

# The Hybrid Form of Kosovel's Constructivist Diaries: From Testimony to Poetic and Dramatic Self-Construction\*

## Introduction

This article explores the unique and hybrid nature of the diaries of Slovenian avant-garde poet Srečko Kosovel, combining the diary form with that of poetry and drama, placing them in dialogue with the diary entries of his contemporary, Italian futurist F. T. Marinetti. While Marinetti's diaries are overtly political, extroverted, and deeply intertwined with the emergence of fascism, Kosovel's writings take an entirely different approach. His entries are intimate, conceptual, and profoundly lyrical, sometimes even dramatic or theatrical, offering a highly distinctive reflection on aesthetic, political and social realities. Rather than engaging in direct ideological discourse, Kosovel blends poetry, essays, drama and other literary forms to construct a deeply personal yet socially resonant narrative. Kosovel's diaries occupy a largely unexplored space within 20<sup>th</sup>-century avant-garde writing. They transcend the conventional function of diaries as mere personal records or historical documents, instead operating as complex chronicles of introspection and poetic self-exploration. At the same time, they serve as powerful vehicles for highly personal comments on collective memory, capturing the intellectual and emotional currents of their time. This synthesis of personal reflection and broader cultural critique situates Kosovel's diaries within a singular literary tradition, one that challenges the boundaries between autobiography, fiction, poetry and political commentary. Through this lens, the essay sheds light on Kosovel's innovative approach to diary form and its significance within the larger context of modernist and avant-garde literature. The additional aim of the essay is to introduce to international scholars the diaries of Slovene avant-garde poet Srečko Kosovel

---

\* The article was written in the framework of the research program "Theatre and Interart Studies" (P6-0376), co-financed by the Slovenian Research and Innovation Agency from the state budget.

(1904–1926), a contemporary of F. T. Marinetti from the Region of Trieste, a poet who conceived his own version of hybrid constructivist poetry with some clear influences of Italian futurism and Soviet Constructivism. Both Marinetti and Kosovel jotted down their thoughts in tiny notebooks that they carried around almost everywhere. Both diaries cover one of the most dramatic moments of the twentieth century, a period that includes the experience of the Great War in Italy and Slovenia.

Kosovel was born in a small village in the outskirts of Trieste, some fifty miles from the Slovenian capital Ljubljana. Trieste had been flourishing as a significant centre of Slovenian culture since the middle of the nineteenth century and had firmly established institutions and a Slovenian political party at the time Srečko Kosovel was writing. Although he grew up in Ljubljana, Kosovel can rightfully be considered part of the rich group of modern Slovene-speaking intellectuals from Trieste. These include among others the novelist Vladimir Bartol (1903–1967) and avant-garde painter Avgust Černigoj (1898–1985), as well as a successive generation of writers such as novelist and concentration camp survivor Boris Pahor (1913–2022). Unlike Marinetti's highly political and extroverted diaries, Kosovel's writings engage with political themes, but they do so in a highly distinctive way – blending poetry, drama and other literary genres into short, hybrid forms. Kosovel's contemporary and the first editor of his collected works, the prominent Slovene comparative literature scholar Anton Ocvirk, highlighted the elusive nature of Kosovel's writing. In the notes to the third volume of Kosovel's collected works, Ocvirk remarked that the texts grouped under the section titled *Diaries* were labelled as such almost arbitrarily, given their genre-defying nature. He noted:

The material before us is interesting but strangely written, as it includes, besides verses – of which there are many – also drafts for letters, outlines for articles; in short, everything that comes to a person's mind, including various strong personal confessions. (Kosovel 1977a: 123)

Kosovel approaches the diary form with specific demands and literary potential. It consists of both gaps and continuations, representing the world and biographical self. He comments on political life while combining poetry, essays, and other literary forms into specific short hybrid forms. In Kosovel's case, unlike most diaries, we do not get the sense that “the main event in this genre is the writing itself, the act of writing the diary, for which the narrator has voluntarily excluded himself from all other activities in life” (Kralj 2006a: 212). It seems as if the poet, through his diary entries, which are distinctly synthetic, immerses himself even more intensely into the reality in which he makes essayistic, philosophical, and highly personal statements. For example, the assertion that science as such does not correspond to art, with which it is in complete opposition, as art undoubtedly creates something else: beauty. This is because the artist must be “like

an antenna that receives the furthest intuitions from the cosmos, a sculptor who shapes from himself the face of the future. His light illuminates the whole, not the particulars like the light of the scientist, thus he is religious” (Kosovel 1977a: 95).

