

**Marchelo Potocco**

*Italy, Trieste*

*Department of Slovene studies*

## **The Way of Neo-intimism, and the Role of the Poet in the Post-independence Slovenia**

Slovenian writers had taken an active part in the effort to gain independence of the new state of Slovenia. Although some of the authors also took part in the political sphere, in the years following 1991 the symbolic capital of writers and of the cultural sphere drastically diminished. In poetry the process was accompanied by the rise of the so-called neo-intimism which programmatically opposed especially the political engagement of writers. Such opposition is most visible in the poetry of Uroš Zupan. The reaction of neo-intimist poets to the politicization of the literary sphere is comparable to the prevalence of the so-called Slovenian intimist poetry in the 1950s which also focused on the individual's feelings and private experience. Both groups actively opposed the orthodox position of the then socially engaged literature and/or writers. Yet, during the period of neo-intimism writers showed almost no opposition to their own marginalization, and by consenting to the systemic quantification of their work, they accepted the (neo)liberal imperative of growth.

**Key words:** contemporary Slovenian literature, neo-intimism, intimism, literature and politics, Yugoslavia, neoliberalism.

### **Introduction**

The year 1991 marks the proclamation of the Slovenian independence but also the appearance of the poetry book *Sutre* (Sutras) by the then young poet Uroš Zupan (b. 1963). Seemingly these two events bear no connection, despite the fact that in the critical reception and in much of literary history, Zupan's *Sutre* were understood as a major shift against

the then dominant literary paradigm. Probably due to the apolitical nature of Zupan's poetics, Slovenian literary history has not attempted to connect his poetry to the political events of the time. It is also true that the investigation of the novelistic production before and after independence has denied any traceable changes in the traditional pattern of the Slovenian novel due to the new political reality (Troha 2001).

So how can we explain Zupan's shift of the literary paradigm? To start with, the very term »shift« has to be taken with caution. We shall see that his book *Sutre* can also be defined as a return to some of the older paradigms. Precisely this »return«, which was adopted also by his contemporaries, in particular by Peter Semolič (b. 1961), and some of the poets of the younger generations, indicates that in a very peculiar way Zupan's poetics did not appear without any connections to the political sphere.

### **The context of Yugoslavia**

Beside economic factors, the growth of nationalisms in the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was a major factor in the breach of the state (Lorenčič 2010:267–270; Borak 2010:29). The situation during the 1980s was a complex one since there existed a strong tendency towards centralization of Yugoslavia along with growing nationalisms in the individual republics. The contradicting tendencies had roots in the constitutional changes adopted in 1974 under the influence of Edvard Kardelj (1910–1979), which on the one hand reinforced the autonomy of individual republics and on the other centralization in the form of absolute rule of the central Communist Party (Vodopivec 2010:19–22).

Often, an inclination towards centralization concealed latent nationalism. One of such actions was the educational reform proposed in 1983 by the Conference for Advancement of Education in the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, which was discussed by the School boards of each Yugoslav republic. The document suggested a uniform curriculum for all of the Yugoslav elementary schools and in part for secondary schools. According to Božo Repe, the proposal served several purposes, one of them being the desire of the Yugoslav political leadership (particularly

the Serb one) to reinforce the Yugoslav idea (Repe 2006:61–63). Although hidden, the proposal reflected the wish to establish a clear hierarchy of the nations constituting Yugoslavia. To begin with, the proposal wanted to abolish the autonomous national school policy in the individual republics which would have severely weakened the role of the Slovenian school system as the core of national identification.<sup>1</sup> But the idea went further – according to the proposal, the curricula should provide as much space for each Yugoslav nation as the percentage of it in the entire Yugoslav population (Cvirn et al. 2008:376–379). This was especially problematic in courses of language and literary history as it would have drastically diminished the share of Slovenian authors in the school curricula. Therefore it came as no surprise that it provoked strong protests especially among writers. Ciril Zlobec (1925–2018), who was the first to notice the proposal of the reform, reacted in the journal *Sodobnost* (Zlobec 1983) with a polemical essay followed by the excerpt of the proposed curricula. Tone Pavček (1928–2011) and Janez Menart (1929–2004) adopted Zlobec’s concern in a debate which concluded first with the rebuttal of the proposal by both the Slovenian Writers’ Association and the Slovenian Academy of Arts and Sciences, and later also with the rejection of the proposal by the Slovenian political authorities (Repe 2006:62–66).

