

Systems of Literature Outside their Matrix: Framing Unstable Émigré and Stable 'Voluntary Exile' Models of National Literature

Boris Škvorc
Macquarie University, Sydney

Abstract

Vinko Brešić defined the essential difference between émigré and exile literature in his article *Hrvatska emigrantska književnost (1945-1990)* (Croatian Émigré Literature [1945-1990]). This paper, which is based on the hypotheses of Brešić and Grubišić (1991), as well as some of my articles written in 195 and 1998, attempts to work out the literary models of unstable groups of émigré literature, affirming the difference between the émigré (migrant), the ethnic (minority) and, finally, the third group of what I call the 'voluntary' exile model. In this sense, this paper deals with the types of 'dislocatedness' in the corpus of émigré literature, and the models of their incorporation/exclusion in the matrix of Croatian literature and the adopted literary framework (in this case, Australian literature).

Here I use two recently published novels as examples that illustrate some of the border phenomena in the context of the above model. The first is the fictitious autobiographical novel *Mojmir* (1999), written by Ivana Bačić Serdarević, which partly fits into the émigré model. The second is Branka Čubrilo's 'unhistorically' motivated family chronicle, *Male laži, velike laži* (Small Lies, Big Lies, 2001), which belongs to 'voluntary' exile literature, and thus belongs more to Croatian literature proper than to émigré literature. Both authors live in Sydney, but the model of their incorporation/exclusion into the two aforesaid bodies of literature are essentially different. On the basis of an analysis of these novels and their relation to the sources that condition them (the displaced environment), towards the end of this paper I try to determine their relation to the aforesaid bodies of literature which the novels, in a certain sense, are supposed to distinguish from one another.

1. *Émigré (migrant) literature or literature in the diaspora (exile)?*

Vinko Brešić (2001:179-212) contends that the corpus of Croatian literature is "incomplete, and [that] its current is disorderly, owing to political and demographic fractures in the history of the nation." He believes that the consequences of this are a literary-artistic production among Croatians and in the Croatian language which lives "more or less outside the current of the national matrix" (ibid.:179). That literature outside the 'national matrix' Brešić divides into the categories of stable and unstable: the first has developed in countries where Croatians live as national minorities, such as Austria, Vojvodina (in Serbia), Romania and Hungary (see Blažetin 1998); the second has developed in countries where Croatians live as migrants or in exile (see Grubišić 1991:77-80). Since migration is understood as an event and exile as a state (see Pross, in Brešić, ibid.:180), *émigré* literature can be roughly defined as that which develops independently and relatively freely of its matrix, while exile literature maintains contact with its matrix, as was the case with Russian literature from the time of the October Revolution to the 1990s. Concerning exile literature, it need not influence the matrix literature because its works are often unknown in the countries in which the latter develops, and this is due to historical and other factors that do not allow for mutual communication between the two. When considering the Croatian case, just like the Russian or Czech, one must bear in mind the decades of pressure exerted by the totalitarian regime. At the same time, its freedom was limited by given internal factors, and its thematic and formal starting-points were conditioned by external pressures. In mentioning and describing the reasons for these restrictions, Vinko Grubišić notes that the restrictive factors frequently arise out of the framework of what is given and influence "not so much the style, but the essence of writing" (1991:37).

On the basis of the aforesaid assertions advanced by Brešić and Grubišić, as well as some corrections to papers I published in 1995 and 1998,¹ I will try to shed some light on the types of 'dislocatedness' in *émigré* (migrant) and exile literature. My intention is to determine the contextual assumptions upon

which it is possible to specify the parameters of incorporation (or exclusion) of this type of 'banished' corpus into two diachronic systems. There is, on the one hand, that type which belongs within the corpus of the 'home country' and is characterised, temporally and spatially, by the 'conditioned sources' of certain texts. On the other hand, there is that national corpus of language in which works have emerged to which they are more related, thematically and stylistically, than to the conditioned sources of the adopted corpus. 'Conditioned source' here refers to the Australian (English) language, literature and extra-literary framework. Of itself, this sort of situation represents a specific phenomenon and it is possible to conduct research into 'banished' literary communication from one's own environment.²