Art, therefore, is not similar to or even identical to science: “Art is living knowledge. It is not like science, which accumulates 'objective' results for us, yet still cannot tell us what life is, what eternally nourishes and moves it; nor does it ask, like science, for the 'permanent' laws of life” (Kosovel 1977a: 96). Kosovel understood new forms and new avant-garde art as follows: “The modern poet breaks down form to come to vivid direct life” (Kosovel 1977b: 740). With his hybrid approach, art in Slovenia asserted the particular tensions between the grotesque and the sublime, the poetic and the almost documentary, which were characteristic of Futurist, Constructivist and Expressionist aesthetics of the time. One could say that Kosovel’s diary form perfectly suits the description Ana Jackson gives in the introduction to her *Diary Poetics: Form and Style in Writers’ Diaries, 1915–1962*. Namely that “the diary tends to be thought of as a genre that is virtually formless” in the sense of Virginia Woolf’s metaphor for the diary as “some deep old desk, or capacious hold-all, in which one finds a mass of odds & ends without looking them through” (Jackson 2010: 14). In his specific synthetic notes, Kosovel claimed that science as such does not correspond to art, to which it is completely contrary, because art indisputably creates something else – beauty.

## From a European General Context to Marinetti and Kosovel

Using some examples, we will illustrate how Kosovel's diaries are neither “fictive diaries” (Gustav Rene Hocke) nor “diary fiction” (H. Porter Abbott), but rather use hybrid forms from autobiographical notes and writings, to essays or manifestative forms. Moreover, this form of non-fictional diary is (according to Valeria Taddei) a hybrid object, suspended between practical note-taking and literary expression, particularly difficult to pin down (Taddei 2023). They nevertheless produce one of the most remarkable perspectives on the cultural and political history of the first decades of the twentieth century. However, modern writing styles and concepts that permeate his diary writing were diverse or hybrid. This diversity can be partly explained by anomalies in the distribution and reception of their concepts, representations, and texts. At the same time, following Marko Juvan's perspective on Kosovel, they can also be understood as a prominent symptom of modernism as a system of divergent sociolects responding to a shared set of issues (Juvan 2005). One should however not forget that Kosovel shared a special interest with James Joyce in Futurism's innovative approach to syntax that was discussed for the first time by Marinetti, during a highly publicized *serata futurista* at the *Politeama Rossetti* in Trieste (13 January 1910). Moreover, James Joyce attended the *serata* according to Triestine circles, which had a particular

impact on him, especially the technique of free words (*parole in libertà*). Among the protagonists of Trieste's intellectual and cultural life were also some of Kosovel's friends.

However, let us go back to the general European context. One could start with the assumption that the popularity of the diary continued to grow until it was halted by World War II. Robert Musil commented on this phenomenon in 1901, saying "Diaries? They are a sign of the times. How many diaries are being printed! This is the most convenient, least restrained form" (Musil 1955: 31). European publishers were printing and reprinting diaries. Some of the older ones began gaining prominence: Rousseau's diary and the extensive diary of Stendhal's contemporary, Henri-Frédéric Amiel, which spanned over 14,000 pages. Strindberg's *Inferno*, the diaries of Tolstoy, Rilke, Hofmannsthal, Wagner, Nietzsche and Ludvig II of Bavaria. These books radiated the glory of authenticity, which was considered a specific quality. The diary was interpreted as not a product of literary art but a piece of real, unadulterated life. Due to this persuasiveness, it became even more popular. The production of fictional diaries also increased. We shall now turn to a brief comparative analysis of the diaries of two avant-garde artists: Marinetti and Kosovel. As their diaries cannot be understood merely as documents, they may lose some objectivity but point to the fact that their goal is not objectivity, but rather the belief that they belong to both reality and fiction. Slovene avant-garde poet and thinker Srečko Kosovel, and Marinetti, the most important representative of Italian Futurism, often expressed their ideas, definitions, and elaborations on art and artistic creation in letters, articles, essays, and diary entries. Thus, the two avant-gardists used their diaries to portray their artistic concepts. However, at the same time, they utilised their avant-garde sensitivity to guide the writing procedures of their diaries as specific hybrid forms combining fiction with fiction as well as dramatic procedures.

