The Planetary Turn

Moraru, Christian, Elias, Amy J.

Published by Northwestern University Press

Moraru, Christian and Amy J. Elias.
The Planetary Turn: Relationality and Geoaesthetics in the Twenty-First Century.
Project MUSE. muse.jhu.edu/book/38757.

For additional information about this book
https://muse.jhu.edu/book/38757
Planetary Poetics

World Literature, Goethe, Novalis, and Yoko Tawada’s Translational Writing

JOHN D. PIZER

Because of its cosmopolitan and global orientation, as well as its focus on transnational interchange, Johann Wolfgang Goethe’s Weltliteratur (world literature) paradigm has been engaged in a variety of works in which scholars are in the process of developing an emerging planetarity paradigm. While Goethe saw Weltliteratur as a still-evolving phenomenon in his time, it has acquired a somewhat overdetermined character due to the disparate way critics have defined and appropriated it since 1836, when the term became widespread through the publication of the Gespräche mit Goethe (Conversations with Goethe), collected and edited by his former amanuensis Johann Peter Eckermann, where it was first enunciated in print. Goethe initially employed it in 1827, at a time when the fervent nationalism in Germany attendant to the successful conclusion of the Napoleonic Wars had been effectively suppressed through the edicts of the Congress of Vienna, executed with Machiavellian skill under the leadership and guidance of Austrian statesman Klemens Metternich. The almost coercively imposed cosmopolitanism that inspired Goethe’s coinage was already crumbling by 1836, leading literary historians subsequently to associate Weltliteratur with canonicity, the global marketing of literature, and closed circulation. The ongoing planetary turn, on the other hand, has more the resonance of a provisional, open-ended dialogue. While it must be stressed that precisely such free, unclosed, interactive exchange among the practitioners of culture across national boundaries informs all of Goethe’s elucidations of his paradigm, elucidations marked by a fragmentary and uncohesive character, many critics today, including those who are preoccupied with the planetarity phenomenon, have lost sight of this circumstance and associate Weltliteratur with a hoary traditionalism. Therefore, the juxtaposition of “world literature” and planetarity as quite disparate, if not antithetical, paradigms is unsurprising. Such a juxtaposition is evident, for instance, in Emily Apter’s essay “Untranslatables: A World System,” published in a 2008 special-topic issue of New Literary History devoted to “Literary History in the Global Age”: “‘World Literature,’” Apter
writes in “Untranslatables,” “is the blue-chip moniker, benefiting from its pedigreed association with Goethean Weltliteratur. World Literature evokes the great comparatist tradition of encyclopedic mastery and scholarly ecumenicalism. It is a kind of big tent model of literary comparatism that, in promoting an ethic of liberal inclusiveness or the formal structures of cultural similitude, often has the collateral effect of blunting political critique.” After summarizing other transnational literary models such as Pascale Casanova’s notion of a “world republic of letters” and certain recent Kantian cosmopolitan/cosmopolitical formulations, the critic remarks that “‘planetarity’ would purge ‘global’ of its capitalist sublime, greening its economy, and rendering it accountable to disempowered subjects.”¹ In contrasting world literature’s putative tendency toward neutralizing effective political discourse with planetarity’s positive ecological and socially inclusive trends, Apter does not imply that Goethe himself is to blame for creating an “association” with Weltliteratur that seems possessed of reactionary, or at least conservative, political and literary tendencies. However, given the circumstance that it may be difficult if not impossible to strip “world literature” of such linkages, a distinct but related conceptual constellation might be more fruitful in helping steer the course of the planetary turn.

The early German romantic author Friedrich Leopold Hardenberg, whose nom de plume was “Novalis,” never used the term “Weltliteratur” in his writing. However, in his 1979 article “Novalis und die Idee der Weltliteratur” (“Novalis and the Idea of World Literature”), Thomas Bleicher shows that in many ways Novalis’s writing anticipates Goethe’s notion. Only 28 when he died in 1801, Novalis did not experience the coerced Metternichian cosmopolitanism that led Goethe to postulate the concept of an evolving Weltliteratur. Romantic cosmopolitanism in Novalis’s day was grounded, at the political level, in the transnational hopes generated in the late eighteenth century by the Enlightenment and the French Revolution. Whereas Goethe’s musings on world literature have a scattered, unsystematic character simply because he only sought on random occasions to define and elucidate his paradigm, the radically unclosed, fragmentary structure of Novalis’s proto-Weltliteratur musings is consistent with his unmethodical methodology, partaking of a deliberate strategy evident in most writings associated with early German romanticism. Both Goethe and Novalis focused on the commerce-driven nature of an increasingly European-wide literary exchange.² However, typically for an early German romantic, Novalis’s ideas on such transnational literature were more open-ended, utopian, and approximative than is the case with Goethean Weltliteratur. While Goethe’s paradigm is grounded in the dialectic of the universal and the particular, planetarity in this digital age of solitary (albeit not necessarily isolated) men and women hunched in front of their computers but interconnected through the Internet is more informed by the dialectic of the individual and the collective. As the title to Barbara Senckel’s important 1983 study of Novalis’s “anthropology” indicates, his thought
shuttles between the poles of Individualität und Totalität—individuality and totality (though in some cases he does consider the local and the particular, as we will see)—and this circumstance may allow us to bring this early romantic into a more fruitful contiguity with the unfolding planetary turn than would the effort to elucidate a productive intersection between planetarity and Goethean Weltliteratur. Nevertheless, my drawing upon some theorists who are beginning to work toward the development of a planetary consciousness while excluding others is governed by my wish to highlight potentially useful zones of filiation between contemporary planetarity, on the one hand, and the cosmopolitan world literature ideas expressed by both Goethe and Novalis, on the other. Not recognizing this filiation, in my view, would risk the failure of twenty-first-century literary criticism to ground historically its attempt to bring about the planetary turn.