In this sense, it is worthwhile mentioning the view that today, in the age of globalisation, it is extremely difficult to talk about exile as a state, be that German, Russian, Serbian, Czech or Croatian literature.³ I would contend, however, that it is possible to employ the concept of 'voluntary' exile, namely, self-banishment from one's place of origins, home or 'house',⁴ as well as from one's own language and culture, irrespective of the political, economic or cultural motives involved. The fact that this situation is today the natural state of affairs and that we can observe this type of 'exile' in all fields of human activity – from the 'poor conditions' for the development of young scholars, to the 'lack of a creative atmosphere' and 'small-mindedness' in the case of artists who 'decide' in favour of voluntary exile – shows that banishment is the prerequisite for a certain form of creativity.⁵

Changes in international political conditions, in which the world has artificially become a 'global village', has created a situation whereby exile from the imposed state of affairs has become a voluntary category and, as such, is subject to changes and transformations in the possibility of realising one's own otherness and return, be that physical or spiritual, into the arms of the corpus of one's native language and a range of conditioned sources which that language encompasses. The practical realisation of this sort of post-exilic state we notice in writers such as Boris Maruna and Vinko Nikolić, both of whom returned to Croatia following the changes of 1991, or Alexander Solzhenitsyn and Czesław Miłosz. On the other hand, we also notice cases of post-exilic existence

in *another* place and the transition of writers into the language and cultural corpus of the adopted country. These receptive, and usually, 'large' cultures have accepted 'former' exiled persons and adopted them as migrants, as is the case with some very influential writers during the second half of the twentieth century. The same often applies to transitional smaller countries. We need only mention here writers such as Vladimir Nabokov, Ivo Andrić, Mirko Kovač and Milan Kundera.

There are, of course, authors who have chosen voluntary exile, thereby remaining within the literary corpus of the language and country of their origins, but who also opt for the position of otherness within *another* culture. Thus Australian writer Helen Gardner has lived for years in Greece and Peter Carey, Australia's most read and esteemed author, continues to live in New York. In Croatian literature there is the famous case of Dubravka Ugrešić, but in this paper we will have something to say about Branka Ćubrilo who, I think, is representative of a similar situation, but on a different level of artistic creativity.

In contrast to the 'post-exilic' situation, in which writers both accept and influence two literary corpuses, we can take heed, conditionally speaking, of the formation of a corpus of émigré literature which often frames itself independently of the two relevant (matrix) corpuses: the language and country of origin, in our case Croatia, as well as the adopted country and its literary corpus. That literature relates itself only sporadically to trends in the two corpuses: one corresponds to a set of frames, the other provides the language and tradition. From the set of frames and tradition, this type of dislocated continuity (Brešić, *ibid.*) and non-relatedness decides in favour of non-selectively and creates a pseudo-postmodern type of expression in which 'everything is permitted' (Lyotard 1984), and in which "everything that can be combined together goes" (Fiedler 1969). It does not demolish the existing tradition of modernism, but rather creates its own path which is not, in principle, motivated. And this corpus 'in formation' we can divide into two groups: the first is migrant literature in the traditional sense of the word, represented mainly by first generation writers;⁶ the other relates to the appearance of ethnic literature which is part of the literature of the adopted country. It secures for itself a unique space and the possibility of deviating

from the major encompassing corpus which, in essence, is more than a corpus to which, according to the logic of things, migrant literature primarily relates itself. At the same time, however, that literary production does not, with its 'aberration', approximate itself to the systematisation of the corpus of the 'country of origin'.

2. The unstable portion of the corpus of extra-matrix literature

We have already seen that Brešić refers to the unstable course of extra-matrix literature (ibid.). The textbook model of this type of literary production is discernible in the case of the history of the literature of Hungarian Croats, whose continuity was described by Blažetin (ibid.) This model of extra-matrix literature relates to the matrix corpus as a constructed system and can be compared, with its general differences and similarities, to this system. We can also notice the intertwining of two matrix literatures as diachronic series, between which we recognise certain mutual conditions in, if nothing else, the 'cracks' in the systems.

On the other hand, the unstable model of extra-matrix literature is accompanied by more problems for the researcher. First, it is extremely difficult to determine the corpus itself and its range. The researcher will encounter many problems because individual works were published by small, and often no longer existing, publishers or by the authors themselves. Many books are not catalogued, and frequently nothing has been written about them in periodicals. There is no continuity in critical reception, nor is there, traditionally speaking, communication among individual exilic groups (mainly nationally oriented and linked with clubs and churches)⁷ or migrant associations (often in contact with appropriate institutions of the former Yugoslavia,⁸ including schools and consulates). Following the changes in Croatia during the early 1990s, this division has been eradicated, but the problems associated with research and the collection of data remain the same.

