

CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture

<<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb>> ISSN 1481-4374 ©Purdue University

CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture (ISSN 1481-4374) is a peer-reviewed quarterly of scholarship in the humanities and social sciences published online in full text and in open access by ©Purdue University and in hard-copy annuals in the Purdue University Press series of Books in Comparative Cultural Studies <<http://www.thepress.purdue.edu/series/compstudies.asp>>. *CLCWeb* publishes scholarship in the widest definition of the disciplines of comparative literature and cultural studies designated as "comparative cultural studies." The journal encourages scholarship in a global, international, and intercultural context and work with a plurality of methods and approaches. In addition to the publication of articles, *CLCWeb* publishes review articles of scholarly books and publishes research material in its *Library Series* <<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweblibrary/library>>. Work published in the journal is indexed in the American Humanities Index, in the Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature, in the Arts and Humanities Citation Index, and in the International Bibliography of the Modern Language Association of America. *CLCWeb* is mirrored on the website of the British Comparative Literature Association <<http://www.bcla.org/clcweb/>>, it is preserved at research libraries in the Stanford University lockss system <<http://www.lockss.org/lockss/>>, and it is archived in the *Electronic Collection of Library and Archives Canada* <<http://www.collectionscanada.ca/electroniccollection/>>.

***CLCWeb* Volume 8 Issue 2 (June 2006) Article 1** **César Domínguez, "Literary Emergence as a Case Study of Theory in Comparative Literature"** <<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol8/iss2/1>>

Contents of *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 8.2 (2006) <<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol8/iss2/>>

Abstract: In his paper, "Literary Emergence as a Case Study of Theory in Comparative Literature," César Domínguez constructs an interdisciplinary theoretical model which sheds new light on literary emergence, a phenomenon that defies literary, artistic, and cultural boundaries. Domínguez opens his discussion with a synthesis regarding the state of the question, paying particular attention to the contradictions provoked when an inventory of emerging literatures is attempted and goes on to develop a theoretical framework in which the dynamic processes which define emerging literature are seen relative to world literature. He understands world literature as a mega-system in which emergence finds itself intrinsically linked to the phenomenon of literary change. Thus defined, the smallest systemic units comprising *Weltliteratur* are identified and the function of the secondary subsystem of codification is analyzed (among these are national literatures), forming the impetus for these emerging literatures, as they define themselves in response to the counter-restrictions, redefinitions, and exclusions imposed upon them. The innovative perspective of Domínguez's paper is the questioning of the currency of "national" literatures within the framework of traditional comparative literature.

César DOMINGUEZ

Literary Emergence as a Case Study of Theory in Comparative Literature

Translated from the Spanish by Carla Dechant* and Mark D. Wiersma*

The concept of "emerging literatures" has enjoyed widespread coverage within comparatist and English studies circles in university programs, monographic issues of periodicals, conference proceedings, and including online publications and work. Such coverage contrasts starkly with the scarce theoretical attention that it has been given in comparative literature proper, for to date it has been the object of analysis of just three monographs. Add to this the fact that these works are characterized by their mutual unawareness, their disdain towards other disciplinary perspectives of emergence, and were all written in the second half of the 1980s (reflecting interest sparked at that time in ideas connected to the financial world). The objective of this essay is to propose a new theory to explain this phenomenon, in which simply substituting the expression "emerging literature" for "literary emergence" already means taking a clear stance within the framework of critical dialogue in relation to the aforementioned studies. This is carried out by an interdisciplinary and pluralist model and by an introduction revising the state of the question. Overall, I present a program of comparative research which seeks to test the hypotheses proposed in the theoretical framework on literary emergence.

In the arena of comparative literature, literary emergence is not an emerging literature. Contrary to what might seem a trivial play on words, this statement makes reference to a specific meaning of this concept, namely a "body of works, associated with a specific disciplinary dilemma, which has received notable academic attention." I insist on the multiple meanings of the term, thus arriving at a fuller and more complete understanding of the phenomena which I continue to reformulate as "literary emergence." In fact, to date there have only been three theoretical comparative studies dedicated to "emerging literatures," all of which were written during the same time period: a) in 1988 Wlad Godzich contributed to Clayton Koelb and Susan Noakes's book entitled *The Comparative Perspective on Literature: Approaches to Theory and Practice*, with an essay entitled "Emergent Literature and the Field of Comparative Literature"; b) two years later, in 1990, Claudio Guillén began a study coordinated by Reingard Nethersole (*Emerging Literatures*) with a panorama titled "Emerging Literatures: Critical Questionings of a Historical Concept"; and c) in 1996 the prologue of Jean-Marie Grassin's tenth volume, dedicated to *Littératures Émergentes / Emerging Literatures*, from the proceedings of the XI Congress of the ICLA: International Comparative Literature Association, entitled *The Problematics of Emergence in Comparative Literary History*. To these one can also add the proceedings of conferences which took place at the Università di Macerata in 1994, published by Paola Galli Mastrodonato in 1996 and entitled *Ai confini dell'impero: le letterature emergenti*, although, in reality, the volume lacks a programmatic study. Along with this low number of studies, it is worth noting their mutual unawareness. This minimal and unconnected bibliographic view is complemented, on the one hand, by critical analyses which approach specific emerging literatures, the majority of which are included in the volumes edited by Nethersole, Grassin and Gali Mastrodonato, and, on the other hand, with the only two specialized dictionaries that I am aware of which include a specific entry to this subject: the *Diccionario de termos literarios* by Equipo Glifo and the *Dictionnaire International des Termes Littéraires / International Dictionary of Literary Terms* (Grassin, "Émergence" <<http://www.ditl.info/>>). Other theoretical uses of the notion of "emerging literature" occur in Commonwealth studies and/or applied to such literatures as Canadian or Australian. This is a large topic beyond the scope of this essay; instead, what I focus on is how emerging literature has been conceptualized in comparative literature.

In this paper, I aim at demonstrating the centrality of literary emergence as a comparative problem. Let us consider an initial and very tentative characterization of "emerging" literature starting with the *Oxford Dictionary* definition given for emergent as "new and still developing" (376). If, in the provisional state in which we find ourselves at the moment, emerging literature is

that which is nascent, which breaks the surface, it seems obvious that this definition supposes a historiographic and supranational problem inasmuch as literary historiography should take these nascent literatures into account. At the same time, the very act of emergence implies a rereading of the canon through a special thematic and genealogical work which establishes intertextual, interliterary and interartistic networks, networks in which the translation processes are integral. Finally, an emerging literature, which offers itself in order to be received, provides an immeasurable amount of material towards the realization of comparative poetics -- *vraiment générale*, to use the famous term coined by René Étiemble. The study of emergence requires an interdisciplinary focus as we are dealing with a phenomenon which goes beyond the boundaries of literary, artistic, and even cultural circles. This need has been ignored by the studies we have seen to date. Comparative research responds to this, underscoring, as Karl Popper has demonstrated, that science is born out of a quest to solve problems and that these do not fit within rigid academic frameworks. The multi-dimensionality of literary work, emergent included, requires the application of theoretical and methodological frameworks employed in other disciplines in order to gain a balanced perspective, that is to say, that which Darío Villanueva ("Pluralismo crítico y recepción literaria") has defended as "critical pluralism."

