

• PART III •

Literature and the World

MORE THAN GLOBAL

The intellect acquires critical acumen by familiarity with different traditions. How much does one really understand by merely following one's own reasoning only?

—Bhartrihari

The wide world, extensive as it is, is only an expanded fatherland, and will, if looked at correctly, be able to give us no more than what our home soil can endow us with also. What pleases the crowd spreads itself over a limitless field, and, as we already see, meets approval in all countries and regions. The serious and the intellectual meet with less success, but those who are devoted to higher and more productive things will learn to know each other more quickly and more intimately.

—Goethe

Do not so much as imagine that I will show you the way to a world literature. Each of us must make his way forward according to his own means and abilities. All I have wanted to say is that just as the world is not merely the sum of your ploughed field, plus my ploughed field, plus his ploughed field—because to know the world that way is only to know it with a yokel-like parochialism—similarly world literature is not merely the sum of your writings, plus my writings, plus his writings. We generally see literature in this limited, provincial manner. To free oneself of that regional narrowness and to resolve to see the universal being in world literature, to *apprehend such totality* in every writer's work, and to see its interconnectedness with every man's attempt at self-expression—that is the objective we need to pledge ourselves to.

—Rabindranath Tagore

If literature is truly sacred in the sense that I have tried to explain in chapter 1, then it is crucial to read each literary work more or less in detachment from its local roots in a specific author and locale, as well as in detachment from its place in so-called world literature. The work's sacredness, that is, its complex relation to an imaginary realm, is what is most important about it, more important than its local and global affiliations.

Literature is nowadays often said to be at once global and local. This, by extension, also means that, after all, there is nothing either local or global about literature. Djelal Kadir's sensible proposal to associate the lexis "world" with "no particular or necessarily predictable referent" means that the development of world-literature programs is neither logical nor inevitable:

This discovery makes it unavoidable for us to have to explain the phenomenon we are referring to as the predicate object or as the predicative process of our worlding actions—which world, at what time, in what location, through which language, and with what intentions. World, in other words, can never be taken as a given since it is invariably the constructed outcome of our particular performative interventions. And, by extension, the literature it conditions becomes a particular literature whose specificity is a derivative of the instance of the phenomenon "world" we define as predicative referent of our action in the verb to world.¹

The acts of "worlding" are deeply performative and transfigurative. Such acts (in)fusionize; that is, they fold the "inside" of our experiences (by which I mean one's own local contexts, the specificity of native tradition, the train of inheritance of a thought in a particular culture and knowledge system) into the "outside" (the epistemic and cultural contexts of different traditions and knowledge worlds). The revelations of the inside and the outside do not come together in a two-way course in which either the local reaches for the global or the global tries to find connection with the local. Although we cannot ignore the strict divisions between the inside (we may for clearer understanding call it local) and the outside (global), the acts of worlding demonstrate that connections, the scale enlargements, are not built in a unitotal pattern. Worlding promotes "planetary time," which Wai Chee Dimock argues is "supranational time" that "goes backward (a recursive loop in the past), and it goes forward (a projective arc into the future)." Dimock points to a

jurisdictional order whose boundaries, while not always supranational, are nonetheless not dictated in advance by the chronology and territory of the nation-state. As a set of temporal and spatial coordinates, the nation is not only too brief, too narrow, but also too predictable in its behavior, its sovereignty uppermost, its borders defended with force if necessary. It is a prefabricated box. Any literature crammed into

it is bound to appear more standardized than it is: smaller, tamer, duller, conforming rather than surprising. The randomness of literary action—its unexpected readership, unexpected web of allegiance—can be traced only when that box is momentarily suspended, only when the nation-state is recognized as a necessary but insufficient analytic domain, ceding its primacy upon scale enlargement.²

This promises a “more,” the unexpected web of meaning, which I have termed the “more than global.” On the surface, the local and the global have their usual separateness and rupture; but, in what I argue is more than global, such ruptures often become a kind of provocation to question the promise and latency of a dialogue between the two. Diffractive refigurings produce the more than global phenomenon that acknowledges how globality becomes the “enclosure in the undifferentiated sphere of a unitotality” and is suppressive, as Jean-Luc Nancy points out, of “all world-forming of the world.”³ Literature cuts “together-apart” leaving the local-global in new temporalities—“spacetime-matterings.”⁴ Doing literature is “entangled intra-relating,” which is, as Karen Barad explains, “not to say that emergence happens once and for all, as an event or as a process that takes place according to some external measure of space and of time, but rather that time and space, like matter and meaning, come into existence, are iteratively reconfigured through each intra-action, thereby making it impossible to differentiate in any absolute sense between creation and renewal, beginning and returning, continuity and discontinuity, here and there, past and future.”⁵

So the more than global is inscribed in what I call “intra-active transculturality,” which is not about going beyond the global or reducing the local to a form of representation or meaning-formation. It is the destruction of an expressive and organic “totality” but is also a way of providing a sense of a totality, a world-wide-forming totality, whose access is not always in accessibility.⁶ The more than global is radical immanence, not a choice but an event.

Worlding formed through intra-active transculturality inheres in a complicated reading of *monde* (world). Jean-Paul Martinon observes:

There is indeed a strange parallel between globalization and what Nancy calls “world-forming” (*mondialisation*). This parallel shows that neither comes full circle, both exceed each other, thus never allowing for sense (world-forming) to make *absolute* sense or for non-sense (globalization) to end in either a *parousia* of (scientific) meaning, or total annihilation.