The diaries of Kosovel and Marinetti thus not only tell stories but also invent concepts, artistic comments and utopic thoughts in quite unique forms that are highly subjective. In essayistic diary fiction, conceptualisations sometime become stronger than their wish to be objective. Both authors show how the diary can produce a wide range of writing procedures, from essay, fiction to drama and poetry. They contain a mixture of styles: sober, laconic passages alternate with experimental "words-in-freedom" and purely visual drawings or sometimes even dramatic sketches. Marinetti employed in his diaries some of the experimental methods of representation outlined in the *Technical Manifesto of Futurist Literature* (1912). The aim was to give the literary text a greater force of verisimilitude and to stimulate the reader to widen his perceptive faculties almost to the point where life is substituted by literature. The same assumption could also be valid for Kosovel's diaries that introduce hybrid and other techniques into the genre of diary writing. His artistic procedures opened themselves to reality, absorbing it entirely. To reflect this reality as directly and powerfully as possible, Kosovel employed

various methods and perspectives that depicted the modern world as a crossroads of cultural influences, a space where the periphery and centre of the cultural semiosphere continuously interacted and shifted. The eclecticism, hybridity, and genre and stylistic fluidity of both avant-gardists can thus be understood as part of cultural and civilizational diversity, the mutual enrichment of different cultures and styles, and the intentional or unintentional plurality of artistic expression. Let us have a closer look at two examples.

The first one will be Kosovel's hybrid poem, constructed in a similar way as his diary entries and entitled *One-Act Play – Jutro (Morning)*. The fragment uses the principle of montage, assembling fragments and tableaux reminiscent of Eisenstein's montage of attractions. The stylistic structure of the text is hybrid, his poetic language "opens itself to contemporary discourses, including those beyond the domain of traditional literary genres: hence, in Kosovel's Kons compositions, we find philosophical, theological, and psychological concepts, mathematical symbols, the vocabulary of modern technology, physics, and natural sciences, as well as political phrases and journalistic expressions. This results in a blending of the elevated and the prosaic registers" (Juvan 2005: 66). The second example will be a longer essay-like fragment about the future of criticism (which brings to mind Oscar Wilde's famous dialogue *The Critic as Artist* and its famous statement "Criticism is itself an art"). Kosovel introduces the critique of a specific type of criticism, as published by art critic contemporaries, and opts for the elimination of that specific kind of criticism and introduction of a more radical one:

Criticism should not put the reader to sleep, it should awake him. /.../ Critics sometimes seem to me like a tourist who has chosen a lousy summer resort and is now praising it constantly to persuade himself of the opposite. What *Kritika* is lacking is fire and a whip. It should contain such an internal fire that it can hardly restrain from burning everything down; its whip should expel all the merchants from the temple. (Kosovel 1977a: 698)

In his *Crisis*, Kosovel advocates a new art in which "the difference between content and form in art disappears forever in the museum of aesthetics; the content wishes to express itself in a free, modern organic form, it wants to be the content and the form all in one, making way for constructivism" (Kosovel 1977a: 13). In Kosovel's final period, after his turn "to the left" it becomes clear what he considers as the significant role of modern art: the truth. This is a value the artist emphasizes on several occasions during his final period: "The triumph of truth in cultural, of humanism in economic, of virtue, in social life, will be the greatest triumph of modern man" (Kosovel 1977a: 11). Kosovel's new content is therefore also reflected as a need to emphasize justice and truth in art. One could compare Kosovel's diaries to the diaries of two other prominent avant-gardists in Slovenia: Triestine novelist and dramatist Vladimir Bartol, and the most influential Slovene Expressionist fiction author and playwright Slavko Grum. All three used the diary

form to express thoughts in forms they would never dare publish in a review, essay, or similar objective genre; they can only appear in the diary, where the pressure of language and writing process immediately begin to change the initially objective position into something that is increasingly fictional.

