

## The Slovak Comparativist, Dionýz Ďurišin, and his International Reception

MARIÁN GÁLIK

Institute of Oriental Studies SAS

Dionýz Ďurišin (1929–1997) was one of the best Slovak literary theorists and a well-known literary comparativist abroad. From the 1970s until his untimely death, he collaborated intensively with literary scholars from the former Czechoslovakia and from other countries of Central and Southern Europe. One of a small number of Slovak literary scholars at the beginning of the 1970s, with the publication of his *Vergleichende Literaturforschung. Versuch eines methodisch-theoretischen Grundrisses*<sup>1</sup> and *Sources and Systematics of Comparative Literature*<sup>2</sup>, Ďurišin became one of the most important theorists of comparative literature amongst the members of the AILC/ICLA. His first book, translated into German in 1972, was originally entitled *Problémy literárnej komparistiky* (Problems of Literary Comparison).<sup>3</sup> Translations followed, from Slovak or Russian, into other languages, including Hungarian, Macedonian, and even Chinese and Japanese. An exception amongst scholars from Central, Eastern and Southern Europe, Ďurišin was a source of inspiration for scholars of interliterary research in the United States, Canada, Latin America, Germany, France, The Netherlands, Italy, Spain, Portugal, and even in India, China and Japan. It is a pity that the works of the last period of his life are still less well-known in the West and in Asia, but now it would seem a good time for international scholars to become familiar with them.

### 1

Ďurišin's first book on the theory of comparative literature was entitled *Problémy literárnej komparistiky*. It appeared in Slovak in 1967, one year before Ulrich Weisstein's *Einführung in die Vergleichende Literaturwissenschaft*.<sup>4</sup> Ďurišin's mentor, Mikuláš Bakoš, described this text as an extraordinary work that provided a 'structuralist theory of comparative literature'. In the same year, Ďurišin participated in the Fifth Congress of the AILC/ICLA in Belgrade where he stood in the shadow of the old Soviet theoretician, V. M Zhirmunsky, and his colleagues. Three years later, at the Sixth Congress of the AILC/ICLA in Bordeaux, Ďurišin read his paper 'La Conditionnalité historique des formes de la communication interlittéraire'.<sup>5</sup> Two of the most famous scholars of comparative literature, René Wellek and Douwe W. Fokkema, paid special attention to him. Wellek knew him from his first book that he praised highly and regarded as superior to Ulrich Weisstein's book. Fokkema began

to take an interest in Ďurišin at the Bordeaux congress. In Ďurišin's theory, Fokkema discovered new and forward-looking elements such as, for instance, Ďurišin's term *interlittéraire* which was new and unusual and which he used later in his own theoretical reflections. A student of Russian Formalism, and of Soviet traditions of literary criticism and comparative literature, Fokkema found in Ďurišin a Central European literary theorist who could be helpful in elaborating a sensible theory of comparative literature after the discipline's crisis in the 1950s.

In one of our discussions, Fokkema told me that Ďurišin had a crucial impact on his own views of comparative literature in the 1970s. We can see this clearly in Fokkema's seminal essay, 'Method and Programme of Comparative Literature'<sup>6</sup>, where he gave a highly positive account of Wellek's well-known essay, 'The Crisis of Comparative Literature', as well as of the two books by Ďurišin, mentioned above. It is difficult to say which of these two books, later described by Ulrich Weisstein as a *magnum opus*,<sup>7</sup> had a greater impact on Fokkema. It was probably the second one, *Systematics of Comparative Literature*, mainly because here Ďurišin pointed to the works of A.N. Veselovsky, the Russian Formalists and the Czech Structuralists as three sources of the theory of comparative literature elaborated by Slovak scholars.

## 2

After Wellek and Fokkema, the western scholar most interested in Ďurišin was probably Henry H. H. Remak. Remak and Ďurišin met personally in Bratislava at a symposium organized after the Meeting of the Board of the AILC/ICLA on March 1, 1975. Dionýz Ďurišin, the Slovak translologist Anton Popovič and I read papers, and H. M. Block, H. Frenz, Z. Konstantinovič, B. Kőpeczi, Eva Kushner, G. M. Vajda and H. H. Remak, amongst others, participated in the discussion. Ďurišin's paper, 'Les Problèmes théoretiques et méthodologiques du comparatisme littéraire slovaque'<sup>8</sup> is of the most interest here. In it, Ďurišin presented his views on the study of 'interliterary' aspects of the literary process and underlined the role of the target message of the texts in the receiving structure, an emphasis that later had a large impact on comparative literary studies and on the theory of translation. As is evident from the discussion that followed, Remak's remarks were most productive and probably helped Ďurišin in his later theoretical musings.

