

Foundations for a Poetics of Movement

Thus more urgently than ever (and not only in the realm of literary studies, but far beyond) does the task of advancing a poetics of movement present itself today.⁶⁷ While the temporal, historically chronological foundations of our thought and of our processing of reality, so dominant in European modernism, have grown weaker in postmodern thought-configurations (which have already become historical), at the same time, spatial concepts and mindsets, and also patterns of perception and modes of experience were revalued and exponentially increased semantically. Most recently, in the second half of the eighties, spatial concepts were developed that are perhaps most convincingly reflected in the conceptual work of Edward W. Soja.⁶⁸ Before the backdrop of a relationship to space that, for traceable historical reasons, was problematic in Germany, the extraordinary German economic boom completed a turn to the spatial—as successfully publicized, for example, by the historian Karl Schlögel in his demand for “ein Spatial turn, endlich”⁶⁹ (“a spatial turn, finally”)—merely an adjustment that, in the new millennium, in light of developments in the realm of the most widely varying “turns,”⁷⁰ can certainly no longer be designated in an international context as being new.

Certainly, the process only briefly sketched here is not one that, within a logosphere shaped by postmodernism, would be uniformly directed and would have proceeded without contradiction. Yet the discussions of the eighties and nineties of the 20th century—and this continues into the present—were marked quite substantially by geopolitical, geocultural, and geopoetic questions which in no way were limited to cyberspace, but instead generated territorializations,

67 I draw attention to this necessity at the conclusion of Ottmar Ette: “Wege des Wissens. Fünf Thesen zum Weltbewusstsein und den Literaturen der Welt.” In: Sabine Hofmann / Monika Wehrheim (eds.): *Lateinamerika. Orte und Ordnungen des Wissens. Festschrift für Birgit Scharlau*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag 2004, pp. 169–184.

68 Edward W. Soja: *Postmodern Geographies. The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*. London: Verso 1989.

69 Karl Schlögel: *Im Raume lesen wir die Zeit. Über Zivilisationsgeschichte und Geopolitik*. Munich–Vienna: Carl Hanser Verlag 2003, p. 60.

70 C.f. Doris Bachmann-Medick: *Cultural Turns. Neuorientierungen in den Kulturwissenschaften*. Reinbeck bei Hamburg: Rowohlt 2006.

mappings and remappings,⁷¹ as influenced by the postcolonial or the clash of cultures.

With this background, even Samuel P. Huntington's vision of the *Clash of Civilizations* may be assigned to still another (geoculturally and geostrategically implemented) spatial turn that is distinctly of a continentally territorializing nature. Mapping and remapping of fronts and borderlines previously considered stable have been the order of the day for decades. In the sense of Amin Maalouf's considerations mentioned at the beginning, however, it would be imperative that these mappings—"set fast" in whatever database—be carried over into living mobile mappings, in order to be able to counter effectively the prevalent territorialization of any kind of alterity.⁷² Additionally, there is need of a poetics of movement which, based upon the seismographic function of world literatures to indicate present and future tremors, would be in a position, viewing spatial structures from the perspective of movement, to understand them in a new way and depict them in the context of a history of movement.

Still missing from the field of philology is a sufficiently differentiated and precise terminological vocabulary for movement, dynamics, and mobility.⁷³ As a rule, we must deal with an often quite subtle colonization of movement by means of a flood of spatial concepts which "set fast" and conceptually reduce the dynamics and vectorizations under the influence of an obsessive spatialization, insofar as they deliberately omit the dimension of time.⁷⁴ This book proceeds from early-modern mappings that, with the help of various methods, avoid this trap in order to be able to depict adequately the dynamics of the historical European expansion process.

For upon the basis of a vectorial image of the world in the midst of rapid change, a view of the world arose that, in terms of its geopolitical and geocultural features continues to exist today, but which at the same time was spatialized and continentally territorialized. It is embarrassing to observe how far Samuel

71 C.f. Wai Chee Dimock / Bruce Robbins (eds.): "Remapping Genre." In: *PMLA—Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* (New York) CXXII, 5 (October, 2007), pp. 1377–1570.

72 See also Julia Kristeva: *Etrangers à Nous-mêmes*. Paris: Gallimard 1991.

73 I first presented this set of problems in Ottmar Ette: *Literatur in Bewegung. Raum und Dynamik grenzüberschreitenden Schreibens in Europa und Amerika*. Weilerswist: Velbrück Wissenschaft 2001.

74 This argumentation does not contain any sort of return to a dominant time-oriented concept of history, such as that which grew prevalent following the paradigms of development and progress at the close of the 18th century in Europe; c.f. Doris Bachmann-Medick: *Cultural Turns*, p. 286.

P. Huntington's world map from the end of the 20th century has fallen behind the map of Juan de la Cosa from the year 1500, although copious geopolitical power-claims may be found not only among the US-American political scientists and presidential advisers, but among the Spanish protagonists of the *Descubrimiento* as well. Have we really come much further in our late-modern-era views of the world?

The paucity of movement-concepts bespeaks at present a damaging and distorting reduction of space-time developmental processes and choreographies to spatial freeze-frames and mental maps which serve both to filter out the dynamic element and cause it to disappear. But spatialization has a high price, as long as it steals from movement. For it establishes what can only extract sense from movement—and *as* movement.

Spaces first arise—when they are used by people, and thus used culturally—through movements. To be sure, the cultural concept has been tied since the time of western antiquity to the ground,⁷⁵ but it has not been shackled: for even the most soil-rooted agricultural usage is unimaginable without movement, and it would come only to fruitless results. Culture presupposes movement: a cultural space is necessarily a migratory space.

Only movements, with their patterns and figures, their specific transits and intersections, put forth a space in the full (and not merely Euclidean) sense. Can we really comprehend the space of a city without registering it vectorially? Can we really understand a lecture hall and its function if we filter out of it the motions of the speaker and those who are listening and interacting? Can we grasp the quality of a concert hall without ever having experienced a performance there? Can we truly describe and investigate a geocultural area if we simply blank out from our depiction the movements and migrations that travel within and across it?

Whoever filters the movement out of their object of investigation hides life. The open structurings of literature show the hopelessness of such an endeavor—and by no means only in the category of travel literature. Walter Benjamin's passages, for instance, form not only spaces, but configurations—just as the title of the *Passagen-Werk* indicates: mobile, vectorized migratory spaces in which, among the places and movements, other places and other movements may always be recognized.

⁷⁵ See Hartmut Böhme: "Von Kultus zu Kultur(wissenschaft). Zur historischen Semantik des Kulturbegriffs." In: Renate Glaser / Matthias Luserke (eds.): *Literaturwissenschaft–Kulturwissenschaft. Positionen, Themen, Perspektiven*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag 1996, pp. 51–53.

