

## Contents

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Péter Hajdu<br>Preface.....   | 7   |
| Nikola Georgiev<br>The Images of the Other in Literary Communication: Dialogues,<br>Interferences?.....                                       | 12  |
| József Szili<br>Gadamer's Plato.....  | 19  |
| Alexander Panov<br>The Anthropological Approach in Literary Studies.....  | 51  |
| Orsolya Rákai<br>Philological Interferences – Factual Congruences? (Formation<br>of a Major Paradigm of 19th Century Literary Criticism)..... | 69  |
| György C. Kálmán<br>Strange Interferences: Modernism and Conservatism vs.<br>Avant-Garde, Hungary, 1910's.....                                | 79  |
| Radosvet Kolarov<br>Je est un autre: Roles of Authorial Self-Estrangement.....  | 99  |
| Péter Hajdu<br>Secrecy and the Transcendental Desire for Order in Drama<br>and Narrative.....   | 105 |
| Gábor Bezeczký<br>Self-Consuming Arguments.....   | 120 |
| Angel Angelov<br>The Limited “European Philology” of Erich Auerbach.....  | 133 |

András Kappanyos

One Work – Two Authors? On Ezra Pound's Interference  
in the Creation of T.S. Eliot's 'The Waste Land' .....

164

Maurice N. Fadel

Happiness as Going Beyond Human .....

174

PÉTER HAJDU

## PREFACE

The fruitful cooperation of the Institutes of Literary Studies of the Bulgarian and Hungarian Academies of Sciences dates back to 1981.<sup>1</sup> Initially it was a contact between the departments for literary theories of two socialist academies; later it comprehended whole institutes in countries that both became members of the European Union. The context has changed immensely, but the intense intellectual climate of the encounters of groups of Bulgarian and Hungarian literary scholars did not. Workshops, conferences, academic visits, and joint publications characterise the cooperation, which resulted in the foundation of a book series in English called *Images of the Other in Literary Communication*. The first volume was published in 2006, and it has taken six years to prepare this second one. What we are offering here is not a usual volume of conference proceedings, but rather a selection of papers representing the achievement of two research institutes of literature and their cooperation. Some articles based on presentations in two Bulgarian-Hungarian conferences make up a part of this book. The first of those conferences was entitled *Images of the Other in Literary Communication: Dialogues, Interferences*, the second *Literature and Literary Criticism*. Six papers from this volume were presented in those meetings – some of them in abbreviated or in a “work in progress” form to provoke scholarly discussion. Five other papers were submitted directly to this volume. Angel Angelov and Maurice N. Fadel presented

---

<sup>1</sup> See Radosvet Kolarov, “Preface” in Radosvet Kolarov & György C. Kálmán (ed.), *Images of the Other in Literary Communication*. Sofia: Penev, 2006, 10–17.

other papers in the conferences, while József Szili, György C. Kálmán and Gábor Bezeczky could not attend. All these colleagues have played very important roles in the history of the cooperation of our institutes, therefore their contribution is characteristic of the joint research in the realm of dialogue as an approach to literary communication, literary criticism, and otherness.

The editors decided to open the book with Nikola Georgiev's paper, which – in its title – simply puts a question mark at the end of the title of one of the conferences, to emphasise his doubts about the concept. The article discusses the problem of notions travelling from one discipline to the other. Literary criticism is always looking for new sources of inspiration, and dialogue with other disciplines sometimes fertilises the ground, yet sometimes it does not. Let me refer to the wider context of this problem in the discourse on language – first of all, academic language. Capturing a notion of any discipline and putting it in the context of literary scholarship is *metaphor*, both in the original meaning of the Greek word (*metaphora* – transposition, bringing something somewhere else) and as a rhetorical term. Metaphors play a central role not only in explaining concepts, but also in inventing them by creating connections between different areas of discourse.<sup>2</sup> Professor Georgiev is happy to embrace the metaphors of “literary communication” and “dialogue,” but very sceptical about the usefulness of “interference,” a notion of physics, in literary studies.

József Szili scrutinizes a case where philology, literature, and philosophy seem to interact. In *Der Anfang der Philosophie*, Hans-Georg Gadamer attributed a constitutive trait of Plato's philosophy to the literary qualities of the dialogues, and claimed that in the transition of Greek philosophy from mythological appreciation to conceptualization (from *mythos* to *logos*) fictionalization ranked high as a genuine structural element of philosophical speculation. Meanwhile Gadamer's reconstruction of pre-Socratic philosophy in view of its Platonic reception seems to be subordinate to his conviction that Heidegger's revolution was unprecedented in the history of philosophy. In Szili's representation,

<sup>2</sup> The literature that can be quoted here is immense, therefore I refer only to two important items: Jacques Derrida, “White Mythology”, transl. F.C.T. Moore, *New Literary History* 6 (1974): 1, 5–74; Paul Ricoeur, *The Rule of Metaphor*, transl. Robert Czerny, London: Routledge, 1977.

philology also appears as a sort of literature, creating various fictions of Plato's intellectual development and life history based on and/or resulted in various possible chronologies of the dialogues.