Remak underlined the importance of the receiving structure in his contribution to the discussion, asserting: 'As a reversal of the priority given in the past (for instance, in the bibliography by Baldensperger-Friederich from 1950) to the emitter rather than receiver, the stress laid by Ďurišin and other scholars on the receiving rather than the received literature is justified.'<sup>9</sup> Remak also agreed with Ďurišin's emphasis upon 'non-sociological elements on the genesis of literature' and the 'role of aesthetic, imaginative consideration'.<sup>10</sup>

Remak's interest in Ďurišin's work was also apparent later. During the AILC/ICLA Congress in Innsbruck in August 1979, he asked me to interpret for a discussion between him and Ďurišin. We had breakfast together and the theme of our conversation was very simple: what was Ďurišin working on and what were his plans for the future. Ďurišin's reply astonished both Remak and me. Ďurišin started by rejecting

his own theoretical work, characterizing it as ‘traditional’ comparative literature. Remark could hardly conceal a smile at this, and I asked him in Slovak if he really meant what he said. The words that followed were Ďurišin’s earliest formulation of his new interliterary creed that was later realized in the seven essays that appeared in the book entitled *Teória medziliterárneho procesu*<sup>11</sup>, with its rich marginalia concerning the views of different Slovak and foreign authors, and later in its English version as *Theory of Interliterary Process*, unfortunately without marginalia.<sup>12</sup>

Well-known Western comparativists started to be interested in Ďurišin mostly after the Innsbruck Congress. In his essay, ‘On the Genesis and Development of Literary Systems. Part II’<sup>13</sup>, Earl Miner remarked that *Sources and Systematics of Comparative literature* ‘shows how astute Ďurišin’s observations are on a matter of literary history that has been popular recently, reception or influence.’ In another seminal study, ‘Some Theoretical and Methodological Topics for Comparative Literature’<sup>14</sup>, it is clear that Miner tends towards ‘reception.’ ‘[Ďurišin’s] argument for considering as reception what is usually termed influence,’ Miner asserts, ‘earns my conviction.’

At the Bratislava Symposium of 1975, Haskell H. Block also appreciated the work of Ďurišin and his collaborators. As he wrote to me on February 10, 1998: ‘Ďurišin’s contribution to the understanding of comparative studies is very great and has had significant impact in the US. You probably know the discussion by Claudio Guillén in his book *The Challenge of Comparative Literature*.<sup>15</sup> Guillén’s formulations here clearly depend on those of Ďurišin. Perhaps you might mention this at the forthcoming conference.’

The work of Ďurišin and of his international literary team was positively evaluated by Eva Kushner at the Thirteenth Congress of the AILC/ICLA in Tokyo (1991). In her paper on vision and re-vision of literary theory she wrote that ‘in the spirit of both polysystem studies (Itamar Even-Zohar, Tel Aviv group, M.G.) and the kind of studies that Dionýz Ďurišin has been conducting with the Bratislava group, the focus should be not on the complete inventory but rather on the nature of the intraliterary and interliterary process itself, and that more limited historical spans and geographical areas should be studied in greater depth, with concentration of families of literature which have interacted and on the understanding of the dynamics of the interaction, including attention to the socio-economic roots of regional commonalities.’<sup>16</sup>

Tania Franco Carvalhal in her booklet, *Literatura comparada*, followed on from Ďurišin’s earlier works from the years 1972 and 1974. In *Literatura comparada* (p. 42), she also referred to another long study by Ďurišin, ‘Aspects ontologiques du processus interlittéraire’, that had been distributed to the participants of the Paris Congress of AIL/ICLA in 1985. In her essay, ‘Comunidades Inter-literárias e Relações entre Literaturas de Fronteira’<sup>17</sup>, she followed the methodological line on ‘interliterary communities’ from the *Theory of Interliterary Process*.