And while some of the migrant portion of this diaspora model is known in Croatia, very little is known of patriotic

periodicals and writers in exile, and the framework of the matrix corpus very rarely includes exiled persons, even in cases when they were part of the matrix corpus prior to their period of exile. Unfortunately, the instability of the model conditioned by political frameworks has not changed much after the disappearance of the 'conditions' of its existence. Namely, since the 1990s there no longer exist conditions for calling this literature exilic, but only migrant or émigré. And during that period of division, when two matrixes began to intertwine into a unique system of émigré literature, and when the exilic state became something else, there was also an improvement in the conditions for the description and systematisation of data, namely, for listing the corpus. The majority of published books are linked with specific small communities and are not known outside their own circles. An example of this is the August Šenoa Literary Society in Melbourne, whose publications are rarely known even to their colleagues in Sydney. Co-operation between HALUD and the Mile Budak Literary Society almost does not exist, even though both organisations operate in Sydney. Some works have been published by the Croatian Studies Centre at Macquarie University. There are small organisations and publishers in New Zealand, as well as in Perth and other cities and continents where Croatians live. In this sense, not only can we not say that both corpuses are known to us, but we cannot even say that their contours are completely clear to us. Thus it is extremely difficult, for example, to obtain individual samples of several novels written during the 1950s and 1960s in Australia, and it is even more difficult to obtain collections of poems which, like novels, are often self-published and are not catalogued in the National Library.

And though every attempt to describe the 'entire corpus' appears futile, it seems to me that some processes, which are evident from an analysis of the available material, are very similar. Certain literary procedures and stylistic peculiarities appear in various areas and in books that are, generically, of the same origins, in spite of mutual non-correspondence and insufficient communication between different spatially and ideologically conditioned sources. In this sense, for example, stylistic similarities and a formal correspondence, and even the occasional poetry

which glorifies 'heroes' of different kinds, are discernible by listing through *Nova doba* (*The New Age*), *Spremnost* (*Readiness*), *Hrvatski dom* (*The Croatian Home*) and *Hrvatska sloboda* (*Croatian Freedom*) during the 1970s, on the one hand, and *Hrvatski vjesnik* (*The Croatian Herald*) during the 1980s, on the other. Spatially and ideologically distant, this type of poetry relates (or does not relate) in a similar way to the matrix corpus. The same can be said for prose works which are more rare than poems.⁹

On the basis of the above, it seems to me that, today, we can speak of three sub-groups in the unstable model of extra-matrix literature. The first is the sub-group of émigré literature, a literary corpus in formation which tries to create its own developmental course and reserves for itself that status which the extra-matrix groups of a stable character have. This group oscillates between relating to the literature of its mother tongue, the literary works of ethnic literature in the adopted country and the systematisation of its set of frames.¹⁰ The main characteristics that uphold the divergent processes are exclusion from both corpuses, the semblance of independence, a certain type of 'airless space' within which this literature exists, the need for a diachronic component, stylistic and grammatical hesitations (problems), and ordinary group performance. The second sub-group we can label ethnic literature, which predominantly relates to the literary corpus and language of the home country, while simultaneously maintaining its extra-literary otherness. In the case of Australia, this mainly concerns second generation Croatian poets (Sam Dušević, Mark Milić) and several prose works and plays, such as the scenario texts of Jenny Vuletich. As I wrote elsewhere (1998), among this group of literary experts the biggest problem is determining which work belongs to ethnic literature, and which is part of the majority cultural community of the home country. In contrast to her earlier texts, and with the exception of a musical number in Croatian (a remake of the Talking Heads song "Burning Down the House") and the reference to the Croatian origins of the main character's father, in the play *Tennessee and Me*, for example, there are almost no firm 'ethnic' elements. In this sense, it is almost impossible to find the appropriate parameters of 'ethnic' literature among second generation artists. In New Zealand we have the example

of the story-teller Amelija Batistich who writes in English, but who deals with the 'ethnically Croatian' in most of her works. Owing to this, some critics suggest that she is not accepted by the wider New Zealand public (Nola 2001:117), but her role in that literature is nevertheless significant because she represents a pioneering attempt to present another culture within a majority community (ibid.:127). In this sense, I believe that there will emerge external criteria for determining 'ethnic' literature, which is already visible in the literature.¹¹

The second form of 'ethnic' acceptance of 'other cultures' and creativity in 'another language' concerns the generation of writers who originally belong to another culture and for whom English is a 'learnt' language, but who nonetheless write in English and endeavour to produce literature within the corpus of the adopted country. This concerns, namely, a generation of writers for whom the language of the adopted country is not their first language, as opposed to second and third generation writers for whom English has become the first language. In Australia and New Zealand we have the examples Florida Vela, a first generation migrant who writes prose in English, and Tony Sunchich who, in spite also belonging to the first generation of migrants, also wrote a novel in English.

