension of **trade** from the domestic to the international and global realm. I agree with the proximity that Birus establishes between Goethe’s concept and the **Communist Manifesto** because, to my mind, it is at the intersection of expanding trade and international traffic of “stories” that Literature proper is born from (Enlightenment) secularisation and (Romanticism’s) interiorisation. The literary canon, subject of much attack recently and

8 What could be done in this respect by “Westerners” who, indeed, know far too little about East Asian Literatures, but who are surrounded by everyday goods “made in China”, Korea and Taiwan, is to begin, at least, with the kind of reflexion that for Benjamin in his “Berlin Childhood” (*Berlin Kindheit um Neunzehnhundert*) emanated from his family’s use of the famous Meissen “onion pattern” dinner-ware (Benjamin 1980b:265-266), translated, of course, into present conditions.

9 See in this regard Li Xia’s contribution with its demand that “[c]omparative literature must highlight culture (art, music, literature) as an inclusive living structure (not museum exhibit) that shapes the way people live, view themselves and understand the world around them”. In order to fulfil this task, an exclusive focus “on cultural icons selected by a minority representatives of privileged Western ‘nation-states’” needs to be abandoned “in order to seriously and constructively confront the development of the electronic mass media which have produced new ways of seeing (and manipulating) the reality people live in. It will mean that comparative literature (together with multicultural studies) must examine the values that audio-visual media produce, market and distribute in the new culture of television, film, CDs, computer networks, advertising and so on.”
impaired by countless proliferation and diversification ranging from the inclusion of popular (low-brow) examples to specialised “feminist literature”, “workers’ literature”, “immigrant literature”, “Holocaust literature”, etc., used to constitute, for the educated citizen, the liberal market economy’s Other in form of “fiction”; that is the site in which the imaginary, domesticated and constrained by relentless rigour of both the market and manufacturing (industry), could roam unbound. Flaubert has a great deal to say about this, not so much in his famous Madame Bovary, but rather in L’éducation sentimentale and Bouvard et Pécuchet.

A Comparative Literature, interested in the kind of “contact studies” for which Joseph V. Ricapito delivers a compelling example with his analysis of Cervantes’s novella “La Señora Cornelia”, disavows the troubled idea of literary comparison. An idea, which it seems Birus, for instance, likes to see replaced by Weltliteratur as “not a thesaurus of texts” but as the study of “international literary communication”. Given what Goethe had envisaged, namely that “the spirit would gradually feel the desire to be admitted to the more or less free intellectual trade”, as cited by Birus, the suggestion by Marc-Mathieu Münch might be feasible. Münch proposes “provocatively” that the researcher go to the very heart of “the poetic” and collect in encyclopaedic fashion, irrespective of canonical consecration, whatever poetic expression is felt by the peoples of the world to authentically reflect their experience of the ineffable. The author realises that epistemological differences undergirding distinct cultural articulations might militate against such a project; yet he feels that if the researcher were to take as measure the very sound of what is described in many tongues as the “poetic” a collection of that which constitutes poésie could be compiled. (Reminiscences, perhaps, of Herder and the latter 18th century in contemporary garb?)

Münch’s envisaged project, although not lacking certain pragmatic considerations, is very different to John Neubauer’s proposal of a “comparative history of literary cultures in East-Central Europe”. Involving “more than eighty contributors” under the co-editorship of Marcel Cornis-Pope, Neubauer’s project (that appeared in book form since the Pretoria gathering) attempts to lay out a “new” literary historiography quite distinct from earlier, linear histories of (national) Literatures. Although concentrating on “literary culture”, by which is meant “literature and its institutions”, this undertaking, in the wake of Foucault’s work and that of
subsequent “New Literary History”, is by no means merely “formal”. Deeply “contextualised” but not “sociological”,¹⁰ this literary history includes the “social, political and economic and other extra-literary dimensions”, albeit not “independently”, but “only inasmuch as they were relevant to literature, namely as literary themes, as events involving the writers and, last but not least, as institutions and events shaped by the literary imagination”.

In concert with other contributors (Kistner, Remak, Li Xia), Tomo Virk notes a “crisis” in Comparative Literature. In partial agreement with Tótoşy, Virk feels that “the discipline Comparative Literature” should first of all be “socially legitimised, and professionally consolidated”. According to Tótoşy: “The question raised is, how can literary scholarship make itself socially relevant by producing relevant, outstanding, and replicable work for both its own immediate field and the general public?” The reader will meet the relevancy question again in Matshakayile-Ndlovu’s contribution, although Virk’s response differs markedly from that put forward from an African perspective. Suggesting that Comparative Literature “should be engaged in research and should with its methodology demonstrate particularly [an] otherness, which is illustrated in literature and is closely related with its ‘essence’, namely literariness”, Virk focuses on an “essence” that, like Münch’s “poésie of poetry” might reside in the literary text. However, by implicitly drawing on the Russian Formalist notion of “many definitions of literariness, from defamiliarisation to paradox, ambiguity and heteroglossia” Virk’s ground differs significantly from that inhabited by Münch; not least because it is the “other of literariness” that, “constructed, functional, relationally conditioned, ideologically marked, and therefore historical and transitory”, for him is constitutive “for literature and literary science, and also for comparative literature”. Worried about Comparative Literature’s loss of “identity” while accepting contextualisation of creative writing, Virk regards it as necessary that the discipline “remain emphatically open also to that which addresses it from literary art as the Other”.