In this way, there is no escaping this impossibility to recycle properly because creation is what goes radically beyond the logic of production (and therefore recycling), and, yet, the possibility of this production never leaves the horizon of creation. The two always go together while always exceeding themselves. This is not a circular thought; it is the facticity of thought itself, that is to say, it is the facticity of the world itself. In this way, there is no pure creation or world-formation as such. There is an exposure or opening that both creates *and* for good or bad also produces.⁷

The more than global, much in the spirit of *monde*, the problematic involving the contrastive acts of production and creation and making sense of *horizein* or *horos* as bound or landmark, staves off the ascendancy of “homo-hegemonization” to reveal sense and contradiction among multiple points of articulation. In world-wide-ization, in processes of worlding, connections through intra-action and autoimmunization are built mostly through reflective, interpretive judgments. Commenting on Derrida’s “Globalization, Peace, and Cosmopolitanism,” Victor Li rightly observes:

The importance of establishing *mondialisation*’s Euro-Christian provenance is that it enables a deconstructive genealogical examination of globalization together with its ethico-politico-juridical concepts of national sovereignty and territory, cosmopolitanism, human rights, and international law. . . . Such a genealogical deconstruction would establish globalization not as a neutral, objective process, but as *mondialisation*, or, even better, as *mondialatinization*, a worldwide-ization emanating from a Christian Europe. Thus, since globalization is really *mondialisation* or *mondialatinization*, we have to concede that it is, as Derrida bluntly notes, “Europeanization.” But just as *mondialisation*’s European genealogy elliptically interrupts globalization’s universal encompassment or encirclement of the earth, so too *mondialisation* as the Europeanization of the world suffers its own elliptical interruption in the form of an autoimmunitary process. In other words, we are witnessing, Derrida tells us, a “double movement”: “globalization [*mondialisation*] of Europeaness and contestation of Eurocentrism.”⁸

Intra-active transculturality, revealed through the more than global, eventalizes sense more than the mere reclaiming of Europeaness, which is symbolic of creating and producing horizons. The critical habitation of

Wordsworth's "Daffodils" within some parameters of Sanskrit poetics, as exemplified in the next section of this chapter, is not a contestation of Eurocentrism, an act that becomes another polarized, Eurocentric way of seeing procedures of knowledge formation, but a form of world-wide-ization. The more than global is not a project to dehistoricize and deterritorialize Eurocentric filiations, because in its intra-active embeddings the approach worlds and unworlds its always already inscribed rootings and routings. We don't globalize (horizoned, hence, landmarked in globularity and sphericity) but stay globalized and presentified with the *apprehension* of *totality* in its world-wide-ness.

The more than global, then, is not "after global" and, thus, does not necessarily demand an exegesis of what happened to literature in its post-national constellations. So to consider the more than global as merely resulting in world literature is to undercut my arguments. It is a taking place that forms and norms its own ways of address. This address, as Nancy notes, is a kind of thinking that "addresses itself to 'me' and to 'us' at the same time; that is, thinking addresses itself to the world, to history, to people, to things: to 'us.'"⁹ The more than global is our "curious 'being-with one-another' [*être-les-uns-avec-les-autres*], toward our addressing one-another."¹⁰ How can meaning be generated beyond the "me" and invested in the "us"? How can the me (local) find its meaning not in the other (global) but in us? This implies that meaning is not just in the local or the global or after global or before local but exists in an immanent and continued circulation that is more than global. Nancy observes: "If one can put it like this, there is no other meaning than the meaning of circulation. But this circulation goes in all directions at once, in all the directions of all the space-times [*les espace-temps*] opened by presence to presence: all things, all beings, all entities, everything past and future, alive, dead, inanimate, stones, plants, nails, gods—and 'humans,' that is, those who expose sharing and circulation as such by saying 'we,' by *saying we to themselves* in all possible senses of that expression, and by saying we for the totality of all being."¹¹ The more than global is obligated to make sense of this circulation as a singular, plural entanglement. The singularity of the more than global makes us realize that "every one is just as singular as every other one, and consequently substitutable. Communication both singularizes them and divides them out; what is commensurable is their incommensurability."¹² The more than global worlds through what Nancy argues is the coextensivity of understanding, where the acts of grasping and escaping are coenactments.

More Now

Zhang Longxi points out that “once we recognize the diversity and heterogeneity of the Other, as we do of the self, cross-cultural understanding can be seen as part of our effort at understanding in general, of our endless dialogue with others, with ourselves, and with the world at large.”¹³ However, cross-cultural understanding is not merely about reaching out for the other through dialogic interplay among cultures, civilizations, and concepts. It is also about judging and orienting one’s peculiar nativism, cultural exclusiveness, constellative patterns of beliefs, manners, and languages in an intra-active negotiation involving “unpeace,” the *excès sensible* (the profusion and fusion of sense or sense making) that inscribes the contesting territories of power, domination, obscurity, obfuscation, and elision across time and historical periods. Unpeace is the other name for seduction, assemblage, and curiosity, the immanent power to world the already existing, yet imperceptible, establishment, the being-with that “manifests in concrete, contract, commerce and most profoundly in confidence.”¹⁴ Miller implicates this unpeace when he raises the question: How can world literature avoid being dominated by some single national academic culture? And again: How can a discipline of world literature respect the many different conceptions of literature in different times and places throughout the world? Appropriating the brilliant and resonant vocabulary of Michel Serres, I would like to see the more than global in “displacements, confusing allegiances” that do not ignore “wide pages and tenuous differentials” and,¹⁵

as if chance fluctuation, unexpected storms or atmospheric disturbances, spread stochastically through the space of the high seas, suddenly led to (the formation of) a temporarily stable locality, an island where another time would come into being, a local time forgetting the past, the ordinary and the time of the journey. Remote in relation to the methodical path, these islands create order through fluctuation, a different order that could well be called exodic. You will never find these islands with a methodical approach. Exodic, exotic, ergodic, they lie outside the global equilibria of the episteme. Method minimizes constraints and cancels them out; exodus throws itself into their disorder.¹⁶