Thus a space is created through respectively specific patterns of movement and figures of movement, whereby the continuity of a given space depends upon the very choreographies and pathways that first generate it. Should certain patterns of movement be discontinued, the corresponding spaces and their limits collapse: the same holding true at the level of architectonic or urban as well as at the level of national or supranational spaces. The mobility of the notions of Europe,⁷⁶ but also the hemispheric constructions of the American continent, which have been constantly changing since the so-called “discovery” in 1492, present here over the course of centuries rich material for consideration.⁷⁷ For is not the Spanish-speaking realm that, moreover, steps forth in its mobility through the complex archipelagic connections between the Canaries, the Caribbean, and the Philippines, a global migratory space *par excellence*? These and many other comparable questions should be developed and answered from multiple perspectives in this book.

The retention of old (and even future) patterns of movement which appear in current movements and which one may *come* to know anew may be most accurately described as *vectorization*. It reaches far beyond that which is ever individually experienced and that which may be experienced in a lifeworldly sense: vectorization also comprises the realm of collective history, the movement-patterns of which it retains in the discontinuous, highly fragmented post-Euclidean vector field of future dynamics. Among movements of the present—and it is on this that the concept of vectorization at its epistemological core is targeted—the old movements again become recognizable and perceptible: as movements within the firm structure and within the mobile structuring of spaces, they are ubiquitous. Consequently, we can only adequately understand spaces if we investigate and comprehend the movements that configure them and their specific dynamics. Is not the movement-form of a transatlantic circuit, so firmly anchored in collective knowledge since 1492, even today of fundamental significance to a spatialized model, so to speak, for understanding the New World—starting, indeed, in Europe?

It would seem to be the obvious thing, from the perspective of the 20th century, the “century of migrations,” expulsions, deportations, delocalizations, and movements of widely varying sorts, to shift the focus from territorialization to vectorization, from border demarcation to border crossing. The reasons be-

⁷⁶ See Anne Kraume: *Das Europa der Literatur. Schriftsteller blicken auf den Kontinent (1815–1945)*. Berlin–New York: Walter de Gruyter 2010.

⁷⁷ See Peter Birle / Marianne Braig et al. (eds.): *Hemisphärische Konstruktionen der Amerikas*. Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert 2006.

hind the fact that this path, leading from an epistemology that thinks in terms of static entities to a highly dynamized movement-model, was hardly ever actually trod are undoubtedly many, and have something to do with the cohesive and persistent powers of academic institutionalization.

And yet, in the field of philologies there would have been voluminous material for consideration that only in very recent times has been brought to a more intense light. The development of literatures, as may be observed in the past century, which possess no fixed abode in the sense of being translingual or transcultural forms of writing⁷⁸ has now led us to the point that all production-, distribution-, and reception-aesthetic dimensions and aspects of the literatures of the world are far more radical than ever before, gone “off (national-philological) course,” and, consequently, no longer to be tied down to purely national-literary frames of reference. The long-observed vectorization of all spatial referents must have consequences within literary and cultural theory which allow us to better and more precisely grasp and understand the different phases of accelerated globalization, but also the interspersed phases of global or regional deceleration.

The *literatures of the world*, as certainly the most complex retentive and generative medium for knowledge, comprising also the greatest variety of times and cultures, offer us here, in relation to that which is mobile, a multitude of life-forms and life-norms that should enable us, poly perspectivally and polylogically, to reread, to rethink, and to re-experience our world. For ultimately, they avoid every attempt to systematize the world all-inclusively from *one* point, from one single place of writing. Differing from the concept of world literature formulated by Goethe, the literatures of the world are not centered in Europe, nor are they static; instead, they form a highly dynamic force field that is characterized by the constant interchanging of cultural logics, languages, and coordinates, and which can no longer be considered and “evaluated” from Europe alone. Thus do the translingual phenomena of literatures without a fixed abode form, without a doubt, new challenges for a theory of the translational, which

⁷⁸ See also Ursula Mathis-Moser / Birgit Mertz Baumgartner (eds.): *La Littérature “française” contemporaine. Contact de cultures et créativité*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag 2007; Ursula Mathis Moser / Julia Pröll (eds.): *Fremde(s) Schreiben*. Innsbruck: Innsbruck University Press 2008; and Ottmar Ette: *Writing-between-Worlds. TransArea Studies and the Literatures-without-a-fixed-Abode*.

has incrementally arisen from the single demand for a linguistically conceived science of translation.⁷⁹

Vectorization in literature harks back not only to (collective) history, but also to mythos: to that reservoir of myths, legends, and inherited notions of images and beliefs, the historically accumulated and only seemingly fixed movements of which are again “translated” and integrated into current sequences of movement by literature. In order to understand the European literature(s), we must likewise bring into our considerations a Europe *in motion*⁸⁰ as well as—from a transareal perspectivism—a Europe *as motion*,⁸¹ and at the same time attempt, with an eye to the “New World,” to advance the development of transarchipelagic modeling and models for understanding.

Only from a point of perspective of this sort do many previous patterns of movement become recognizable in literature as being vectorially retained in the movements of a protagonist. Thus, in Edouard Glissant’s Caribbean sketch of Easter Island in the Pacific⁸² for example, not only the Antilles, but islands on a world-wide scale become visible: islands that in their differing logics point to one another and, within this mobile, extensively fragmented network,⁸³ set in motion post-Euclidean processes of understanding movements and migratory spaces. In the most widely varied contexts, we perform thought- and travel-movements that we program, that program us, and yet which have come to us from very far away. Thus, for example, do the exodus from Egypt or the wandering of Odysseus, but also even the abduction and rape of Europa or the legend-enshrouded voyage of Columbus to the New World lend to the migration movements of the 20th and 21st centuries an additional potential for meaning that semantically charges and intensifies even the simplest choreographies. Move-

79 See also Doris Bachmann-Medick: “Introduction: The Translational Turn.” In: *Translational Studies* (London) II, 1 (2009), pp. 2–16; and Naoki Sakai: *Translation and Subjectivity. On “Japan” and Cultural Nationalism*. Minneapolis–London: University of Minnesota Press 2009, p. 3 ff.

80 C.f. Klaus Bade: *Europa in Bewegung. Migration vom späten 18. Jahrhundert bis zur Gegenwart*. Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck 2000.

81 C.f. Ottmar Ette: “Europäische Literatur(en) im globalen Kontext. Literaturen für Europa.” In: Özkan Ezli / Dorothee Kimmich et al. (eds.): *Wider den Kulturreizwang. Migration, Kulturalisierung und Weltliteratur*. Bielefeld: transcript Verlag 2009, pp. 257–296.

82 See Edouard Glissant: *La terre magnétique. Les errances de Rapa Nui, l’île de Pâques*. In collaboration with Sylvie Séma. Paris: Seuil 2007.