¹⁰ Perhaps this kind of work needs to be mapped across sociologies of Literature as inspired, for instance, by Bourdieu, or the historiographical work produced in the name of Cultural Studies, in order to ascertain the degree to which literary historiographical scholarship remains more illuminating.
At the crossroads of connections between, on the one hand, reader and text whereby the reader is attentive to what for Mukaļvskā were “problems of aesthetic norm”, and connections between differing literatures on the other, Goethe’s observations hold surprising actuality. Namely, his reference to “entirely eased communication” and to the “ever increasing speed of traffic”, thanks to “constantly spreading industrial and trade activities”, cited by Birus, signal, if not a greater availability of literary texts in translation from the furthest corners of the world, then, at least, the spread of “Traveling Theory”, by which Said (1984) means the reception of theoretical thought on part of other linguistic groups and in other situations than those in which they first arose. This re-opens a perspective that reaches beyond the contrast between two sets of literary articulations, alluded to by Franco in connection with a national (French) and a “foreign”, northern (German) character of literary expression.

Typically at stake in the “age of globalisation and multiculturalism”, outlined by Li Xia, are the particular connections and

Although Li Xia’s contribution explains multiple (political) levels of application of the term, I like to reiterate that “multi-culturalism” is neither an “essence” nor a “fact”, but that, as a concept, it performs the way we see/perceive the world. Besides Bourdieu’s (1991:286) reminder that “cultural difference is probably the product of a historical dialectic of cumulative differentiation”, we ought to keep in mind the link between recognition and multi-culturalism. —The term “recognition”, coined by the Canadian philosopher, Charles Taylor (1994), refers explicitly to a policy model which redresses perceived ethnic disadvantages and injustices. Taylor framed his idea of respect for individual human rights on the basis of a civic and contractual definition of citizenship within the debate on multiculturalism in Canada, from where it spread to the US. —In 1971 Canada had adopted an official policy of multiculturalism in place of bilingualism and biculturalism (English/French) which had operated for over a century. Faced by the need to eliminate racism and discrimination of immigrant and indigenous groupings other than English and French settlers, to overcome problems of integration of ethno-cultural and visible minorities, and by the desire to promote the shared values upon which the nation is based, Canada developed a multicultural model to replace the increasingly ineffective assimilation model. —“Multiculturalism”, in the words of Inglis (n.d.:6), “is a democratic policy response for coping with cultural, social and ethnic diversity in society”. Although initially limited to countries like Canada and Australia, multiculturalism is fast becoming the norm for other countries under conditions of post-colonialism and globalisation. Decolonisation on the one hand and the collapse of the communist regimes on the other have not only created new states but these contain within their borders often diverse, regionally based ethnic minorities. In addition, the long cherished notion that concomitant with the 19th-century emergence of modern, industrial society, ethnic groupings would lose their saliency in the lives of individuals had to be drastically revised. Instead of class as the driving force in social organisation, as was assumed by social scientists from Marx to Durkheim, Weber and beyond, it is increasingly ethnicity and identity politics which are shaping policy making at the beginning of the new century. The work of Giddens (1997[1991]) and Castells (1996-1998) among others, corroborate this. Thus for Giddens, the self becomes a “reflexive project” sustained through a revisable narrative of self-identity, whereas Castells notes (in Vol. II: The Power of Identity, p. 2f) a widespread surge of
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relations as played out along trajectories intimated, for instance, by Wang Ning. He thematises the opposition between (traditionalist) voices that want to resist “Western influence” and, pleading for closer contact between Sinology “(done by foreign scholars) and traditional Chinese learning (done by domestic scholars)”, he feels that such contact might not only overcome domestic “blindness” “in recognising our own cultural shortcomings” but might contribute also to a clearer recognition of “our own value”.