The second cornerstone which is usually discussed in relation to Yugoslav nationalisms is the unofficial Memorandum of the Serbian Academy of Arts and Sciences issued in 1986. As can be seen from the first official publication of the Memorandum a decade later (Mihailović, Krestić, and Pantić 1995), the Memorandum created a narrative of the exploited Serbian nation in the context of Yugoslavia, along with the call for the change of this situation either within or outside the Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia (see also Gödl 2007). The memorandum provoked protests in Yugoslavia but Dejan Jović maintains that it was prepared as a reaction to the meeting between Serbian and Slovenian dissidents, the latter being gathered around the journal *Nova Revija* (1980–2010). According to Dobrica Ćosić, the Serbian writers realized that Slovenians had had their national program almost ready (Jović 2009:248).

Truly, along with Zlobec and Pavček, the main locus of Slovenian efforts aimed against Yugoslav centralism was *Nova Revija*. In February 1987, half a year after the publication of the Serbian Memorandum, a spe-

cial issue of the journal emerged with the significant title »Contributions to the Slovenian National Programme«. Jović and Ćosić were right in stating that the Memorandum might have been a reaction to Slovenian dissidents, as the decision to publish the special issue – regularly this was the 57<sup>th</sup> issue – was taken as early as 1985, and it should actually be publicized a year earlier (Friš and Šela 2017:830). Apart from being a symbolic shift, the 57<sup>th</sup> issue of *Nova Revija* helped to establish an intellectual but also a political background for the process of Slovenian national self-determination. The editors and collaborators of the journal were closely connected to the Slovenian Writers' Association. Rudi Šeligo (1935–2004), one of the authors of the 57<sup>th</sup> issue, was at the time the president of the Writers' Association. A year later, in April 1988, the Writers' Association under his presidency organized a public discussion on proposed changes in the Yugoslav Constitution which again strove to enhance the centralization of the state. Instead of the discussion on the Yugoslav Constitution, the Writers' Association proposed two documents with the material for the new Slovenian Constitution. These documents, known as the Writers' Constitution, were one of the bases for the Slovenian Constitution which was adopted in 1990 and which provided the juridical basis for the proclamation of independence of the Republic of Slovenia.

### **Independent Slovenia and »Neointimism«**

In the years following 1991, many authors of *Nova revija* and members of the Writers' Association actively participated in the political sphere, e.g. in Slovenian presidency (Ciril Zlobec), Ministry of Culture (Rudi Šeligo), Foreign Ministry (Dimitrij Rupel) and the Slovenian parliament. Some of them – although not being active as politicians – publicly supported political parties (Dane Zajc, Niko Grafenauer).<sup>2</sup> Nonetheless, the importance of literature and of the cultural sphere in general drastically diminished in the decades following 1991, particularly after the turn of the millenium. I would like to argue that the process of pushing literature and culture into the marginal positions in society is not noticeable only in the public reception of the works of art. The process

was accompanied by at least two specific, intrinsic mechanisms. One was that Zajc and Grafenauer's generation of writers remained wrapped in the self-perception of the national importance of both writers and literature in general, whereas society – once the goal of the independent state was reached – lost contact with the mobilizing impulse of literature. As we shall see, Uroš Zupan's poetry detected this problem. Yet I would like to go more into depth in showing the other intrinsic mechanism, which is closely connected to Zupan's poetry.

Beside the poetry of his contemporary Peter Semolič, Zupan's first book *Sutre* (1991) is often described as the turning point initiating the poetics of neo-intimism which became one of the dominant paradigms in the Slovenian literary system at the turn of the millenium.<sup>3</sup> In *Sutre* as well as neo-intimism we can find a programmatic shift towards the poetics of the American poetry of the 1950s and the 1960s, especially confessionalism.<sup>4</sup> The reference to Allen Ginsberg's sutras is clear in the title of Zupan's collection, but in the book we find various other references both to Ginsberg and to American poetry. Ginsberg, Frank O'Hara and William Carlos Williams have all influenced his poetry (Kos 2001:390). Consequently, the wave of neo-intimism is characterized by a longer, free verse, a strong narrative impulse combined with a less frequent use of metaphor, and especially by confessionalist poetry, i.e. a strong focus on the experience and/or the emotional state of the empirical author. These features are used in diverse quantities and in diverse combinations throughout neo-intimism whose main exponents beside Zupan and Semolič are also the younger Jure Jakob (b. 1977), partially Primož Čučnik (b. 1971), Veronika Dintinjana (b. 1977) and several others.