## Comparing Marinetti's and Kosovel's Diaries

Let us now focus on a brief comparative analysis of the diaries of Marinetti and Kosovel. We will examine them from both a literary and ideological-political perspective to study the affinities and differences between their corpora of texts, with particular emphasis on their shared interest in themes. Both artists often expressed their ideas, definitions, and reflections on art and artistic creation in letters, articles, essays, and diary entries. It can be said that both avant-gardists used their diaries to shape their artistic concepts as well as to experiment with form. Kosovel's and Marinetti's diaries belong as much to reality as to fiction. In their hands the diary genre, long considered primarily a source of biographical or historical data, became a text comparable to other forms of literature: poetry, essay, even drama. It becomes a specific hybrid type of literature. One should not forget when speaking about the specificities of Kosovel, that his "division into 'fictional' and 'essayistic' texts is often fundamentally questionable, as poetry had cognitive significance for him, and he often wrote his articles and thoughts in a highly poetic manner" (Komelj 2019a: 49). The avant-garde diaries of Kosovel and Marinetti manifest inventive concepts, artistic commentary, and utopian thoughts, which are often subjective and highly dramatic. In the essayistic diary corpora, conceptualizations sometimes become stronger than the desire for objectivity. Both authors demonstrate how their notes contain a mixture of styles: restrained, laconic passages alternate with experimental "free words" and purely visual graphic language. In various transformations of the diary form, they employ some experimental methods of presentation.

Thus, in the manifesto *Destruction of Syntax, Imagination Without Strings, Words in Freedom* published on May 11, 1913, Marinetti urged the reader to imagine a friend recounting a dramatic experience, whether it be a revolution, war, shipwreck, or earthquake. According to Marinetti, this friend would instinctively begin to brutally break the syntax of speech: "He will not waste time forming sentences. He will disdain punctuation and adjectives. He will disdain the formation and nuances of language and will quickly launch into his visual, auditory, and olfactory sensations" (Marinetti 2005: 70). The entries of both artists demonstrate the commitment of the two avant-gardists to break traditional literary forms and reflect the chaos and sensory overload of modern life through their writing. We can hypothesize that Kosovel was, in fact, writing diaries as essayistic, fictional, poetic and dramatic fragments, using a specific manifestative hybrid form – a unique

synthesis emerging from his various readings and ideas. These fragments simultaneously evoke some of the most metatheatrical or meta-artistic futurist syntheses while also commenting on the state of civilisation. It can be said that they behave similarly to his drama and poetry, which we discussed in the essay *The Heterogeneity of Kosovel's, Mrak's, and Delak's Dramatic Experiments*: “Kosovel constructs them according to the principle of montage of fragments, tableaux, reminiscent of Eisenstein's montage of attractions. The stylistic structure of the text is often hybrid” (Toporišič 2023: 113).

## Kosovel's Notion of the New Art

In his reflections on art and European society, Kosovel initially aligns himself with Micić and his barbarogenius, which he understood as the antithesis to Marinetti's futurist definition of a barbarian. Thus, in “Diary II we find the phrase 'barbarically primitive artist – genius' as opposed to the 'cultured man,' who 'furrows his brow,' 'has been to school and has learned to think” (Kosovel 1977a: 608). For this purpose, in the essay *Crisis of Humanity* he understands Europe as a madhouse of rational minds: “It is a reformulation of the concept of barbarogenius by Ljubomir Micić” (Vrečko 2012: 261). This reformulation helped him “to clearly and visibly distinguish himself from Marinetti” (Kralj 1988: 34).<sup>1</sup> Kosovel advocates a new art in which “the difference between content and form in art disappears forever into the museum of aesthetics; content seeks to express itself in a living, free, contemporary organic form, wanting to be content and form at the same time, hence constructivism” (Kosovel 1977a: 13). He is convinced that “the new era demands new forms, which must not only be visually new but also profoundly new in their inner essence, for form also has its causal interiority” (Kosovel 1977a: 209). From this new concept, which largely stems from the thoughts of Benedetto Croce, Kosovel derives the hypothesis that the artist and his works are always situated in a specific historical period, which is in a specific dialogue with the authors, while at the same time embodying some new means of expression. However, unlike the majority of avant-gardists who were content with introducing new forms and destroying the old, Kosovel insists that the new means must be connected and integrated with new content. Being well acquainted not only with the ideas and concepts of Italian futurists but also with the demands and works of Soviet constructivists and futurists (Vrečko 2011), Kosovel formulated his own version of aesthetics and politics, allowing him to combine “new forms” of constructivism with “new content” .