Let us reexamine the provisional characterization according to which an emerging literature is something that is "nascent," something that breaks the surface. One of the immediate questions that arises from this characterization is the question what constitutes an emerging literature? In the absence of a clear definition, it is necessary to resort to the use of certain mechanisms in order to find an adequate explanation. I limit myself to exploring two such mechanisms in the following. The first mechanism, an indirect approach, can be found in comparing diverse editions of a reference work, such as the *Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*, coordinated by Alex Preminger and T.V.F. Brogan. To date there exist three editions: 1965, 1974 (which reproduces the first but with a supplement), and the 1993 edition, renamed *The New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*. In the "Preface" of the third edition it is affirmed that "recent political changes in these areas [Africa, Eastern Europe, Asia and Latin America] have been swift, extensive, and complex, resulting in burgeoning national literatures ... we have increased dramatically our coverage of emergent and non-emergent Western poetries" (Preminger and Brogan vii-viii). In relation to the literary cartography of 1965, the supplement to the second edition of 1974 incorporates four literatures: African, Hausa, Porto Rican, and Swahili. The third and final edition adds nine "new" literatures: Afro American, Chicano, Esperanto, Inuit, Occitan, Somali, Sri Lankan, Basque, and West Indian. If we compare this specific list with the passage cited in the "Preface," which alludes to a dramatic increase in non-Western emerging literatures, it is not easy to reach solid conclusions. Of the thirteen "new" literatures, only 38 percent are non-Western, which either obliges us to think that the remaining 62 percent pertain to emerging literatures, or to ask ourselves whether the condition of being both non-Western and emergent is or is not mutually exclusive. If we compare the newly registered literatures to each other, our task is no less difficult since, for example, it is difficult to decide which common process of emergence in the 1990s would allow for literatures in Esperanto, Inuit, and Basque to be considered in the same category. Just one non-explicit framework allows us to ponder an explanation for the particular successive cartographies of the Princeton encyclopedia: a *Weltliteratur* set forth, among its diverse possibilities, according to the additive concept, that is to say, as a mere sum of world literatures, in such a way that when one recognizes the absence of a region on the literary map, it is thus mapped. Regarding this implicit framework, it is necessary to point out that a decade before the year of inflection (1965) set by the editors of the Princeton encyclopedia, Erich Auerbach published a significant essay entitled "Philologie der Weltliteratur." In the essay Auerbach, similar to the editors of the Princeton encyclopedia, recognized the ever-increasing number of new literatures (4) and, like the aforementioned editors, seemed to emphasize from the start the "national" character of the aforesaid literatures, which, according to the date of the publication of his work (1952) could give us an exact idea of the geographic location of these nascent literatures whose origins are not discussed, since these are implicit in the emphasis put on the exact nationalist nature compared to the European. "National wills are

stronger and louder than ever, yet in every case they promote the same standards and forms for modern life ... European cultures ... still retain their individualities" (Auerbach 2). In my study here, I address this conception of *Weltliteratur*, the supposed geographic specification of nascent literatures, and the vision which the West projects of them later.

The second mechanism to determine which literatures are emergent is more direct than the first. It consists of taking inventory of those literatures that form part of studies dedicated to emergent literature itself. From such an inventory we reach the following conclusions: literary emergence seems to be associated with a) European languages used in non-Western territories, e.g., in Western territories that have been subject to "dislocation" as a result of exile or immigration, b) Nation states, c) new states that have emerged through decolonization after 1945, and d) ex-colonies of France and Britain. These four vectors of emergence flaunt flagrant contradictions: i) literatures in European languages are conceived as authentic autonomous systems, without possible interaction with non-European literatures, ii) national literature is privileged over any other literary formation, iii) the concentration of these literatures in new post-colonial States seems to ignore the fact that "in Europe, between 1990 and 1997, 14,200 kilometers of new borders were created, the Soviet Union disappeared, and 31 states were born or reborn" (Nogué Font and Rufí 105; unless indicated otherwise, all translations are by Dechant and Wiersma), and iv) the polarization in the ex-colonies of Britain and France overshadow the existence of other European and non-European empires. These implicit coordinates on the map of emerging literatures, those derived from the Princeton encyclopedia and those compiled from critiques dedicated to emerging literature have their expression in the three programmatic studies mentioned above, divided between the association of emergence with the evolutionary phase of national literature (a position defended by Guillén) or with all non-national and non-canonical literature, whether it be ethnic, regional, or minority (a position defended by Godzich and Grassin). Both factors seem responsible for the simplistic and trivializing stances towards emergence processes. In this sense, the fact that research on emerging literatures initiated in the 1980s is highly significant, coming precisely at a time when emerging economies and emerging markets (see Maté de Castro) became popular terms to refer to the rise in stock markets in certain countries, mainly in the Third World, as opposed to the more traditional stock markets of New York, London, Frankfurt, and Tokyo. Worth noting is the fact that the map of emerging markets, recognized by the International Financial Corporation, a unit of the World Bank, resembles closely the map of literary emergence derived from theoretical comparative studies cited thus far. I now elaborate on my approach to emerging literatures through a critical dialogue with the proposals put forward by Godzich, Guillén, and Grassin, analyzing new cases of emergence, as yet unexamined, originating in such diverse fields as epistemology, philosophy, biology, and sociology. This interdisciplinary prism draws from many sources: the Cultural Semiotics of the Tartu-Moscow School, the polysystem theory of Itamar Even-Zohar and the Tel Aviv School, the interliterary theory of the school of Bratislava, the cultural materialism approach of Birmingham School, interwoven with, and integrated by those tenets for comparative literature put forward by Steven Tötösy de Zepetnek regarding the methodology and interdisciplinarity of (comparative) cultural studies, a framework in which he proposes to move away from the nation approach established in comparative literature and based in a contextual and evidence-based methodology as I demonstrate below. My proposed theory is developed through the following general and preliminary hypotheses that all natural language generates a category of discourse which is conventionally identifiable with the label "literature," setting aside the comparative points which this term requires and the proposition that no literature is self-sufficient. These two general and preliminary hypotheses create a holistic framework for the study of the process of literary emergence, a process conceived at the same time in heuristic terms. Such a framework is co-formed by diverse literatures in the closely-woven network of their interrelations, such that, in accordance with the second general hypothesis, each system imports and exports material from or to other systems, forms subsystems, and encourages new unions. One of the most urgent questions put forth by the study of this world literary mega-system is that of the concept of "literary change," a phenomenon which lends itself precisely to literary emergence since, with

regards to the provisional characterization of literary emergence I am using momentarily, it is obvious that the birth of a "new" literature implies a change, a reconfiguration of the interliterary network in the same way that a new text reconfigures the intertextual network. Traditionally, literary change is described by literary history in the context of a literature within the framework of a nation state. However, the option offered by a holistic framework implies not understanding literary change (and with it, literary emergence) literature by literature, but rather in the wider context of a world literary mega-system as each of these literatures is no more than a small portion of a larger picture.