Whereas disputes between adherents to “national values” and legacies and “representatives of ‘internationalism’” are legion in the history of Comparative Literature, the landscape of “multiculturalism talk” that is becoming popular in the contemporary Taiwanese public sphere, manifests “a differentiating as well as a homogenising process” that Waters (1994) ascribes to globalising processes, and that I mentioned earlier. In the overview provided by Liao Ping-hui, it appears as if, with assistance from post-colonial travelling theory, “the putative nexus between nation and state” (ibid.) that tended to homogenise Taiwan’s indigenous ethnicities, e.g. Minnan and Hakkar, together with mainland Chinese, is being weakened. From a confederation of minorities, clearly discernible by their family name, the reader gains the impression that a re-imagining of the nation in distinct contrast to mainland China is underway in Taiwan. Manifest in the spirited, public exchanges between scholars of different institutions and ethnicity,

powerful expressions of collective identity that challenge globalisation and cosmopolitanism, on behalf of cultural singularity and people’s control over their lives and environment. These expressions are multiple, highly diversified, following the contours of each culture, and of historical sources of formation of each identity. They include proactive movements, aiming at transforming human relationships at their most fundamental level, such as feminism and environmentalism. But they also include a whole array of reactive movements that build trenches of resistance on behalf of God, nation, ethnicity, family, locality, that is, the fundamental categories of millennial existence now threatened under the combined, contradictory assault of techno-economic forces and transformative social movements.


Defining social movements “as being: purposive collective actions whose outcome, in victory as in defeat, transforms the values and institutions of society”, Castells admits to a “deliberate obsession with multiculturalism” arising from the contradictory plurality of our world.

The acceptance of the vicissitudes of demographics and economics as shown by Shideler and Komar in their UCLA example, together with the task for Comparative Literature, outlined by the former, as one that seeks to “create a faculty and student body that is diverse in ethnicity, culture and gender” can be seen to fit the category of “liberal multi-culturalism”, as outlined by Li Xia.
“aborigines” and 1950-refugees from Mao’s Peoples Republic, the bone of contention is the date of Taiwan’s final “decolonization and hence of its postcolonialism”. (It needs to be remembered that the island peoples were first conquered by the Chinese, before being colonised by the Portuguese, the Dutch, the Spanish, and finally the Japanese.) “[L]ocal Taiwanese—to be more precise—scholars tend to refer to 1987, the year martial law was lifted, as a new era of ‘postcoloniality’ that, typical for globalising processes, paves the way for ‘identity construction’.”

Such construction together with fiercely contested identity politics elsewhere, all of which claim their own stories to be heard, preferably in the academy, might resemble conditions that favoured the birth of national literatures in early 19th-century Europe. Yet, despite familiar excavation of the roots of “a revisable narrative” (Castells 1996-1998, Vol. II:2) that might secure communal cohesion by replaying its relationship with the past, for instance in a discourse of “rebirth”, as is done presently by the “African Renaissance” in South Africa, the self-assertion at stake is precisely not a “national” one. For besides liberation from the dominant culture, that today is, more often than not, a colonial culture, current identity constructions usually disavow a hierarchically structured overarching edifice that we have come to associate with the nation-state. Rather, as in the case of Taiwan (and South Africa) the romantic quest of building a cohesive unitary nation embraces the dream of accommodating heterogeneity without domination of the one by the other. Thus, what is played out today in the post-colonial state on “national”, local level resembles the aspirations held by “world citizens” or cosmopolitans like Goethe and Arjun Appadurai (1996) for the world at large.

Goethe’s pious wish that a Weltliteratur would come about in “general, free and open interaction of all contemporaries” who, as writers would also be constantly concerned “for that which remains from the past and that which continues to be familiar” (quoted by Birus) awaits fulfilment. Goethe, at the threshold of an age (Enlightenment) that believed in universally applicable emancipation (of the bourgeoisie), and an age that intensely promoted individual uniqueness (Romanticism), before a horizon of expanding international trade and communication, had if not so much a

---

12 Goethe’s contemporaries developed the railroad, the precursor of infra-structural development that today is dominated by the automobile and the airplane. Goethe also witnessed the extension of the Prussian Custom’s Union that eventually embraced all German-speaking principalities. Of importance in
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república de las letras más que, al menos, una república de lectores en la mente. Sin embargo, a pesar del creciente libro publicado y traducción, la lectura lenta y profundamente rumiante está disminuyendo en un período dominado por valores como "prueba de rendimiento" (incluso en la clase de la academia), "velocidad", "producción", "retorno rápido del capital", etc. El concepto de "valor" en sí, por supuesto, pertenece al discurso del comercio y el intercambio de mercancías, así como el concepto de reconocimiento, que, cedido por Taylor (1994), desempeña un papel integral en "la charla de multiculturalismo".1

El placer de cuidadosamente considerar la escritura desde el punto de vista de rastrear la distancia nunca resuelta entre el sentido de la lengua y semántica, en particular, es a desbloquear la débil alianza entre el objeto y el lenguaje, una alianza que, la poesía y el prosa—y todas las presentaciones—han de entrar porque la comunicación siempre es una comunicación de comunicabilidad históricamente formada, no compartida por muchos. Además, tiempo recopilado y re-recopilado, está desapareciendo en un período de gestión del tiempo gobernado por el orden de la cuenta.