83 On the epistemology of the network in the social sciences, see also Bruno Latour: *Reassembling the Social. An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford–New York: Oxford University Press 2005; see also Christian Stegbauer (ed.): *Netzwerkanalyse und Netzwerktheorie. Ein neues Paradigma in den Sozialwissenschaften*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften 2010.

ments are frequently connected to life-processes. Not only discovered movements, but invented ones as well shape our lives, our thoughts, our actions. Time and time again, the literatures of the world polyperspectively expose these motions (*Motionen*) and emotions (*Emotionen*) and highlight everything in our lives that lives, everything in our speech that speaks.

Not only the words among words⁸⁴ or the places among places, but indeed the movements among movements indicate the interwoven nature of literature and living mobility as well as the central significance of retained, vectorized patterns of movement to an understanding of both literary and cultural processes. The widespread absence of movement concepts, the explanation of which may be found in the tradition of national philologies, brings to the literary and cultural sciences the consequence that, today, they must first become aware again of the mobile mappings of literature in order to comprehend the challenges and, perhaps even more, the chances that the already long extant crisis of the regional sciences, of area studies, presents to them.

The goal should thus first be to create enduring sensitivity to the forms and functions of movement for a stronger development of scientific investigations devoted to cultural and literary phenomena, and to accomplish the transition from merely spatial history to mobile history. For this, a concept that was developed through the examination of highly vectorial processes and phenomena in the field of literature is necessary. I will thus return, in the following sections, to a terminology that I first tested and clarified within the context of my investigation of literatures without a fixed abode,⁸⁵ such that these conceptual tools, of course, also be designed for the realm of objects that extend far beyond both the analysis of literary texts and the treatment of fundamental aesthetic, semantic, or narrative questions of literature. In the following pages, a series of terminological differentiations shall also be undertaken which arise out of literary scientific analysis, but which by no means should be understood to be restricted to it.

⁸⁴ C.f. Jean Starobinski: *Les mots sous les mots*. Paris: Gallimard 1971.

⁸⁵ See Ottmar Ette: *Writing-between-Worlds. TransArea Studies and the Literatures-without-a-fixed-Abode*, pp. 33–35.

Concepts

On the Disciplinary Level

In the field of area studies, regional research centers of the traditional stamp, that is, as institutions that reach beyond individual disciplines, are set up on one hand as *multidisciplinary*, and on the other as *interdisciplinary*. They are generally based, on the one hand, upon a multidisciplinary juxtaposition of differing and, in each case, disciplinarily anchored individual sciences, or on the other hand, upon an interdisciplinary dialog between the respective representatives of certain disciplines in the institutional framework of the given center. Eventually, this fairly static, equally “disciplined” configuration should be supplemented by *transdisciplinary* structurings that will aim not at the interdisciplinary exchange between conversational partners who are disciplinarily firmly anchored, but at a continual crossing of various disciplines.

It is self-evident here that the developments and outcomes of this “nomadic” and, in a true sense, transdisciplinary scientific praxis would have to be (mono-)disciplinarily and interdisciplinarily tested and ensured through continuous contacts. An “autonomically” self-setting level of transdisciplinary science could more likely yield counterproductive effects. In the context of a transdisciplinarily active but in all instances disciplinarily braced scientific praxis, the most widely varying realms of knowledge can be dynamized and can communicate with one another in a fashion that is at once substantially stronger and more flexible.

Analogous to this terminological delimitation, conceptual definitions should be successively introduced and translated into the logic of the respective fields of research, which would precisely render the newly suggested differentiations at the various levels of analysis with the aid of the four prefixes named here—“mono-,” “multi-,” “inter-,” and “trans-.” The goal of this procedural method is a high terminological transparency and coherency, to which further differentiations are obviously desirable and necessary.

An intensified transdisciplinary approach, incidentally, makes sense with a view to relations with the Romanic world, and not only on the level of analysis, but on the level of subject matter as well. The disciplinary place of philosophy in the Spanish-speaking realm—to give but one example—is unlike others, due to a differentiation process that, compared to the German-, French-, and English-speaking world, proceeded differently. Consequently, there emerged—as may be seen in the works of Miguel de Unamuno, José Ortega y Gasset, or José Enrique Rodó—crossover forms of philosophy and literature which have been

accorded in the transareal context of the Spanish-speaking world another functionality within a pan-societal circulation of knowledge: even though, and indeed specifically when, all three of the mentioned authors intensively refer to Friedrich Nietzsche (and thereby to a representative of philosophy in the German language). Traditional disciplinary delimitations become, as a rule, ill-suited for the dynamics of this sort of transareal referencing if they are based upon exclusionary mechanisms that can lay claim to no universal validity. It follows that on the disciplinary level, a multilogical approach is advisable and adequate to the subjects.

On the Cultural Level

In viewing the analysis of cultural phenomena, beyond *monocultural* monads, one must distinguish between, for instance, a *multicultural* “side-by-sideness” of different cultures which, in a spatial respect, settle in different quarters or zones of a city, and an *intercultural* communality, defined by all sorts of encounters between differing cultures’ members, who indeed engage in exchanges with one another, but for whom their prevalent belonging to a particular culture or cultural group is never in question. The *transcultural* level separates itself then—in a critical continuation of the groundbreaking work of the Cuban ethnologist and cultural theoretician Fernando Ortiz on *transculturalidad*⁸⁶ in 1940—from the previous two levels insofar as it here concerns movements and practices that cross different cultures: a constant springing from culture to culture in such a fashion as not to allow the development of a stable and dominant membership in or connection to an individual culture, or any cultural group or configuration.

In the current phase of accelerated globalization, transcultural border-walkings and crossings are, without a doubt and throughout the world, of growing importance and increasing relevance. Their examination should not be focused upon the differentiation of more or less stable “in-between spaces,” but on the exploration of labile arenas with oscillating patterns of movement and transitional figures. Simply by looking at the circulation processes and interdependencies between the Francophonic, Hispanophonic, Lusophonic, and Anglophonic, one may determine that an analysis of the four phases of accelerated glo-

⁸⁶ C.f. Fernando Ortiz: *Contrapunteo cubano del tabaco y el azúcar*. Prólogo y Cronología Julio Le Reverend. Caracas: Biblioteca Ayacucho 1978. Eng.: Fernando Ortiz: *Cuban counterpoint. Tobacco and sugar*. Translated by Harriet de Onís. New York: Knopf 1947.

balization up to now would no longer allow the privileging of (apparently) *monadic* over *nomadic* conceptions. Between the Italian *isolarios* from the turn of the 16th century to the global icons in the art of Ai Weiwei at the turn of the 21st, from the travel literature design of al-Hassan al-Wazzan alias Leo Africanus in the first phase of accelerated globalization and of Jean-Marie Gustave Le Clézio in the fourth, this book will examine transcultural testing grounds that allow us, in variegated transareal perspectivations to understand the world of yesterday differently and the world of tomorrow more boldly and imaginatively.