---

<sup>1</sup> In this sense, we must also understand Kosovel's phrases scattered throughout his diaries: “Dreams of nihilism; kill everything, destroy everything, die, delight, devastate, devastate” (Kosovel 1977a: 617).

Statements in his diaries and other notes are built with dramatic intensity, yet they quickly collapse into self-irony. Kosovel is not concerned with unambiguous statements or a single interpretation of reality. He is fascinated by paradox, the elusiveness of human existence, which, despite everything, strives for action – only for this action to repeatedly prove to be impossible or absurd. Instead of a coherent narrative of diary entries, Kosovel creates verbal tableaux as paradoxes, diary-essays on the meaning and meaninglessness of human existence, as well as on art and civilization as a whole. He is persuaded that “a true artist does not create his artwork for the museum, for the aesthete, or for archives, but for man and life” (Kosovel 1977a: 94). Kosovel thus warns the reader where the separation between content and form leads. He shows how poets “have nothing to say” (*ibid.*). But again, he sticks to Benedetto Croce and his argumentation of art as “content that is shaped, and form that is filled, so that the emotion is illustrated and the figure felt” (Croce 1969: 41). Like the expressionists, Kosovel often wavers between traditional lyrical expression and an avant-garde stance, which frequently confuses the reader. On one hand, he is drawn to a Nietzschean criticism of the modern bourgeois and Catholic civilization, seduced by the possibility of destroying the old, yet at the same time, he fears this destruction. He proclaims the coming of a new human, yet this figure remains uncertain within itself, marked by a distinctive metaphors of death. Phrases such as “nothing”, “void”, “nihil”, “nihil-melancholy”, intertwine with imagery like “I burn”, “scorching fire”, “iron clouds”, “the more I burn, the more I suffer”, “I am beyond death”.

Kosovel’s notes, and diaries – fragments (similar to his *Worker Poems*, such as the sonnet cycle *Red Atom*) announce both the destruction of the old society and utopian construction of the new. The path from poetry to drama, diary and notes is not a long one, especially considering, as Juvan points out, that “the declarative structure of Kosovel’s modernist texts is already dialogized, ambivalent, polyphonic, and above all, intertextual” (Juvan 2005: 66). In the conclusion of his essay *On Art*, Kosovel writes: “Therefore: do not seek form in new art, but the human. And art will no longer be 'pleasure,' but solace” (Kosovel 1977a: 105). He thus lays the foundation for this argument in his article titled *Art and the Proletarian*, in which he expresses his view on the contemporary art scene. With convincing words, he conveys his belief that the bourgeoisie has monopolized all cultural pathways, thereby entrapping artists: “By doing so, they have cut the artist off from life, distanced him from the primal source of all art” (Kosovel 1977a: 23). They sought to stifle the artist's freedom of expression under the slogan: “Art for art's sake”. This successfully conveyed the message that artists should ignore events happening in their lives, whether just or unjust, and instead focus solely on creating art – “Write, write, art for art's sake” (Kosovel 1977a). In his diaries, Kosovel also develops his own personalized aesthetics and critical thoughts about the criticism of his time (especially in Slovenia). His depiction of the cultural situation of the moment is crystal clear and possesses a unique sense of dark humour. As he writes

at the beginning of his Diary, 15 July 1925: “Oh, poor Slovenian art, who leads you, who tries to lead you! Defiled by journals and taverns, you come to the operating table of pure reason! As if the current era were not deadly enough for art, there is also a need for this most dangerous poison for art: pure reason” (Kosovel 1977a: 711).