Importantly, to date the only explanation in the context of a holistic conception of world literature as a mega-system made up of systems, subsystems, and the network of its interrelations is that provided by the theory of the interliterary process, elaborated fundamentally by Dionýz Durišin and other collaborators at the School of Bratislava. According to this theory, world literature constitutes the superior state of the interliterary process, to which two previous, less integrative levels are added: interliterary communities and national literatures. And this is the critical point: national literature understood as a minimal unit of world literature. This is evidenced repeatedly: in the "Preface" of the Princeton encyclopedia; in Guillén's proposal on the subject of emergence as an evolutionary phase of all national literature; and in Godzich's and Grassin's proposals in which ethnic, regional, or minority emergence is calculated according to their distance from the national referent. I propose that it would be necessary to reflect on this critical point to find an explanation for the emergence processes and the subsequent reconfigurations of interliterary networks they cause. The notion of national literature as a tiny unit of the interliterary process, and therefore, the only constituent subsystem of world literature (seen in the structural model of *Weltliteratur* as well as in the atomistic positivist paradigm), is empirically unacceptable. Together with the historicity of national literature as a construction, its unfeasibility is also seen in other circles, including but by no means limited to literatures which are not just international, but supranational; literatures themselves which project national unification; independent principalities and enclave states which do not claim to have a national literature; literature from partial nation states, whether it be because ethnic groups are dispersed in various states or because the nation is divided; or literatures from bi-national and multinational states. Now, even if it is impossible for national literatures to be considered as the minimum units comprising the network of the general system of world literature, it in no way means that they lack importance, and above all, function. One aspect of their importance derives from the fact that the new world system (see, e.g., Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System*) has converted the State into a general political form through the global extension of the interstate system ushered in with the Peace of Westfalia in 1648, thereby making it a primary cultural "container" extending worldwide. As regards the function of national literature, this should be gauged in relation to its systemic interrelations within the framework of world literature, which, in turn, leads us to determine once again what the systemic units of the world literary mega-system really are and what their relationship to national literatures represents. If, indeed, national literature is an invalid unit of measure, this is owing largely to its very restrictive character. This implies the existence of a more ample unit which I propose calling -- for lack of a better term, inasmuch as it would collide with Boris Eichenbaum's idea of *literaturnyi byt*, "literary life." The literary life of a community is more extensive, rich, and varied than the national literature of that very same community, which does not mean that they are completely independent categories. In fact, there is always an overlapping area and intersection between literary life and national literature -- the primary objectives of national literature being that the two merge. The differences between the domain of literary life and national literature arise in: a) the latter's exclusion of translated works, literary oral traditions, literary traditions classed as para-literary works, and the literary traditions of national margins; of "extraterritorial" authors (see Steiner), and of texts by certain authors owing to their specific linguistic choices and b) phenomena analyzed by Durišin, such as *bi-* or *polylittérarité*, the *binationalité asymétrique*, and/or the *complémentarité* of certain traditions.

If the above examples attest to the restrictions in which national literatures operate relative to their respective literary lives, it is necessary to reconsider the question regarding the

systemic function of national literatures, obviously implying that literary lives comprise authentic systemic units of world literature -- recognition of such systemic character being independent from the relative level of accumulated *capital symbolique* as Pierre Bourdieu puts it. Upon contemplating the same examples from a linguistic point of view, one will notice that the exclusions practiced by national literatures are functionally equivalent to those practiced by grammar textbooks with regard to natural languages. Like grammar textbooks, national literatures thus work as systemic self-referential descriptions, self-organizations which differentiate the systemic from the non-systemic, and are thus essentialist. Thus, the most idiosyncratic function of the national literature as a segregated subsystem of literary life is an additional reorganization, both synchronically and diachronically of its repertoire and products in a simplified way -- sometimes this reorganization being so rigid that it practically refrains from intersecting with the literary life it attempts to describe. However, if the notion of national literature as an exclusive and systemic unit of world literature is unacceptable empirically, the same affirmation should be made regarding national literature as the only self-descriptive subsystem of literary life. This appears to be case in two ways: first, it should be recognized that in certain phases in the history of a literary system, especially that phase which, for example Xoán González-Millán refers to as "literary nationalism," various national meta-descriptions can operate on a single literary life, i.e., different models projecting an ideal literary national state and second, national literatures are not the only systemic models capable of fulfilling the function of self-referential description, but rather another possibility among other self-organizations concerning institutional expressions of a social group which occupies a hegemonic position in the community in question. All in all, the pre-eminence of national literature as a self-descriptive subsystem of literary life is undeniable in accordance with the state model from the Peace of Westfalia (1648) and nineteenth-century nationalism as epitomized by the congress of Vienna (1814-1815) until its universalization during the decolonization processes after 1945 (the year the United Nations was established). When the complexity of literary life goes beyond a certain structural level, the self-description of the codifying secondary subsystem promotes a homogenization and simplification of the system, giving this a new homeostatic identity. It is precisely this state, updated by meta-descriptive subsystems -- national literatures being among them -- that constitutes one of the dynamic mechanisms of the system by creating, in Iuri Lotman's terms, "a basis for a new period of complications" ("Un modelo dinámico del sistema semiótico" 78). I should emphasize in this the exemplification of Ludwig von Bertalanffy in his 1968 *General Systems Theory* in which, through dialectics between the static and the dynamic changes to the system over time can reflect an initially unstable state with tendencies towards stability or it can reflect an outside stimulus requiring adaptation and response (Bertalanffy 166). It is here where I find a meeting point between the semiotic and systemic theories on the one hand, and cultural materialism on the other -- this convergence serving as an explanation for literary emergence. The restrictions and exclusions of the subsystems of secondary codification provide a catalyst for emerging responses.

In 1973, Raymond Williams published in the *New Left Review* an essay titled "Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory" in which he developed a critical revision of the model of the forces and relations of work (the base) as being determined by social conscience (the superstructure) and the class system. Williams concluded that this model of base and superstructure is more appropriate in explaining the succession of the great historic periods than in analyzing its internal dynamics. Recognizing a unique hegemonic method for each of these periods, along the lines of the Hegelian *Zeitgeist*, Williams affirms that "hegemony is not singular; indeed ... its own internal structures are highly complex, and have continually to be renewed, recreated and defended; and by the same token ... they can be continually challenged and in certain respects modified" (38). In this respect, he qualifies as "dominant" the central system of practices, meanings, and values of a society at a specific period of time. Different social institutions such as family, methods of labor organization, or educational models are responsible for the transmission of the dominant culture, a process in which the construction of a selective tradition is of the utmost importance. Of the myriad meanings and practices, past and present, only a portion of them is selected -- among these the processes of de-limitation and re-

interpretation. These processes attempt to avoid contradicting other elements of the dominant culture, while other meanings and practices are excluded and abandoned (Williams, "Base and Superstructure" 39). The similarities between this model of social dynamism and the semiotic and systemic model I referred to earlier, as well as their similarity to the literary dynamic, are of course evident (consider, for example, national literatures in terms of selective traditions). Williams's revision of the base-superstructure model of the Marxist vulgata reaches its most profound analysis in his emphasis on the cultural dynamic in which the dominant culture is involved, as it incorporates the practices, experiences, meanings and values which are not yet integrated, insofar as they can be sustained by its internal structures -- a strategy geared towards its self-reproduction. First and foremost, Williams differentiates between two categories according to their alternative or oppositional function. Alternative forms, typically associated with individuals or small groups, do not attempt to modify dominant forms while oppositional forms linked to political and revolutionary practices do have this objective ("Base and Superstructure" 41-42). Secondly, each form not integrated into the dominant culture can be residual or emerging. Residual forms, whether they be alternative or oppositional, have been "effectively formed in the past, but ... [are] still active in the cultural process" (Williams, *Marxism and Literature* 122). Emerging forms, also alternative or oppositional, encompass "new meanings and values, new practices, new relationships and kinds of relationship [which] are constantly being created" (*Marxism and Literature* 123). Thirdly, with reference to the distinction made previously in relation to the integrationalist dynamic of dominant and hegemonic cultural methods, Williams distinguishes between incorporated and non-incorporated residual and emerging formations.