This type of otherness is especially interesting, and not only in the case of Croatians. Do Kundera's short novels *Slowness* (*La Lenteur*, 1995) and *Identity* (*L'Identité*, 1997) belong to French or Czech literature? And if these two novels really do belong to French literature, then what does that say about Kundera's presence in the corpus of Czech literature? Similar questions can be posed in the cases of Nabokov and Ivo Andrić, for instance. Where and when does Andrić's presence in the corpus of Croatian literature end, and when does he cease being an ethnic (Croatian) author in the corpus of Serbian literature, writing in Serbia as a Serbian writer? Do the works *Ex Ponto*, *Nemiri* (*Restlessness*) and *Pripovetke* (*Stories*), all of which were written in 1924 in the Ijekavian dialect, belong to the Croatian literature, and later works and novels to Serbian literature? Or do the novels *Croatia Mine* and *Taxi Driver*, written in English by Vela and Sunchich respectively, belong to New Zealand (Vela) or Australian (Sunchich) literature, or do they (nevertheless) relate

to the corpus of Croatian émigré literature, similar to the way Croatian Latin writers relate to the corpus of Croatian literature? And where does that portion of the corpus which Aponiuk says concerns 'depiction' belong, namely, the description of a certain nation in the literature of conditioned sources of the 'adopted country', irrespective of the author's ethnic origins or the majority community of the adopted country.¹²

Belonging to the third group of writers are authors who find themselves in voluntary exile. They still write in the language of the country from which they have been 'expelled', but by relating to that country as the *other* they attempt to fit in with the corpuses of both literatures: in the literary corpus of the adopted country and in the one in which they are remembered to have left, or intended to leave, some sort of trace. Good examples of this sort of situation are two writers who appear to go in opposite directions, but as part of a generic process that is not ideologically driven. The first is Dubravka Ugrešić, the other is Josip Novaković. And while Ugrešić writes in Croatian and takes on the role of *otherness* in Anglo-Saxon countries, Novaković writes in English and appears in Croatia as the *other*, a writer of Croatian origins who writes in English, and who fits into the system of Croatian literature through translations, that is, indirectly.

At a glance of the literary production of other nations, we can see that this sort of situation is present in other so-called minority literatures. We have, for example, in the case of Polish literature a whole series of young writers who live in Denmark and Germany, whose works are quickly translated into Danish and German, thus being in some sense more present in those literatures than in the Polish. Lukač (2004:142) wrote about the case of the Hungarian Jew Imre Kertésza, whose novels are more popular in German than in Hungarian, the language in which they were written. Bearing in mind similar historical circumstances, the same is the case with some novels by Peter Nádas, but this has more to do with the politically conditioned situation than with the exile model, which is evident with younger Polish authors at the 'voluntary' level, just like in the case of Ugrešić, Drakulić, Drndić or Novakovića. In Australia we can notice this type of exile in the case of Branka Ćubrilo.

3. *Two examples and (non)inclusion in the associated corpuses*

I have chosen two examples for the purposes of this paper. I should immediately say that it is impossible to give a detailed analysis of them here. Rather, I will speak only in broad strokes, and that mainly at the macro-structural level, and in relation to the systems which those macro-structures condition.

I begin with the assumption that one of these works fits into the unstable model of the corpus of émigré literature, and that the other belongs to the 'voluntary' exile model of the corpus of the extra-matrix unstable group. The latter relates more to the literature of the country of origins than to the literature of the country in which it was written, and whose conditioned sources encompassed the author during the time of writing. Regarding the types of non-relation of émigré literature with the homeland and the corpus of the country in which the work emerged, and especially in terms of poetry, I have already had something to say in the article "Suvremeni trenutak književnosti na hrvatskom jeziku u Australiji" ("The Contemporary State of Croatian Language Literature in Australia"). Here I will only briefly reiterate some of the most important points from that article. Apart from defining émigré literature, which continues to pose an almost insoluble problem, the question persists concerning the ungroundedness of the synchronic situation of this literature, be that in terms of a set of frames, namely, in relation to the literature of the adopted country which provides an extra-textual context (Australian and Anglo-Saxon in general), be that the literature of the country of origins, namely, the matrix literature with which it shares generic and stylistic characteristics, which are observable at first glance in the cases of German, Russian or Czech exile/exile literature. As for the Croatian case, which frequently depends on the synchronic state in the Croatian national matrix, we can first say that some segments of the Croatian literary diachroneity correspond. Apart from occasional poetry, patriotic poems that are linked more with the period of National Revival than with Croatian postmodern poetry, and some more successful works in the wake of poets such as Maruna and Vida (see Franjo Pervan, Duška