Especially in the distrust of metaphor and in confessionalism, one can see a breach with modernist poetics, a feature shared with American poetry, and in many ways neo-intimism programmatically opposed both modernist poetry and the social engagement of authors and literature itself. While Zupan's poetry, just as Čučnik's, does not make a total break with modernist poetics, especially since both still use complex metaphor, the two targets of Zupan's mainly ironic poems during the years 2004–2014 are precisely modernism and the engagement of poets and philosophers gathering in the circle of the *Nova Revija* journal. The entanglement of both comes as no surprise, as *Nova Revija* was at the time

the centre of modernist poetry, especially that of the second generation. In the poetry collections *Lokomotive* (Locomotives, 2004) and *Jesensko listje* (Autumn Leaves, 2006), Zupan constantly ironically attacks the poets and sometimes also the philosophers of Nova revija: Niko Grafenauer and Tine Hribar (b. 1941) with their Heideggerianism, Dane Zajc, Boris A. Novak (b. 1951) with his excursions into Academy, and along with them, the professor of comparative literature Janko Kos (b. 1931) who was the creator of the Slovenian modernist canon and after 1991 also the supporter of the Nova Revija circle. One of the clearest ironic rebuttals in Zupan's poetry occurs in the poem *Zagreb* in the collection *Nafta* (Oil, 2002), with the exclamation: »fuck you with your raising of the consecrated bread to the holy grid of language« (Zupan 2002:39). The exclamation refers to claims that the national language is indistinguishable from Slovenian identity. But it also refers to a specific practice of the Nova Revija circle to which Zupan in his personal commentaries often referred to as the »the national holy mass«. In the years following the establishment of Slovenian independence, Nova Revija every year organized poetry readings on Statehood Day (25<sup>th</sup> June) in the garden of the parish church of the capital's district Trnovo. The symbolic meaning of these gatherings was double. One was obvious – the creation of a national state had been a long-awaited national dream and Slovenian writers contributed their share along with the politicians, which was acknowledged with the presence of some prominent right-wing politicians at these gatherings. The other meaning is in close connection to the most celebrated Slovenian national poet. The parish church of Trnovo is known as the place where France Prešeren (1800–1849) met his muse Julija Primic. As this love, which was constructed on the model of Petrarch's love for Laura and Dante's for Beatrice, was an inspiration for some of his most nationally engaged poems (see e.g. Kos 2001:89–92),<sup>5</sup> such as *The Wreath of Sonnets* (1834), the parish of Trnovo can be understood as the beginning of the narrative in which Slovenian poets and Slovenian culture were fundamental in establishing an independent state.

Zupan's irony shows disagreement with such a narrative, moreover it shows the consciousness that the narratives in the society have changed: they are no longer laden with the problem of national self-realization nor

---

\* Uroš Zupan, several times in personal conversation.

do they acknowledge literature as an eminent sphere in the life of society. Yet Zupan's poetry – although correctly detecting the problem – cannot propose the remedy. Zupan reverts to confessionalism which is not only the feature of the American poetry of the 1950s and 1960s, but as Zupan himself hints, is also the feature of older poets such as William Carlos Williams, and can be traced as far back as Romanticism. In Zupan's poetry, this is emphasized by the use of language. I have argued elsewhere that Zupan's exposed use of colloquialisms and the lowest register of language, along with the grotesque, is in the function of raising the status of the lyrical narrator and consequently the author to the level of a subject-genius, who is able to make poetry using even the lowest, banal material, both in language and the narrated experience (Potocco 2009:247). This was, of course, one of the basic premises of the romantic paradigm(s). In this way, Zupan substitutes the idea of the national importance of the poet with the importance of the poet as a genius.