I now proceed to refine the initial characterization of emerging literatures as nascent and breaking the surface. Apart from the simplifications, limitations, reinterpretations, and exclusions that the secondary subsystem of codification exerts over the wide range of products and repertoires of their respective literary lives, there are emerging literary trends, which either offer a new selective tradition parallel to the hegemonic (alternative literary emergence) or look for a total reconfiguration of the selective hegemonic tradition (oppositional literary emergence). I thus reformulate the traditional label "emerging literatures" to "literary emergence," as the former possesses clear essentialist and monologic connotations which clash with the reality of the literary dynamic. The fact is that not only the great literary periods, but also each moment in time describes a process of dynamic and contradictory relations in the dialectics of dominant, residual and emerging forms. If, as Williams affirms, sectors of emerging literature are uncommon, the emergence of an entire literary system is even more uncommon. However, before embarking upon an examination of certain theoretical problems that literary emergence implies, or perhaps stems from, one must question the results of the interplay of social change in its cultural context. Williams offers interesting insights into this question as he examines the central body of Marxist theory, according to which the formulation of a new social class and its acquiring of class conscience constitutes a source for the process of emergence. These considerations are of utmost interest, considering formalist theories about the evolution of literature and the role these assign to literature for the masses (including the proletariat) in the renovation of nuclear literary formations, and the resonances of the Goethean *Weltliteratur* in the *Communist Manifesto*.

Williams, although accepting the axial nature of a new class for cultural emergence, recognizes the need to identify other possibilities; dominant cultural forms do not succeed in controlling all the cultural forms of the community. But to where exactly do they correspond? In answering this, we must consider the distinction between state and civil society with their respective classes of hegemony, which merge with what Jürgen Habermas has designated public culture, defined as a type of mirage which floats over society in an attempt to be its national life, forcing certain interests to be silenced. Thus, we find ourselves faced with what Williams calls the selective tradition or with a secondary subsystem of codification in semiotic terms. Obviously, this public culture fails to represent the majority of society. Thus, public space is characterized by its fragmentation. Dominated by a hegemonic discourse which attempts to wear down its existence, counter spaces lurk in these public spaces, each representing its own flourishing essence. Only by way of an in-depth study of these unique and independent "counter spaces," will we be able to

understand more precisely their emerging cultural forms. To conclude, it seems fitting to analyze certain fundamental problems associated with the proposed theoretical model of literary emergence such as systemic configuration, literary evolution and change, and reception as a catalyst for emergence. This list is in no way exhaustive, it merely attempts to represent adequately the comparative implications of the phenomena examined. To start with the Polysystem Theory, this framework offers important hypotheses towards understanding the systemic configuration of emergent literature. According to this theory, systemic weakness, associated with phases of imbalance, turns out to be a defining characteristic of emergence. In this sense, emerging literatures would form part of the widest-ranging group of the so-called "dependent literatures" (see Even-Zohar, "Laws of Literary Interference" 55). Thus, the systemic weakness of an emerging literature resembles the systemic weakness of a dominant literature in a state of crisis. This similarity is not, however, the result of identical causes. Polysystem theory has identified systemic statism and its subsequent autarchy as the primary cause of an emerging literature's state of crisis. But we should pay attention to other causes in both cases. In this way, the crisis of a hegemonic literature can also be a consequence of the strong constrictions placed on literary life by the subsystem of secondary codification to the point of making this life an extreme idealization, whereas the state of crisis of an emerging literature responds to its habitual lack of institutional support, an aspect neglected by the Tel Aviv School, as Theo Hermans has suggested. Broadening the range of causes of systemic crises should not obscure, nevertheless, the interesting verification that this critical phase is shared by both dominant and emerging literatures. Their respective solutions are similar too, although in opposing directions: the central notion for both of them is interference. Thus, a dominant literary system in crisis can resolve its shortcomings by resorting either to residual or emerging peripheral intrasystemic strata (this is the formalistic principle of lateral evolution), or to other systems, whether they be dominant or emergent, in the same way that an emerging literary system can solve its shortcomings by pulling from either the dominant system's nuclear or residual strata, or by looking to other dominant or emerging systems. A good example of the former is the phenomenon known as asymmetric binationality, and of the latter, the fact that for most cases emerging novelty is a counterproduction of both the dominant discourse and the fact that emerging interliterary communities constitute themselves as an attempt to increase their literary capital compared to the dominant literature.

As Hermans has pointed out, the polysystemic model of binary opposites leads to structured relationships, such that literary systems are expressed in identical terms, a critique that Lotman ("Sobre el papel de los factores casuales en la historia de la cultura") had already made concerning Iuri Tinianov and Viktor Shklovski's model of literary evolution because of its dependence on a single process: the conversion of the extrasystemic into the systemic. It is here where Williams's distinction between alternative and oppositional emergence becomes especially useful. Alternative emergence should be understood in polysystemic terms as a subsystem that, rather than attempt to free itself from the system in which it is integrated, identifies, through the proposition of a parallel canon, those practices and meanings which to date have been excluded from it -- some of which eventually end up being incorporated into the hegemonic system. Oppositional emergence, in contrast, tries to break away from the hegemonic system and convert itself into a dominant system with its own independent canon, as exemplified by the counterperformance of its subsystems of secondary codification. All in all, the process of emergence should be contemplated from both an intra- and intersystemic standpoint. Finally, it is worth noting that the analysis of the systemic configuration of literary emergence should not neglect the fact that this is only one of the possible manifestations of the general emergence of social counterspace, as interartistic and interdiscursive factors also participate in this same systemic configuration. Thus, for example, studies on national appropriation of literary discourse show that literary discourse is precisely the first to be consolidated as social discourse in the collective imagination, while when the remaining ones, including other artistic discourses (visual arts, music), initiate their participation in the national matrix, literary discourse becomes less prominent (see González-Millán 68). In addition, the processes of alternative literary emergence,

whose results are often incorporated into the dominant cultural formation, demonstrate that the driving force of emergence is sometimes situated in the non-verbal artistic spheres, gradually extending out towards literary counterdiscourses (see Lotman, "Sobre la reducción" 237). Both cases can be explained by identical causes: the cultural dynamic is not monostructural but rather, as Lotman affirms, "the different branches of art take turns to drive the semiotic process" ("Sobre la dinámica de la cultura" 209) and the arts unfurl into a spectrum of nuclearization and peripherization with respect to the national matrix, in which literature is conceived as a the quintessence of particularism.