The inherent antagonism (unpeace) in world or comparative literature is not in view of a meeting of opposites but a sort of refusal to accept the existence of opposites. Worlding sees incommensurability with approval,

a provocation to avoid the encyclopedia and endorse what Serres calls a “scalenopcedia”—not an isosceles, right-angled or equilateral triangle, but “unbalanced in parts, scalene signifies lameness, like Hephaistos, an inventor and the husband of Aphrodite, lame like several relatives of Oedipus, with sore feet, like him; scalene describes an oblique, twisting, complicated path.”¹⁷ Construction, conjoining, and conflict become a single act. Comparative literature must deeply invest in the unpeace, in the intra-action, and indulge in “leaping sideways,” wandering “as free as a cloud,” gazing in every direction and improvising. Serres observes that “*improvisation* is a source of wonder for the eye. Think of anxiety as good fortune, self-assurance as poverty. Lose your balance, leave the beaten track, chase birds out of the hedges.”¹⁸ However, wandering and improvisation are not absolutely without and outside sense. In fact, cultural specificity is a part of a process where circulation and comparison consort antagonistically without ignoring certain irreducible differences that are inherent in transcultural negotiations. My more than global program of thinking indisputably acknowledges cultural specificities and exemplarities, certain unchangeable dimensions in a particular thought-tradition and system of knowledge because without such acceptance and understanding of certain specificities the whole idea of doing literature transculturally is destined to get chaotic and inconsequential. So both the specificity and the irreducible differences among cultures and traditions synergistically intensify and complicate the exchange value of a given work. This contributes to the circulation, the sense-making, of the more than global where specificities and paradigm-transcendence are intra-related, augmenting the off balance factor in literary understanding. But any critical inclusiveness is deeply opposed to hegemonies inflicted upon us by certain languages in their global circulation. Several languages spoken by large numbers of people, and, thus, blessed with a significant corpus of literature, can generate a conceptual pool to globalize an idea or a paradigm. This implies, for instance, that the hermeneutic nexus among Hindi, Chinese, Spanish, German, and English can clearly ignore Sanskrit. Being global can then become a kind of self-imprisonment within an insular local. This generates the stultifying provinciality of being global from which literary studies must seek its own modes of independence.

Comparative literature, working out of its traditional penchant for sources and inevitable comparison of cultures and times and thought, came to identify, with the publication of the American Comparative Literature Association report of 1993, a course removed from traditional Eurocentrism

that was vectored to be global (Miller provides an account of the growth of comparative literature in North America in the next chapter).¹⁹ But the question that has been debated here is whether comparative literature exists only to become comparatist in our doing and understanding of literature or any close reading of literature is removed from the domain of such practices. But has literature ever been without its peers—distant or teleomorphic? Being conscious of initiating a comparative framework is one aspect; the other aspect is the belief in literature’s embedded comparative status—the entangled status, the molecularity, and what I call its intra-active transculturality. Jonathan Culler argues that “comparative literature should accept the differential possibility that the evolution of literary and cultural studies has created, as the site for the study of literature as a transnational phenomenon, did not gain many adherents, and the question of what comparative literature should be has remained as much in dispute as ever, except insofar as we agree that it is the nature of comparative literature to be the site at which the most diverse options of the humanities contend—not just a discipline in crisis but by its very nature a site of crisis.”²⁰

Indeed, literature, or *sahitya*, is a site of crisis whether one disciplinizes it as comparative or leaves it alone to manifest its own nodes and modes of comparison—a panorama and not a landscape, to follow Serres. Comparative literature is less a discipline in need of promotion and establishment than a norm and an inevitable urge (the more) to understand what literature can do and is capable of doing. Fernando Cabo Aseguinolaza rightly notes that “literature is a European concept—even Eurocentric in the most radical sense of the word—both in terms of its genealogy and in its fundamental link to the alphabetically written word and to the idea of the book. So, too, are the corpora with which it was originally associated and the basic fields towards which the first historiographic attempts, from Bacon on, were oriented.”²¹ Through intra-active transculturality, I intend to dilate the radius of literature’s meaning-making ability, rendering an aesthetic whose generous tenancy shall include non-European writing with cognition and recognition. It is also a strategy to re-premise “Angloglobalism” arguing for an inclusion of the complexity of the European space (comparison can also be intra-European or intra-Asiatic).²² This works against the imperialism of canonicity or ideological group behavior in literary studies that are adamantly unidirectional in trying to see the evolution and formation of literature as literary models, graphs, and maps.²³ It is about changing the measure of critique—the geo-politics

and spatiality of knowledge—of literature irrespective of whether we label it as world literature or comparative literature. There is much more than is usually understood both in Gottfried Herder’s concept of the globe as inscribed in incommensurable cultures and in the interdenominational capaciousness of Goethe. Goethe’s *Weltliteratur* involves a critical ecumenism whose dynamics has always been far more complicated than what the matrices of the global-local divide and of the theory of epochs have allowed us to conceive. Being global is not simply a reaching out constricted by the strengths of the reigning critical methodologies; it is also a reaching in, voyaging centripetally to form more global configurations of understanding, a reconceived *Weltliteratur*.²⁴

My arguments built on intra-active transculturality are out of rhythm with what Zhang Longxi, endorsing the popular cooptative momentum in comparative literature, affirms in *Unexpected Affinities*. Longxi does this, for instance, by way of a comparative exegesis of John Bunyan’s *The Pilgrim’s Progress* and the sixteenth-century Chinese *Journey to the West* (*Xi you ji*). Longxi clusters Liu Xie, John Keats, Gustave Flaubert, Heinrich Heine, A. E. Housman, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Alfred de Musset, Franz Grillparzer, and others to elucidate the Confucian notion that poetry provides an outlet for the suffering soul.²⁵ Here the predominant spirit tries to avoid the shock, the adventure, and risk of bringing unfamiliar patterns and paradigms of reading into serious play. Intelligent and investigative, with citation of pertinent passages, Longxi’s text rides the “going global” mode. He leaves out the dystopian unease, or the unpeace that intra-active transculturality brings. He minimizes the vagaries of incommensurability, does not let critical world formations inhere in what Rosi Braidotti’s calls “transposition” and, hence, reduces the potentialities of “taking place.”²⁶ Comparative dystopic unease then invites the anxiety of conflictive exchanges, the “gradient” of comparison and difference, dismantling, most often, the enclaves of literary systems that preserve canonicity or *horizontes* of world literature.²⁷ The more than global, through sense-able (the ability to generate sense and also about making sense able) and sense-less (the act of not finding conventional sense all the time) unease, introduces the impurity in our reading of literature across time and cultures—an eroticism that refuses to stay exclusively immured in specificity, culture-boundedness, and conceptual autonomy. Going global has a direction, but the more than global is a possibility. This might head and veer otherwise, where difference is *sens-ing*. Veering (connected to the French verb *virer*, to turn or turn around, and the Latin verb *vertere*, to