The following chapter has four intersecting areas of focus. The first will explore what Goethe intended by the term Weltliteratur, especially in the historical context of its genesis, and what role this paradigm, along with the broader concept of world literature, has been playing in the recent emergence of the “planet” as a cross-culturally oriented framework for comparatism. I will then look at Novalis’s proto-Weltliteratur literary fragments and examine how they are relevant to the nascent planetarity paradigm. Indeed, though they precede Goethe’s thoughts on Weltliteratur chronologically, they are in some ways more valuable to a truly planetary turn because they are less rooted in a specifically western European framework. Goethe, at times, consciously associates Weltliteratur with European literature, and he primarily elucidates his term as a means to create greater balance and cosmopolitan insight among literary circles of the western European nations. Novalis’s proto-world literary fragments, on the other hand, adopt a relational model that seeks an ideal romantic transcendence of cultural production grounded in discrete nation-states. In this regard, his enunciations take a more authentically transnational turn than do those of Goethe.

My examination of comments by Goethe and Novalis on the general principle of Weltliteratur will be followed by a brief comparison of their tripartite translation schemes, a key element in their respective ideas on world literature and of significance for the planetarity notion. Finally, I will explore a recent work by the Japanese-German author Yoko Tawada as exemplary of planetary consciousness, a consciousness, in her case, grounded in a reflective sensitivity to issues connected to translation in the broadest sense of that term. Tawada’s poetics are located in what Apter, in the title of her 2006 book, terms “the translation zone.” Tawada’s stories and poetry are hyper-conscious of the avenues through which transnational cultural exchange is mediated in and through language. As I will show, she consistently evokes a planetary hybridity rooted in a practice of border-crossing relationality more resonant with Novalis’s pre-nationalist cosmopolitanism than with Goethean Weltliteratur. Goethe’s paradigm was largely generated by a prophetically
accurate fear that the xenophobia triggered by the Napoleonic Wars fought after Novalis’s death might soon reemerge. Tawada’s writing is generally devoid of such fear. Given her uniquely acute attunement to how language mediates transnational encounters, Tawada is included in this essay not only because of her exemplary planetary poetic praxis, but also because her writing illustrates the major role translation plays, according to Goethe and Novalis, in planetary interlingualism.

Goethe’s Weltliteratur in a Planetary Context

The publication of Fritz Strich’s Goethe und die Weltliteratur (Goethe and World Literature) in 1946 was significant for two reasons. First of all, its appendix brought together the passages scattered throughout Goethe’s diaries, letters, and conversations in which Goethe, starting in 1827 and ending in 1831 (the year before his death), employed the term “Weltliteratur.” This gathering of all Goethe’s enunciations (albeit sometimes in abridged form) on Weltliteratur into one brief (397–400) contiguous compilation has enabled scholars to access these remarks without the effort of combing through editions of his collected works. Secondly, Strich’s own interpretation of Weltliteratur as an expansive cosmopolitan paradigm allowing one to regard the most noteworthy works of Europe, the Far East, and America as a broad literary network collocated through Goethe’s visionary gaze inaugurated the postwar tendency to link Weltliteratur to various forms of globalist discourse, a trend most strikingly manifest once the “age of globalization” began after the collapse of the Soviet Union and the concomitant end to the Cold War. To be sure, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels had forecast, in their 1848 Communist Manifesto, the birth of a “Weltliteratur” from all the various national literatures, going beyond Goethe in predicting their dissolution by bringing them into allusive contiguity with national industries, which they saw as disappearing through bourgeois world capitalism and—so they hoped and were calling for in the revolutionary year 1848—the unification of the proletariat on a global scale.3 However, such internationalism collapsed with the failure of the 1848 Revolution, ushering in the intense nationalism of the Western world, which lasted until the end of World War II. Thus, until the appearance of Strich’s book—and indeed in Strich’s own prewar engagement with Goethe’s paradigm—the cosmopolitan resonance of Weltliteratur was largely ignored by critics, who tended to focus on canonicity, transnational commerce, and reception as indicative of an author’s relative world literary status.4 The National Socialist “scholar” Kurt Hildebrandt went so far as to claim that, for Goethe, Weltliteratur was the product of Aryan populations who experienced the Renaissance, and that Goethe’s perception was racially oriented.5

Apter’s previously cited association of Weltliteratur with “blue-chip,” “pedigreed,” and thus canonic works is not simply justified by such developments
in the reception of Goethe’s paradigm, a phenomenon also evident in Strich’s monograph and which continues today, but in Goethe’s own treatment of the subject. In language that anticipates almost verbatim the claim of Marx and Engels in the *Communist Manifesto*, Goethe asserted that national literature signified little at the time and that the epoch of *Weltliteratur* was at hand. However, he also equated world literature with European literature, primarily because the infrastructure and communication advances enabling border-crossing literary discourse at that moment were restricted to western Europe. In addition, he prophesied what would become the literature market-driving dictates of popular tastes, a trend one would strive in vain to resist but which he believed to be only a temporary current (*Strömung*). He therefore urged the serious-minded to create their own modest “church,” presumably as a means to preserve the viability of elevated literature. He issued this recommendation in the course of his famous pronouncement that the world, in the current age, was nothing more than an expanded fatherland.