As I indicated previously, literary emergence clearly falls within the context of literary change, inasmuch as the surfacing of a "new" literature implies a reconfiguration of the interliterary network. Whereas the theoretical model proposed herein recognizes the complex participation of the various types of change -- transformation, discontinuities, and continuities (see Taylor 8-9) -- theoretical comparative studies conceive the process of emergence exclusively within the framework of a linear continuity according to the model of developmentalism. This takes for granted the existence of a linear sequence of phases through which all societies -- and their literatures I would add -- must pass. This is exemplified most clearly in Rostow's stages of economic growth (Taylor 6), which divides British economic history into five stages from traditional society to mass consumption. In keeping with Rostow's ladder, Third World countries, situated on the lower rungs of the scale, can travel the path of development until they reach the economic level of the most developed countries. This model of economic development is not at all unwarranted when comparing it to literary emergence, especially if we remember that its predominant geocultural genesis is, precisely, the Third World, according to traditional criticism. At this point we must examine two factors implied by the general model of developmentalism. Firstly, this model supposes another form of homogenizing essentialization which, with its opposition of hegemonic literatures to emerging literatures, leads to what Johannes Fabian has called the "denial of coevalness," i.e., the reinscription of the spatial difference in temporal distance. Hegel's *Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Geschichte* are the most systematic formulation of this denial of coevalness and its principles are based on the traditional model of *Weltliteratur*, understood as synecdoche of the major European literatures, the erasure of African and American literatures and the presence of Oriental literatures as absolute past. Secondly, and as a consequence of this denial of coevalness, situating literary emergence within a linear development policy implies presupposing a teleological orientation that leads to a single goal: the eschatology of emerged, canonical, and European literatures. Linear developmentalism, obviously feeding on Darwin's model of evolution, constituted one of the basic pillars of imperialist ideology, with its identification of European space as intrinsically progressive and non-European space as intrinsically primitive and, therefore, in need of modernization. We should wonder, however, if the explanation of literary emergence as literary change could not benefit from other evolutionary models whose strengths lie in accepting precisely that which Darwin's model rejects: the leap. By leap I mean a break within the process as result of the incorporation of an element outside the sequence in such a way that, between the time leading up to and after the break, one can see a qualitative difference. This could be an appropriate formula in explaining both the incorporation of an emerging or residual element to a hegemonic formation or of a hegemonic or residual element to an emerging formation as well as the substitution of a dominant formation with an emerging one. Such an alternative evolutionary model is found in the *Theory of Emergent Evolution*, first developed by Conwy Lloyd Morgan in *Emergent Evolution* (1923), to be reformulated later by various authors from the likes of Samuel Alexander and William M. Wheeler to Karl Popper and Mario Bunge (*La investigación científica; Emergence and Convergence*).

Morgan conceived three basic theses of the model of emergent evolution to explain the novelty of evolution: a) evolution is a process of change which produces qualitative novelties in all aspects of reality, b) qualitative novelty is the possession of a system of, at least, one emergent property not present in any of its parts, in which one can also find resultant features, that is, properties already present in the parts themselves or by summation or subtraction, and c) reality can be analyzed as a structure of unyielding levels, each one consisting of a system characterized

by a new emergent property (see Blitz 175-183). Here we must emphasize the "unpredictability" component of emergent evolution (the nucleus of Chaos Theory) as linked to novelty as a property not possessed by the assembled parts of the new system. In ontological terms, the relationship between the system's properties and those of its parts should not be confused with the epistemological principle of the knowledge possessed by human beings (Blitz 179-80). Emergence is a novel property, unpredictable, which causes a change along evolutionary lines. This change or leap, resulting in a qualitative difference, could be conceived of as the tampering by the logic of chance in the logic of causality, one of the most articulate explanations for which is found in Lotman's theory of "explosion." Gradual and explosive processes only exist because of their reciprocal relation, so that any synchronic slice in the cultural process would demonstrate that the explosions of some strata join the gradual development of others. Lotman describes explosion in the following terms: "The development curve jumps to a completely new, unpredictable, and more complex path. Any element of the system, or even an element of another system ... can become the dominant element, a fortuitous attraction to the explosion of the interweavings of the possibilities of future movement. In the next phase, however, this chance element creates a predictable chain of events" (*Cultura y explosión* 28-29). In this sense, the moment of emergence is explosive and yields unforeseeable consequences in terms of the novelty which will emanate from it, be it through an intrasystemic reorganization or intersystemic attraction, or through the mutual influence of both processes. The beginning and the end of the explosion, a problem which is apparently difficult to resolve, can be determined according to the systemic variables themselves. What the Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies calls "hegemony in crisis" is an apt moment for emergent irruption, while the appearance of a new subsystem of secondary codification, with its attempt to explain what has happened, indicates the inflection of emergence and the re-establishment of causality. To conclude, let us look at two other important questions to understand literary emergence. First, chance impacting causality has as one of its consequences the phenomenon called by G.D. Gacev "accelerated cultural development" ("Sobre la reducción" 235), especially when the emergence has an intersystemic dimension. The emergent literary sector, in keeping with Even-Zohar's law of proliferation ("Polysystem Theory" 26), increases its repertoire through the importation of extrasystemic materials, which causes literary rhythm to speed up, a phenomenon deserving analysis in relation to what Durišin (58) has called *polyfonctionnalité* to refer to that author who in his own literary system performs all of the evolutionary tasks performed by an entire group of authors in another system. Second, the novel component of emergence should not be accepted blindly. Thus, it is not wise to ignore the importance of "novelty" for the capitalist system which, as Wallerstein has analyzed, in its "endless accumulation of capital requires as one of its mechanisms a collective orientation towards consumption" (*Geopolitics and Geoculture* 165), pivoting around the new item, even when it works in a purely formal dimension. In other words, emergence can also be a commercial phenomenon (think of the so-called world fiction), which, from another perspective, leads us back to something Williams cautions: the difficulty in distinguishing between truly emerging novelty and novelty as a strategy of self-reproduction of hegemonic cultures.

Up to now, the explanation I present for literary emergence is focused on two aspects: emergence as a process (the poetics of emergence) and emergence as a phenomenon (the textuality of emergence). This does not mean, however, that I disregard a third and highly important aspect: the reception of emergence. In fact, the constant references to Williams's warnings, the insistence on the notion of "novelty," the effectiveness of counterdiscourse, and the possibility of confusion between the ontological and epistemological dimensions of emergence all point to the axial nature of the observer to the point that, one could say, emergence begins to cultivate the participation of the implicit reader excluded from hegemonic discourse. And I stress another aspect of reception, directly involved in the previously mentioned factors, namely reception as a driving force of emergence. To do so, I base my ideas on a theory of emergence developed in the field of cognitive psychology: gestalt theory, whose basic premise states that human beings perceive structured totalities and not aggregates of isolated sensations. This leads to the identical conclusion as that set forth by emergent evolution: the whole is more than the

sum of its parts. In this respect, context, or periphery proves to be fundamental when producing a specific configuration, such that the same object seems different in different contexts and, even within the same field of vision, is interpreted differently according to whether it forms part of the figure or the background. Consequently, the emergence of meaning (the whole) is the process by which heterogeneous elements are configured in a coherent structure, an indeterminate process which can yield conflicting values. The gestalt theory of emergence compels us to question once again the traditional essentialist and homogenizing approaches to emerging literatures and to develop a pragmatic phenomenology of literary emergence. In this respect, the notion of a phenomenology of intentionality, which has been applied to the field of realism and fiction by Villanueva in his *Teorías del realismo literario*, lends itself to our purposes, while maintaining his arguments, if we replace the term "fiction" with "emergence." The two possibilities that Villanueva proposes are understood in this context as a) cointentionality: author and reader share the designation of the emergent quality of a particular text and b) reader intentionality: the reader alone perceives this quality. In short, reception as the driving force of emergence assumes recognizing that its function consists in not only accepting the dominant ideology, but also in promoting acts of resistance. One need only consider Jonathan Culler's "hypothesis of reading" or examples of non-cooperative reading found in feminist criticism.