La concentración y la atención, el Benjamin’s eingenennen parece estar demasiado esforzado en vista de la diversión hecha a la medida, el comprable distracción y la rápida púa del (ordenador) ratón que asegura la conectividad mundial gracias a las nuevas tecnologías comunicativas; tecnologías, que sugiero no, en sí mismas, renunciar la necesidad de la lectura. Si algo, el arroyo de palabras liberadas por estas nuevas tecnologías en lo que se llama con bonificaciones la "sociedad del conocimiento" requiere lectura atenta más que nunca. Eingenennen, una memoria “pensamiento en algo” que no es a confundir con "empatía" o un "sentimiento en", define una relación con la lectura

---

13 Este es, de acuerdo con Hegel (par. 192;176, Knowles, p.226) y en los términos de los emprendedores que ven una oportunidad del mercado y el consumidor que descubre una necesidad para el producto, que dos individuos como "reconocer a cada uno" (Hegel’s italics) como atender a sus necesidades y medios mutuos. En este momento de recogida, junto con la conexión del mercado a la democracia que necesitamos tener en cuenta al considerar el “mercado capitalista” que, de acuerdo con Marx (Comunismo, 1848), reemplazó “el viejo local y nacional aislamiento y auto-suficiencia”, con, “intercambio en todas las direcciones”, creando “interdependencia universal de naciones”. Aunque esta histórica "sustitución", debido a intercambios asimétricos, ha venido con costos pesados a la bienestar social en la modernidad, un retorno a alguna alternativa pre-moderna no es posible.
that, instead of taking possession of it in thought, attempts to focus on that very interstice residing between thought/reading and the text, entails work that defies homogenisation into a “message”. **Eingedenken**, (*denken* means “to think” in German), describes a critical process leading to momentary recognition of the said as if in a “flash”, a rapture that allows the utterance to expose (render thinkable) that which the representation silences. The exposition of the silenced in which thought and the imaginary converge constitutes, for me, that critical awareness of the (local) world in which I live, that many of the contributors regard as the task of Comparative Literature.

However, for teaching reading I do not have to be a comparatist, although the *littérature générale, allgemeine Literaturwissenschaft* or “theoretical” aspect that traditionally defines her “expertise” are an advantage. And if the “fact of multiculturalism” were to promote Comparative Literature with its (important) multilingual orientation, the South African demographic and academic landscape would make for an ideal test case. South Africa has 20 universities, some in metropolitan and some in rural areas, and some that teach in Afrikaans, the language of the original settlers who came to the Cape in 1652. Some universities, in contrast to formerly Afrikaans and liberal English-speaking universities, were designed by the apartheid regime, to cater purely for black, Indian and coloured (mixed-race people) in the past. These are known today as “HBU’s” (Historically Black Universities), deserving increased funding, provided they exhilarate instruction in science and technology. There are 11 “official languages” among the some 70 languages spoken by South African residents. These include indigenous African languages besides others like Mandarin, Persian, Hindi and Urdu. And despite mother-tongue instruction at primary school level, publishing creative fiction or poetry in any of the ten “official” indigenous South African languages, except

---

14 The distinction between “officially recognized” languages, based on numerical criteria, and minority languages like the Khoisan languages, Tsonga, Swati, Puthi and others, already provides grounds for conflict due to their “non-recognition” and exclusion. Besides, full administrative recognition of the other 11 languages remains vacuous because of the financial implications arising from translation. Besides, there is a debate around the function of English as cohesive—or at least integrational—factor within a multilingual and ethnically divided society, as is the case with many ex-colonial countries.
Afrikaans, is hardly a viable proposition because sales do not exceed 800 copies,\textsuperscript{15} due to a lack of readers.

“Multiculturalism”, therefore does not really lend itself to a new, more effective or more authentic articulation of Comparative Literature. The “franker labeling” of “literatures of Western Civilization” that K. Anthony Appiah (1995:55) thought the discipline should have adopted in the past, is not made good by expanding the field and including a few non-European language texts into a “world literature” course. It is, rather, the site of a perilous \textit{in between} from which the comparatist does her work, secure in the knowledge that fiction, historiography and often philosophy converge. Expert in two domains: “theory” and “communicability” (by having been trained in the “discipline” of reading, preferably in two language/literatures, and another area of knowledge) the comparatist concerns herself with the interconnectedness offered to her in particular places by (literary) texts and stories that circulate and circulated in that “home” space, a space that always bordered on that of other civilisations and cultures. Her job is to lay bare contacts—of whatever kind\textsuperscript{16}—that manifest the mingling of ideas in a world that, through trade, could never be compartmentalised into monolingual, pure unitary entities, irrespective of strategies, policies, and tactics of containment employed. That which faces us today in the guise of “globalisation”, and that despite deeply unjust imperialist expansionism, is nothing other than a sign that marks the two slopes of the “global” and the “local”, requires vigorous investigation by the comparatist well suited to exposing, connecting and communicating the always already existing ties between peoples, their language and their creative cultures, including the site of the withering Humanities that were charged once with providing ground and frame for such analyses.