Selenić-Crnić or Ivana Bačić Serdarević), few are the works which can co-relate to contemporary or even modern Croatian literature.

Especially interesting in this regard is that the two novels considered here are a simulated autobiography, a very popular genre in Croatia today (see Helena Sablić-Tomić), and an 'unhistorically' motivated family chronicles, almost in the style of Latin American authors. We could perhaps establish a certain inter-textual correspondence between them and the novels of Nedjeljko Fabrio, given that they deal with the cultural intersections of the Adriatic and the Mediterranean region in general. The first novel was written by an author who has long been active in the migrant community as a poet, and she has already published a number of collections of poems. The works of Ivana Bačić-Serdarević are part of the émigré corpus and, apart from certain elements that relate to the aforementioned poets, correspond more with the works of other Croatian poets in Sydney, Melbourne and New Zealand (Glavor, Kumarich, Pervan, Jakopanec) than the works of the national corpus. These authors are subject to very different influences, including types of continuation with poets associated with *Hrvatska revija* (*The Croatian Review*), Croatian civil poetry of the 1930s, and even by pre-Kranjčevićan poetry, even though this relation is very arbitrarily determined. Namely, this probably has something to do with 'extra-corpus' instability rather than a conscious (negative) relation with the tradition.

The second author is a writer of prose who is not present in the corpus of émigré literature, even though she has lived and worked for years in Sydney. Her works do not appear in Australia, but in Croatia. Moreover, her novel (*Little Lies, Big Lies*, 2001) was published in Rijeka. According to external criteria, she is a typical example of an author in 'voluntary' exile, and not a case of someone who fits into the émigré unstable corpus.

The novel *Mojmir* by Ivana Bačić-Serdarević was published in Sydney, and is based on the narration of Mojmir Damjanović and his memories of Croatia after his arrival in Australia. Unlike contemporary postmodern autobiographical prose, Bačić-Serdarević's work contains all the elements that are characteristic of émigré 'banished' literature, which are

practically irreconcilable with any system to which they are indirectly related. Bačić-Serdarević does not utilise the story-telling tactics that are characteristic of today's prose, nor are there in her work textual levels 'behind the text'. Thus in the introduction the author says:

Eternal thanks to Mr. Mojmir Damjanović Bragadin, who faithfully retold to me his life story in 1995. For years I lived through and lived alongside Mojmir, and that is why I wrote this biography, in the form of a novel, in the first person singular. With this work I want to give you at least one pearl from the rich treasury of Mojmir's soul.

In (simulated?) naivety, the author does not question the reliability of the story, even though she is offered the possibility of controlling the manner of expression and the (narrative) power of multiplying the expressive potential. She believes the narrator, whose expression is transformed into material for a simulated autobiography. That this is not her (postmodern) tactic is visible in the fact that the text is interwoven with folk wisdom, the self-love of the narrator (Mojmir) and a documentary nature which is typical of émigré prose, with all its details and insistences. Only at the level of textual reception is it transformed into a pseudo-documentary and receive certain characteristics of the fictional text (the novel). Here I cite several examples from the text which illustrate the fact that, beneath the narrative, there is no hidden narrative tactic that offers something more (or other) than what Mojmir says, whose thoughts are conveyed by Bačić-Serdarević, and who wants to present his story to the 'public' in the hope of "entering into the eternity of forgetfulness and immortality."

For as the world fills up, we squander our energy, squandering it without stage-fright in sync with time, with the ticking of the clock which is sometimes a moment of joy for us, or in the company of hopeless eternity. I will remember for a moment my youth, when an hour with a beautiful girl was like a minute, when it seemed more than an hour in difficult times of despair, thereby affirming for me Einstein's theory of relativity about the conception of time in which everything is relative (p. 13).