turn), as Nicholas Royle argues, “involves contemplating all sorts of turns, funny and otherwise.”²⁸ He points out that veering “entails an experience or event of difference, of untapped and unpredictable energy.”²⁹ It might go “*toward* something open,” as Paul Celan writes, “inhabitable, an approachable you, perhaps, an approachable reality.”³⁰ So the dystopian unease in comparative thinking can surely come from a transpoetical veering in which the subject is irrevocably split horizontally to announce itself with *différence*.

When we formally identify the world and the globe in the global, we miss what it means to experience the more than global. I am arguing for a recircumscription—both in the deeper inflection implied by Herodotus’s *oikoumene* and home as the world. I am certainly not gesturing toward a boundless chaos. “It rather suggests,” as Didier Coste observes, “that we should move away from the priority of any single origin and consider the one-and-whole both as origin and goal, and thus itself bi-centered. Comparative thinking, as it moves away from that one-and-wholeness in order to make sense, creates its own bipolarities, around which it is up to our anthropological self-consciousness to move—elliptically also in the sense of an omission, an abbreviation, an encryption and a forgetting.”³¹ These moves, Coste suggests, import a radical openness and a newfound familiarity among correspondences of ideas and paradigms widely separated in time, context, and culture. With this come cognitive shifts, chromomorphic transits, the unease that interpretative profits in cultural translation bring, and the conceptual inflections that result from epistemic interplays. So the worlding through intra-active transculturality is clearly not produced additively but generates itself coadunatively replete with the peculiar modes of (in)fusion, subtraction (the shrinking of meaning-premises to generate reterritorialization), and inwardness, which for me is a movement in perception and insight that reinterrogates the capaciousness, viability, and horizoning power of concepts.

The more has an undertow of joy. This is a joy that does not make us, as Rabindranath Tagore argues, “limited by the power of the intellect or the power of work,” but makes us experience ourselves without any “cover or calculation in between.”³² Tagore continues:

The son is dear not because we long for the son, but because we long for the *atma*, our true self. Property is dear not because we desire the property but because we desire the *atma*, or the self. This means that in whatever we experience ourselves *more* fully, we desire that. The son

eliminates my shortcomings; I find myself all the *more* in my son. In him, I become *more* of myself. This is why he is my dearest kin; he is a manifestation of my self outside of me. It is the truth I experience so certainly within myself that makes me experience love; that very same truth I know in my son and therefore my love for him expands. That is why to be close to someone is to know what they love. It is thus that we understand where, in this wide world, they have located themselves and how far they have spread their souls. Where my *affection* does not lie, my soul only skirts the rim of its own boundary.³³

The more than global is an affection that leads one to experience the other outside oneself and eventually to know oneself better. The local is known better outside itself as much as the global is understood better in the more than global, which is, however, not beyond global. It is a profound desire that dwells in the joy emerging out of being local and global at the same time—the father (the global, as it were) finding himself in the son (our assumed local). This enables the son to become dear to the father. In turn, the father comes to know himself more in the affective momentum leading him to reach out to the son. This is his desire to locate himself in his son. That desire, again, is developed paradoxically, through a reaching-in, in modes of inner immigration, leading the father to find himself. So finding oneself more in others is to become more of oneself. The dharma of the more than global then is the *sambandha*, the astute listening where the father (global) and son (local) address each other in a resonant relationality. In *sambandha*, the global finds itself in the local, enabling a knowledge that helps the global to discover its globality, as when the father finds more of himself in his son. Here lies the more that produces joy when one's own truths become the truths of the world. In the words of Tagore: "The house it [I refer here to the more] inhabits is not merely a structure of bricks and mortar—it attempts to make it a home and colours it in its own hues."³⁴ Compared to a house, a home in its affective and aesthetic configurations is more fluid, less constricted, and knows the art of accommodativeness where the father and the son can live and learn and make more senses out of their living (*sambandha*) at different points of time. I would like to argue that the house of the local and the global built out of the bricks and mortar of ideology, principles, traditions, and cultural individualities becomes the home of the more of the global, where the local and the global, like the son and the father, exceed themselves in the joy of discovering and reaching out for each other. The flow

of knowledge in such continued disequilibria is not between the local's reaching for the global and the global's reaching down to meet the local. It rather becomes a moment, a now, that is both achronic and cross-chronic. In this constructed now, the father finds himself to be more than what he is. The son realizes the amount and kind of "father" that was already there in him. So going global that is not understood within the premises of what I call the comparative dystopian unease is not global enough.

The impregnated more in the intra-active transcultural now disturbs us with a presence. Bill Ashcroft rightly argues that the presence in transcultural encounters is a

moment of sudden awareness in which the reader engages an excess, the "beyond" of interpretation in what may be understood as a sense of cultural "otherness." When this works most successfully, the otherness is one's own. This moment may overlap and merge with the aesthetic and indeed cannot be fully separated from it, but it encompasses a radical unfamiliarity that is perhaps better understood as an encounter with the uncanny, the *umheimlich*. The strangest feature of this encounter in the transcultural text is that this uncanny space becomes, potentially, a space of negotiation.³⁵

Presence is absence in process. Presence is in "to be" and what was "not to be." It undoes the presentness of meaning. It, as Nancy argues, is "not form and fundament, but the pace, the passage, the coming in which nothing is distinguished, and everything is unbound. What is born has no form, nor is it the fundament that is born. 'To be born' rather is to transform, transport, and entrance all determinations."³⁶ Intra-active transculturality presences, is itself a presence, which is always already there but "neither in the mode of being (substance) nor in that of there (as a presence)." It is mostly in the mode of being born where meaning is not a representative fixity (global or local) because birth "effaces itself and brings itself indefinitely back." So the birth of a literary text "is this slipping away of presence through which everything comes to presence."³⁷