Comparative Literature’s inherent injunction to connect and thus to shuttle \textit{between} boundaries, be they linguistic, discursive, material (as in the case of the visual arts, film and music) or “disciplinary” means to

\textsuperscript{15} Information supplied verbally by Nhlanhla Maake who has now written his first English novel.

\textsuperscript{16} For instance, work done by Djelal Kadir (at Pennsylvania State University) in conjunction with the \textit{Zentrum für Literaturforschung} in Berlin and other European and Latin American colleagues on inter-American literary relations and contact zones might serve as example.
Reingard Nethersole

Communicate. Communication here bears no relation of what is usually done in Communication Studies. It is not a means to commune or to transport messages from sender to receiver. Communication here means reading, writing and speaking from the threshold as a point of contact with an outside, an alterity that, because it always faces me as I face it, demands communicability by way of establishing relations of sharing. That sharing for the comparatist (but generalisable to all communication as not something held in common but of a communicability according to the formula of Giorgio Agamben 1993, 1995), ought to, perhaps happen not merely on the three planes of speaking/writing outlined in Aristotle’s Organon but especially on a fourth plane that today’s Comparative Literature might claim as its own. This fourth plane or “fourth discourse”, as Wlad Godzich 1 calls the “discursive labour” that I associate with “theory”, stands in a reflexive relation to the other “three discourses or family of discourses”, already foreseen by Aristotle, namely narrative, interpretative and deliberative. It “will be” the task of this “fourth discourse”

to recognise the constructed discursive nature of the experience offered by the other three. In other words, this fourth discourse must take account of the fact that experience takes place in a world already organised and semantically charged by discursivity. Its task is to remind us that we are not Adam and Eve naming creation but that we live in a man-made world determined by earlier human activity. This fourth discourse proceeds through analyses and identifies dramas in the sense that it looks for the genesis of the experience bound to any given situation, and it must identify the forces and diverse discourses that interact in such a situation. Where narrative discourse constructs events, interpretative discourse, models, deliberative discourse, syllogisms, the fourth discourse constructs dialectics. This fourth discourse ought to be called by right historiographic. It should be immediately obvious that historiography in this sense has nothing to do

17 Wlad Godzich, in an unpublished address delivered at the Universities of Cape Town and the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, in November 1997, entitled “Wither the Humanities”, referring to Aristotle’s tripartite typology of discourse in the Organon, captures the difference between the three discourses thus:

Narrative discourse is the discourse of facts and the world; interpretative discourse is the discourse in quest of meaning, and especially of the sort of meaning that could have the force of destiny or law; deliberative discourse is in quest of validity and refers ultimately to reason; it is the discourse of rationalism.
with the narration of events or their interpretation but everything with a
discursive labour on these discourses as well as the deliberative one.

Finally, I like to thank all colleagues who came to Pretoria in 2000
and who waited so patiently for these Proceedings to arrive. May their
teaching and research flourish.

Reingard Nethersole
University of the Witwatersrand
South Africa
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The Co-emergence of *Weltliteratur* and *littérature comparée*

Around 1827, independently of one another, and yet simultaneously, the idea of *world literature* was conceived in Weimar and *Comparative Literature* emerged as a discipline in Paris. This is an astonishing fact, indeed it is one in need of further explanation. But first let us take the “spirit of freedom”—to use the words of Jean Paul (1935:178) —“to turn our look from the object at its sign”. At first glance, Goethe’s newly coined word *Weltliteratur* appears—similar to that of *Weltanschauung* (“world view”, Kant), *Weltbild* (“world picture”, E. M. Arndt), *Weltgeschichte* (“world history”, Herder), or *Weltseele* (“world soul”, Schelling)—as an expression of German idealistic holism, which appeared as completely obsolete since Bertrand Russell’s rejection of his initial Hegelianism and the subsequent triumphant march of analytical philosophy. Indeed, as a prominent American Germanist mockingly suggested, “does the definition of *Weltliteratur* [...] belong to the disarming vocabulary of a German literary character, which enjoys living in the twilight of pathos and platitude?” (Lange 1971:15). —On the other side, the designation of the academic discipline *Littérature comparée* appears as a typical fashionable French word, which was inspired by such book titles as Abbé de Tressan’s *Mythologie comparée avec l’histoire* (1802), Joseph Marie de Gérando’s *Histoire comparée des systèmes de philosophie* (1804), Charles de Villers’s *L’érotique comparée* (1806) or Jean François Sobry’s *Poétique des arts, ou cours de peinture et de littérature comparées* (1810), but above all, however, François J. M. Noël and Guislain de La Place’s *Cours de*
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littérature comparée (1804, 1816). A century later, Lane Cooper (1943:75) in vain protested against the corresponding English term Comparative Literature: “You might as well permit yourself to say ‘comparative potatoes’ or ‘comparative husks’.”