On the Linguistic Level

In a linguistic respect, beyond a *monolingual* situation, whereby the logosphere is exclusively dominated by a certain language, one must differentiate principally between a *multilingual* juxtaposition of different languages and language-spaces, which display little or no overlapping, and an *interlingual* communality in which two or more languages exist and communicate in an intensive connection with one another. Different from an intralingual translation, which one might designate, in Roman Jakobson's sense, as a rewording in the same language,⁸⁷ an *interlingual* translation carries over from the one language into the other, while both languages are clearly distinct from one another, cannot be confused for one another, and seek to remain separate from one another. One may distinguish from the multilingual and the interlingual, however, a *translingual* situation, which here indicates an unending process of the constant intersection of languages.⁸⁸ Two or more languages are thus by implication no longer to be differentiated, but instead mutually permeate one another, such that new translingual formulations arise.

As regards literary writing, a translingual praxis would subsequently describe an author's jumping back and forth between different languages, within the context of his body of work as well as within a certain individual text. Just how broad the hopes connected in this respect to a concrete politics of language can be is shown by Amin Maalouf in a passage reflective of his own activities in language politics from his recent essay:

⁸⁷ See Roman Jakobson: "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation." In: Roman Jakobson: *Selected Writings. II. Word and Language*. The Hague–Paris: Mouton 1971, p. 260.

⁸⁸ For an alternative definition of the concept, see Lydia H. Liu: *Translingual Practice. Literature, National Culture, and Translated Modernity—China, 1900–1937*. Stanford: Stanford University Press 1995.

Were it so that from early childhood on, and throughout an entire life, each person were encouraged to be enthusiastic for a culture and a language other than one's own, that could be freely chosen and fully in keeping with one's own preferences—and which would be studied even more intensively than the inevitable English—the result would be a dense cultural interweaving that would cover the entire planet, insofar as it would support the timid identities, weaken animosities, strengthen bit by bit the belief in the unity of the human adventure, and provide through all of this a beneficial jolt.⁸⁹

The conspicuous significance of translational questioning to the development of the literary and cultural sciences⁹⁰ reveals itself on the level of translation on a planetary scale that Goethe implied within his concept of world literature, but certainly also in a continental dimension in the context of the hemispheric construction of the Americas. The translational dynamic of the literatures of the world in general and of the literatures without a fixed abode in particular has also long since led to developments that confront us—think simply of the novels of authors like Daniel Alarcón or Junot Díaz—with a Hispanoamerican literature in the English language which cannot simply be “outsourced” to the US or delegated to the field of US American studies.

Translational processes pervade our contemporary literatures of the world—and in the German-speaking realm too. Herta Müller or Melinda Nadj Abonji (received at first with thorough astonishment), as winners of the Nobel Prize for literature and of the German Book Prize, have finally firmly anchored this problematic of words among words, places among places, and languages among languages in the public consciousness of a German-language-readership, including its literary critics. New migratory spaces have come into existence, to which static national literary concepts assuredly cannot reach. Also, literary science studies of the Hispanophonic and Lusophonic, but in still greater measure, of the Francophonic and Anglophonic, are faced here with new challenges that can only be rendered fruitful on a world-wide scale with the aid of a poetics of movement and a vectorially reflected concept for a better understanding of not only contemporary literature. The literatures gathered in this book, shaped by four phases of accelerated globalization, hold ready numerous examples for this.

⁸⁹ Amin Maalouf: *Le dérèglement du monde*, p. 106 f.

⁹⁰ C.f. Doris Bachmann-Medick: “Introduction: The Translational Turn,” pp. 2–16.

On the Level of Media

With a view to the media configuration, one could (analogously to the already developed terminology) differentiate—beyond single-medium (*monomedial*) contexts—between a *multimedia* situation, in which a plurality of media exist side-by-side, but such that it does not come to a great deal of overlapping or areas of contact, and an *intermedia* situation, where the above-mentioned media correspond and dialog intensively with one another, but without losing their respective distinguishability and distinctness. In a *transmedia* situation, however, different media permeate and cross over one another in an unending process of overstepping boundaries, transiting, and “carry-overs,” such as is the case, in an exemplary way, with iconotexts and phonotexts—that is, transmedia combinations wherein the text and pictures, or sounds, as the case may be, do not reciprocally “illustrate,” but rather, mutually transform one another.

The respective visual beginnings of the four main chapters of this text should also be understood from a transfer- and transformation-process of this sort, should they be dealing not with “mere” illustration, but rather, with complex combinations of picture and writing, whereby neither the picture nor the writing is supposed to “illustrate” the other. Every transmedia incipit is aimed at making it possible to sensorially experience as a process the desired visualization of transformation in media, and to bring to light complex catenations which connect the literatures of the world to the widest variety of artistic forms.

It is of course also true here, as in the sets of definitions already discussed, that multi-, inter-, and transmedia phenomena cannot always be “cleanly” separated from one another, whether in a spatial or temporal sense. The definitional transparency and rigor strived for here, however, are aimed at pointing out, in a second step, just such overlap-zones and incidents of cross-over, in order then to be able to examine and differentiate them with higher resolution and accuracy. The goal is not the charting of static roots but as precise as possible an understanding of the unending, process-oriented nature of dynamic routes in literature and culture: a movement-historical dimension that should be communicated within the transmedia back-and-forth.

On the Temporal Level

Within the terminological raster presented here, the dimension of time in its processual nature may also be conceptually structured in a similar fashion. If *multitemporal* processes concern the juxtaposition of different time frames

which exist and “elapse” independently of one another, then *intertemporal* processes should describe a constant mutual correspondence and communication between different time frames that neither mix with one another nor coalesce into one. *Transtemporal* processes or structurings, then, refer to an incessant crossing of differing time frames whereby such an interweaving of times creates a highly particular temporality which, within its very transtemporality, brings transcultural or translingual phenomena strongly into the foreground, and is capable of actuating accordant processes of exchange. The intensification of transtemporal ultraconnectivity is a privilege of neither the present, nor of contemporary literatures.

At this point, regarding the dimension of time and its periodization, reference may be made to the above-mentioned four phases of accelerated globalization, which are of the greatest relevance to the temporal structuring of economic, political and social, and above all cultural processes as shaped by colonialism and postcolonialism. This division into phases forms the intertemporal and transtemporal foundational structuring of this book. These very different, yet closely interconnected acceleration phases—certainly in the New World (a temporal designation of America that is by no means accidental), but also, for instance, in Oceania—have taken the most widely differing conceptions of time, have pitted them against one another, and have interwoven them. It is essential to profile more sharply these temporal differentiations, especially in terms of their close connection within the colonial studies of the Spanish-speaking world. Transcultural processes produce in most cases transtemporal forms and norms of experience: experience that can be further sharpened and intensified through intellectual examination with new and precise concepts.