The interaction of literary and anthropological studies is discussed by Alexander Panov. The fertilizing influence of anthropology on literary studies is immense, from the problems of communication, through the organization of discourse and the construction of text to its perception and its impact on society and the individual. Panov's paper offers a wide survey of these possible aspects. Where he finds the real focus of the anthropological approach to literature is the concepts of literary genres, where all those aspects intertwine. He convincingly argues that anthropological approaches logically (or necessarily) result in generic discussions, since the focus on the communicative situation and social embeddedness leads towards genres primarily determined by those issues. Genre does not seem such a fashionable notion nowadays when the post-modern prefers to mix up different genres and challenge generic presuppositions. However, a previous (possibly pre-theoretic) knowledge may be necessary both to the production of a piece literature that breaks up with generic traditions, and its appreciation on the part of the audience.

The subsequent papers turn to literary history, although they also have very solid theoretical bases for their approach. Byron had an immense influence on 19<sup>th</sup> century Hungarian literature. Orsolya Rákai analyses the academic aspect of this influence, and the various theories Hungarian literary historians elaborated to understand why Byron of all British poets was so important for the Hungarians. The purpose of the paper is not to reach the correct answer to that 19<sup>th</sup> century question, but to understand the ways those scholars tried to reach an answer. It is interesting to see how much they focused on the biography of the author, and a supposed correspondence between personal life and literary production.

The Avant-Garde movement in Hungary received double criticism, both from the literary circles of conservatism and classical modernism. György C. Kálmán offers a broad survey of arguments which were made use of in the discussions to discredit the Avant-Garde. The circles using those arguments were not allies (despite the fact that they had a common enemy) and they were not involved in any kind of dialogue with each other about the common topic. Their discourses, however,

interact with each other, and the locus of that interference is very probably the discourse of literary history, where new connections are created between parties that from many other viewpoints (including their own self-representations) used to be antagonistic.

Radosvet Kolarov is interested in the inner dialogue of the human being, especially the literary author or their creative self. Three cases of self-discrepancy seem especially intriguing from his viewpoint: self-revision, self-criticism, and self-destruction. William Wordsworth, Friedrich Nietzsche, and Nikolai Gogol respectively are the analysed examples. Even in those extreme cases of broken lines of life (which provoked rather radical, confronting ways of self-dialogue) literary history tends to find a solution to create a coherent life story for the authors. In other cases, the authors themselves do anxiously bridge the gap between their alienated selves.

A secret in a literary text initiates a delicate interplay between narrators and readers, since the latter must be informed of existence, or even of the content of the secret. Péter Hajdu's paper analyses various samples from this viewpoint, starting with Euripides' *Hippolytus* and *Ion*, where—due to the absence of any narrator—the interplay of secrecy develops between the agents, the chorus, the gods, and the audience. The other samples are taken from European novels (Thackeray's *The History of Henry Esmond*, Kundera's *The Unbearable Lightness of Being*, and Jókai's *Friedrich Trenck* and *Franz Trenck*). Secrecy often functions as a hint at a secret order or a hidden entity that guarantees order. The order, or rather the impression of arrangement, may function as a suggestion of a secret sense. The meaning can be described as the secret of literary texts, which is always present in the form of a promise.<sup>3</sup>

It is difficult to tell if Gábor Bezeczky offers a critique of Stanley Fish from the angle of linguistic heterogeneity or he discusses the topic of linguistic heterogeneity departing from a critique of Fish. What is sure is that the interference of linguistics and literary studies proves particularly fruitful in this case. He does not simply describe some basic contradictions in Fish's theories, but also explains that literary criticism

<sup>3</sup> We would like to express our gratitude towards Akadémiai Kiadó for their permission to re-publish the papers by József Szili and Péter Hajdu that appeared in the journal *Neohelicon* (volumes 34/2: 167–189 and 35/2: 203–213, respectively).

cannot get rid of this kind of contradiction without challenging the concept of linguistic uniformity.

Angel Angelov investigates how Erich Auerbach developed his idea of a European philology. Concepts of literary or cultural geography play an important role in this investigation. As a student of romance philology in Germany, Auerbach already had to cope with issues of looking at the subject either from inside or from outside, and when he was forced to leave the western world and tried to do literary research in an environment where it had no real tradition in the European sense, such problems must have been overwhelming. Exile in Istanbul probably contributed to his commitment to elaborate his concept of Europeaness.

András Kappanyos challenges a narrative of literary history, which seemed to tell a story of interference, as if *The Waste Land* had been the fruit of a shared creative effort of T.S. Eliot and Ezra Pound. A careful analysis of the variations of typed manuscripts and biographical data, which give the paper the air of a detective story, results in undermining the inherited (and quite attractive) story of the genesis of the poem.