The interconnection between cosmopolitanism, on the one hand, and qualitatively superior literature/discourse/intellectuals, on the other, is also evident in a number of the fragments from Strich’s appendix. Strich himself strongly contributed to the association between *Weltliteratur* and canonicity in *Goethe und die Weltliteratur*. He argues that much work that has crossed national borders and was widely read and translated does not deserve the *Weltliteratur* appellation because such texts might be mere popular diversions (*Unterhaltungsliteratur*), sensationalism, or fads, and so are likely to disappear from the global literary catalogue as quickly as they rose to the top of international bestseller lists. With respect to Goethe’s contemporaries, Strich cites the example of August von Kotzebue, who, during the Age of Goethe, had the greatest international commercial success of all German-language authors but lacked the capacity to achieve enduring renown. According to Strich, the German term *Weltliteratur* signifies not only supranational (*übernationale*) but also supratemporal (*überzeitliche*) validity. However, establishing the linkage between *Weltliteratur* and canonicity was not Strich’s primary purport in his book; much previous scholarship had cemented this bond, which has endured—as the passage from Apter indicates—to this day. Rather, in the wake of the extreme, murderous xenophobia that gripped the Axis powers, especially Germany, during the Second World War, Strich, a Swiss-German scholar, wanted to hold up Goethe as an exemplar of genuine cosmopolitanism to the German-speaking nations. He also hoped to recuperate Germany’s deservedly damaged reputation with respect to transnational, globalist outreach, a reputation the German-speaking regions just as deservedly enjoyed during Goethe’s lifetime. The subsequent imbrications scholars (including Apter, with her allusion to *Weltliteratur*’s “ecumenicalism”) have highlighted in their work between cosmopolitanism and *Weltliteratur* show Strich was quite successful in this regard.
There is no question but that Goethean *Weltliteratur* is marked by a certain degree of elitism. Goethe stresses in one instance that it is cross-border, translinguistic collaboration among the most advanced intellectuals and scientists that is enhanced through world literary dialogue. In many cases, leading thinkers from one nation are in a better position to judge the merits of writers in another than critics who share the nationality of the authors under discussion. As an example, he argues that Thomas Carlyle’s biography of Friedrich Schiller exhibits greater perspicacity than might be found in the perspective of Schiller’s fellow Germans, and finds the opposite is true with respect to Shakespeare criticism. He also contended—and this is frequently overlooked by critics who believe Goethe first perceived world literary interchange as occurring at a wide-ranging international level—that the different lands had already been taking note of each other’s literary products for some time, and that *Weltliteratur* signified productive social interchange among a rather select group—“die lebendigen und strebenden Literatoren” (“the lively striving men of letters”)—as he told a group of scientists in 1828. Given planetary’s stress on outreach to “disempowered subjects,” Goethe’s underscoring of an elite few who participate in the world literary dialogue would seem to indicate that his *Weltliteratur* paradigm, in this respect, is less than ideal in helping guide the planetary turn. However, Goethe was not always consistent in this regard. In his last note on the concept, he remarks that the consequence of *Weltliteratur* for the diverse nations would be the ability to more quickly benefit reciprocally from each other’s advantages. Goethe’s concept is so deeply rooted in respect for alterity that Homi Bhabha was able to use it as a heuristic instrument in turning to the work and lives of the planet’s most dispossessed citizens. Alluding to *Weltliteratur*’s germination through the dislocations caused by the Napoleonic Wars, Bhabha comments “that transnational histories of migrants, the colonized, or political refugees—these border and frontier conditions—may be the terrains of world literature.” Rüdiger Görner, who stresses the open-ended nature of *Weltliteratur* as Goethe envisioned it, goes so far as to claim that “Goethe was indeed the first European writer who had recognized, in the aftermath of the French Revolution, that the sufferings of emigration would dominate civilization henceforth.” This is what makes Goethe a natural ally, despite his elitism, of those who, like Bhabha, see *Weltliteratur* as productive in elucidating and promoting the thought of the marginalized and disenfranchised.

Goethe’s oscillation between an emphasis on national literatures as enriched through cosmopolitan intercourse and the global (or at least European-wide) networks enabling this border-crossing dialogue has inspired Claudio Guillén’s assertion that Goethean *Weltliteratur* commences at the national level, “thus making possible a dialogue between the local and the universal, between the one and the many.” In her introduction to *Sense of Place and Sense of Planet* (2008), a work which anticipates and helps inaugurate the planetary turn, Ursula K. Heise challenges the very notion of the
local; a work such as Douglas Adams’s *The Hitchhiker’s Guide to the Galaxy* creates an interplanetary tableau in which Earth itself, the entire globe, is articulated as a quite discrete particular space *tout court*, so that Adams’s book “redefines the meaning of the word ‘local.’”¹⁸ Through discussions of globalization, contemporary advocates of cosmopolitanism begin to move away from national and even locally based modes of identity, in Heise’s view, thus hinting at the possibility of a truly planetary consciousness.¹⁹ Already in his seminal essay “Turn to the Planet: Literature, Diversity, and Totality” (2001), Masao Miyoshi points to “the spread of desocialized individualism,” a process that has come about through globalization, and bluntly speaks of the growing inefficacy of the local and national domains as sites of positive contestation in the public, cultural sphere.²⁰ He goes so far as to argue that there is no going back to the nation-state model and proclaims that “literature and literary studies now have one basis and goal: to nurture our common bonds to the planet—to replace the imaginaries of exclusionist familialism, communitarianism, nationhood, ethnic culture, regionalism, ‘globalization,’ or even humanism, with the ideal of planetarianism.”²¹ Whether such a radically planetary approach on the part of literary scholars is desirable or even viable may be subject to debate, but it does suggest that Goethean Weltliteratur, with its oscillation between the local and a grounding in discrete national literatures, on the one hand, and the transnational/universal, on the other, may not be useful as a heuristic tool in the service of “planetarianism,” even when it is adapted to Bhabha’s version of an anti-exclusionist approach to the cultures of marginalized groups.