On the Spatial Level

It should hardly be surprising in this context that in looking at the spatial structures, a differentiation may be conducted between a *multispatial* juxtaposition of spaces with the greatest paucity of contact and an *interspatial* structure of intensively corresponding spaces that, however, do not coalesce. *Transspatial* structurings, however, are shaped by constant transiting and intersections of different sorts of spaces and also by a pattern of movement that, as a concept, should subsequently be much more strongly developed and more precisely delineated.

One might well also remember at this point that spaces are produced through movements and specific patterns of movement,⁹¹ such that, as a consequence, one clearly may not proceed from the assumption of a static spatial concept. The *Periquillo Sarniento* of José Joaquín Fernández de Lizardi, so important in the development of the history of the Hispanoamerican novel, may well prove, with its diegetic coexistence of multispatial, interspatial, and transpatial spaces, how complex the spatial models that the literatures of Spanish-speaking America were producing have been, even from early on.⁹² The sharp asymmetry of transatlantic relations, shaped as it is by the first two phases of accelerated globalization, generated spaces that—one need only think of the antagonism between city and country—were marked by a most discriminatory vectoricity. This is precipitated, however, on the level of specific figures of movement.

On the Choreographic/Literary Level

Starting from an analysis of writing methods of travel literature,⁹³ the results of which may often be understood to be texts that are *frictional* (and thus, texts that oscillate between fictional and dictional forms of writing), different *dimensions* of the travel report—the three dimensions of space, and with them, those of time, of social structure, of imagination, of literary space, of genre elements, and of cultural space—can now be distinguished from one another.

As a second step, different *places in travel literature*—especially departure, highpoint, arrival, or return—may be delineated and differentiated from one another as passages of particular semantic concentration. These places are, for their part, incorporated into basic *figures of movement* which—as perhaps a circle, pendulum, line, star, or spring—present and, so to speak, choreographically carry out before the eye the hermeneutical motions of understanding on the part of the reader. The literatures of the world continually hark back to all of these patterns of movement, retained over millennia in various cultural contexts.

⁹¹ A progression of basic patterns of movement in literature is developed in Ottmar Ette: *Literatur in Bewegung*.

⁹² See also Ottmar Ette: “Fernández de Lizardi: ‘El Periquillo Sarniento.’ Dialogisches Schreiben im Spannungsfeld Europa–Latein Amerika.” In: *Romanistische Zeitschrift für Literaturgeschichte / Cahiers d’Histoire des Littératures Romanes* (Heidelberg) XXII, 1–2 (1998), pp. 205–237.

⁹³ Compare extensively with Ottmar Ette: *Literatur in Bewegung*, pp. 21–84

These conceptual differentiations, first introduced some years ago, are highly relevant to the examination of the extremely complex scope of a globalization history of literature and, accordingly, to the examination of phases of accelerated globalization, so long as they allow a spatiotemporal delineation and substantiation of text analyses that is, as a rule, intersubjectively easy to test. The vectorial dimension of literature also configures migratory spaces which submit to no logic of fixed-position, no reductive two-dimensional territorialization, instead forming the mobile structurings of all literary knowledge in such a fashion as to be capable of being reconstructed and, indeed, trajectoryally re-experienced.

The analysis of the movements amidst the movements of (and in) literature vividly evinces the fundamental degree to which spaces are formed only through movement, through motions and emotions. In this book, the conceptual model presented with all necessary brevity here shall be rendered fruitful for the development of a literary and cultural science which serves as the centerpiece for a poetics of movement.

On the Level of the History of Movement

In order to be able, especially in light of notions of spatial history, to develop movement-historical concepts terminologically with more precision and comprehensibility, a terminological delineation of the relationships between culture and language, space and time, medium and discipline is necessary to being able to grasp more precisely actual movements in space, with an eye to generating a poetics of movement. At the same time, it is important that, on the level of the history of movement, five different gradations should be distinguished from one another, in order to put more graphically into perspective the respective implications of the corresponding relationality.

Movements on a *translocal* niveau settle between urban or rural places and spaces of limited extent—in the sense of Bharati Mukherjee's landscapes and cityscapes⁹⁴—whereupon it comes to an obvious discontinuity of movements that spans the sometimes broad territories that lie in-between, such that we often must consider connections insofar as they characterize islands that, while they lie far apart, are yet bound to one another.

⁹⁴ C.f. Bharati Mukherjee: "Imagining Homelands." In: André Aciman (ed.): *Letters of Transit. Reflections on Exile, Identity, Language, and Loss*. New York: The New Press 1999, pp. 65–86.

In contrast, movements on a *transregional* niveau are situated between certain topographical or cultural spaces which are either located within the expanse of a country, or are clearly perceptible units divided among different national states. The concept of “region” is expressly not to be confused here with that of “world region,” as is the case (in an often confusing manner) in the conventional term “regional science” and in all the compounds that stem from it.

Consistent with this concept, *transnational* describes movements between different national spaces or states, as the case may be, while *transareal* movements are situated between different *areas*—such as the Caribbean, the Maghreb, or Southeast Asia—wherein the concept of area, as in the current name of so-called “area studies,” is used quite variably and can be equally applicable to a world region or to a specific cultural space. In taking recourse to the concept of the transnational, it is essential to consider that it—unlike the term “transareal”—presupposes the existence of the nation, such that a “transnational literature” or a “transnational literary science” can be conceived of in an actual sense only in the context of a highly advanced process of nation-building. *Transcontinental* movements, on the other hand, take place between different continents such as Asia, Australia, Africa, America, or even Oceania, where the geographical boundaries of Europe (which may be designated a continent only in a conferred sense) and its various regions are certainly the most indistinct.⁹⁵

The fact that dynamics on the individual niveaus, each according to its type of movement, can be sub-divided into *multi-*, *inter-*, and *transnational* processes is easily comprehended in the context of the conceptual model proposed here. Analogously, further conceptual applications are correspondingly easy to form in terms of the chosen terminological coherency and transparency.

Movements (also in the sense of motions and emotions) decidedly contribute to the constitution and semantization of living-spaces, as long as the *internal relationality* within a given space is of significant relevance within its relationship to an *external relationality* that connects a certain space to others. Internal and external relationality are there to be examined separately, but always in reference to one another.

⁹⁵ C.f. Maria Todorova: “Wo liegt Europa? Von der Einteilung eines Kontinents und seinen historischen Regionen.” In: *Jahrbuch des Wissenschaftskollegs zu Berlin* (Berlin) 2004–2005 (2006), pp. 294–316.

Why Transareal Studies?