It is rather a commonplace that happiness cannot be a tempting topic for literature. ("Happy families are all alike; every unhappy family is unhappy in its own way," begins Tolstoy's novel *Anna Karenina*). Maurice N. Fadel approaches the theme of happiness from a different angle through the concept of time. If "happiness comes as a sudden occurrence, without being expected or wished for," if it "breaks the sequence of past, present and future," if it is actually not time-bound, then it is highly problematic to represent happiness in narrative, which is more or less about time. He takes the example of *The Lover* by Marguerite Duras to show how the uncatchable nature of happiness can be represented – as an exception of rare moments in the general unhappiness represented as the rule. The analysis of this novel, however, is naturally connected to the main topic of this book; the encounter of a poor European girl with a rich Chinese man creates the opportunity to refer to many types of tension (as in gender, class, race). Since the lovers become speechless towards each other (and can communicate only with their bodies), and it is the girl (or rather a woman who used to be that girl) that speaks, Fadel's discussion can focus on the representation of the other, and the possibilities of communication.

interact with each other, and the locus of that interference is very probably the discourse of literary history, where new connections are created between parties that from many other viewpoints (including their own self-representations) used to be antagonistic.

Radosvet Kolarov is interested in the inner dialogue of the human being, especially the literary author or their creative self. Three cases of self-discrepancy seem especially intriguing from his viewpoint: self-revision, self-criticism, and self-destruction. William Wordsworth, Friedrich Nietzsche, and Nikolai Gogol respectively are the analysed examples. Even in those extreme cases of broken lines of life (which provoked rather radical, confronting ways of self-dialogue) literary history tends to find a solution to create a coherent life story for the authors. In other cases, the authors themselves do anxiously bridge the gap between their alienated selves.

A secret in a literary text initiates a delicate interplay between narrators and readers, since the latter must be informed of existence, or even of the content of the secret. Péter Hajdu's paper analyses various samples from this viewpoint, starting with Euripides' *Hippolytus* and *Ion*, where—due to the absence of any narrator—the interplay of secrecy develops between the agents, the chorus, the gods, and the audience. The other samples are taken from European novels (Thackeray's *The History of Henry Esmond*, Kundera's *The Unbearable Lightness of Being*, and Jókai's *Friedrich Trenck* and *Franz Trenck*). Secrecy often functions as a hint at a secret order or a hidden entity that guarantees order. The order, or rather the impression of arrangement, may function as a suggestion of a secret sense. The meaning can be described as the secret of literary texts, which is always present in the form of a promise.<sup>3</sup>

It is difficult to tell if Gábor Bezeczky offers a critique of Stanley Fish from the angle of linguistic heterogeneity or he discusses the topic of linguistic heterogeneity departing from a critique of Fish. What is sure is that the interference of linguistics and literary studies proves particularly fruitful in this case. He does not simply describe some basic contradictions in Fish's theories, but also explains that literary criticism

<sup>3</sup> We would like to express our gratitude towards Akadémiai Kiadó for their permission to re-publish the papers by József Szili and Péter Hajdu that appeared in the journal *Neohelicon* (volumes 34/2: 167–189 and 35/2: 203–213, respectively).



cannot get rid of this kind of contradiction without challenging the concept of linguistic uniformity.

Angel Angelov investigates how Erich Auerbach developed his idea of a European philology. Concepts of literary or cultural geography play an important role in this investigation. As a student of romance philology in Germany, Auerbach already had to cope with issues of looking at the subject either from inside or from outside, and when he was forced to leave the western world and tried to do literary research in an environment where it had no real tradition in the European sense, such problems must have been overwhelming. Exile in Istanbul probably contributed to his commitment to elaborate his concept of Europeaness.

András Kappanyos challenges a narrative of literary history, which seemed to tell a story of interference, as if *The Waste Land* had been the fruit of a shared creative effort of T.S. Eliot and Ezra Pound. A careful analysis of the variations of typed manuscripts and biographical data, which give the paper the air of a detective story, results in undermining the inherited (and quite attractive) story of the genesis of the poem.

It is rather a commonplace that happiness cannot be a tempting topic for literature. ("Happy families are all alike; every unhappy family is unhappy in its own way," begins Tolstoy's novel *Anna Karenina*). Maurice N. Fadel approaches the theme of happiness from a different angle through the concept of time. If "happiness comes as a sudden occurrence, without being expected or wished for," if it "breaks the sequence of past, present and future," if it is actually not time-bound, then it is highly problematic to represent happiness in narrative, which is more or less about time. He takes the example of *The Lover* by Marguerite Duras to show how the uncatchable nature of happiness can be represented – as an exception of rare moments in the general unhappiness represented as the rule. The analysis of this novel, however, is naturally connected to the main topic of this book; the encounter of a poor European girl with a rich Chinese man creates the opportunity to refer to many types of tension (as in gender, class, race). Since the lovers become speechless towards each other (and can communicate only with their bodies), and it is the girl (or rather a woman who used to be that girl) that speaks, Fadel's discussion can focus on the representation of the other, and the possibilities of communication.