When writing about Kosovel's diaries, the great connoisseur of historical avant-gardes Lado Kralj compares them with the diaries of two other important Slovenian avant-gardists, the Trieste writer and playwright Vladimir Bartol, and the most influential Slovenian expressionist writer and playwright Slavko Grum. He finds that the diary in Kosovel's case is “structured somewhat differently from Bartol's or Grum's, as it does not contain coherent narrative blocks, but consists of a large number of small, fragmentary units” (Kralj 2006b: 150). Kosovel's work embodies the tensions of his era: the interplay between destruction and creation, despair and hope, negation and affirmation. His fragmented, hybrid forms resist fixed interpretation, mirroring the fractured, unstable reality of the modern world. Rather than providing clear answers, his texts challenge the reader to engage with uncertainty, forcing them to confront the paradoxes of both art and existence. Kralj highlights another thought that is very telling for Kosovel's diaries. The Slovenian avant-gardists used the diary form to express thoughts “in forms that Bartol, Kosovel, or Grum would never have dared to write down in criticism, essays, or similar objectivist genres; they only dared to do so in the diary, where the pressure of language and writing process immediately begin to transform the initial objectivist position into something increasingly fictional” (Kralj 2006b: 152).

## Dynamic Nationalism and Critique of Futurist Ideology

His fragmentary diary, as Marko Juvan precisely observes in relation to Kosovel's poetry, operates within “the modernist plurality and simultaneity of diverse artistic voices”, situated “in an intermediary space between various literary discourses of the 1920s: Late Impressionism and Symbolism, Expressionism, Avantgardism, Proletkult, New Objectivity, and Existential Modernism” (Juvan 2005: 64). One could summon that Kosovel's diaries feature a mixture of styles: from laconic passages to experiments with *parole in libertà* and purely visual interventions, mostly in the form of drawings. Marinetti employed some experimental methods of presentation, Kosovel relied on his Kons and integrals and their dynamic graphic form. The major differences between the concepts of art and society as established by the two artists in their diaries and other notes can be summarized as follows:

a) Marinetti's futurism advocated an exclusive, elitist, and politically constrained vision of nationalism. As the leader of the futurists, he sought to engage with the rapid dynamism of modern life by promoting an optimistic and

intentionally simplistic view of technology – one in which its creative potential overshadowed its destructive force. Marinetti perceived war as an embodiment of a fundamental “love for battle” viewing its technological aspects primarily as an aesthetic phenomenon;

b) In contrast, Srečko Kosovel adopted the technical innovations of the futurists while simultaneously articulating a distinct critique of their ideology. Unlike Marinetti, he did not romanticize war as a noble battle but instead regarded it as an ethically troubling phenomenon. His perspective aligns with what Salvatore Pappalardo, in his analysis of Trieste’s ideological struggles, describes as cosmopolitan modernist strategies rooted in the city: “Däubler’s poetics of bilingualism, Kosovel’s ethics of mediation, Musil’s politics of the nonnational, Svevo’s aesthetics of liminality, and Joyce’s ethnolinguistics of myth. Expressed both in their critical writings and literary fiction” (Pappalardo 2021: 39).

One could say that Kosovel created something far more constructive than Marinetti’s concept of nationalism. Like other Trieste writers of his generation, he was “part of a literary culture whose regional multicultural patriotism aroused suspicion in him towards monolithic notions of nation. Kosovel’s literary invention of Europe thus moves from condemning the rhetorical exclusion of Slovenians in Italian discourses of Trieste identity to affirming an inclusive ethics of mediation” (Pappalardo 2021: 80). He did not equate citizenship with nationality. However, he belonged to a minority ‘nationality’ within the modern and violently homogenizing national state body. Thus, he was “excluded from the social and civic privileges of the hegemonic nation” (Pappalardo 2021: 88). One could say that the goal of Kosovel’s construction of Europe was to expose the divisions in society sown by capitalist-imperialist propaganda through calls for nationalism.

## Conclusion

Kosovel simply resisted the social and historical pressure to assimilate into the culture of the Italian-speaking majority in his diary entries. He claimed his right to be simultaneously a Triestine, a Slovenian, and a European. His ethical stance on the geographical and linguistic periphery did not merely signify competition between the centre and the periphery: it redefined the very essence of centre and margin. Being a poet from the Karst region paved the way for a phenomenon that is very relevant today: the issue of language crossing and hybridity of the identities. One could say that Kosovel’s work speaks of the essential dilemmas of the post-World War I era and the time after the millennium we live in today. The goal of his critical analysis of Europe was to reveal the divisions in society and separate the idea of the nation from its exclusive representational demands. When Valleria Taddei (alongside modernist authors such as André Gide, Virginia Woolf, and Carlo Emilio Gadda) describes the diary as a hybrid object that moves between

practical writing and literary expression (Taddei 2023), she could be speaking also about Kosovel, about his diary, in which he pursued the goal that his art should reflect the reality of life as much as possible, which he literarily placed in non-automated and non-classical ways. His diary entries are thus tools for achieving this goal.

