

Namely, since the beginning of the 1980s, owing to the closing down of the tavern "Tingl Tangl", the Jutro poezije Forum has not managed to find suitable long-term "accommodation" for its programme, which is why it has frequently been forced to change locations, even to make forced pauses, which would sometimes last for several months.

The Jutro poezije Forum — which has, since the beginning, imposed itself as a prominent Saturday cultural event in the city — has been visited by virtually all eminent names of Croatian poetry; while apart from the poets, actors — who would later become famous — began their acting careers in it.

Announced in advance, the poet for a particular Saturday would arrive somewhat earlier, get his drink and would arrange with the chairperson the details concerning his presentation. The rules were set a long time ago: the main guest would introduce himself to the audience with his entire poetic oeuvre, and then a pause would follow. After the pause, each of the present poets would recite one of their poems. In the end, after an hour and a half or two, the Jutro poezije Forum would end.

In 1990, the position of the chairman of the Jutro poezije Forum was taken over by the writer Saša Meršinjak. In 1998, it was registered as an association. Two poetry awards were established: The Josip Sever Award and the Ružica Orešković Award, and the publishing of books was initiated — of both younger authors as well as recognised Croatian poets. In the "Jutro poezije" ("Morning of Poetry") book series — which is conceived as a space for the best and the most recent in contemporary Croatian poetry — nineteen authors have published their works, among whom there have been many renowned Croatian poets. A month after the death of Saša Meršinjak, in 2008, Robert Roklicer became the chairman of this cult poetry forum. The living poetic word has returned to the Saturday mornings of Zagreb.

]] d.s.

THE BOUNDARIES OF FRANCOPHONIA

"Francontraste", the First International Francophone Scientific Convention of the University of Zagreb, 2nd — 4th December 2010

At the first Francophone scientific convention at the University of Zagreb — *Le français en contraste: langue et culture francophones dans l'espace de la communication* (French in Contrast: The Francophone Language and Culture in the Space of Communication), eighty-two participants gave their lectures in the French language in four fields: didactic, linguistic, literary and translation. It is incredible how many lecturers, consciously or subconsciously, referred to the preoccupation of all participants in the collective subconscious — therefore, of all of us. We are all, namely, interested in boundaries. Even when they did not call them so, they could not escape the motifs of the space, place, obstacle and openness.

All the four thematic determinants adopted the opposition between the place and the space, both the outer as well as the inner, whether it was the opposition of the spirit — the outer world (in literature); the language of the native speaker — the foreign language (in linguistics); the sound of the source language — the intonation of the foreign language (in translation), or it was the matter of crossing the boundaries of a national state, therefore the original space abroad, therefore the outer foreign space, with the help of a linguistic passport, in the didactic sense (Yvonne Vrhovac).

The boundaries were reexamined from five different viewpoints. Linguistic boundaries were reexamined *on the timeline*. Linguists were reexamining the category of "easy" and "difficult" languages, and they concluded that the English language — with its "easiness" — had spread the demagogic idea that it was more easily accessible than, for instance, French — which had, for a long time, been the *lingua franca* (Francis Yaiche). The idea was discussed that one language could also become one culture, and that cultures and their heterogeneity would be lost. Namely, the first language influences the space of the second; in a way, it tears apart the reality and the world of the second language (Raymond Renard). The inner world of every Romance language was also considered on the comparative level in its microcosm (Dražen Varga).

On the level of the sound, the echo of the source language in the world of the foreign language was being reexamined in many different aspects. Thus, the role of the "theoretical ear" was emphasised, i.e. the ear which imagines the communication differently than the speaker in the everyday situation does (Olivier Soutet). Different

focalisation was also considered, and the author determined that every interpretation of the text was a "solitary work", where the unexpected also happened; namely, we lose our voice, or entirely unexpectedly, manage to express the identities which hide behind the text (Nenad Ivić).

The boundaries were also reexamined on the level of the open, *outer space*. That space is what lies behind the real boundary of a character (his window, his doors, an obstacle, or a real country), or it lies behind the imaginary boundary (the dislocated motifs of the reality in Victor Hugo — Ivić), the airport and the railway station in Jean Echenoz (Alonso Sutil Maria Cruz), the climatological determinism in the authors of the Enlightenment (Ben Saad Nizar), or the boundaries in the chivalry play in *Chrétien de Troyes* (Đurđa Šinko-Depierris). This is also a case of an entirely practical crossing of the boundary with the help of the media (the example of the Francophone television channel "TV5 monde", Evelyne Paquier), or by using a linguistic passport (Ivana Franić, Vedrana Berlangi).

The boundaries were also analysed on the level of the inner, *spiritual space*. We are, namely, governed by single-layeredness, the inner freedom which René Char possessed, a free place of an empty spirit (Marie Legret). We are governed by our former homeland, which is manifested in our creative work — also in the second homeland and in the second language — as in the example of the Cameroonian authors in France (Messa Wambé Caroline Flore); and we are also governed by our multilingualism, such as the Russian, French and Arabic multilingualism, in Isabelle Eberhardt (Annemarie Dinvaot).

Finally, the boundaries were analysed also *on the level of identity*. If we analyse identity, we can analyse it in many oppositions; we can write an autobiography and chose the subjectivity ourselves; we can deal with fictitious themes and identify ourselves with mythical characters; discuss the relationship between us and the other, the thing and nothing, the otherness and the exile of an immigrant woman. We can also identify ourselves with the contemporary *I* and "become what we are".

Nevertheless, the writer is always in exile; his homeland becomes the identity of the writer — the literary country, where his fellow citizens are other men and women writers. We can determine ourselves in terms of the climate, merge with it,

but at the same time the nation, or the language as its synonym, can become our instrument of power. Languages are the luggage of every immigrant; but if he uses them powerfully, he changes his identities, for that is what he wanted.

Once we have acquired multilingualism or unilingualism, we have not performed a conscious action (Julio Murillo Puyal). We subconsciously use many languages, but only as long as they are effective and usable, and that is why the context of the French language, but also of all other Romance languages, is exceptionally important. The context, in other words, the culture and the history of the language, is subconsciously transferred onto the speaker, and it is how the Roman civilisation survives and is created anew, which gives it an exceptional role — the international dimension.

The primary role of language is educational: it raises the speaker in such a way that he adopts an



entire plurality of meanings. If we are left devoid of all languages, if we do not revive our languages of very few speakers, if we do not revive them by our own national history and meanings, and then also by the history and the meanings of a foreign language that we use, only one human culture will remain, but who says that this unilingualism will be good? All lecturers defended the prominence of the French language and culture in the conflict with precisely opposite tendencies. The Francophone speakers agreed that the French language had to survive, and in this, the Croatian scholarly circle struggles to help. I hope that next year the Francophone lecturers will also be encouraged to join us in the work on this exuberant linguistic ecology.

|| Ana Kapraljević