Although such connotations might be near at hand, the real crux of both terms has not yet been touched. As for the term Weltliteratur, its first (until recently unknown) coining by Christoph Martin Wieland (cf. Weitz 1987/1988:349-352) as an ad hoc substitute for “erudition, the widely read, and politeness”, combined with “knowledge of the world”, did not have the slightest thing in common with the holism of German idealism. The same was true for Goethe’s usage of world literature, that had less to do with idealistic notions, such as world view or world spirit, than with more sober Goethean terms, as world piety (vs. domestic piety), world citizens (vs. city or national citizens) or world trade (vs. domestic trade), that exceed the private, local or national limits.

On the other hand, the label “étude de littérature comparée” (“the study of comparative literature”), which since Abel-François Villemain’s lectures at the Sorbonne between 1827-30 (1830, 1890:1, 87) rapidly gained in popularity, was not at all merely a fashionable formulaic expression à la “Érotique comparée”. And the same holds true with Jean-Jacques Ampère’s (1833:3) competing, but all too long-winded designation “l’histoire comparative des arts et de la littérature”. The term littérature comparée was eventually pushed through by the literary critic Sainte-Beuve (1870:183-185) in 1868 (in an Ampère obituary of all things!). By the way, as the young Sainte-Beuve in 1831 received an offer by the University of Liège (Lüttich), the offer was for a chair labelled with the seemingly ultramodern denomination “Littérature generale et comparée”; only after he declined the position was that chair renamed “Littérature comparée” (cf. Jeune 1968:38). The success of this designation within such a short term was obviously due to the analogous naming of Anatomie comparée, the lead science of the time.

This again leads us directly from the signifiers to the facts that are signified. For Littérature comparée borrows not only its name from Anatomie comparée, whose official and special, even literary resonance is attested to by the Avant-Propos (1842) to Balzac’s Comédie humaine (1976:1,7-20, esp. 7 f.), that appeals to Cuvier, as much as to Geoffroy
Saint-Hilaire and Goethe, to name but its most outstanding contemporary exponents. Rather, the founding of the discipline *Littérature comparée* following 1827 by Villemain, J.J. Ampère, Philarète Chasles, Edgar Quinet and their successors, might be understood in general as an adaptation of comparative anatomy and morphology, albeit in the area of language and literature. Thus the late Ernst Cassirer (1945:99-120) could interpret Cuvier’s *Leçons d’anatomie comparée* (1800-1805) as a methodological model of linguistic structuralism. Hence it is Ampère who underscores the influence of the new science for literature:

Il faut établir ici, comme en botanique et en zoologie, parmi les objets que l’on classe, non des divisions arbitraires, mais des séries et des familles naturelles [...] La théorie doit naître de la connaissance approfondie des faits. C’est de l’histoire comparative des arts et de la littérature chez tous les peuples que doit sortir la philosophie de la littérature et des arts.

(Ampère 1833:29,3)

And: “La philosophie de la littérature ne sera complète que lorsque, de l’étude de toutes ses manifestations partielles, on se sera élevé à ses lois générales et à son principe souverain” (Ampère 1867:1, 123).

*Littérature comparée* during its formative stage aimed to be more than a positivistic collection and comparison for its own sake. Etiemble’s (1988:59-164) annoyed expression: “Comparison is not reason” would have forced an open door. But while Wilhelm Scherer as well as Aleksandr Veselovskij continued to propose the ambitious project of *Comparative Poetics*, toward the end of the 19th century the institutionalised *Comparative Literature* reduced itself to a mere “Litteraturvergleichung” (“comparison of literature”), as Betz, and Elster put it in 1901.

Just as the emergence of *Littérature comparée* arose not only with the development of literary studies in France, but also derived from the influence of the natural sciences of that era, so too the idea of *Weltliteratur* resulted from internal and external factors in literature. On the one side, there occurred an explosion of the traditional literary horizon at latest with the appearance of Herder’s collection of *Volkslieder* (“Popular Songs”, 1778/1779): poems representing more than two thousand years; from nearly every country in Europe (Herder 1990:69-428), but also as far reaching as Greenland and Peru; from samples of Homer and Shakespeare down to street songs and colloquial verse in local dialect. From this sprang Goethe’s
conviction, voiced in his “Serbische Gedichte” (FA: 22, 386f.) “that there would be a general world poetry which would distinguish itself according to the circumstances; [...] wherever the sun shines its development is certain”.