When the diary ceases to be merely a simple document, it loses some of its objectivity and increasingly belongs to both fiction and reality. Kosovel formed something new, which was much more constructive than Marinetti's concept of nationalism. He imagined “an ever-pending post-national futurity, invested in divining the social and cultural coordinates of a forthcoming body politic” (Pappalardo 2021: 39). Like other Triestines of his generation, Kosovel was “part of a literary culture whose regional multicultural patriotism made him suspicious of monolithic conceptions of the nation. Kosovel’s literary invention of Europe, then, moves from a denunciation of the rhetorical ostracism of Slovenes in Italian discourses of Triestine identity to the affirmation of an inclusive ethics of mediation” (*ibid.*: 80). Kosovel resisted the social and historical pressure to assimilate to the culture of the Italian-speaking majority and claims, from a position of marginality, the right to be simultaneously Triestine, Slovenian, and European:

For Kosovel, the danger that Triestine Irredentism posed extended beyond its local coordinates because it posited a nationalism that thrived on the equivalence between citizenship and nationality. Belonging to a minority ‘nationality’ within the modern and violently homogenizing nation-state meant to be excluded from the social and civic privileges of the hegemonic nation. (*ibid.*: 88)

One could say the aim of Kosovel’s construction of Europe, clearly seen in his hybrid literary tactics from poems to diaries and drama fragments, was to “divorce the idea of the *narod*, an idea similar to the German concept of *Volk*, from the exclusive representative claims of the nation (*ibid.*: 81). His hybrid diary belongs not only to reality, but also to an increasing degree to fiction. The diary establishes itself as a text comparable to literature – in fact, it is a specific, hybrid form of literature. Yet, while a large part of Marinetti's diaries seem to be written with the intention of future publication, we cannot say this for Kosovel. Nevertheless, we could not say that his hybrid fragments are indeed far from being publishable, not only as an important literary-historical source, but also as a highly interesting and provoking work of art.