On the basis of the movement-historical perspective change, the vectorized proliferation of logics and viewpoints, and the already-described instruments sketched above, it is quite easy to comprehend the enormous possibilities and range of transareal studies. Thus might one—to give an example that happens to be important to this work—only adequately understand the special nature of the Caribbean if one incorporates into a world-wide panorama not only its internal, archipelagic relationality of multiple communications between its islands and archipelagos, but the dynamics of external relationality as well. This should happen, within the viewpoint of the transarchipelagic, with the Canaries or the Philippines as the case may be, and likewise, with a view to the changing relations to different European (colonial) powers. For just as the example of the “Black Atlantic”⁹⁶ and the forced deportation of millions of slaves show, it is essential to incorporate, on the level of external relationality, the respective possessions of these colonial powers in Africa, Asia, or Oceania, in the Americas or in the Arab world, in order to be able to comprehend transareally, and with it movement-historically, the entire complexity of colonial and imperial biopolitics. Of just how much significance these connections are to history and cultural theory has been impressively demonstrated by the cultural theoretician and poet from Mauritius, Khal Torabully, in his reflections on Indian coolies and the concept that follows from it, “coolitude.”⁹⁷

If a space is thus substantially developed and molded by the movements related to it in the past, the present, and (prospectively) the future, then the combinatorics between the five gradations distinguished from one another here are extremely informative as regards political, cultural, or specific literary phenomena which, without these movements, could not be adequately considered or described. *TransArea* aims at perspectivizing world-wide relationality in both an internal and an external interweaving, such that in no way must Europe stand at the point of intersection nor even in the focus of the widely varying figures of movement. On the contrary: transareal studies are interested in a particular way for South-South relations as they have been the order of the day since the begin-

⁹⁶ See, along with the already-mentioned “classics” of Paul Gilroy, the volume *Der Black Atlantic*. Published by the House of World Cultures in collaboration with Tina Campt and Paul Gilroy. Berlin: Haus der Kulturen der Welt 2004.

⁹⁷ See Khal Torabully: *Cale d’Etoile—Coolitude*. La Réunion: Editions Azalées 1992; also Marina Carter / Khal Torabully: *Coolitude. An Anthology of the Indian Labour Diaspora*. London: Anthem Press – Wimbledon Publishing Company 2002.

ning of the first phase of accelerated globalization and the first slave markets of the “New World.” That these phenomena and processes of untrammled plundering are also incidentally of enormous value to an understanding of the developments in the northern portion of the globe certainly need not be emphasized again at this point.

With the example of the *Istanbul-Berlin-Trilogie*⁹⁸ of the Turkish-born Emine Sevgi Özdamer, who now ranks among the most renowned of German-language authors, it was already possible to demonstrate in an earlier study⁹⁹ that, as translocal urban movements arrange themselves at the same time within a transnational and transareal space of migration, the pendular movements of the female protagonist between the European and Asian shores of Istanbul are already always pointing in advance to those movements that the young woman will make in divided Berlin between East and West. The degree to which, in an experimental fashion, new vectorial conceptions of big cities arise in the overlying figures of movement can also be demonstrated by means of the narrative texts of Assia Djebar, Yoko Tawada, or Cécile Wajsbrot,¹⁰⁰ to name but a few of the many possible examples. The transarchipelagic relations traced in this book by means of ever-changing examples and phases expand this transareal perspectivism into a globalized context.

Let us then draw briefly upon an additional transareal example. For hardly less complex than Emine Sevgi Özdamer’s trilogy is the structure of the diegesis of the 1999 novel *The African Shore*,¹⁰¹ by the Guatemalan author Rodrigo Rey Rosa. Here, in the form of the three central protagonists, Africa, Europe, and America, or accordingly, Morocco, France, and Colombia, are so interwoven with one another that the transcontinental and transnational dimension in Moroccan Tangier creates a translocal microcosm, so to speak, upon which is superimposed, in a concentrated form, the long history of Spanish and Portuguese, English and French colonialism. And worthy of note: this is by a Guatemalan author who, through the long years of his own very particular exile, is intimately familiar with many of the original locations of *La orilla africana*. The chance meeting of the three main characters brings together a highly variegated

98 Emine Sevgi Özdamer: *Sonne auf halbem Weg. Die Istanbul–Berlin–Trilogie*. Cologne: Kiepenheuer & Witsch 2006.

99 C.f. Ottmar Ette: *ZwischenWeltenSchreiben. Literaturen ohne festen Wohnsitz*, pp. 181–203.

100 See also Ottmar Ette: “Urbanity and Literature—Cities as Transareal Spaces of Movement in Assia Djebar, Emine Sevgi Özdamer, and Cécile Wajsbrot.” In: *European Review* (Cambridge) XIX, 3 (2011), pp. 367–383:

101 C.f. Rodrigo Rey Rosa: *La orilla africana*. Prefacio de Pere Gimferrer. Barcelona: Editorial Seix Barral 1999.

collective and individual knowledge for living that impressively presents to the eye the transareal dimension of this Central American novel not only on the level of the diegesis, but on that of the various forms and norms of physicality. The vectorial dimension is present in the foreground of all translation processes that take place between the languages, between the cultures, between the bodies in a profoundly translocalized place—in the fractal, insular world of Tangier.

The literatures of the world hold and unfold in their multilingual texts not only the most variegated life forms and life norms, but also generate a complex and transareal knowledge for living and knowledge for living together¹⁰² that is experimentally tested in both the discovered and the invented landscapes of the theory of these texts. At what point may the discovered be distinguished from the invented? Are not both bound to an experience and to a “being-lived,” which in their nomadic, transareal dimensions shape the environment of millions of people today?

In the constant pendular movements, and the circulation of knowledge and goods associated with them, between exiled Cubans in Miami and the families from which they came in the *Oriente* of Cuba, and between indigenous communities in Guatemala and urban *comunidades* in greater Los Angeles, choreographic figures appear which, in a translocal manner, pose transnational and transareal questions as well as, of course, transdisciplinary ones. In the same way, if the boundaries of disciplinary divisions in the academic field are put in question here, then the 19th century¹⁰³ migrations of leased laborers from the Indian region could also generate connections of a translocal sort within a transcontinental framework, as had already been the case during the second as well as the first phase of accelerated globalization in another transatlantic power structure, that is, between villages in Spanish Extremadura and the high plains of New Spain or the Island World of the Philippines. Everything is connected to everything, and does not tolerate being hacked into little pieces: amidst the movements, we come upon earlier movements, amidst places, other places. *Une mondialisation peut en cacher une autre.*

As a perfect example of the deliberately vectorial construction of worldwide interconnectedness that, through the movements of the protagonist, time and again produces the old migrations in ever new ways, one could perhaps

102 C.f. Ottmar Ette: *ZusammenLebensWissen*

103 See also Jürgen Osterhammel: *The Transformation of the World. A Global History of the Nineteenth Century*. Translated by Patric Camiller. Princeton–Oxford: Princeton UP 2014. Ger.: Jürgen Osterhammel: *Die Verwandlung der Welt. Eine Geschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts*. Munich: C.H. Beck 2010.

suggest Amin Maalouf's 2004 text *Origines*¹⁰⁴ no path that was not cleared by earlier paths, no village in Lebanon that might not stand in connection with villages and cities world-wide. Any sort of attempt to identify the "origins" of a movement thus opens itself again and again to other, earlier or later, movements, such that *the* sought-after origin loses itself, again and again, in countless plural origins. Movements always give evidence of how they were facilitated, and they, for their part, again and again facilitate, anew and from the beginning, that which, time and again, points to what came earlier and anticipates what is to come. For transareal studies, too, it is not about a *single* origin, but as many origins as possible, not about a *single* background, but as many backgrounds as possible, which try out, in the experimental space of the literatures of the world—and not a world literature centered upon Europe—futures that are new and perhaps not yet thought of.