The next major work to suggest a planetary approach to literary studies, and which has had a major influence on comparatism, is Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak’s 2003 volume *Death of a Discipline*. The discipline Spivak finds to be in the process of demise is Comparative Literature. She suggests that its impending doom is caused by a homogenizing globalization, which imposes a uniform “system of exchange” across the planet.²² She objects to the very term “globe,” a place, she claims, no one actually inhabits. The place we inhabit is the planet, albeit on loan, and planetary—as opposed to global—thought is Other-directed, grounded in alterity, and capable of reenchanting the terrestrial sphere—uniform and drab when conceptualized as “globe”—through its ability to reinvest it with the “unheimlich,” the sense of ineffable mystery that can make everyday life interesting. Antithetical to such planetary uncanniness, to Spivak’s mind, is world literature, which she associates with English-language hegemony on a global scale. She fears the universal spread of world literature anthologies, which, she predicts, will lead to such scenarios as the reading by Taiwanese students of Chinese-language classics like *The Dream of the Red Chamber* in English-language translation made available in extremely abridged form in textbooks or compendia published in the United States.²³ Spivak worries about the specter of “U.S.-style world literature becoming the staple of Comparative Literature in the global South”
because it would undermine the possibility that Comparative Literature on a planetary scale could be enriched by cultural and linguistic diversity. In her view, comparatism under the sign of planetarity is viable only when the discipline’s practitioners, including those in America, are conversant with the languages of the Southern hemisphere and possess a more than superficial acquaintance with that region’s cultures; she proposes that an attention to the latter’s nuances would be enhanced through an Area Studies-style immersion into their particularities. Thus, a world literature approach as defined by Spivak—monolingual, univocal, and culturally hegemonic—is completely opposite to Comparative Literature as a field of study undertaken with a planetary consciousness. Indeed, in her opinion, world literature is strongly contributing to the slow “death” of Comparative Literature as a discipline.

In my 2006 book The Idea of World Literature, I have submitted that “World Literature” as an introductory-level humanities course—a pedagogical domain primarily to be found, contrary to Spivak, in colleges and universities across the United States—must be conceptually disentangled from the Goethean Weltliteratur paradigm. Death of a Discipline is not exactly guilty of conflating “World Literature” with Weltliteratur, but Spivak does treat Goethe’s concept rather negatively in criticizing Franco Moretti’s widely cited 2000 essay “Conjectures on World Literature.” Partly inspired by Immanuel Wallerstein’s world-systems theory, Moretti argues for a “distant” reading that examines broad transnational trends in literature rather than engaging in a New Critical–style “close reading” attentive to often minute textual details and informed by philological rigor. Given Spivak’s desire that comparatism should inculcate an appreciation of the “Otherness” of texts, especially those of marginalized cultures in little-studied languages—a telos of planetarity quite distinct from that of Miyoshi—her dissatisfaction with Moretti’s approach is unsurprising, even though part of Moretti’s intention in practicing distant reading is to bring “cultures that belong to the periphery of the literary system” into critical consciousness through broad examinations of literary genres and styles. Moretti opens his essay by complaining that literary studies have not lived up to the promise held by Goethe’s approach and proposes that “we return to that old ambition of Weltliteratur: after all, the literature around us is now unmistakably a planetary system.” He realizes that this return cannot involve studying all literatures from all times, but rather must attempt to show how these literatures are “interrelated,” constituting “one world literary system.” In her critique of Moretti, Spivak recognizes as positive his attention to the periphery but maintains that “there is something disingenuous about using Goethe, Marx, and Weber as justification for choosing world systems theory to establish a law of evolution in literature,” because such an approach relies on the work of others from the periphery itself to fill in the necessary details. Though she does not use the term, Spivak virtually suggests that adherents to Moretti’s model would have to engage in a kind of scholarly outsourcing. Indeed, Moretti more or less
admits this; he realizes that simply more reading of texts written in a plethora of languages is not possible, so a reliance on the work of those who focus on something other than western European narratives (Moretti’s specialization) must be part of the equation.29

In her 2006 essay “Scales of Aggregation—Prenational, Subnational, Transnational,” Wai Chee Dimock suggests a form of planetarity that incorporates Weltliteratur in a manner that taps into the local/universal dialectic of Goethe’s paradigm. In so doing, she avoids both the homogenization Spivak associates with world literature and the perhaps literally all-too-farsighted scale proposed by Moretti in his world literary system conjectures, even though Dimock refers neither to Goethe nor to his concept in her essay. Bhabha, however, persuasively locates, via Mikhail Bakhtin, in the subnational and prenational elements of Goethe’s work, in its local and particular dimensions, the possibility of a transcendent historical synchronicity. Indeed, for Bhabha, Bakhtin’s reading of Goethe evokes the uncanny, that liminal sense of mystery Spivak would resurrect in her planetary approach to Comparative Literature.30 Whereas the subnational and prenational tendencies in Goethe’s oeuvre, which inspire transnational topographies in the thought of Bakhtin and Bhabha, were enabled by the circumstance that Goethe never lived in a genuine, politically integrated German nation (which did not undergo its first unification until 1871, almost forty years after Goethe’s death), Dimock grounds her triadic terms in the principle of an “unbundling and rebundling” of the humanities proposed by a variety of scholars, a paradigm shift that would occur with respect to both discipline and national tradition, that is to say, would presuppose, for example, the elimination of the exclusive (and exclusionary research) of American literature in departments of English and American Studies. Pre-, sub-, and transnational literary studies would examine marginalized cultures and endangered languages not affiliated with the nation-state, creating a “species-wide platform” linking the disciplines of anthropology, history, and literary studies in a manner suggestive of planetary comparatism, enriched, as proposed by Spivak, through an Area Studies–type of immersion into cultural and linguistic localities and particularities.31

In arguing for a transnational methodology mindful of localized details, Dimock’s approach is germane to the universal/particular dialectic inherent in Goethean Weltliteratur and at the same time anticipates a recent effort by Reinhard Meyer-Kalkus, who wants to take “world literature beyond Goethe,” as the title of his 2010 essay indicates. The maneuver is prompted by the recognition that contemporary writers are no longer bound by discrete ethnic/linguistic/national affiliations, as is evident in the large number of authors who were originally Iranians, Turks, or Arabs but now reside in Germany and write in German. Meyer-Kalkus also argues for the need to closely examine the prenational “preliminary stages” of the planet’s literatures.32 Thus, like Dimock, albeit in his case consciously drawing on Goethe’s paradigm,
John D. Pizer

he endorses a study of literature informed by pre-, sub-, and transnational constellations and concludes that transnationalism is a relatively recent phenomenon the tendencies of which scholars can only perceive when they “put their ear to this rail network of the new cultural mobility.”