Given the thread of argumentation developed thus far from the holistic model of *Weltliteratur* and the heuristic conception of literary emergence, this paper cannot justifiably conclude with a mere synopsis of achieved objectives. The general hypotheses, based on analogy as proposed above allows us to sketch an initial, partial and gradual comparative image of the phenomenon of literary emergence. I complete, thus, the first phase of comparative non-deductive inference, which must then be followed by a second inductive phase, that is, experimental verification, in which one will find facts that either confirm or refute the theory. In both cases, new problems emerge -- to use the term in the most Popperian epistemological sense of the word -- provided that a comparative hypothesis is always found in a state of verification. In consequence, my next step is dedicated to presenting a comparative research program on literary emergence. The series proposed below is not in any way exhaustive; its function is to describe and to orient.

Emergence and counterlanguage. Clearly, a comparative study of literary emergence would be limited if it failed to contemplate the knowledge that sociolinguistics could offer it -- for instance, the function carried out by M.A.K. Halliday's so-called anti-languages in social counterspaces. The role that diastatic, diatopic, and diaphasic variations play in literary emergence should therefore be considered. It is worthwhile noting that theoretical comparative studies seem to conceive emergence under the notion of immediacy, and in keeping with the recent appearance of novelty. However, the analysis of anti-languages allows us to scrutinize their appearance in "latent traditions," their survival within the restrictive and constrictive forces of hegemony demanding a more covert unfolding. The study of counterlanguage must also consider critically phenomena which mainly concern postcolonial criticism, such as abrogation, appropriation and interlanguage, analyzed by Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin regarding literary *linguas francas* and Creole literary languages (see also Lang) or what Jean-Marc Moura calls *hétérolinguisme*, but we must question whether or not they are exclusive to postcolonial situations. We must therefore enlarge the range of phenomena, which appear to distribute along a spectrum between the end points of assimilation (hypercorrection, national recentering) and desassimilation (self-translation, diagraphic works, linguistic utopias). The interstitial notion of hybridity is implied, encompassing more than just linguistics in the strict sense and exhibiting movement directly towards genology. Finally, perhaps one of the most pressing aspects concerning the study of the link between counterlanguage and literary emergence is to provide an explanation for the apparent predominance of choosing the exophonic over the endophonic option, at least if we consider the cartographies of literary emergence currently available to us. Obviously, the explanation for this option lies in the counteroffensive and explosive nature of work within the dominant language itself, to the point that a work is often developed parasitically until it completely distorts the hegemonic hierarchical structure, something which should be kept in mind when dealing with what James C. Scott calls hidden registers, which in turn coalesce with Mikhail

Bakhtin's central ideas concerning carnivalesque heteroglossia. In this regard, Kafka's *Diaries*, for example, deserve special attention, as they reflect on the *kleine Literaturen* and address the institutional and commercial dimension of literary reality, which goes a long way towards explaining the exophonic option.

Emergence and *présentativité*. Durišin defines *présentativité* as the documentation of reality in all of its aspects by those literatures that have developed under the conditions of colonial domination (61). We are dealing with a genologic and thematologic aspect emphasized over and over by postcolonial criticism to the point of converting it into a prominent interpretative and, thus, essentialist key. One of its most commented-upon debates is between Fredric Jameson and Aijaz Ahmad concerning the national allegories of Third World literatures. The theoretical framework outlined above should favour a relocation of the analysis of *présentativité* within emergent counterresponses in contrast to the silencing and exclusion of practices, meanings, and values in the hegemonic cultural formation. *Présentativité* is one way among others (nativism, idylism, and exoticism serve a similar function; on this, see, e.g., Moura) of overcoming that silence, and in such a way that certain social groups find their representation in literature. Through this prism of reappropriation one should consider the pre-eminence of poetry in emerging processes (in which other factors would also intervene such as editorial institutionalization or the role of anthologies, scholarly journals, and literary magazines), autobiographical forms, paying special attention to testimony, nostalgia for lost paradises, appraisal of one's own semantic world, or resources such as compensation myths. However, one should avoid limiting the interpretative keys to just one. Like linguistic utopias, *présentativité* also can be mere fiction. In this respect, for example Israeli autumn poetry, studied by Ziva Ben-Porat, or monsoon poetry in Malaysia and Singapore, analyzed by Woon-Ping Chin Holaday, comprise an effective antidote. In both cases, their analysis should not focus entirely on intersystemic interference as the consequence of a repertoire's weakness. Instead, it would be useful to consider the formalistic law of defamiliarization or reflect on the so-called inability of an exophonic language in exploring another reality.

Emergence and historiology. I verified the intimate link between literary emergence, change, and evolution in the theoretical framework proposed above. Now the need presents itself to consider the historiological problem implicated by an emerging literature. This contrasts with the disregard with which Western literary historiography has treated the phenomenon of emergence, even for that phase which would be clearly emergent according to its narratological constructions, such as medieval literature, an authentic semiotic zero, as Lotman terms it ("Sobre la dinámica de la cultura" 194). Literary historiography's lack of attention towards emergence phenomena stems from its adherence to Darwin's model of linear development, centered in very monist literary eras. Under this approach only the rupture between one era and another is perceptible -- the latter simply replacing the former like in the great Marxist eras -- but not the rich internal dynamic where, as Guillén suggests, "the continuity of certain components, the disappearance of others, the awakening of forgotten possibilities, the swift irruption of some innovations or the retarded impact of others" take place ("Cambio literario y múltiples duraciones" 264-65). Thus, I propose to examine the processes of emergence in light of George Kubler's "intermittent durations," which embrace phenomena belonging to historico-cultural temporality, such as resurrections (Durišin's notion of incorporation would be fitting here) and strong accelerations (Durišin and Lotman's *développement accéléré*). At the same time, we must wonder how literary historiography could represent the various rhythms of a synchronic cross-section of the cultural dynamic, the alternation of the arts in the management of the semiotic process, or the Eurocentric challenge in measuring literary time, which stresses spatial and temporal difference in the Hegelian framework which lauds the realization of the absolute truth as unlimited self-determination. A significant historiological problem also arises from the selection not only of temporal models of emergence, but of plot models as well, among which one might foresee parallels. Quite striking here is Linda Hutcheon's discovery of a phenomenon by which plot tendencies of national literary histories, with their tension between political progress and aesthetic degeneration, have been adopted by minority groups to write the history of their emergent

expressions.