WORKS CITED

- Abbott, H. P. 1984. *Diary Fiction: Writing as Action*. Ithaca, NY – London: Cornell University Press.
- Croce, B. 1969: *Breviario di estetica*. Bari: Editori Laterza.
- Day, S. 2013. Futurist War Noises: Confronting and Coping with the First World War. *California Italian Studies* 4, 1. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8fx1p115>. Accessed 22 Apr. 2024.
- Hocke, G. R. 1963. *Das europäische Tagebuch*. Wiesbaden: Limes.
- Jackson, A. 2010. Diary poetics, form and style in writers' diaries, 1915-1962. *Routledge studies in twentieth-century literature* 12. London.
- Jurgensen, M. 1979. *Das fiktionale Ich. Untersuchungen zum Tagebuch*. Bern – Munich: Francke.
- Juvan, M. 2005. Kosovel in hibridnost modernizma. *Primerjalna književnost* 28 (special number): 57–71, 189–204.
- Komelj, M. (ed.). 2019a. Introduction. *Vsem naj bom neznan – 1. zvezek*: 13–54. Novo Mesto: Založba Goga.
- Komelj, M. (ed.). 2019b. Spremnna eseja. *Vsem naj bom neznan – 2. zvezek*: 758–934. Novo Mesto: Založba Goga.
- Kosovel, S. 1977a. *Zbrano delo* 3. Ed. A. Ocvirk. Ljubljana: DZS.
- Kosovel, S. 1977b. Dnevniki. *Zbrano delo* 3/1: 591–783. Ed. A. Ocvirk. Ljubljana: DZS.
- Kosovel, S. 2019. *Vsem naj bom neznan*. Neobjavljeni del zapuščine. Book 2. Ed. Miklavž Komelj. Novo Mesto: Založba Goga.
- Kralj, L. 1988. Jaz sem barbar. *Primerjalna književnost* 11, 1: 29–41.
- Kralj, L. 2006a. Dnevnik in pismo kot modela slovenske kratke proze med vojnama [The Diary and Letter as a Model of Interwar Slovene Short Pose]. *Slavistična revija* 54, 2: 205–220.
- Kralj, L. 2006b. Literarna kritika v pisateljevem dnevniku. *Primerjalna književnost* 29: 145–152.
- Marinetti, F. T. 2005. Distruzione della sintassi, Immaginazione senza fili, Parole in libertà. In: *Teoria e invenzione futurista*: 65–80. Ed. Luciano De Maria. Milano: Mondadori.
- Pappalardo, S. 2021. *Modernism in Trieste: The Habsburg Mediterranean and the Literary Invention of Europe, 1870–1945*. New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Passamani, B. 1985. *Dall'alcova d'acciaio al Tank ai Macchi 202. Frontiere d'avanguardia. Gli anni del Futurismo nella Venezia Giulia*, katalog razstave: 18–61. Gorizia: Musei Provinciali.
- Pirjevec, Marija. 2021. Moj pogled na Kosovela je nekoliko drugače. *Delo*, 20. 3. 2021.
- Pizzi, Katia. 2001. *A City in Search of an Author: The Literary Identity of Trieste*. London – New York: Sheffield academic press.
- Rainey, Lawrence and Laura Wittman. 1994. F. T. Marinetti: Selections from the Unpublished Diaries. *Modernism/Modernity* 1, 3: 1–44.
- Taddei, Valeria. 2023. *Uses of the Personal Diary: A Modernist Writerly Tool? Uses of Modernism*. Ghent University, Accessed 22 Sep. 2024. <https://www.modernism.ugent.be/panels/writing-the-self/valeria-taddei-university-college-dublin/>. Accessed 22 Apr. 2024.
- The Musil Diaries: Robert Musil, 1899-1942*. Basic Books, 1998.
- Toporišič, Tomaž. 2023. Heterogenost Kosovelovih, Mrakovih in Delakovih dramskih poskusov. *Slavia Centralis* 16, 1: 110–127.

- Vrečko, Janez. 2010. The Formation of Kosovel's Constructivism: A Conflict between Composition and Construction. *Primerjalna književnost* 30, 1: 1–22.
- Vrečko, Janez. 2012. Barbarogenij, barbarsko in fašizem. *Primerjalna književnost* 35, 3: 261–270.

## SAŽETAK

### HIBRIDNA FORMA KOSOVELOVIH KONSTRUKTIVISTIČKIH DNEVNIKA: OD SVJEDOČANSTVA DO POETSKE I DRAMATSKE AUTOKONSTRUKCIJE

Rad je posvećen dnevnicima slovenskoga avangardnog pjesnika Srečka Kosovela koji se tumače u komparaciji s dnevničkim zapisima F. T. Marinettija, osnivača talijanskoga futurizma. Analizom odabranih dnevničkih zapisa pokazat će se da Kosovelovi dnevnići odudaraju od *fiktivnih dnevnika* R. G. Hockea kao i od *dnevničke fikcije* H. P. Abbotta te da je posrijedi hibridna forma, svojevrsna mješavina autobiografskih i esejističko-manifestnih bilježaka koje donekle podsjećaju na Marinettijeve. Ipak, Kosovelovi dnevnići nude jedinstvena razmatranja kulturne i političke povijesti ranoga 20. stoljeća. Oni sadrže izjave koje se Kosovel možda ne bi usudio objaviti u kakvome eseju ili prikazu, a sam čin pisanja pretvara objektivna opažanja u nešto posve subjektivno, pa čak i fiktionalno. Kosovelovi dnevnići svakako su nedovoljno proučen primjerak modernističkih dnevničkih zapisa, koji su istovremeno introspektivne kronike, ali i originalna mješavina osobnoga i kolektivnoga sjećanja. Kao što je slučaj s Marinettijevim dnevnicima, oni mijenjaju konvencionalno shvaćanje dnevnika kao čisto biografskoga ili povijesnoga izvora pretvarajući ga u samostalnu književnu formu.

Ključne riječi: S. Kosovel, F. T. Marinetti, futurizam, konstruktivizam, dnevnići, avangarda