Reality was not unknown to me in life. It was somehow closest to me, because I was by nature realistic and actual. Even in my craziest dreams I was realistic, my legs always firmly steadfast on the ground (p. 271).

She was carried away by his kindness, courtesy and numerous compliments which did not stop, but grew and multiplied day by day. It seemed that the value of compliments grew with their demand; it would come somewhat like the greater value of the exchange rate when there is a greater demand for loans (p. 299).

A bombastic style is one of the main characteristics of the Australian extra-matrix current of the development of literature in the Croatian language, which has the tendency to fit into the corpus. From poems which occasionally demonstrate a departure at the level of meaning between the signified and the signifier (not being their deconstructive intention), to prosaic passages (see 1995 and the textual analysis of Veselko Grubišić) in which similar problems concerning an insufficient selection of material also appear, we can notice the same processes of stratification of the narrative (or the rhythmic) due to the pseudo-didactic and pseudo-intellectual extra-literary authorial intention, which literature wants to retain at every cost, holding onto its privileged role in relation to the community with which it communicates and relates to. In the novel, whose content is extremely interesting and which describes the life of Mojmir Damjanović, a (un)typical Australian Croatian, the manner of expression quickly loses itself in the detail and pseudo-intellectualism, and in relation to the corpus of matrix literature it is a textbook example of remaining outside the matrix. This is due to the complete loss of control over the author's intention and allowing the material to attain primacy over the narrative potential. The spectacular use of excessive words and self-attraction which refers to Einstein's theory of relativity or "reality as being closest to the character," because he "by nature was realistic and actual," represent a typical example of a non-economical approach and the loss of cohesion in expression, which is characteristic and almost typical precisely for the poetry of the émigré sub-group. The example of the "growth of compliments with his demand" speaks in more flourishing

words than the first two about the type of problem that this type of literary production initiates at the level of expression. In this sense, the problem with this novel is not its lack of quality or failure, but its inability to relate to the horizon of expectation of the matrix literature, to which it sort of belongs linguistically and thematically. The unwillingness to utilise narrative tactics, which are characteristic for this kind of prose, is such that the novel is almost irreconcilable in the synchronic series, as well as in the diachronic segment of some earlier period of Croatian literature with which it could correspond.

In the case of the novel by Branka Ćubrilo, its belonging to the matrix corpus is at first glance obvious, given the place of publication. In the novel there do appear a whole series of macro-structural problems at the level of formulating the plot, but that is not the concern of this paper. And even with a cursory analysis it is evident that the novel corresponds more to the matrix literature than the literature of the adopted country. The plot unfolds in Italy, Slovenia and partly in Spain, with Croatia in the background. The superficiality in presenting the characters and the problems associated with framing the plot are not that which will determine whether the novel does or does not belong to the matrix corpus. Thus we will not discuss them here. The fantastic elements evident in the novel, together with a certain straining of hypotheses, link it with the texts of Sanja Lovrenčić or Vesna Bega, for instance. Also, it is possible to establish an inter-textual relation with the literature of the previous generation (the so-called fantastic writers), especially in terms of the changes in narrative perspectives in individual chapters of this Romanesque structure. In this sense, there exist contextual presuppositions about the way this novel fits into the matrix corpus, more so than in the case of Mojmir, which is formed in a differently organised, émigré corpus of conditioned sources. At the level of content, however, the question of fatal love, a fatal male and the crucial role of 'destiny' in that process, completely separates the possible 'Italian-Croatian historical link' and its investigation in the above mentioned Fabrijo from this work, which remains at the surface and corresponds exclusively to a pseudo-romantic attempt at stratifying the plot, almost to the degree which we could declare to be exhibitionist.

So the fantastic element loses that significance and place which it has in Lovrenčić or Bege. But this very possibility of speculation and relation to contemporary Croatian writers shows that the novel, irrespective of value judgements, is definitely a part of the Croatian matrix, and not its external unstable portion, as is the case with *Mojmir*.