The other exponents of neo-intimism do not explicitly expose the theme of the status of poetry in society. However, the shift from modernist play with language to a mainly narrative language – a partial exception in this pattern is Čučnik<sup>6</sup> – and the shift to the experience predominantly connected to the empirical self, are indicative. The consciousness and to some extent the persistence of the position that the author should not be political, the determination that the author should concentrate on literature without attempting to reflect the role of literature in society, was evident, for example, in the public discussion on poetry and the political at the Slovenian literary festival Pranger in 2005. In the journalist reports of this debate, Peter Semolič was described as the one deliberately maintaining the position of »someone who does not want to know what his position in the society and in the political sphere might be« (Vidali 2005). In the debate, Čučnik declared that »in the near past many Slovenian authors were politically active, but there hadn't been any real political poetry« (Krečič 2005). Čučnik's explication advocated the possibility of political poetry, but at the same time it was a refusal, similar to Zupan's, of the politically privileged poetry and privileging poetry as »national substance«.

## Neo-intimism and ... intimism

The reaction of neo-intimist poets is comparable to the shift in Slovenian poetry during the years 1949–1958 when a poetic was introduced which focused on private experience and the emotional impulse of the empirical author. Labeling them »intimists«, Slovenian literary history includes under this term authors such as Ada Škerl (1924–2009), Zlobec, Pavček, Menart, Kajetan Kovič (1931–2014) and Ivan Minatti (1924–2012). While these intimists were a reference point for naming neo-intimism at the turn of the millenium, the latter has not shown any intertextual reference to intimism of the 1950s, thus literary history has not striven to explore the possible connections between the two. But similarities between the two groups exist and they seem to shed additional light on the position of neo-intimism in regard to the relation of poetry to political and/or social action.

Despite the lack of intertextual connection between the authors of both groups, they both undeniably show a common source in the romantic paradigm. In this respect, Uroš Zupan is, again, a paradigmatic author; according to Matevž Kos, Zupan's poetry seeks models in the poetics of authors following the tradition of Walt Whitman – i.e. the Black Mountain Poets<sup>7</sup> – and the interconnecting Beat poets (Kos 1996:67). The most important common point between Zupan and Whitman lies in the subjectivity underlying the first-person lyrical narrator, a subjectivity which, though still based in traditional metaphysics, functions also as a rejection of metaphysics, especially since it is rooted in the narrator's primordial spontaneity (Kos 1996:67). Janko Kos strives for an even more detailed periodization of Zupan's references, claiming that using the models from American poetry, Zupan creates a »synthesis of modernism, renewed romanticism and post-symbolism« (Kos 2001:390). J. Kos makes a similar characterization in regard to intimist poets: »their poetry /.../ was at first glance highly traditional, following post-romanticism and renewed romanticism, /.../ fully restoring the meaning of lyrical subjectivity as first constructed in the period of Romanticism« (Kos 2001:350).<sup>8</sup>

In both cases, the first-person lyrical narrator is an expression of romantic subjectivity, along with its emphasis on personal experience, and in both cases personal experience is used as an opposition to the

predecessors of each of intimisms. As I have argued, neo-intimism opposed the extra-literary engagement of writers, especially but not exclusively those gathered around the *Nova Revija* journal. The reason for the narrowing to »extra-literariness« lies partially in the fact that modernist poetry had not been frequently used to directly express social or political critique, whereas in prose and especially drama such critique was more frequent. Intimism, on the other hand, sprang up as an opposition to the prevailing socialist realism of the 1940s. Socialist realism, spanning over a period of a few years, from 1945–1952, was in many ways a leftover of the pre-war social realism and, especially, of partisan war poetry. According to J. Kos, social realism extends through partisan war poetry until 1950, thus also incorporating socialist realism. At the same time, Kos observes that during this period one can hardly speak of realism; although the »proletarian« social and ideological inspiration was at the core of this poetry, it is highly indebted to the romantic and post-romantic tradition (Kos 2001:339, 323). In the context of the poetry of the partisan movement, Boris Paternu and J. Kos also point to medieval peasant rebel songs and the revolutionary poetic of V. Majakovski (Paternu 1974:102; Kos 2001:339). Both the revolutionary theme and rhetorics as well as the prevalent collective lyrical subject-narrator of partisan poetry also became the main features of socialist realism. With their emphasis on confessionality, intimists were hence opposing the standard topoi of socialist poetry: the collective subject which fights for a socialist future, and the topos of engaged literature, one that corresponds to the revolutionary objectives of the political sphere.