His intervention presents a model of how, when oriented by planetary consciousness, literary studies may rely on Goethe’s Weltliteratur paradigm but move beyond it.

It is worth recalling that Goethe developed his thoughts on Weltliteratur at a time of almost literally coercive cosmopolitanism. He had been horrified at the extreme xenophobia that flared up when the tide turned against the French in the last years of the Napoleonic Wars. He was enough of a visionary to sense that extreme nationalism might overwhelm Europe in the near future, as it did beginning in 1848 and lasting until 1945. In the conversation with Eckermann on January 31, 1827, in which Goethe made his most often-cited pronouncement concerning the advent of Weltliteratur, he speaks of a “pedantic darkness” that will befall the Germans if they do not cast their gaze beyond the narrow circle of their own environs, a darkness he sensed in the last stages of the Napoleonic Wars. There is a note of urgency when he claims that all must do their part to accelerate (beschleunigen) the epoch of Weltliteratur. Subsequent to the collapse of the Soviet Union, the world also entered into an era of cosmopolitanism, coercive not through a network of agents such as those who served Metternich but through economic necessity; English became the world language of multinational capitalism on a universal scale, and national governments lost the ability effectively to regulate commercial activity. Cosmopolitanism continues to be thought of, at least among most intellectuals, rather favorably, as long as it is attuned to, and celebrates, cultural differences.

The negative term used to describe the cultural/economic coercion and homogenization of our time, the dark side of contemporary cosmopolitanism, is “globalization.” This is evident, for example, in Death of a Discipline, when Spivak refers to globalization as “the imposition of the same system of exchange everywhere.” She differentiates between the “globe” as uninhabited cyberspace and the “planet” as the locus of diversity and difference. This kind of contrast explains the move, exemplified by the essays in this volume, toward planetary thinking and away from globalism/globalization, toward a heterogeneous rather than uniform cosmopolitanism.

Novalis’s Proto-Planetary Idealism

These considerations precede a consideration of Novalis’s proto-Weltliteratur musings in order to highlight the radically different historical context in which he evolved them. Nationalism had not yet swept through Germany, and the French Revolution had not yet aroused deep antipathy toward France. Early German romantic cosmopolitanism was marked neither by a sense of
coercion nor by a sense of urgency, as it was in the later stages of Goethe’s life, when he made his observations on Weltliteratur. This lack of duress in Novalis’s proto-Weltliteratur formulations imbues them with a certain idealism, indeed utopianism, and this aspect renders them productive in the envisioning of a liberatory planetarity. Novalis’s proto-Weltliteratur fragments also lack the elitist dimension characteristic of certain elucidations by Goethe of his paradigm. In their preface to Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire, Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri define the multitude as “an open and expansive network in which all differences can be expressed freely and equally, a network that provides the means of encounter so that we can work and live in common.” Unlike the “people” or the “masses,” the “multitude” is a diverse, differentiated collection of individuals.38 While Novalis addressed his remarks to the educated, he seems to favor literary networks among writers, which, he thinks, would counteract the pablum marketed to the multitude of readers around the world (whom mass literature marketers themselves have tended to regard as a homogeneous collection of potential buyers). As noted previously, Goethe, by contrast, proposed the formation of a modest “church” that would stoically but quiescently constitute a counter trend to literary mass marketing. Where Goethean Weltliteratur, as Apter suggests, is the model for a globally based but somewhat rarified Comparative Literature, Novalis’s proposals speak to a more planetary stance. For, if planetarity is to encompass some form of “world art,” a truly cosmopolitan organization seeking to promote a planetary aesthetics through a creative commercial approach directed toward diverse networks of readers in resistance to the current worldwide marketing of literature geared to the lowest common denominator of manipulated mass cravings for mindless entertainment might be a desideratum, even though such a strategy might also be regarded by some as elitist.

The rather speculative, visionary character of Novalis’s thought is evident in his aphorisms on cosmopolitanism; he claims a truly complete human must live simultaneously in a variety of locations and in other humans, with a broad circle and multiple events constantly present to mind. In this way, presence of spirit (Gegenwart des Geistes) will turn the individual into a genuine cosmopolitan (Weltbürger) and make one thoughtfully active.39 A genius has the ability to act on the basis of both imagined and real objects and to engage with these objects. Without the capacity to act as a suprasensual being (ein übersinnliches Wesen) capable of being outside oneself and conscious while rising beyond the realm of the senses, one could not be a cosmopolitan, indeed, one could only be an animal.40 The European stands above the German, the German stands above the Saxon, and the Saxon above the citizen of the (Saxon) city of Leipzig. Above the European (and apparently above all) stands the cosmopolitan. This seems a relatively practical, politically rooted evaluative scale, but Novalis goes on to remark in this fragment that all the more limited, confined entities—the national, temporal, local, and
individual—can be universalized. The individual coloring of the universal is its “romanticizing” element: “Thus every national, and even the personal, God, is a romanticized universe.” Such dialectical interplay between the cosmopolitan and universal, on the one hand, and the local/national/individual, on the other, promotes a self/Other dialogue unbound by political and economic constraints. Grounded in his studies of early romantic philosopher Johann Gottlieb Fichte’s idealism, Novalis’s fragments concerning the relationship between the ego and the external world posit that personal consciousness itself creatively shapes what lies outside it; the human spiritual sanctum and the phenomenal universe external to it are so profoundly interconnected that, as the previous quote suggests, the national God and the personal God constitute a romanticized—that is to say, wholly integral—universe. Such early romantic thought is unencumbered by worries on how to cope with extreme national/political divisiveness. This virtually unmitigated relationality between the self and all that is external to it, such unimpeded interactivity on the part of the true cosmopolitan, may be attractive in formulating utopian ideals for a planetary paradigm, ideals resistant to the repressive elements of globalization. The danger, of course, is the potential for solipsistic egoism on the part of interlocutors who might see in Novalis’s Fichtean cosmopolitanism more the opportunity for a literal self-sufficiency than the ability to employ a romantically invested imaginary in seeking genuine dialogue and an understanding of what lies outside the personal sphere. It should also be added that Novalis had some reservations concerning the sweeping character of Fichtean consciousness and self-knowledge and recognized that what is found through reflection already appears to exist.