In intra-active transculturality, a text's taking place—presence to presence—does not necessarily need a precondition to come to power. In agential intrarelateing a text builds resonance and "travelling frequencies." These frequencies, Dimock argues, are "received and amplified across time, moving farther and farther from their points of origin, causing unexpected vibrations in unexpected places. . . . Texts are emerging phenomena, activated and to some extent constituted by the passage of time, by their con-

tinual transit through new semantic networks, modifying their tonality as they proceed.”³⁸ The resonance and presencing demonstrate how much noise a text carries inside it. A literary text, for me, is always a noise, an intricate and challenging mix of sound and frequencies. It is when we ascertain a meaning of a text that we adjust its frequencies to generate sense (consonance and clarity). But all music is fundamentally noise because the slightest of maladjustment of registers can turn music to noise. So it is noise that is an ontological reality and the music that comes out of it is only a reality manifested through fine-tuning and studious adjustment. If we consider Wordsworth’s “Daffodils” as a romantic poem, we are merely adjusting the noise of the poem to a certain frequency; it is music to many and will continue to stay as a particular genre of music (romantic nature poem) to many for many years. But the event of the more than global is mostly about engaging with the noise and, hence, the poem, as we shall see in the following pages, struggles to speak in unitotality: it thickens its tonality, develops inflections, and reverberates with new pitches and rhythms. These noises are what I argue to be contradictions, the fermenting sources that a text generates intra-actively.

The more than global produces a now with multifold presents making the poem available through spacetime matters. The now is an exposure in and to the new, where no memory of a contradiction or incommensurability comes to infringe on the domain of the not-yet formed. The freedom emerging out of the exposure has a life of its own outside the memories that all presents (with their competences and contradictions) usually bring into the crucible of the now. What I mean by this is that my reading of “Daffodils” within the now will not have any memory of how the poem was read at different points of time and space. This is achieved in a detemporalized flicker of interfusing concepts—the nowing of diverse cultural and epistemic hemispheres hitherto thought of as foreign to the poem. The more-now exists in every location of space and time. It functions in a swirling inclusiveness that is formless and characterless and yet prodigiously productive. T. R. S. Sharma claims that “there is nothing like an ageless concept, for concepts age like men, sometimes even faster. The more ancient they are, the more recent they sound, and often the most ancient concept turns out to be the most modern or post-modern or easily lends itself to a post-modern appropriation.”³⁹ The traveling differential that such fluidity generates makes Raimundo Panikkar’s “diatopical hermeneutics” an important dimension to world-ization.⁴⁰ Understanding “Daffodils” is not about putting two periods, two times, and two texts together

in contrast, comparison, and correspondence. This understanding is not the result of a simple strategy of interwelding the *desivad* (nativism) with *videshivad* (Euro-Americanism). G. N. Devy has seen this strategy as the dialectical tension between *mārga* (the mainstream) and *deśi* (the local or regional).⁴¹ The creative antagonism, revealed through the taking place of “Daffodils,” to be presented in the pages that follow, is not informed by Devy’s entrenched attitude about adducing nativist empowerment through the appropriation of *deśi* traditions and thoughts; rather, it has the presence-power of intra-active transculturality that allows the *mārga* and the *deśi* to intersect and flow into each other, creating a diffractive *sudesivad* (neonativism) in entangled topoi and mythos.⁴²

Comparatists might leap into an attack, claiming, perhaps rightfully, the legitimacy of the coming into contact of diverse cultural paradigms in intra-active, transcultural world-formations. I don’t deny their anxieties. I believe that literature’s worlding is not achieved by cheering a chaos born out of the incoherent interplay of ideas. We need to accept that there are certain irreducibles in linguistic, cultural, and epistemic formations, without which literature cannot proceed in its meaning-making. This, indeed, makes for a yes-no space. But intra-active transculturality continually reorients questions that are phrased not as “why this?” but as “why not this?”

Taking Place

“Daffodils” is a simple, seemingly innocent, poem. Dorothy Wordsworth notes: “When we were in the woods beyond Gowbarrow Park we saw a few daffodils close to the water-side. We fancied that the lake had floated the seeds ashore, and that the little colony had so sprung up. But as we went along there were more and yet more; and at last, under the boughs of the trees, we saw that there was a long belt of them along the shore, about the breadth of a country turnpike road. I never saw daffodils so beautiful.”⁴³ William Wordsworth, placing the poem in “Poems of the Imagination” (1815), observes: “The subject of these Stanzas is rather an elementary feeling and simple impression (approaching to the nature of an ocular spectrum) upon the imaginative faculty, than an *exertion* of it. The one which follows . . . is strictly a Reverie; and neither that, nor the text after it in succession, ‘The Power of Music,’ would have been placed here . . . except for the reason given in the foregoing note.”⁴⁴ Despite its notional anchorage in elemental feeling, imagination, beauty, reverie, and seeing—the approved and authentic principles of understanding Wordsworth’s

poetic art—intra-active transculturality worlds the poem’s taking place in a diffractive space where the poem builds an entangled habitation in certain domains of Sanskrit poetics. Spacetime matters produce contact points that generate sense but do not reduce meaning to itself. The more than global happens through these contact points which are substantial and have their own singularities. The meaningful happening of “Daffodils” through “contacts” with some particular paradigms of Sanskrit poetics and Hindu philosophy is the co-incident, a kind of trans-immanent event. The event of the poem and its Sanskrit territorialization are being-with—superpositions that generate correspondence through already existing disruptions and dispositions. So the simple taxonomies of a supposedly romantic poem and certain elective dimensions of Sanskrit poetics are not held in a dialectical play but stay world-wide-ized in an entangled relationality. Comparative dystopian unease spooks the poem with certain aspects of Sanskrit poetics, and is, hence, haunted and *re-turning* unannounced. The taking place is both an exposure (a world of nows to its already existing presents) and a deposition (the sedimentation of presents worlding a repository of meaning, the plurality of nows) where the text in question subtracts itself to add to its life. Subtraction is the poem’s ability to withdraw from itself, its nature, its already existing music developing a nothingness that presences, from the already-always to not-yet. Comparative dystopian unease decimates the binary and makes sense of the restlessness of intrarelated correspondences beyond the brute givens. The world cannot be worlded and worlding cannot stay worlded to enable more than global formations. Urs Stäheli appropriately notes that “using discourses on the local and global, then, is a particular way of making invisible the constitutive paradox of the world—the impossibility of its unity.”⁴⁵ So the world of the poem stays withdrawn enabling Sanskrit (in)fusionist modes to enliven a radical articulation of its blind spots.