Literary landscapes—the highly developed examination of the *paysage littéraire*¹⁰⁵ in France, too, could provide a great many examples—may be read in the occidental tradition as *landscapes of theory*.¹⁰⁶ They embody, vividly to the point of the picturesque, complex movements of understanding within a migratory space that they themselves expand, a space which so often, in the highly variegated literatures of the world (especially during the phases of accelerated globalization), undermines or oversteps the demarcations of national borders. To the same extent, whether it concerns deserts devoid of human life or densely populated archipelagos in this landscape of theory, lonely mountain regions or flooded river landscapes: they always embody and stage the movement-model of life forms and life norms in which historical trailblazing and contemporary turnings enter into a mobile network of coordinates in order to territorialize reproducibly the hermeneutic motions of understanding to which they aspire.

Landscapes of theory are *also* landscapes of politics—and vice versa. Characterized by transnational relations on a level that is at once transareal and transcontinental—to offer here again but one example—are the political efforts that, on the initiative of the Brazilian president at the time, led in May, 2005, to the calling of a summit in Brazil between the countries of Central America and

104 Amin Maalouf: *Origines*. Paris: Editions Grasset & Fasquelle 2004.

105 From the secondary literature, which meanwhile has grown to be quite comprehensive, but which, admittedly, does not seldom depend on more static conceptions of landscape, here I will mention only Simon Schama: *Paysage et mémoire*. Paris: Seuil 1999; also Marc Desportes: *Paysages en mouvement—Transports et perception de l'espace, XVIIIe–XXe siècles*. Paris: Gallimard 2005.

106 On this concept, c.f. Ottmar Ette: *Literatur in Bewegung*, pp. 531–538.

the states of the Arab League. These efforts, too, stand in the long line of a tradition of political path-finding and initiatives whereby, in this case, the consequences of altered world-political configurations and trade possibilities led to forms of more intensive cultural cooperation. Brazil has long since become a powerful factor in the global South.

In the political realm, transcontinental and transnational South-South relations undoubtedly stand at the center of public debate and world political attention. Exerting an effect that is only visible in the long term, but is in no way less significant, are the strengthening Arab-American cultural connections on the transareal niveau.¹⁰⁷ They concern not only the Arab-Americas, but also throw a significant light upon new forms, practices, and methods for thinking of Latin America transareally within a world-wide context and understanding it in a new way. There are, meanwhile, numerous studies on hand that examine not only Arab-American, but also, to no small extent, American-African, American-European, or American-Asian relations, the mobile networks of which configure the hemispheric space of the Americas like single nations or nation-states.¹⁰⁸

This intensification of transareal studies does not, of course, relate only to the current phase of accelerated globalization, but rather—just as this book, in connection with the aforementioned conference proceedings, should demonstrate—brings earlier phases of accelerated globalization to new light. How could we, without a poetics of movement, understand—to lift but a few examples from the third part of the present volume—such a fascinating translingual

107 See also Ottmar Ette / Friederike Pannewick (eds.): *ArabAmericas. Literary Entanglements of the American Hemisphere and the Arab World*. Frankfurt am Main–Madrid: Vervuert Verlag–Iberoamericana 2006.

108 See also, among others, Marianne Braig / Ottmar Ette, et.al. (eds.): *Grenzen der Macht–Macht der Grenzen*; Peter Birle / Marianne Braig, et.al. (eds.): *Hemisphärische Knostruktionen der Amerikas*; Ottmar Ette / Friederike Pannewick (eds.): *ArabAmerikas*; Ineke Phaf-Rheinberger / Tiago de Oliveira Pinto (eds.) *AfricAmericas. Itineraries, Dialogues, and Sounds*. Madrid–Frankfurt am Main: Iberoamericana–Vervuert 2008; Ottmar Ette (ed.): *Caribbean(s) on the move–Archipiélagos literarios del Caribe. A TransArea Symposium*. Frankfurt am Main–New York, et.al.: Peter Lang Verlag 2008; Ottmar Ette / Dieter Ingenschay, et.al. (eds.): *EuropAmerikas. Transatlantische Beziehungen*. Frankfurt am Main–Madrid: Vervuert Verlag–Iberoamericana 2008; Ottmar Ette / Horst Nitschak (eds.): *Trans*Chile. Cultura–Historia–Itinerarios–Literatura–Educación. Un acercamiento transareal*. Madrid–Frankfurt am Main: Iberoamericana/Vervuert 2010; Ottmar Ette/Gesine Müller (eds.): *Caleidoscopias colonials*; Ottmar Ette / Werner Mackenbach et.al. (eds.): *Trans(it)Areas. Convivencias en Centroamérica y el Caribe. Un simposio transareal*. Berlin: edition tranvía – Verlag Walter Frey 2011; Ottmar Ette / Gesine Müller (eds.): *Worldwide/weltweit. Archipiélagos como espacios de prueba de convivencia global*. Madrid–Frankfurt am Main: Iberoamericana 2012.

work as that of the Philippine-born author and freedom fighter José Rizal who, like the Cuban José Martí, drew from his own experiences on different continents his insights into the accelerated globalization of his time at the turn of the 20th century? And what challenges to our geocultural and geopolitical thinking lie within the multifaceted work of Lafcadio Hearn, that appeared during the third phase of accelerated globalization, if we analyze his connections (not solely biographically created) between the Aegean, the British Isles, the Island World of the Mississippi delta, the Caribbean, and the Japanese archipelago from a transareal perspective of movement? In this sense, TransArea studies attempt to formulate a creative answer to the challenges of the current phase of accelerated globalization, which, of course, will not remain restricted to investigation of the turn from the 20th to the 21st century. Transareally directed investigations are aimed, in an epistemologically grounded fashion, at the movements within the movements, at the globalizations within globalization.

Research and institutions of the traditional variety, oriented by regional studies, tend demonstrably either to overlook transareal patterns of movement completely or, at least, to minimize their significance, if such phenomena do not seem to fit into the loose territorial or even continental framework that constitutes and institutionally (perhaps as an interdisciplinary center) stabilizes their own field of investigation, be it Great Britain or Italy, Southeast Asia or Latin America. For patterns of movement that reach beyond each respectively familiar *area* appear not infrequently as being presumably far less relevant, as long as they do not pertain to centers within Europe or the USA.