And by way of conclusion, a word or two about the way these defined types of émigré and 'voluntary' exile novels corresponds to the corpus of the adopted country, namely, to the corpus of the set of frames. Both novels are written in Croatian, thus the linguistic barrier is the first element which thwarts its direct co-relation to the corpus of Australian literature. The question of co-relation will concern, in this concrete case, the establishment of a relation between contemporary Australian (simulated) autobiographical prose and the novel of Bačić-Serdarević, as well as the interweaving of the fantastic (and the pseudo-romantic) with the unhistorical in contemporary Australian literature. The fantastic element in contemporary Australian literature (Carey, Cortes, Falconer) relates more to the world of advertisements and illusion which, in a consumer society, has created the phenomenon of late capitalism, than to the tradition of pseudo-romanticism. In this sense, Branka Čubrilo's novel can co-relate with the corpus of Australian literature, be that at the level of the synchronic situation or its inclusion in the diachronic series. The eventual possibility of co-relation is linked to trivial romantic literature, but on that score Čubrilo is more pretentious. On the other hand, we have already mentioned that the expressive organisation of the (auto)biographical novel, of the type that Bačić-Serdarević offers us, corresponds to another type of expressive structure, be that in the Croatian matrix or in Australian literature. Thus there is practically no real basis for comparison.

In this sense, these two novels are typical examples of two untypical extra-matrix models of Croatian literature. In the case of the novel *Mojmir* by Bačić-Serdarević, the text represents a typical sample of émigré literature with all its specificities, which in the first place concern the characteristics of content, the use of language and a stylistic framework which does not fit in with any set of frames of a stable synchronic corpus

(Croatian or Australian). In the case of the novel by Branka Ćubrilo, entitled *Little Lies, Big Lies*, the text represents a good example of 'voluntary' exilic literature that does not fit into the corpus in which it physically emerged, namely, in Australian literature. Its place in the corpus of the Croatian matrix is not noticeable, but with its characteristics it nonetheless belongs to the current of Croatian literature. In this sense, we can conclude that a literary work that arises out of 'voluntary' exile has the possibility of choosing to establish communication channels between the literature and language of the country of origins and/or the literature of the 'adopted country'. In the case of an open choice, the works of these writers can become part of the relevant national corpus (Australian, American, New Zealand, Canadian), and their authors can (but do not have to) remain ethnic authors. As for this type of thinking, something has already been said about the kinds of inclusion of Kundera's later opus in French literature, or 'existence' in the framework of ethnic literature with authors such as Vela or Batistich. And the question of so-called ethnic authors in this context remains completely open-ended. We did not dare speculate about the eventual definition which would distinguish, in the concrete Australian case, between 'Australian (or New Zealand) writers of Croatian origin' and 'ethnic (Croatian) writers' in the context of Australian or New Zealand literature, which is often, for example, determined by the creative modus of Amelija Batistich. The consoling fact here is that this concerns a problem which is not associated exclusively with the (unstable) group of extra-matrix Croatian literature, but already appears in many literatures, from the Russian and Czech, on the one hand, to the Australian, on the other, in which we mentioned the physical separateness of Peter Carey. In this sense, perhaps there will come, on the basis of many different experiences, a certain consensus among researchers that will encompass the markedly wide and complex portion of that problem.

¹ Here I primarily have in mind the systematisation of terminology. There was some terminological confusion in an article from 1995 (*Hrvatska revija* [The Croatian Review] vol. 45/4: 594-610), in which I did not pay enough attention to distinguishing exile and émigré (migrant) elements. In an article from 1998 (*Hrvatska revija* vol. 48/1-2: 256-276), I wrote that there no longer exists an émigré literary component, and referred to that which represents, from a systematic perspective (and in view of Brešić's claims), a separate exile literature as something that has ceased, while the émigré type continues to behave as a separate unstable category outside its matrix.

² A similar state of affairs exists with other exile/ethnic/exile South Eastern and Eastern European literature in Australia, including Greek and Macedonian, or Polish and Ukrainian, ethnic/émigré literature. In some ethnic communities, however, the element of ethnic literature is more explicit, in which works are written in English with an element of separateness - 'otherness' - while in the Croatian and Macedonian cases the dominant element is one of not relating to the adopted (Australian) framework.

³ On German and Russian literature prior to the fall of the Berlin wall, see Grubišić, *Književna smotra* (The Literary Review), vol. 66-67 (1991); G. Struve, "Russian Writers in Exile," *Književna Smotra*, vol. 65-66.

⁴ According to Proppov's *Morfologija bajke* (A Morphology of the Fable), 'house' represents a secure place, while 'forest', in this case voluntary exile, is the place of separation which offers a whole series of possibilities that are absent in the warm home.