Central, in Novalis, to a cosmopolitan engagement with the world through the romantic imagination is poetry, and his projection of a “poeticizing of the world” is the fulcrum of his proto-Weltliteratur reflections. To this end, Novalis called for “the establishment of a literary-republican order, which is of a thoroughly mercantile-political character, an authentic cosmopolitan lodge.” Cosmopolitan societies and lodges constituted an essential aspect of intellectual life in eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Germany, as reflected in the popularity at that time of orders such as the Illuminati and the Freemasons. Goethe was deeply involved with such orders, albeit not always on a friendly footing when he felt they threatened the established political system. In commenting on this and other passages in which Novalis proposes to establish an “intellectual knightly order,” Bleicher speculates that the writer may have imagined that such an organization would use the knightly orders and Freemason lodges of the Middle Ages as a model; like most other early German romantics, Novalis was fascinated by this period, and one of his most widely read works, Die Christenheit oder Europa (Christendom or Europe, 1799), expresses a yearning for the kind of politically and religiously harmonious Europe that Novalis—a Protestant—believed was in existence prior to the Reformation. Bleicher compares Novalis’s pronouncements...
concerning a literary/republican/intellectual order to the kind of Weltliteratur-Bund (world literature federation) constituted by today’s global PEN Club. However, while PEN tends to work toward goals such as writers’ freedom from governmental oppression, and, concomitantly, resistance to all forms of censorship, Novalis’s emphasis on the mercantile character of the proposed fellowship points in the direction of promoting the sale and marketing of poetic literature on a worldwide scale. After all, Novalis proclaims elsewhere that the spirit of commerce (Handelsgeist) is the great spirit awakening countries, cities, and works of art; it is the spirit of culture and of the perfection (Vervollkommnung) of the human race. He distinguishes between the historical spirit of commerce, slavishly adherent to the needs of the moment, and the creative (schaffenden) spirit of commerce.

A central domain of Weltliteratur for Goethe, Novalis, and those who seek to interpret and develop this paradigm today is constituted by the theory and practice of translation. Indeed, in his well-received book What Is World Literature? (2003), which contains an illuminating overview of the genesis of Goethe’s Weltliteratur, David Damrosch argues that works can be categorized as belonging to the select genre named in his title only when they circulate widely throughout the planet—and are critically enhanced—by means of translation. Certainly, even if one agrees with Spivak and many others that reading in translation is detrimental to authentic comparatism, the planetary turn cannot do without it. The tripartite translation schemes proposed by both Goethe and Novalis can be helpful here. At the first level of Goethe’s model, the translator creates a prose version of the text, which faithfully transmits the content presented in the source language. The second-level rendering reflects the stylistic tendencies of the translator as grounded in his or her own language. At the third level, the translator foregoes precisely such tendencies, giving up an adherence to the grammatical and stylistic conventions of the target language and surrendering them to the rhythms and nuances of the source language. This method will lead to an initial sense of estrangement on the part of the reader but ultimately enhances the suppleness and structural range of the target language.

Such an approach is reminiscent of one of the qualities Novalis associates with romantic poetry, namely, the art of making the object (Gegenstand) of the literary work both alien (fremd) and familiar, as well as attractive. However, his classificatory scheme is somewhat distinct from that of Goethe. As Novalis claims, a translation is either grammatical, infused with the power to alter (verändernd), or mythic. Grammatical translations, not unlike those at Goethe’s first, prosaic level, require scholarly knowledge (Gelehrsamkeit) but are conventional and demand only discursive ability on the part of the translator. Like Goethe’s second-level translation, those renditions with the potential for changing the character of the source-language text are most frequently carried out by authors themselves: they must be undertaken by what Novalis calls the (source-language) poet, who allows the poem to speak according to
the idea (Idee) of both individuals, the original author and his or her translator. However, Novalis’s third category, the mythic translation, is quite unique. He contends that renderings of this kind do not completely convey the content of the actual work of art but only its ideal. As such, no fully realized model of this type of translation yet exists; only luminous traces (helle Spuren) of such efforts are available. Not just books, but everything can be translated in these three modes. In its hint at language’s lack of self-sufficiency, Novalis points forward to a similar notion in Walter Benjamin’s celebrated 1921 essay “Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers” (“The Task of the Translator”), with its notion of an originary, prelapsarian language only glimpsed in trace form through the palimpsest of the source language and the target languages into which it is translated. Novalis’s scheme also suggests a utopian relationality potentially valuable for planetary thought, but Goethe’s third-level translation concept, Other-directed and grounded in a realizable alterity, may constitute a more practical path toward a productive twenty-first-century geoaesthetics.

Neither Goethe nor Novalis eschews a national, indeed vaguely nationalist dimension with respect to the relationship between translation and world literature. Goethe believed that Germans would play a central role as interpreters (Dolmetscher) in the world literary marketplace. Indeed, whoever speaks German will find himself or herself in the market where all nations offer their wares, but it is also the case that every translator is a mediator in the literary intellectual trade. In a study of early German romanticism, Andreas Huyssen argues that the early German romantics saw Germans as master translators on a global scale. Therefore, the German nation is destined to lead Europe into a golden age. In discussing Novalis’s myth-centered translation postulate, Huyssen notes that at this level, the individuality of neither the original author nor of the translator is relevant. Mythic translation cannot be practically realized; rather, its articulation points in an eschatological manner toward a future in which all humanity will be poetic and is also a corollary to Novalis’s declaration that all poetry is translation. The mythic translator translates reality into myth, and mythic translation is a cipher for the aimed-for romanticizing of the world, through which harmony will reign, and peace, love, religion, and poetry will predominate. Novalis’s mythic translation is a constitutive element of what Huyssen refers to as an early Romantic “literary spiritual utopia of a German Weltliteratur.” However, in proposing a relational practice on a universal scale and not restricted to just rendering words and syntax from one national tongue into another, Novalis’s all-encompassing notion adds a unique dimension to planetary thinking.