On the other side, Goethe’s understanding of such a “general world poetry” was in no way identical to the idea of Weltliteratur, as he proclaimed it in the well-known conversation with Eckermann (FA: 39, 225) on January 31, 1827: “National literature does not mean much today, the time has come for world literature, and we all must act now to get this epoch underway.” The urgency of this development presumes the Europeanisation, indeed the globalisation of trade, economic relations and communication, as it appeared for the first time since the end of the Napoleonic order of Europe. Thus, decades later in the Communist Manifesto, we read:

The bourgeoisie has through its exploitation of the world market given a cosmopolitan character to production and consumption in every country [...] And as in material, so also in intellectual production. The individual creations of individual nations become common property. National one-sidedness and narrow-mindedness become more and more impossible, and from the numerous national and local literatures there arises a world literature. (Marx 1990:421)

Contrary to what one might suspect, aside from the Marxist term “exploitation”, this is in no way a belated sociological reinterpretation of Goethe’s concept. For what was of foremost importance to Goethe’s idea of Weltliteratur, was not a thesaurus of texts, either exclusively or hierarchically structured, but instead an as yet to be realised form of international literary communication: namely (as the poet had formulated more than twenty years earlier) a “general, free and open interaction of all contemporaries”, to be sure “in constant concern for that which remains from the past and that which continues to be familiar” (Goethe, FA: 18, 809). That is why Goethe himself had referred in a plain and prosaic way to the emerging world literature as coming about due to the “entirely eased communication” (FA: 22, 427), to the “ever increasing speed of traffic” (FA: 22, 866), and to the “constantly spreading industrial and trade activities” (p.868) of his age. Only then “the spirit would gradually feel the desire to be admitted to the more or less free intellectual trade” (p.870).
By his idea of *Weltliteratur*, Goethe plays the role of a “fondateur de discursivité” for Comparative Literature (but also goes well beyond it), as Michel Foucault exemplified with respect to the cases of Marx and Freud:

They have created a possibility for something other than their discourse, yet something belonging to what they founded [...] it is the science or the discursivity which refers back to their work as primary coordinates.

(Foucault 1979:154,156)

That fact that the discipline of *Littérature comparée* and its subject matter *Weltliteratur* emerged simultaneously was not at all a historical coincidence. During this period of time, the protagonists of each of these developments had communicated intensively with one another. On the one hand, the shipment of two annuals of the newly founded *Le globe*, early in 1826, awakened Goethe’s considerable interest in this “Journal littéraire”, so much so that on September 20, 1826 he reported to his old German-French confidant, Graf Reinhard: “Friendly missives from France, particularly from Mr. Cuvier, have drawn me into the observation of nature”, and in the very same breath Goethe says: “The nearly daily communications with the men of *Le Globe* give me much food for thought.” Particularly Ampère’s review of the *Œuvres dramatiques de Goethe* (in *Le globe*, April 29 and May 20, 1826) pleased the author so much (cf. his letter to Reinhard, May 12, 1826 in *FA*: 37, 374f.) that he translated it immediately (cf. Goethe’s Diary, May 31–August 6, 1826 in *WA*: 1887-1919/1987, “Goethe’s Diary, May 31–August 6, 1826”, 10, 198-227) and published and commented on portions of it in his journal *Ueber Kunst und Alterthum* (“On Art and Antiquity”, *FA*: 22, 258-265 and 340-347).

On the other hand, Goethe’s journal was closely followed by the core group of *Le globe*. And when Goethe (*FA* 22, 356) on the occasion of a French adaptation of his *Torquato Tasso*, for the first time declared: “I am convinced that a general world literature is emerging”, this was immediately reported in the *Le globe* (November 1, 1827), however narrowed to “littérature occidentale ou européenne” (1238) instead of littérature mondiale. Goethe, on his part, collected such echoes in *Ueber Kunst und Alterthum* (*FA*: 22, 427 f.) and supplied the following introductory lines:

My hopeful word: that due to the present highly turbulent epoch and due to the entirely eased communication, there as soon as possible is to be hoped a
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world literature—this is approvingly received by our western neighbours, who indeed should do great things for it, and they comment on it as follows [...] (FA: 22,427f.)