Emergence and (counter) spaces. The spatial dimension of emerging literatures has been a constant reference throughout this paper, which makes it thus a more than fitting subject to discuss here. At the beginning of my paper I examine diverse cartographies of literary emergence, which pinpoint this process in the Third World, or, to be more exact, within some areas -- those delimited by the economic terms emerging markets and emerging economies. A Rostowian literary scale and an essentially intersystemic model of emergence was derived from these positions: the emergence of a dependent excolonial system in a metropolitan hegemonic backdrop. Beyond this intersystemic bias, it should be noted at this time that these economic parallels are not those belonging to the periphery but rather those of the semiperiphery of Wallerstein's world-economy, that is to say, zones that dynamically meld processes of center and the periphery. The semiperiphery exploits the periphery and is simultaneously exploited by the center, to the point that the great reorganizations of world space happen when the center is in a phase of recession, although these are limited reorganizations since not all of the semiperiphery can abandon its condition. In light of this affirmation, we could state that this is precisely the model of world literary space. For example, is the Latin American boom not the result of the recession of European literature or *présentativité* as a manifestation of the exploitation of the periphery (the precolonial world, vernacular languages, autochthonous literary traditions) at the hands of the semiperiphery (the postcolonial world, exophonic languages, assimilated literary traditions)? To this I must add an issue which is implied in the theoretical model presented above along such Foucaultian lines as where there is power there is resistance, which leads us to extend considerably the coordinates of emergence and, especially, to question the essentialization of the submerged periphery, of the emerging semiperiphery, and of the emerged center, something already foreseen by political geography when it verifies that hegemony operates on a world as well as on a national or local level. It is therefore fitting to assess a world distribution of dominant and emerging cultural forms beginning with Durišin's interliterary communities and interliterary centricisms. In addition, area-specific current proliferation must be examined in greater depth. Consider John Friedmann's so-called world cities, which, with their accumulation of wealth and internal pluralism, are a privileged space for literary emergence.

In 1967 in Tunisia Michel Foucault wrote a brief essay titled "Des espaces autres," the publication of which he did not authorize until 1984. These other spaces are precisely the counterspaces generated by emerging discourses which have been addressed herein, thus making an analysis of their typology highly pertinent. For Foucault, those spaces that contradict other spaces can be classified into heterotopias and utopias. Heterotopias are counterspaces, real and effective places in which human behavior deviates from hegemonic spaces and in which, consequently, heterochronia is projected. These heterotopias include, for example, jails, psychiatric hospitals, and imperialistic colonies. In this sense, one could affirm that throughout my paper I contemplate the diverse manifestations of heterotopic literary emergence. Now, we should inquire as to the possibility of utopic literary emergence, as long as the utopias are counterspaces, analogical inversions, but without a real place in society. They are no less important for emergence, since utopias embody the possibility of a new social order, which replaces the previous hegemonic one (see Williams, "Social Darwinism") and supposes a driving force behind emerging forms. In this respect, an analysis of the utopic literary tradition reveals that of its two poles, the one which has prevailed is that represented, for example, by H.G. Wells's *The Time Machine* rather than Plato's *Republic* -- a good indicator of the unpredictability of literary emergence (what other literature could possess Wells's morlocks or Fritz Lang's workers?). One finds it difficult to imagine utopic literatures when one takes into account the innocence of literary utopias. If a concept demands the attention of such unrelated disciplines such as epistemology, philosophy, biology, psychology, economy, sociology, and comparative literature, to the point that it gives rise to a debate in which even those who doubt its heuristic usefulness take part, I believe it is safe to say that we are dealing with a phenomenon which goes beyond the limited spectrum of academic interests and constitutes an authentic scholarly as well as scientific problem. This is the case of emergence, which I hope to have demonstrated. Milan Kundera, in an essay aptly titled "The

Unloved Child of the Family," affirms that "the concept [of the small nation] is not quantitative; it describes a situation, a destiny: Small nations haven't the comfortable sense of being there always, past and future ... faced with the arrogant ignorance of the large nations, they see their existence perpetually threatened or called into question; for their very existence is a question" (190). The same affirmation could be made with respect to emerging literatures through a Kafkian reading, seeing the *kleine Literaturen* in their connective role(s). Thus, it makes sense to ask the following question: Is not this ontological insecurity of emerging literature a sign of Comparative Literature's epistemological insecurity, whose elusive object of study always waits to be discovered? Since this began with Auerbach, it is not surprising that it should end now with Ernst Robert Curtius, who affirmed that "interrogation is not the worst way of taking leave of a subject" (445).

Note: The above paper represents partial results from the research project *Historia comparada de las literaturas: aplicaciones al dominio ibérico*, funded by the Ministerio de Ciencia y Tecnología: HUM2004-00314 and Xunta de Galicia: PGIDIT05PXIC20405, Spain, and FEDER Funds, European Union.

Works Cited

- Ahmad, Aijaz. "A retórica da alteridade de Jameson e a 'alegoría nacional'." Trans. Clara Peñaranda Martínez and Manuel Outeiriño. 1986. *A Trabe de Ouro* 13 (1993): 31-51.
- Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-colonial Literatures*. London: Routledge, 1991.
- Auerbach, Erich. "Philology and Weltliteratur." 1952. Trans. Maire Said and Edward Said. *Centennial Review* 13 (1969): 1-17.
- Ben-Porat, Ziva. "Represented Reality and Literary Models: European Autumn on Israeli Soil." *Acculturation*. Ed. Eva Kushner and Milan V. Dimic. Bern: Peter Lang, 1994. 117-23.
- Bertalanffy, Ludwig von. *Teoría general de los sistemas. Fundamentos, desarrollo, aplicaciones*. 1968. Trans. Juan Almela. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1993.
- Blitz, David. *Emergent Evolution: Qualitative Novelty and the Levels of Reality*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1992.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Les Règles de l'art. Genèse et structure du champ littéraire*. Paris: Seuil, 1992.
- Bunge, Mario. *La investigación científica. Su estrategia y filosofía*. Trans. Manuel Sacristán. Ariel: Barcelona, 1976. 5th ed.
- Bunge, Mario. *Emergence and Convergence: Qualitative Novelty and the Unity of Knowledge*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2003.
- Curtius, Ernst Robert. "Remarks on the French Novel." 1950. *Essays on European Literature*. Trans. Michael Kowal. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1972. 437-45.
- Durišín, Dionýz. *Communautés interlittéraires spécifiques*. Trans. Alena Anettová. Bratislava: Institut de Littérature Mondiale, Academie Slovaque des Sciences, 1993.
- Equipo Glifo. *Diccionario de términos literarios*. Santiago de Compostela: Xunta de Galicia, Centro Ramón Piñeiro para a Investigación en Humanidades, 2003. e-h.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar. *Polysystem Studies*. Special Issue of *Poetics Today* 11.1 (1990): 9-26.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar. "Laws of Literary Interference." *Polysystem Studies*. Special Issue of *Poetics Today* 11.1 (1990): 53-72.
- Fabian, Johannes. *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object*. New York: Columbia UP, 1983.
- Foucault, Michel. "Espacios diferentes." *Obras esenciales*. 1967. Trans. Ángel Gabilondo. Barcelona: Paidós, 1999. 431-41.
- Friedmann, John. "The World City Hypothesis." *Development and Change* 17 (1986): 69-83.
- Galli Mastrodonato, Paola, ed. *Ai confini dell'impero. Le letterature emergenti*. Roma: Vecchiarelli, [1996].
- Godzich, Wlad. "Emergent Literature and the Field of Comparative Literature." *The Comparative Perspective on Literature: Approaches to Theory and Practice*. Ed. Clayton Koelb and Susan Noakes. New York: Cornell UP, 1988. 18-36.
- Godzich, Wlad. *Literaturas emergentes y Literatura Comparada*. 1988. Trans. Josep-Vicent Gavalda. Valencia: Episteme, 1997.
- González-Millán, Xoán. "Do nacionalismo literario a unha literatura nacional. Hipóteses de traballo para un estudio institucional da literatura galega." *Anuario de estudios literarios galegos* (1994): 67-81.