Tawada’s Planetary Poetics

In her recent essay “Planetarity: Musing Modernist Studies” (2010), Susan Stanford Friedman explains that “planetarity as I use the term is an epistemology,
Planetary Poetics

not an ontology. On a human scale, the ‘worldness’ the term invokes—to echo Glissant—means a polylogue of languages, cultures, viewpoints, and standpoints on modernism/modernity. It requires attention to modes of local and translocal meaning-making and translation, to processes and practices of perception and expression on a global scale.” In her description of what she intends the term “planetarity” to signify, Friedman unintentionally summarizes the poetics of the contemporary German-Japanese language author Yoko Tawada. Unlike most other German-language writers for whom German is not the mother tongue, Tawada is a true authorial polyglot; she writes as much in her native Japanese as in German. The most consistent focus of her oeuvre is precisely the “local and translocal meaning-making and translation” highlighted by Friedman; Tawada constantly reflects on how meaning and modes of expression as well as signification vary according to their local and translocal contexts. She is “polylogue” in the sense that her attention is not solely focused on the interface between the languages, cultures, and topographies of Japan and Germany; her second language is Russian, and she has traveled and taught in the United States. The attention she pays in her writing to “processes and practices of perception and expression” has a truly “global” reach. She concentrates more on how perception and knowledge alter from one language and topography to another rather than attempting to articulate an ideal overarching realm of being transcending linguistic diversity, an ontology pursued by Novalis, Benjamin, and, albeit not in his translation theory, by Goethe. This concluding section will examine Tawada’s planetary poetics as exemplified by her 2007 collection of poetry and prose entitled Sprachpolizei und Spielpolyglotte (Speech Police and Polyglot Play).

Tawada is one among a large and increasing number of contemporary German writers who are foreign-born inhabitants of that country, non-native speakers, and not ethnically German. Other, more commercially successful writers who immigrated to Germany and first learned the language there include the Russian-born Wladimir Kaminer, Turkish-born Emine Sevgi Özdamar, and Syrian-born Rafik Schami. While they and many other immigrant German writers frequently thematize issues such as transnational understanding (or a lack thereof), cultural border-crossing, and interlingualism, none are as attuned as Tawada to the way language mediates relationality between and among diverse populations. This linguistic relationality is at the core of a planetary turn that would—or should—not simply assume that the global English spoken by the globe’s elites will be planetarity’s exclusive mode of communication.

In his study A Transnational Poetics—which, although it focuses on English-language literature across the globe, is sensitive to interlingual issues—Jahan Ramazani characterizes Melvin Tolson’s book of poems Harlem Gallery as informed by “polyglot hybridity and pan-cultural allusiveness.” More than other German authors of the present, Tawada’s work exhibits these traits
because of her hyperawareness of the linguistic, and often translational, dimension of inter-national human (mis)understanding. This makes her work especially exemplary for a planetary poetics that draws upon world literary thinking. There is a perpetual liminality shaping Tawada’s works. They are almost always situated at the intersections between and among cultures considered by most people to be discrete with respect to language and thought. Working against this assumption, Tawada demonstrates the inherent inter-relationality of such cultures, indeed their often-overlooked imbrication in the current age. In this way—and again, rather uniquely among German-language authors—she carries on the world literary dialogue envisioned by Goethe and Novalis, on a planetary scale but without any trace of the former’s elitism and of the latter’s romantic eschatology.