The intra-active transcultural development of the poem happens through the singularity of dance and joy. The poet is united in a dance (all four stanzas of the poem mention the word *dance*). In this dance, the existential unites with the cosmogonic:

The waves beside them danced; but they
 Out-did the sparkling waves in glee:
 A poet could not but be gay,
 In such a jocund company:
 I gazed—and gazed—but little thought

What wealth the show to me had brought:

For oft, when on my couch I lie

In vacant or in pensive mood,

They flash upon that inward eye

Which is the bliss of solitude;

And then my heart with pleasure fills,

And dances with the daffodils. (lines 13–24, italics mine)

The dance is the synthesizing principle and a celebration of aesthetic delight. It is a consciousness of joy that finds a diffractive entanglement with the spirit of the *Brihadaranyaka Upanishad*, where individual creative delight is seen as part of a universal continuum of immanent and immutable joy.⁴⁶ The poet commits to a power to encompass the life, the spirit, and the truth that is undergirded by joy. The *Upanishad* tells us—*ananda rupam amritamyad vibhuti*, from the speck of dust at our feet to the stars in heaven—that all is a manifestation of truth and beauty, of joy and immortality. Joy manifests itself through the poet's submission to the daffodils and the objects orbiting around them, as it were. The poet who “could not but be gay” relishes the experience with a stable delight, a radiant joyousness of spirit (*prasada*). It is significant to observe that he moves among the objects of sense with a mind brought under his control. This control of the mind is not for a joyless asceticism but for a tranquility that generates happiness. The “bliss of solitude” accompanies a “pensive mood” and the *ananda* (joy) becomes the state of self-sufficiency. It is a repose within itself where the daffodils, as objects of poetic desire, are assimilated into the poetic being, resulting in blissful exaltation. Within the inherent *anandavada* (principle of joy) of the poem we find clear concentric lines of the expansion of the ego. From beholding the flower, the ego moves to embrace the clouds, the trees, the bay, the sparkling waves, and then transits to the inner thoughts. This inward movement effectuates a confluence of the blissful heart (inner being) with the daffodils and, finally, dilates into an all-pervasive manifestation that Rabindranath Tagore would point out as *ananda dhara bohiche bhuvane* (currents of joy are flowing across the universe). The poet and this immanent bliss are partners in being and becoming where “every event is virtually present or immanent in every other event.”⁴⁷ This projects the periodic transition of the poetic ego, the *ahamkara*. Each stage of transition is subversion and submission proceeding from that stage and into the next one. The anterior reality of the ego (the consciousness that bursts into the relish of nature)

is sutured to the *madhyamavastha* (the middle phase) where the poetic ego proliferates into *bhavas* (myriad sentiments) as it comes into contact with other elements of nature. The disruption in *madhyamavastha* sublates into the *uttarakoti* or *paramakashtha* (the final phase or period) that is the present now of a higher unity where the “flash upon that inward eye” is made possible. Indeed, the poem itself has a flash (the wonder and the joy) in its eruption and, also, in its experience of the harmonic, pensive point of creativity. Such flashes of experience, realization, and achievement point to what in Zen Buddhism is called the Buddha-nature, whose unity is not determinate but dynamically *sunya* (empty), not in the sense of a vacuum but in a form that is procreative. This is what I would like to interpret here as the brimming vacant mood.

The “wealth” revealed externally and eventually relished within prepares the ground for a “flash upon that inward eye.” This is not a transition to the state of absolute transcendence but is the attainment of a kinship with the daffodils. It is an interface of the self with becoming. The poetic being meditatively feels the rhythm of the creation, the life pulsating around the poet, resulting in the bliss of solitude. The flash of an experience in the inner being of the poet is a dip in solitude that gets him closer to the deepest layers of the spirit in nature. The flash, “all at once,” of “a host of golden daffodils” is a sudden illumination that brings Wordsworth in accord with an inward vision. This enables him to connect with a consciousness that is both aesthetic and metaphysical.

There is a projective desire in the poem that through its self-subversiveness collapses the interior and the exterior of aesthetic relish. This relish intractively finds its entanglement in the *tathata*, the “thus-being of things.” This *tathata*, through a suspension of discrimination and choice, encourages a nonduality and nonconditionality of things. The poet and the circumambient objects are held harmonically together by the flash; they are discriminated from one another. So any choice to privilege one element over the other is suspended. The poetic self moves in points of multiple convergences toward an aesthetic evolution. In such a consummate experience with the daffodils the *rasavada* (aesthetic consciousness) and *brahmasvada* (mystical consciousness) integrate into each other, *ānandaikaghana* (bliss of unity).