⁵ On banishment and the position of 'voluntary' exiled persons, see Vera Linhartová, "Za jednu antologiju izganstva" ("For an Anthology of Banishment"), *Republika* (The Republic), vol. 9-10 (1996). There still are, of course, a certain number of countries which do not treat their exiled persons as 'voluntary'. Unfortunately, in the last few years some democracies, which we understood to be as such, conjecture the possibility of creating a climate in which exile will again become a form of life.

⁶ See my article in *Hrvatska revija* (1998:262-267). Some sections of that article have been reformulated here in a different context.

⁷ On the work of these associations and groups in Australia, see *Hrvatski dom* (Croatian Home), *Hrvatska sloboda* (Croatian Freedom) and *Uzdanica* (Mainstay) (these three publications have long since ceased to exist). See also *Spremnost* (Readiness) and *Hrvatski vjesnik* (The Croatian Herald).

⁸ On these writers and their works, see *Novo doba* (New Age), which was published up until 1991, and in *Nova Hrvatska* (New Croatia) after 1991. Some of these authors occasionally publish in 'traditional patriotic' weeklies, such as *Hrvatski vjesnik* in Melbourne and *Spremnost* in Sydney, mainly in the form of literary competitions or poems commemorating certain dates. No newspaper systematically follows literary production, nor do they have literary critics.

⁹ For more on these processes, see the two articles cited in footnote 1.

¹⁰ However, one should have in mind here the conditioned sources which determined this position of twofold exclusion, and the ways in which the Australian Croatian community and the extra-literary context construct a 'parallel world' for

its existence. See "O jednom primjeru kultur(al)ne razlikosti: Ishodišta raslojavanja australske hrvatske zajednice" ("An Example of Cult(ural) Differences: Starting-Points for the Stratification of the Australian Croatian Community"), *Hrvatski iseljenički zbornik 2002 (Croatian Émigré Annual 2002)*.

¹¹ In two anthologies of stories by Australian 'ethnic' writers, published in association with a multicultural festival in New South Wales, *Homeland* (1991) and *Harbour* (1993), apart from the names of the authors, it is difficult to find determining criteria according to which they would 'belong' to ethnic literature. At the same time, writers such as David Malouf, a second generation Australian of Lebanese origin and one of the most esteemed Australian writers of the 'older generation', and Christos Tsiolkas, a second generation Australian Greek and one of the most popular Australian writers born in the late 1970s, are not mentioned among 'ethnic' writers in spite of their 'ethnic' themes (and names).

¹² We have the example of one of the most renowned Australian authors of today, Tim Winton, who wrote a very authentic story about ethnic Macedonians (*Neighbours*). Whether this work relates in any way to the corpus of Macedonian émigré literature, even if only as material for the eventual possibility of intertextual intertwining, is a question for which I think there is as yet no answer. The same applies to the New Zealand film *Broken English*, in which the main characters belong to a Croatian family.

Bibliography

Blažetin, Stjepan, *Književnost Hrvata u Mađarskoj od 1918. do danas* [Croatian Literature in Hungary from 1918 to the Present] (Osijek: Matica hrvatska, 1998).

Brešić, Vinko, "Hrvatska emigrantska književnost (1945-1990)" ["Croatian Émigré Literature (1945-1990)], in: *Teme novije hrvatske književnosti* [Themes in Recent Croatian Literature] (Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Matice hrvatske, 2001).

Craven, Peter, "Australia," in: John Sturrock (ed.), *The Oxford Guide to Contemporary World Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996).

Fielder, Leslie, "Cross the Border – Cross the Gap," *Playboy* (December 1969): 195, 239, 252-254, 256-258.

Grubišić, Vinko, *Hrvatska književnost u egzilu* [Croatian Literature in Exile] (München and Barcelona: Knjižnica Hrvatske revije, 1991).

Lukač, Stjepan, "Uvod" ["Introduction"], in: "Mađarski kulturoskop" ["The Hungarian Cultural-Scope"], *Kolo*, vol. 3 (2002): 41-144.

Lyotard, J.-F., *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984).

Nola, Nina, "The Rolled R - Writing the Croatian Diaspora in New Zealand," in: Žanić, Ivo (ed.), *Hrvatska / Australija i Novi Zeland: Povijesne i kulturne veze* [Croatia / Australia and New Zealand: Historical and Cultural Ties] (Zagreb: The Bridge, 2001).

Sablić-Tomić, Helena, "Ljepša polovica književnosti 1990-ih" ["The More Beautiful Half of Literature in the 1990s"], *Republika* [Republic], vol. 3-4 (2000): 47-56.