In the opening poem of Sprachpolizei und Spielpolyglotte, “Slavia in Berlin,” the entire planet is constellated through paronomasia, catachresis, and other forms of wordplay. The first line, “Ich nahm Abu Simbel von meinen Kamerun und ging/Los Angeles” (“I took Abu Simbel from my Cameroon and went/Los Angeles”), connects three distinct geographic entities through the short-circuiting misapplication of place names substituted for any other potential nouns that might create lucid syntax and signification.\textsuperscript{58} Marjorie Perloff describes the poem as a tableau “in which ordinary German street conversation is viewed from the angle of the foreign visitor, who processes simple directions and bits of information according to the place-names they contain,” where such terms as “Ägypten” (Egypt) and “Finnland” suggest, through homonymic relationality, German terms such as “gibt es” (there is, there are) and “finden” (to find).\textsuperscript{59} However, the sheer jumble of such proper place names brought into a striking and unexpected contiguity through wordplay also forces the reader to consider how meaning is constituted in and through signifiers for various localities. In their untraditional phonemic and syntactic imbrications, they make one reflect on how translocal signification is created when the words standing in for multiple geographic sites across the globe literally collide. In this case, “worldness” comes into consciousness through the concatenation of random cities, countries, and so on. The poem concludes with the line “Du gehst in den Taunus zurück/und ich fahre zu dem Bahnhof Nirgendzoo” (“You travel back to the Taunus and I travel to the train station Nowherezoo”), whereby the narrative “I,” Slavia, indicates that her auditor returns to the comfort of a real existing site, the Taunus region of the state of Hesse, perhaps the auditor’s home, while Slavia travels to the train station “Nowherezoo,” a pun on “nirgendwo.”\textsuperscript{60} This “nowhere” is also everywhere, as it is (also) a zoo with animals from throughout the globe. Thus, it is a cipher for the disoriented border-crossing traveler in a poem that evokes all corners of the planet in a jumble of paronomastic place-name signifiers; at the end of the poem as at its beginning, Slavia is—and is traveling—everywhere and nowhere, even when she seems to be in—and traveling from—Berlin.
In an interview conducted around the time Sprachpolizei und Spielpolyglotte was published, Tawada noted that the German verb for “translate,” übersetzen, also signifies the steering of a boat from one shore to the other. Perloff cites this passage in conjunction with another in which Tawada speaks of how, when an author whose native language is a “minor” tongue starts writing in a “major” language, the target language itself becomes transformed, and even the way the “magical” is sensually perceived may manifest itself in “the target language.” We have observed that, for Goethe, the stylistics, semantics, and even the sensual dimension of the target language can be enhanced at the third level of translation. In Das Märchen (Fairy-Tale, 1795), where a boatman shuttles passengers—and “translates” Goethe’s text—back and forth between prosaic and poetic/eschatological realms, Goethe also exploits the dual potential of übersetzen, which evokes the meaning noted by Tawada when the stress in pronunciation falls on the first syllable rather than the second. As Huyssen notes in describing Novalis’s early romantic world literature utopia, poeticizing the world is to be equated with the creation of the fairy-tale world; the world is “translated”—carried over—to the fairy-tale. Playing on the dual signification of “übersetzen,” Huyssen comments that, for Novalis, because poetry is translation (Übersetzung), it also brings about the conveyance (Über-setzung) of the human race into a golden age and thereby redeems it. Tawada does not engage in such fairy-tale eschatology; her planetary poetics locate and elucidate magic solely in the domains of words and syntax, but, as with Goethe and Novalis, this magic is instantiated when Übersetzung takes place in the most inclusive sense of both acts signified by this term. In the longest text of the Sprachpolizei und Spielpolyglotte collection, “U.S. + S.R. Eine Sauna in Fernosteuropa” (“U.S. + S.R. A Sauna in Far East Europe”), the narrator opens with the tableau of a boat traveling the short distance from a Japanese point of embarkation to the Russian territory of Sakhalin, an island wrested from Japan by the Soviet Union at the close of the Second World War. Tawada’s evocation of the ship as resonant with interlingual, intercultural dialogue almost magically makes the vessel itself, and not just the maritime territory it traverses, into a borderland where Russia and Japan, Russian and Japanese, are intertwined. Thus, the boat becomes a metonym for translocal space, indeed, for the intertextual, interlingual blendedness of the planet itself. It carries out the act of “Übersetzung” in both senses of the word, ferrying passengers from one nation (Japan) to another (Russia), but also translating back and forth between Russian and Japanese culture through the medium of a third language, German. In this way, the narrative becomes a sort of Benjaminian palimpsest, revealing cross-cultural truths through the collocation of all three national entities and tongues, along with allusions to English and Korean. The linguistic character of the journey is established at the outset, when after declaring that there is always something solemn and ceremonious (Feierliches) about disembarking from a ship and thus establishing the solemn significance of the
act of Übersetzung, she notes that she is balancing on the “tongue” that the ship has extended out to the mainland. As in English, the German term for “tongue”—Zunge—is a synonym for language. The narrator’s description of her balancing, rather precariously, on a “tongue” at the outset of this story-essay foregrounds the self-consciously multilingual milieu, labile with respect to univocal meaning, she will soon establish not only on the boat but in her wanderings on Sakhalin itself.

Tawada frequently interrupts the present-time narrative to reminisce about Sakhalin’s earlier history and linguistic ambience. The narrator remarks that the southern half of the island, under Japanese rule from the end of the Russo-Japanese War until the end of World War II, bore the name “Karafuto.” Kara means “emptiness” and futo is the Japanese term for “sudden.” Thus, in the narrator’s private etymology, “Karafuto” signifies “a sudden emptiness.” She realizes that this etymology cannot be accurate, but, at the outset of the next segment, finds herself standing “on the empty place or square” (Platz) in Karafuto. There is a rather sudden shift here from the narrator’s pondering the significance and etymology of Karafuto to the mise-en-scène of her actually standing on its empty square. As is the case throughout this story-essay, there is no discursive transition between narrative segments; they are only indicated through double-spacing. Similar to Novalis’s proto-Weltliteratur-oriented postulations, translation occurs on two levels here: Übersetzung takes place in both nuances of the term. Verbally, Tawada renders Karafuto, through an admittedly creative etymological act, into the German for “a sudden emptiness”—eine plötzliche Leere. The reader is thereupon instantly—without any narrative transition—transported to the empty square in Karafuto, where the narrator abruptly stands. Again, this double move lacks any sense of Novalis’s eschatological metaphysics. Instead, to once more cite Friedman’s definition of planetarity, Tawada puts into play an etymologically grounded epistemology by paying “attention to modes of local and translocal meaning-making.” “Sudden emptiness” constitutes Tawada’s self-consciously creative, translocal act of meaning-making, while her constant focus on the labile modes of signification on Sakhalin—alternating between Russian and Japanese and transmitted in German—inspires the reader to reflect on “processes and practices of perception and expression on a global scale.” The etymologically faithful but awkward rendering of “Karafuto” not only constitutes an example of what Perloff refers to as “the stubborn literalism of Tawada’s logic,” but also allows the author, through subtle paronomasia, to “translate”—über-setzen—her readers from a linguistically to a topographically oriented narrative segment with the barest hint of a bridge, a bridge as Zunge, as tongue, a “mother” (Japanese) and German tongue with a Russian ambience.

Christian Moraru has recently argued that translation, in order to have validity in the current age, must become more reflective and self-referential. Translation is as much about the translator and the text he or she creates in the target language as it is about the work and author of the source language.
Citing contemporary theorists of translation such as Lawrence Venuti (whose thinking was strongly influenced by Goethe’s third-level translation axiom), Moraru asserts that if “relational semantics and the contingent critique it capacitates” are self-reflective enough, its practitioners “look ‘laterally,’ around the translator’s world and into him- or herself.” Tawada’s planetary poetics render transparent the process of self-reflection and self-referentiality Moraru finds to be desiderata for translation and translation theory in the present age. Her work thus becomes exemplary for the double act/double significance of übersetzen as suggested by Goethe and Novalis in their respective world literary and proto-world literary models. Tawada both self-consciously foregrounds the act of translating words and sentences from one tongue to another and transports the reader from one shore to more distant shores, from the globe of the creating but solitary ego to the planet relationally inhabited, as Spivak indicates, by the self and the Other.
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