Calling into question the global exemplarity of reading a poem that belongs to early nineteenth-century British literature, the discussion so far produces an access to a new operative now where relevant dimensions of Sanskrit poetics and a poem by Wordsworth are caught in manifest,

more-than-global sense-formations (I-other-I). Each exceeds its own formations and provenance to find itself in the other and in more than the other, in the more. This is a greeting of the other by encountering the relevance of the other in the “I.” It serves the double purpose of saving the “I” from being overwhelmed by the other. “I” means the other not merely as the “promised” (the present or presents) but also as the promising (surplus or presence). The “I” is saved by greeting the other because saving need not be considered as the rigid preservation of hermeneutic sanctity. Through submission to the other, the “I” is salvaged and its retention is made possible.⁴⁸ Under the I-other-I bind, generated through intra-active transculturality, the poem has a problematic homecoming where the homecoming is in a *sahit* with the otherness of one’s being. The poem is not in the alterity of the other. The agential intra-actions trigger both this expansion of interlocking epistemes and a folding back onto itself. “I is someone else,” as Arthur Rimbaud has reiterated.⁴⁹ So the dance being the I is also the other. The taking place, thus, neutralizes the hierarchy and power that self and the other construct within a local-global bind. This leaves us in the midst of the more-effect.

The more-effect can be substantially argued through an intra-active understanding of the dance. The dance of the daffodils stimulates nature and cosmically sets off the *lila*, or play of creation. The Vedantic text *Brahmasutra* affirms that Brahman’s creative activity is not undertaken by any need on his part but by way of sport.⁵⁰ This *krida* (sport) is aesthetic creativity. The dance of the daffodils stimulates the *lila*, the *krida*, in the poet. The dance of the poet and the dance in the poet are aesthetic realizations in space and time, resulting in a joyous overflow of energy. This surge, a plenitude of energy, is not anarchic but *kridaniyakam* (play) that promotes a life of sensitivity, aesthetic consciousness, and commitment to a harmonic consummation. Here the *lila*, or sport, finds an aesthetic poise in the poet who surrenders to its intrinsic delight.

The delight and the bliss of solitude are manifestations of *santarasa*. This is an important emotion within the *rasa* theory signifying tranquility and also *sthayi* or the stable. The poet is close to achieving *santapraya*, the blissful serenity of liberation. However, the *santarasa* paradoxically emerges out of the participatory world (the poet’s highly intense interaction with the objects around him) as *uddipanavibhava*, the enhancing stimulus. It uncannily owes its joy to the *lila* and the *alaukika-ahlada*, the transmundane pleasure. The complex dynamics of *santa* (tranquil) corresponds to the *krida*. *Santa* thereby becomes an event of sportive quiet.

The *lila*, the *ananda*, and the *santarasa* come together in *samapatti* (synergy), which is the poet's *sthitaprajna* (poise). This is the *yukta-viyuktadasa*, the bond-liberated state. The poet is *yukta* (bound) to the daffodils and to their circumambient milieu through his immediate experiences of delight and wonder. He is also *viyukta* (liberated) beyond the immediacy of experiences into a moment that becomes his very own. This produces the pensive mood and opens the inward eye. In these moments of aesthetic and sensual relish, the poet has the privilege of being himself and another. In this *yukta-viyuktadasa*, the dance with the daffodils becomes *cittavistara* (the expansion of consciousness). The poetic soul with its ingathered joy becomes *rasenatripta*—satiety in emotions. With this *cittavistara*, the waves, the breeze, the trees, the lake, and the “never-ending line” of daffodils become interwoven beings. They inter-are with all the others. The aesthetic relish—“my heart with pleasure fills”—receives the impulsion of the inner “bliss of solitude” and the poet reaches the *uttarakoti*, the final phase. In this climax, the poetic ego is liberated to the point where it enjoys at once *santarasa* and *krida*. He makes meaning out of his *yukta-viyuktadasa*. It is a kind of *rahasya mudra* (a mysterious posture). This posture is something that Tagore metaphorically finds in a bee who “must sit, steady and unwavering, on the pollen if it is to taste the honey hidden in the heart of the flower.”⁵¹ The *rahasya mudra*, the mysterious poise, whose center is afflicted with a serious disquiet, shows that the poet's succumbing to a joy is not a revel or a riot as it might seem. His joy is the result of a dialectic between *santarasa* and *kridaniyakam* that makes it indeterminate and diaphanous. It is a *lila*, an *ananda*, that de-centers itself continually to find a center (*sthitaprajna*) in flashes of experiences caught in diachronic moments of creative relish. So the present of the dance meets the present of the *lila*. The “I” and the other are caught in a pleasant perplexity—the *lila* taking place both inside and outside the poet is Wordsworth's *rasenatripta* (*rasa* consummation). This makes him find his pensive poise through a deep interiority of aesthetic experiences. The *lila* in nature builds its presence in Wordsworth, resulting in *vivarta*, or transformation of the poetic being, in which the *lila* within and without converge and resonate. The pleasure springs from the *lila* mystique and the poet strikes the *rahasya mudra*, balancing all the forces within him, the jocund clutch of forces in clouds, vales, hills, lake, trees, breeze, stars, bay. He experiences the paradox of poise in *lila*, the leisure in sport, a pause in the flow, a dynamism in the quiet integration of forces. It is the *rahasya* (mystery) of creation.

Within this more than global phenomenon, the poem has come through as a kind of Nancyean fragment that has “accidental and involuntary aspects of fragmentations.” Benjamin Hutchens argues that such fragmentation in its singularity becomes “ecstatic and exploratory in nature.” Nancy points out, “If the fragment is indeed a fraction, it emphasizes neither first nor foremost the fracture that produces it. At the very least, it designates the borders of the fracture as an autonomous form as much as the formlessness or deformity of the tearing.”⁵² The more than global enables the poem to realize the value of textual tearing, the searing of systematicity, frissiveness of fraction, and the entropic energy of world-formations. The poem, in its negotiation with a few accredited parameters of Sanskrit poetics, forms itself as a fragment-event, not a romantic poem understood in a kind of traditional interpretive fatigue and its concomitant satiety but through inscription and exscription with an undecidable energy and a collapse of sense. Within the more than global intra-active band, the poem begins always as an interruption through an immanent worldview that betrays the always already fragmentary state. Sanskrit poetics does not come as anachronic to its exposition; its incidence is invested in the areality of its power and praxis as a work of art. “Daffodils” is both a sharing of sense and a circulation of sense. Hutchens shows us that sense, for Nancy, “is its own constitutive loss. It presents itself in ‘the very opening of the abandonment of sense, as the opening of the world.’ The fact that there is a ‘there is,’ a world of existing singularities, testifies that thinking itself is the possible opening of sense. Within the exigencies of sense, nothing truly ‘has’ sense, but everything in the nonsense of its being reveals sense to the opening of thought.”⁵³ A Sanskrit reading is not outside the poem because by being *entre-nous* it is *cum*, staying and making “sens-able” singularizing “while at the same time connecting these singularities.”⁵⁴ In the sense-ridden, comparative, dystopian grid exposure is exposition.