For a long time, neither the specialists in Japanese nor in colonial Spanish or European art were interested in Namban art. And yet these works of art give fascinating witness, between the poles of Asian, American, and European pictorial tradition, to an artistic creativity that comes into existence in the crossing of greatly differing cultures.¹⁰⁹ The extensive masking of the cultural impact of Indian leased and migrant workers or the Arab-American connections in the tropical regions of the Americas offer for the problematic sketched here equally meaningful examples, like the distribution of Caribbean studies into the most widely differing disciplines and their disciplinary logics. It is in just these sorts of complexly constructed realms of cultural intersection that a transareally applied philology can achieve pioneering accomplishments which will contrib-

109 See, for example, the impressive volume by Rodrigo Rivero Lake: *Namban Art in Viceregal Mexico*. Mexico City: Estilo México Editores–Turner 2005.

ute to the critical scrutiny and clean-up of the national-literary and sometimes racist hazardous waste of the national philologies of the 19th century.¹¹⁰

Not infrequently, disciplinary “authorities” or “affiliations” assert that there are deficiencies in the perceptual models of entire branches of research or highly specialized focuses of regional research. Even though the Arab-American connections of the 19th and 20th centuries are still present in the literatures of Latin America, or the forms of expression of the Namban artists may still be found in the New-Spanish paintings of the 17th and 18th centuries, they appear either hardly or not at all on the radar of purely disciplinarily or, at best, interdisciplinarily anchored regional studies, which concentrate entirely upon their respective *area* and beyond that, at the most, take account of its connection to the (European) location of the institution. Transareal studies attempt to mobilize these mental mappings and to sensitize them to transversal movements. For over the course of the past decade, things have—and not simply through a ‘spatial turn’—demonstrably begun to move.

Phenomena such as those briefly sketched here are, in the context of phases of accelerated globalization, of enormous interest to a science that is directed toward the research horizon of transareal studies. The literatures of the world—and not only those without a fixed abode—are working out this vectorial dimension of the transareal with all desirable clarity. And the knowledge accumulated in literature can serve very well as a corrective for disciplinarily restricted patterns of perception. Might one not express, with Roland Barthes, that literature is “*toujours en avance sur tout*,”¹¹¹ that is, ahead of everything—including the sciences—and thus contains a treasure trove of experiences, insights, and enrichments that must necessarily be discovered and elevated, scientifically and from the perspective of science for living? And would it not then accordingly be an important task of literary science to translate and transmit this knowledge, thus rendering it socially useful?

The future of area studies thus lies—and this is not only in the field of Hispanic or Latin American studies—in opening out into *TransArea studies*, which tie together *area*-connected competencies with transdisciplinary research practices. It is one of the loftiest and most urgent duties of philology not only to lift up this treasure in the awareness of the special relevance of literature as just de-

110 C.f. Markus Messling / Ottmar Ette (eds.): *Wort–Macht–Stamm. Rassismus und Determinismus in der Philologie des 19. Jahrhunderts*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink 2012.

111 Roland Barthes: *Comment vivre ensemble. Simulations romanesques de quelques espaces quotidiens*. Notes de cours et de séminaires au Collège de France, 1976–1977. Texte établi, annoté et présenté par Claude Coste. Paris: Seuil–IMEC 2002, p. 167.

scribed, but also—and herein, too, lies an ethical obligation—to make it democratically available to the broadest possible sections of the population.

For the future of literary and cultural sciences, a transareal and movement-oriented new direction is therefore a matter of greatest urgency. If one were to wish—strongly contouring, to be sure—to differentiate a transareal literary science in the assemblage of various disciplines of TransArea studies from traditional comparative approaches, one might state that the latter statically compare and contrast the politics, societies, economies, or symbolic productions of different countries, while a transareal science is more precisely directed toward the mobility, the exchange, and the mutually transformative processes. Transareal studies are less about spaces than paths, less about border demarcation than border shifting, less about territories than about relations and communications: they examine the traditions accessible to them from a transversal perspective that is interested in transfers, and above all, in the transformations that these bring about. For this networked age demands mobile and relational, transdisciplinary and transareal scientific concepts and a movement-oriented terminology which in the realm of philology, for instance, can no longer be developed and spelled out only on the basis of a few European national literatures.

It seems to me to be evident, in the midst of a world-historical situation of the dissolution of order, of the *dérive* and of the *dérèglement*, that it is also now essential to translate this knowledge into our societies and thereby render it socially productive. Literature as the laboratory of the multilogical has for millennia stockpiled knowledge that can be conducive to bridging the ever more threatening chasm that Amin Maalouf pointed out in his recent essay:

It concerns the rift that yawns between our rapid material evolution, that day by day strips us of more of our shackles, and our exceedingly slow moral evolution, that does not allow us to confront the tragic consequences of this unshackling. Be it understood: the material evolution cannot, and may not, be slowed. Instead, our moral evolution must be considerably accelerated, must most urgently be lifted to the niveau of our technological evolution, which makes necessary a true revolution in patterns of behavior.¹¹²

But where has such a revolution in patterns of behavior, counter to the cultures, counter to the political systems, and counter to historical times, been more intensively tested than in the literatures of the world? Their fascinating, equally provocative and prospective experiments with the knowledge regarding norms of life and forms of life shall be followed in the coming chapters as they cut across four phases of accelerated globalization.

¹¹² Amin Maalouf: *Le dérèglement du monde*, p. 81.

Leaving this compass rose of concepts, *TransArea* can be clearly, prospectively outlined in the sense of a theory-horizon, as it was already tested and put into practice in the framework of various national and international projects.¹¹³ This theory-horizon is committed in its vectorized conceptuality to the literatures of the world and to a poetics of movement.

Mission Statement

Beyond Area Studies,
TransArea Studies point out mobile conceptions of spaces and places.

Beyond spatial history,
TransArea Studies emphasize vectorial dynamisms and processes.

Beyond traditional comparative studies,
TransArea Studies intensify transdisciplinary approaches and perspectives.

Beyond international relationships,
TransArea Studies analyze translocal, transregional, transnational, and transcontinental phenomena.

Beyond continuous territorial conceptions,
TransArea Studies design innovative discontinuous and fractal forms of understanding: internal and external relations of archipelagic and transarchipelagic patterns.

For TransArea Studies, spaces and territories are made out of movements and vectorizations: frontiers are understood by their criss-crossings at a global scale: circulations of knowledge in specific historical periods of accelerated globalization: transcultural landscapes translated into new prospective horizons.

113 I placed the subsequent mission statement at the start of an internet portal that presents such projects, makes their mutually interwoven nature apparent, and seeks to encourage future projects in the transareal field of research. This portal, with the name *POINTS (Potsdam International Network for TransArea Studies)* can be found at www.uni.potsdam.de/tapoints and offers a variety of possibilities for concrete proposals, but also space for comments, tips, and critique.