It is clear that both in the case of intimism and the case of neo-intimism, the poets' opposition against their predecessors is aimed predominantly at the problem of the relation between literature and social-political action. If it had been otherwise, it would have been reasonable to think that both intimists and neo-intimists would also have discontinued the use of poetic forms practised by their predecessors. Yet intimism did not contest the use of traditional form, especially not the use of metrical verse which was widespread especially in the poetry of the partisan movement. On the contrary, most of the poetry by intimist authors – even when they already surpassed intimism – was still written in metrical form, using rhyme and often standardized quatrains, the

sonnet form etc. As we have seen, neo-intimists did not totally abandon the use of complex metaphor, but the same is true in regard to the free verse which had by the 1990s become a standard in Slovenian poetry. Any returns to the standard poetical forms were rare and can be treated as isolated experimentations, especially in the attempt to revive the form of *sestina*. Even in their rare returns to the traditional verse form, neo-intimism is comparable to the poetry of the second generation of modernists.

In Bourdieu's terms, it can be concluded that, in the historic development of Slovenian poetry, both groups were positioning themselves as a heterodox actant actively opposing the orthodox position of the social and political engagement of literature and its authors (Bourdieu 1994). Yet, in the case of neo-intimism, such a shift also presented a serious danger.

### **Personal experience and quantification**

In the era of pushing literature to the margins of the social sphere, literature itself for two decades presented no opposition to this process, even more so, with its poetic strategies, poetry involuntarily supported its own marginalization. In terms of the theory of ideology – neo-intimism, paradoxically, even more thoroughly than modernism, became subjected to the discourse of cultural autonomy. But it was exactly this closing oneself off into »Hölderlin's tower« that was used by the ideology of neoliberalism to break any ties between the cultural and the socio-political system.

What follows is an instance of the subjection of poetry and literature to the ideology of (neo)liberalism, running parallel to neo-intimists' closing off into personal experience. In 2004, the Slovenian government adopted the legal basis for the Public Lending Right which enabled writers each year to compete for the authors' grants. The criteria for receiving a grant have varied over time and they have sporadically become more complex, but since the very beginning, the authors' works have been heavily quantified in the process of applying for the grant. In the application form for the year 2019, the following criteria were measured (Of JAK 2019a): the number of book reviews in the media during the last 5 (3) years (up

---

\* The number of years in question is defined by the type of grant.

to 16 points); the number of articles on the author or interviews with the author (< 10 points); translations of the author's works in the journals (< 8 p.); literary readings (< 2 p.); awards or shortlistings for the awards of minor importance (< 8 p.) and national or international awards (< 25 p.); inclusion into Slovenian and foreign anthologies (< 8 p.); book translations of the author's works (2–20 p.); inclusion into or citation in indexed scientific journals, proceedings, scientific monographs etc. (< 10 p.), and finally the content of the projected new work (< 9 p.). One can see that the content of the proposed work is worth less than 10% of the whole scoring while the rest are quantifiable criteria.

Although at first glance the implications of such quantification might not be visible, the process can be paralleled to the quantification in the field of science with the common factor in the publish-or-perish paradigm. In regard to the Slovenian literary system, the National Library Catalogue shows that in 1992, the first full year of Slovenian independence, 312 books by Slovenian authors were published, in 2003 there were 656 books published and in 2018, 1069 Slovenian books were published, of which 313 were poetry books (Of COBISS+ 2019). The production has therefore tripled, but the data is not totally reliable as it includes reprints, especially in electronic editions. However, the catalogue shows that in the period prior to the introduction of the Public Lending Right both the number of books and the number of authors published approximately doubled (from 447 authors in 1992 to 913 authors in 2003), while in the period after 2004 the number of authors remained relatively steady (rising from 913 to 995 in 2018), but the number of books increased for almost one half. This leads to the hypothesis that authors have increased their productivity.<sup>9</sup> While the data on the number of books might be to some extent inconclusive, the rise of several other parameters in criteria for the Public Lending Right grants is more revealing. After 2004, the number of literary awards has increased (cf. e.g. Of JAK 2019c); 17 new awards and prizes have appeared that are not confined only to the locally or regionally based authors.<sup>10</sup> The number has more than doubled. The number of translations into foreign languages has also increased substantially. According to the data from the National Library Catalogue, the number of books translated into foreign languages rose from 5 books in 2003 to 36 in 2018; this is especially indicative, since in 1992 4 books were translated into foreign

languages, which is almost identical to the situation in 2003. The number of translations into foreign languages that are published in journals and magazines, and the number of literary readings are not measurable, but informal data also show a substantial rise of both parameters.