Post-Posts

In his reading of Nietzsche, Miller initiates a complex negotiation between what Nietzsche calls the burden of the past and a liberating reading in the present. Nomadism can develop as productive experiences, and it happens when the silent pressures on the local to overcome its immediateness result in a reading of the local with a consciousness of the global currents of experience that are considered not just as dissonance. It is antagonism or transfigurative distress, resulting in both knowing and ignorance. This means that literature can be experienced, as Miller argues elsewhere, as

catachresis and as black holes. Miller's discussion becomes an interesting invitation to dialogue on this subject of critiquing the now and the principle of the more. *Sudesivadism* is my rejoinder to the specter of barbarism that Miller critiques in Nietzsche. Nietzsche's opposition to *Weltliteratur* stems from the fear that it would lead to an overabundance of unmanageable knowledge. Miller implicates this "more than enough" in world literature and rightly considers how Nietzsche's distress over universalizing literature is paradoxically a way of exploring more meaningful experiences. Distress turns into a lively unease that leaves us in a circulation where one's own local conditions and milieu of understanding are infected by certain centrifugality. This is a healthy nomadism that does not aspire for Hegelian totality or for the impossible sovereignty in knowledge sought by George Eliot's Casaubon in *Middlemarch*. I concur with Miller on how world literature escapes what Nietzsche considers Alexandrianism by generating the more and exploring the now. It does not give us comfort but inflects the distress as a way to understand and live productively.

A few lines from Lao Zi can help us to understand the more at a different level:

Thirty spokes share a hub: where *absence* is,
there the *use* of the carriage lies.
Mix clay to make a vessel: where absence is,
there the use of the vessel lies.
Drill holes as doors and windows to make a room: where
absence is, there the use of the room lies.⁵⁵

The more in the global is the absence—the sense withdrawn, nothing as sense—that is where the use of literature lies. The absence that lies in the vessel or in the room is the vacuum that provides form and accommodates content. Similarly, the category of the more in globalizing literature creates absences that are not vacant but are points where thinking begins to open sense. Literature's absences thus exist ahead of our occupancy and invite us to connect with the joy that Tagore has brilliantly analyzed. We may see this somewhat in the light of Buddhist emptiness. It is a pregnant *sunyata* in which the tireless plurality of nows becomes events that are intra-relating and forever coming to be. Literature's local specificities are embedded in history, context, and time. Nevertheless, they are perennially exposed to an openness of thought that is not simply about taking a text out of its home base and throwing it into the domains of different cultures in time and place. The restive openness can be qualified as a disclosive affect

of totality both in the sense of its accommodativeness and immanence. Zen master Dogen's seeing of the absoluteness of the bird and the fish as being continuous with the sky and the water is analogous to our intra-active habitation in "Daffodils": "When a fish swims in water, there is no end of the water no matter how far it swims. When a bird flies in the sky, fly though it may, there is no end to the sky. However, no fish or bird has ever left water or sky since the beginning. . . . But if a bird leaves the sky, it will immediately die, and if a fish leaves the water, it will immediately die. You must understand that the water is life, and the air is life. The bird is life and the fish is life. Life is the fish and life is the bird."⁵⁶

The poem becomes self-forgetful in a life of its own. The intra-active fluidity that conceptual figurations of *deśi* and *videsi* bring creates a sustaining life for the more than global. Literature cannot survive without the entangled more, just as the bird or the fish will die without air or water. If air and water are life, the bird and the fish are life, too. If the local and the global are life, the more than global is life, too. This attests to the totality that the life of literature cannot do without. Literature has a life of its own. It has a life in being made global, has a life in not being rendered global, never becoming global, preglobal, and in being more than global, too. The more is the life and the life is the more. Perhaps, the more makes literature disappear better, as Emerson foresaw.⁵⁷

The intra-active enactment in negativity and presence is Nancy's "trembling," the act of being affected, staying in vibration both in visibility and in the *nihil*.⁵⁸ Comparatism unleashes a desire to connect, while the more than global is predominantly about a nothingness, the nothing being the "differential spacing for an encounter with the other—a just-between-us—from which worlds are created by sharing in the same performative modality as sovereignty and the self."⁵⁹ The more than global makes sense of the performative *we*. It is informed in the *we* where Nancy locates the access to sense. The poem's access to sense is the entangled event of being coimplicated within Sanskrit poetics. Hutchens explains:

The origin of the world emanates from any contact composing a "we." Each singular self has access to the presence of the world, but it is only contiguity with other singular selves that enables it to have "access to an access." That is to say, there is a multiplicity of presences of the world within the "we," and each proximity provides a multiplicity of accesses to the presences. If each singularity is co-implicated within the world, then the originary existential state of all singularities is a sharing in

the world, not any ontological divorce from it into a state of transcendence. The “world” is not merely some extrinsic horizon of singular existence, but the coexistence that enables existences to be exposed to the circulation of sense and the presences of a world.⁶⁰

The potency or wealth of the we decimates the sovereignty of the local and global as the two limiting points of understanding literature. The more than global (both *mundas* and *immundas*) is about making sense of the end, the end as the inauguration of creativity. Intra-active transculturality finds the “wandering labour of sense” in the poem—a sense that is not predominantly produced but out there, there itself, letting-it-be, interleaved, insinuated and interlarded. It urges us to read literature with transimmanence freeing us from our conservatism into a conceptual warfare where a meaningful harvest is presented out of the ruins of finitude. It is in the radical nonequivalence of worlding that literature can find its experiences of freedom.