Finally, all that concerned the establishment of Littérature comparée by Ampère and Villemain, was superbly well known to Goethe. The knowledge came first hand from Ampère himself: because he visited Weimar from April 22 to May 16, 1827—precisely during the formative phase of the two concepts—and he was frequently Goethe’s guest. Moreover, three years later, Goethe (WA: III 12, 249) wrote “excellent work” about one of the founding texts of “Comparative Literature” in his diary on May 31, 1830: “De l’histoire de la Poésie par Ampère”. He delivered this lecture in Marseille at the opening of a course on the History of Poetry in General.

The following passage in a late letter to his Frankfurt book dealer (to Carl Jügel, May 16, 1828, WA: IV 44, 96) shows the extent to which Goethe was also interested in Villemain:

I just read in the Globe Number 26 that the lectures of Mr. Villemain were widely distributed via stenography; I wish that you kindly can find a copy of it for me and that you little by little will send me either by horse or by coach mail [...] these papers as they appear. (WA: IV 44,96)

And, in fact, Goethe did read Villemain’s lectures on literature regularly, as is confirmed by his diaries and letters. Still, in the autumn of 1830 he notes (to Sulphiz Boisserée, October 3, 1830, WA: IV 47, 269) the “pretty Gallic manner” of his treatment of the first German poetess, the “much discussed Hroswitha, abbess of Gandersheim”, and of her famous Latin dramas. It is no wonder that he refers specifically to those lectures, when he says in his address “To the Society for Foreign Belles-Lettres in Berlin, founded August 28, 1829”:

If you would wish to become familiar, for example, with the most recent French literature, you should become acquainted with the lectures which were held two years ago and subsequently printed: as Guizot's *Cours de l'histoire moderne*; Villemain's *Cours de littérature française*, and Cousin's *Cours de l'histoire de la philosophie*. The relationship that they have among themselves and to us, is most clearly expressed here.

\(FA: 2, 835-837; \text{cf. also } WA: IV 46,140f.\)

If one finally adds Goethe's reading of Edgar Quinet's *De la Grèce moderne et de ses rapports avec l'antiquité* in November 1830, then one can consider Goethe exceptionally well informed about the beginnings of Comparative Literature in France.

But beyond all such factual communications, which can be historically and anecdotally traced, the co-emergence of *Weltliteratur* and *Littérature comparée* may indeed be based on more essential commonalities of their protagonists. For, as the late Goethe by his coining of the term *Weltliteratur* had in mind not only the increasing globalisation of trade and traffic, but he thought in equal measure of the contemporary natural sciences, so the founders of *Littérature comparée* oriented themselves, in the opposite way, not only by comparative anatomy and morphology, but were also as radical liberals involved in the socio-political manoeuvres of their age. In this way, the discipline, like its subject matter can be traced genealogically to a constellation of discursive practices which date back to the French Revolution as well as to the simultaneous progress of natural sciences.

The origin, conceptualisation and universal dissemination of a *Weltliteratur* (as a qualitatively new form of international literary communication in an era of the beginning globalisation of trade and commerce) as well as of the academic discipline of *Littérature comparée* (as a "philology of world literature" in the words of Auerbach 1967[1952]: 301-310) is not by chance to be found in the first third of the 19th century, after the collapse of the Napoleonic order of Europe. The interrelated emergence

---


3 In his old age, Goethe's political and social interests were by far surpassed by his abiding concern with natural sciences, as is shown by the *quidproquo* of the "news of the beginning revolution of July" and of the "public eruption of the controversy in the Academy between Cuvier and Geoffroy de Saint-Hilaire which is so very important for sciences", reported by Soret, August 2, 1830 (*FA: 39, 726-728*).
of a subject matter, of the strategic coining of a notion (by Goethe) and of
the establishment of a disciplinary frame (by Ampère and Villemain)—in
other words: the co-emergence of *Weltliteratur* and *littérature comparée*—
can be most readily grasped with Foucault’s (1969:39) concept of the
“événement discursif” which is unavoidable for every discourse formation,
whose specific historical realisation must answer the question: “comment se
fait-il que tel énoncé soit apparu et nul autre à sa place?” With this, the
Foucauldian “Discourse Analysis” transforms the questions of traditional
history of literature, science and ideas into an “archeological” analysis of
discourse formations and of the discursive events as their “historical apriori” in
that it grasps discourses as practices (Foucault 1969:63).
“Discourse Analysis” can also—without theoretical reductionism (as in the
Marxist base-superstructure-model)—include relationships to the non-
discursive spheres (institutions, political events, economic practices and
processes) into its research, as Foucault (1969:212) suggests.

I would like to thank Judith Harris Frisk for her help in preparing
the English version of this paper.

Hendrik Birus
*Ludwig Maximilians Universität, München*
*Germany*

---

4 To the “archéologie” as “analyse comparative” cf. Foucault (1969: 208 f.).
5 Cf. the chapter “L’a priori historique et l’archive” (Foucault 1969: 166-173).
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