Certainly, the growth in all of the described parameters cannot be attributed solely to the Public Lending Right grants, as the latter were accompanied by the corresponding assistance measures systemically brought together in the establishment of the Public Book Agency in 2008. However, all the measures of the PBA have been aimed at increasing the production and translation of books, international cooperation etc. (Of JAK 2019b). It can be argued that the rise of the previously described parameters – entrenched by the PBA – is in fact subjected to the growth paradigm, or, rather the growth imperative, and especially the parameters of literary translations and literary prizes tend towards exponential growth. Robert J. Antonio describes growth as the liberal standard for evaluating economies, societies and effectiveness, and Almantas Samalvičius points out that growth has existed as (an economic) imperative for the last 200 years (Antonio 2013; Samalavičius 2018:157). According to Samalvičius, neoclassical economists endorse the growth paradigm as the solution for »all of our problems«. Antonio observes that the neoliberal regime – which in many ways finds its base in the neoclassical economy – has stressed the growth and innovation imperative to the exclusion of other social ends, and above all that neoliberalism promotes exponential growth at the expense of sustainable growth. The rise of the described parameters in the Slovenian literary system, and above all the tendency towards exponential growth in literary translations and prizes may at least partly be understood as subjection to the growth imperative of the (neo)liberal standard.

## **Conclusion**

It can be assumed that in the new millenium the Slovenian literary system has in many ways become subjected to the (exponential) growth imperative endorsed by (neo)liberal policies. Beside accepting the growth-producing policies endorsed especially by the PBA, neo-intimism has also rejected any political or social participation aimed at changing both

the relation between the literary and other systems of society, as well as the discourse of growth and (applied) innovation. It can be argued that by linking subjectivity and the empirical author and by narrowing the latter to personal intimacy rather than establishing a relationship with the environment, neo-intimism has involuntarily supported the dominating ideological discourse.

Truly, the break of historical intimists with the tradition of socialist realism has not been ideologically neutral, either. The fate of the first intimist poet Ada Škerl is illustrative: her first (intimist) poetry collection was published in 1949, shortly after the Yugoslav Communist Party was excluded from the Informbiro and Tito embarked on finding an independent policy of communism. But the book received strong critical rejection, as it was published too early; the break with Stalin echoed in Slovenian cultural policy only in 1952, when the Slovenian Writers' Association officially rejected the Zhdanovist cultural line. In the same year, Zlobec, Pavček, Menart and Kovič issued a programmatical and widely acclaimed poetry collection, a sort of almanac, *The Poems of the Four*. Intimism was thus indirectly also a by-product of the new third-way policy of »self-management socialism«.

But the difference in the impact of both intimisms is striking. The poetry of the historical intimists was quickly and widely popularized – and has remained popular up to the present. On the other hand, the poetry of neo-intimists has remained in a marginalized position. It is beyond my scope to provide an analysis of this difference, but the consequences for present literature are all too visible. At the moment none of the poets in contemporary Slovenian poetry seems to have been able to stop the trend of marginalizing poetry and literature.

## Notes

1. I refer here to the view of the Althusserians that the school system in connection to the national language functions as one of the basic ideologic apparatuses of a national state; this view has later been endorsed, e.g. by Eric Hobsbawm who explicitly points out to the school system as one of the basic discursive practices of national identification (Potocco 2012:29, 36).

2. Rudi Šeligo and Dimitrij Rupel (b. 1946) both participated in the 57th issue of the *Nova Revija*, so did France Bučar (1923–2015) who served as the first president

of the Slovenian parliament. Dane Zajc (1929–2005) and Niko Grafenauer (b. 1940) were both members of the editorial board of the *Nova Revija* journal.

3. The term »neointimism« is debatable; it was used by Miran Košuta and Irena Novak Popov, later by Marcello Potocco and David Bedrač, but Novak Popov in one of her later articles defines the term as a provisional one, since the variety of poetics in the works of the younger poets makes it impossible to use it for the scope of a firm periodization (see e.g. Popov 2013:66; Bedrač 2015).