- Grassin, Jean-Marie. "Émergence." *Dictionnaire Internationale des Termes Littéraires / International Dictionary of Literary Terms* (2006): <<http://www.ditl.info/>>.
- Grassin, Jean-Marie. "Introduction: The Problematics of Emergence in Comparative Literary History." *Littératures émergentes / Emerging Literatures*. Ed. Jean-Marie Grassin. Bern: Peter Lang, 1996. 5-16.
- Grassin, Jean-Marie, ed. *Littératures émergentes / Emerging Literatures*. Bern: Peter Lang, 1996.
- Guillén, Claudio. "Cambio literario y múltiples duraciones." *Teorías de la historia literaria (Ensayos de Teoría)*. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1977. 249-81.
- Guillén, Claudio. "Emerging Literatures: Critical Questionings of a Historical Concept." *Emerging Literatures*. Ed. Reingard Nethersole. Bern: Peter Lang, 1990. 1-23.
- Guillén, Claudio. "Mundos en formación: los comienzos de las literaturas nacionales." *Múltiples moradas. Ensayo de Literatura Comparada*. By Claudio Barcelona: Tusquets, 1998. 299-335.
- Halliday, M.A.K. "Anti-Languages." *American Anthropologist* 78.3 (1976): 570-84.
- Hermans, Theo. *Translation in Systems: Descriptive and Systemic Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome, 1999.
- Holaday, Woon-Ping Chin. "Hybrid Blooms: The Emergent Poetry in English of Malaysia and Singapore." *The Comparative Perspective on Literature: Approaches to Theory and Practice*. Ed. Clayton Koelb and Susan Noakes. New York: Cornell UP, 1988. 130-46.
- Horne, D. *The Public Culture: An Argument with the Future*. London: Pluto, 1986.
- Hutcheon, Linda. "Rethinking the National Model." *Rethinking Literary History: A Dialogue on Theory*. Ed. Linda Hutcheon and Mario J. Valdés. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002. 3-49.
- Jameson, Fredric. "A literatura do Terceiro Mundo na era do capitalismo multinacional." 1986. Trans. María Otero Rodríguez. *A Trabe de Ouro* 13 (1993): 11-30.
- Kubler, George. *The Shape of Time: Remarks on the History of Things*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1962.
- Kundera, Milan. *Testaments Betrayed: An Essay in Nine Parts*. 1996. Trans. Linda Asher. New York: Perennial, 2001.
- Lang, George. *Entwisted Tongues: Comparative Creole Literature*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2000.
- Lotman, Iuri M. "Sobre el papel de los factores casuales en la historia de la cultura." *La semiosfera*. 1992. Trans. Desiderio Navarro. Madrid: Universidade de València, 1996. 237-48.
- Lotman, Iuri M. "Un modelo dinámico del sistema semiótico." *La semiosfera*. 1974. Trans. Desiderio Navarro. Madrid: Universidade de València, 1998. 63-80.
- Lotman, Iuri M. "Sobre la reducción y el desenvolvimiento de los sistemas sígnicos (sobre el problema "freudismo y culturología semiótica." *La semiosfera*. 1974. Trans. Desiderio Navarro. Madrid: Universidade de València, 1998. 231-38.
- Lotman, Iuri M. *Cultura y explosión. Lo previsible y lo imprevisible en los procesos de cambio social*. 1992. Trans. Delfina Muschietti. Barcelona: Gedisa, 1999.
- Lotman, Iuri M. "Sobre la dinámica de la cultura." *La semiosfera*. 1992. Trans. Desiderio Navarro. Madrid: Universidade de València, 2000. 194-213.
- Maté de Castro, Víctor. "Capitalismos emergentes." (2006): <<http://www.ucm.es/info/eurotheo/diccionarioC.htm>>.
- Moura, Jean-Marc. *Littératures francophones et théorie postcoloniale*. Paris: PU de France, 1999.
- Nethersole, Reingard, ed. *Emerging Literatures*. Bern: Peter Lang, 1990.
- Nogué Font, Joan, and Joan Vicente Rufí. *Geopolítica, identidad y globalización*. Barcelona: Ariel, 2001.
- Popper, Karl. "Scientific Reduction and the Essential Incompleteness of All Science." *The Open Universe: An Argument for Indeterminism*. Ed. W.W. Bartley. Totowa: Rowman & Littlefield, 1982. Vol. 3, 131-62.
- Preminger, Alexand, and T.V.F. Brogan, eds. *The New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1993.
- Scott, James C. *Domination and the Arts of Resistance. Hidden Transcripts*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1990.
- Steiner, George. "Extraterritorial." *Extraterritorial. Ensayos sobre literatura y la revolución lingüística*. 1969. Trans. Edgardo Russo. Madrid: Siruela, 2002. 17-24.
- Taylor, Peter J. *Political Geography: World Economy, Nation-state and Locality*. London: Longman, 1985.
- Tötösy de Zepetnek, Steven. *Comparative Literature: Theory, Method, Application*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1998.
- Villanueva, Darío. "Pluralismo crítico y recepción literaria." *Avances en Teoría de la Literatura....* Santiago de Compostela: U de Santiago de Compostela, 1994. 11-34.
- Villanueva, Darío. *Teorías del realismo literario*. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 2004. 2nd ed.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. *The Modern World-System*. New York: Academic P, 1974-1989. 3 vols.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. *Geopolitics and Geoculture: Essays on the Changing World-System*. 1991. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001.

Williams, Raymond. *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1977.

Williams, Raymond. "Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory." *Problems in Materialism and Culture*. By Raymond Williams. 1973. London: Verso, 1980. 31-49.

Williams, Raymond. "Social Darwinism." *Problems in Materialism and Culture*. By Raymond Williams. 1973. London: Verso, 1980. 86-102.

Author's profile: César Domínguez <<http://web.usc.es/~ltcesar>> teaches comparative literature at the University de Santiago de Compostela. His published work includes articles and books in the areas of comparative literature, literary theory, and medievalism. His most recent book is *El concepto de "materia" en la teoría literaria del Medievo* (2004). Among other projects, he is now working on a manual in comparative literature and a theoretical framework and methodology for comparative studies in medieval literatures. His interests are in the fields of theory of comparative literature, comparative history of literatures, comparative studies in medieval literatures, comparative rhetoric, and national cultural formations. E-mail: <ltcesar@usc.es>.

*Translator's profile: Carla Dechant teaches English at the Escuela Oficial de Idiomas in Santiago de Compostela and she is also a free-lance translator and proofreader of academic and scientific texts. E-mail: <iacarla@usc.es>

*Translator's profile: Mark D. Wiersma is pursuing a doctorate in literary theory and comparative literature at the University of Santiago de Compostela. In his studies, Wiersma focuses on narrative issues stemming from "metaconsciousness" prevalent in selected literary texts. E-mail: <illyrian.dream@gmail.com>