4. I use the term in line with Thomas Travisano's definition to define a poetry of a strong experiential and/or emotional impulse of the author in the lyrical narration (cf. Glaser 2009).

5. While in the quoted passages Kos points out the intertextual references to Petrarch and Dante, the interconnection of the subject of love and national identification is more explicitly researched elsewhere, e.g. by Boris Paternu (Paternu 1976).

6. Čučnik's play with language becomes visible in his book *Mikado* (2012).

7. In another passage M. Kos's definition of the Black Mountain Poets includes Charles Olson, Ed Dorn, Robert Creeley, but also Allen Ginsberg and Jack Kerouac. According to M. Kos Black Mountain's poetics is modelled on the tradition by Whitman, García Lorca and W.C. Williams (Kos 1996:104). In Zupan's poetry intertextual references are present at least to the poetry of Ginsberg, Williams and Whitman.

8. It is beyond my scope here to present J. Kos' attempt of periodization, except to note that in the interval between the enlightenment and the modernism Kos distinguishes periods of pre-romanticism, romanticism, post-romanticism (defined by a self-sufficient subjectivity avoiding contact with reality) and renewed romanticism characterized by the reinforced subjectivity deliberately challenging the society.

9. Again, the reprints and e-editions cannot be excluded from the number. The catalogue shows that 133 simultaneous e-editions were published in 2018. Having this in mind, it can still be observed that in the 1992, the ratio of number of books to authors was 0,70 books per author, in the 2003, 0,72 books per author, to rise to 0,94 books per author in the 2018.

10. Eight of them are exclusively poetry prizes or they include poetry as an awarded genre: Čaša nesmrtnosti, Kritiško sito, Lirikonfestov zlat, KONS, Mira, Zlatnik poezije, Sončnice, and Fanny Hausmann prize.

## Bibliography:

**Antonio 2013:** Antonio, R. J. *Plundering the Commons: The Growth Imperative in Neoliberal Times*. *SORE The Sociological Review* 61, no. S2, 2013, p. 18–42.

**Bedrač 2015:** Bedrač, D. *Značilnosti poezije osrednjih slovenskih pesnikov in pesnic, rojenih po letu 1970*. *Slavia Centralis* 8, no. 2, 2015, p. 65–81.

**Borak 2010:** Borak, N. *Jugoslavija med integracijo in dezintegracijo*. Slovenija – Jugoslavija, krize in reforme 1968/1988. Ed. Zdenko Čepič, Ljubljana: Inštitut za novejšo zgodovino, 2010, p. 29–40.

**Bourdieu 1994:** Bourdieu, P. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994.

**Of COBISS+ 2019:** COBISS+. *IZUM. Izbirno iskanje*, accessed 9 nov. 2019, available from <https://plus.cobiss.si/opac7/bib/search/advanced?db=cobib>.

**Cvirn 2008:** Cvirn, J. et. al. *Slovenska kronika XX. stoletja*. Ljubljana: Nova revija, 2008.

**Friš and Šela 2017:** Friš, D., and Šela, A. *Nova revija v primežu Službe državne varnosti*. *Annales, Series Historia et Sociologia* 27, no. 4, 2017, p. 823–836.

**Glaser 2009:** Glaser, B. Br. *Fatherhood in Confessional Poetry: One Facet of Men's Autobiographical Writing*. *College Literature* 36, no. 4, 2009, p. 25–45.

**Gödl 2007:** Gödl, D. *Challenging the Past: Serbian and Croatian Aggressor—Victim Narratives*. *International Journal of Sociology* 37, no. 1, 2007, p. 43–57.

**Of JAK 2019a:** Javna agencija za knjigo RS. *Javni razpisi in pozivi*, accessed 10 nov. 2019, available from [www.jakrs.si/fileadmin/datoteke/Nova\\_spletna\\_stran/Javni\\_razpisi\\_in\\_pozivi/Razpisi/2019/JR5-STIPENDIJE-2019/OBR1-leposlovje-VU-2019.docx](http://www.jakrs.si/fileadmin/datoteke/Nova_spletna_stran/Javni_razpisi_in_pozivi/Razpisi/2019/JR5-STIPENDIJE-2019/OBR1-leposlovje-VU-2019.docx).

**Of JAK 2019b:** Javna agencija za knjigo RS. *O agenciji*, accessed 10 nov. 2019, available from <https://www.jakrs.si/o-agenciji>.

**Of JAK 2019c:** Javna agencija za knjigo RS – Bližji knjigi. *Slovenski knjižni portal – Nagrade*, accessed 10 nov. 2019, available from <http://www.blizjknjigi.si/Nagrade>.

**Jović 2009:** Jović, D. *Yugoslavia: A State That Withered Away*. Purdue University Press, 2009.

**Kos 2001:** Kos, J. *Primerjalna zgodovina slovenske literature*. Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga, 2001.

**Kos 1996:** Kos, M. *Prevzetnost in pristranost: literarni spisi*. Ljubljana: Literarno-umetniško društvo Literatura, 1996.

**Krečič 2005:** Krečič, J. „Politični pranger.“ *Delo*, 13 July 2005, p. 13.

**Lorenčič 2010:** Lorenčič, Al. *Gospodarske razmere v Jugoslaviji v obdobju 1968–1988: na poti v razpad*. Slovenija – Jugoslavija, krize in reforme 1968/1988. Ed. Zdenko Čepič, Ljubljana: Inštitut za novejšo zgodovino, 2010, p. 261–278.

**Mihailović, Krestić and Pantić 2019:** Mihailović, K., Vasilije K., and Pantić, M. *Memorandum of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts: Answers to Criticisms, 1995 reprint*. N.p., accessed 11 October 2019, available from <http://www.rastko.rs/istorija/iii/memorandum.pdf>.

**Paternu 1974:** Paternu, B. *Pogledi na slovensko književnost: študije in razprave*, 1–2. Ljubljana: Partizanska knjiga, 1974.

**Paternu 1976:** Paternu, B. *France Prešeren in njegovo pesniško delo*. Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga, 1976.

**Popov 2013:** Popov, I. N. *Sodobna slovenska poezija v literarni vedi*. Slavistična revija 61, no. 1, 2013, p. 61–75.

**Potocco 2009:** Potocco, M. *Grenko je peti slavo umu ali Resni pesniki morajo biti v prvih bojnih vrstah*. *Literatura* 21, no. 211–212 (jan.–feb.) 2009, p. 234–249.

**Potocco 2012:** Potocco, M. *Nacionalni imaginariji: literarni imaginariji različice nacionalnega poziva v literaturi in v literarnih kontekstih* (book-on-line). Ljubljana: Pedagoški inštitut, 2012, accessed 10 jun. 2013, available from [www.pei.si/UserFilesUpload/file/digitalna\\_knjiznica/Dissertationes\\_20\\_ISBN\\_978-961-270-132-1\\_PDF/DK\\_CC%202.5\\_Dissertationes\\_20\\_ISBN\\_978-961-270-132-1.pdf](http://www.pei.si/UserFilesUpload/file/digitalna_knjiznica/Dissertationes_20_ISBN_978-961-270-132-1_PDF/DK_CC%202.5_Dissertationes_20_ISBN_978-961-270-132-1.pdf).

**Repe 2006:** Repe, B. *The Instruction of History and History Textbooks in Slovenian History*. *Studia Historica Slovenica*, no. 6, 2006, p. 57–73.

**Samalavičius 2018:** Samalavičius, A. *Neoliberalism, Economism and Higher Education*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2018.

**Troha 2001:** Troha, G. *Drago Jančar: Galjot; Dušan Merc: Galilejev lesteneč: vprašanje specifičnosti slovenskega romana po l. 1991*. M.A. thesis. University of Ljubljana: 2001.

**Vidali 2005:** Vidali, P. „Pesnik ob sramotilnem stebri.“ *Večer* 9 July 2005, p. 12.

**Vodopivec 2010:** Vodopivec, P. *Od poskusov demokratizacije (1968–1972) do agonije in katastrofe (1988–1991)*. *Slovenija – Jugoslavija, krize in reforme 1968/1988*. Ed. Zdenko Čepič, Ljubljana: Inštitut za novejšo zgodovino, 2010, p. 13–28.

**Zlobec 1983:** Zlobec, C. *Kaj je tebe treba bilo ... ali Skupna jedra*. *Sodobnost* 31, no. 10, 1983, p. 930–931.

**Zupan 1991:** Zupan, U. *Sutre*. Ljubljana: Aleph, 1991.

**Zupan 2002:** Zupan, U. *Nafta*. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba, 2002.