Some Western literary comparativists were more interested in Ďurišin’s books published before 1986. In the invaluable book, *Vergleichende Literaturwissenschaft. Erster Bericht: 1968–1977*<sup>18</sup>, Ulrich Weisstein, a key witness of the history of comparative literature since the publication, ten years earlier, of his *Einführung in die Vergleichende Literaturwissenschaft*, mentioned Ďurišin’s name several times and analysed his works. Another theorist of comparative literature, Gerhard R. Kaiser,

in his *Einführung in die Vergleichende Literaturwissenschaft. Forschungsstand – Kritik – Aufgaben*<sup>19</sup>, adopted Ďurišin's well-known diagram from *Vergleichende Literaturforschung* (p. 165), illustrating the object of comparative literature and its methods, genetic-contactual and typological (p. 49), and used them to presents examples in the bulk of the book (pp. 57–155). Zoran Konstantinović, an Austrian scholar of Serbian origin, praised highly Ďurišin's 'traditional' comparative literary theory in a book that contained the results of thirty years of his research, entitled *Grundlagentexte der Vergleichenden Literaturwissenschaft aus drei Jahrzehnten*.<sup>20</sup> Roger Bauer, in his essay, 'Continuité et discontinuité dans l'histoire et la matière de la littérature comparée'<sup>21</sup>, described the openness of Ďurišin's system and the possibility of its further development. Recently Manfred Schmelling, the President of AILC/ICLA in the years 2007–2010, in his excellent study of the Ovidian myths and their consequences, 'La métamorphose métamorphosée. Mythe, mémoire, intertexte'<sup>22</sup>, likewise follows on from Ďurišin's arguments in *Vergleichende Literaturforschung*.

In 1982 Pierre Swiggers of Leuven published his essay, 'A New Paradigm for Comparative Literature'<sup>23</sup>, where he pointed out that his new vision 'owes much of its existence and of its epistemological structure to the scientific research program sketched in D. Ďurišin's works *Die wichtigsten Typen literarischen Beziehungen und Zusammenhänge*<sup>24</sup> and *Vergleichende Literaturforschung*. Ďurišin has been the first to offer a systematic typology of literary relations (or metatextual relations), and his program has been sophisticated by, among others, Even-Zohar and Popovič, mostly under the influence of developments in semiotics, communication sciences and (socio) linguistics.<sup>25</sup> Of particular interest is Swigger's assertion that the collective work by James S. Holmes, José Lambert and Raymond van den Broeck, *Literature and Translation. New Perspective in Literary Studies*<sup>26</sup>, owes much to Ďurišin's early works. Here Ďurišin is presented as an initiator of the new theory of comparative literature of the 1970s among the scholars of Leuven as well as Tel Aviv. As far as the Tel Aviv theorists are concerned, in the *Interview with Gideon Toury*<sup>27</sup>, Toury remarked of the 1970s and most probably the beginning of the 1980s:

The basic mechanism was personal connections. If someone in Czechoslovakia of those days (or Slovakia, mainly, since most of the theorists known to us were Slovaks, M. G.) had published something in Czech or Slovak, it was mainly James Holmes who saw it that the rest of us gained access to it. He made friends with the people (certainly Popovič and maybe others from his team at the Department of Literary Communication and Experimental Methodology of the University Nitra, M.G.), he brought us texts. The whole thing was based on networking – on friendships and ongoing exchange of information. There was no real "school" of theoreticians, but there was a nucleus of people – centering on James Holmes, José Lambert, André Lefevere and Itamar Even-Zohar – who were eager to share whatever information and writings they had...<sup>28</sup>

Ďurišin's works were the source of inspiration for several of Even-Zohar's poly-systems studies and Raymond van den Broeck quoted his *Sources and Systematics of Comparative literature* (p. 137) in the essay, 'Second Thoughts on Translation Criticism. A Model of its Analytic Function'<sup>29</sup>. The idea of target text or message in Ďurišin's theory has been taken over by Gideon Toury:

[...] Translation is a highly teleological activity; in other words, that the exertion of any

single act of translating is to a large extent conditioned by the goal it serves. Thus, in order to be able to understand the process of translation and its products, one should first determine the purposes which they are meant to serve, and these purposes are set mainly by the target, receptor pole which, in processes of this type, serves as the ‘initiator’ of the inter-textual, inter-cultural and interlingual transfer<sup>30</sup>.

## 3

None of Ďurišin’s works has had such an extensive impact on theorists of comparative literature and literary translation as the two mentioned above. Indeed, his best work available in English translation, *Theory of Literary Comparatistics* (1984), has been remarked on only by few scholars. As far as I know, only one scholar, Sachin Ketkar of the University of Baroda, has paid detailed attention to it. In his seminal essay, ‘Literary Translation: Recent Theoretical Developments’<sup>31</sup>, he uses arguments from the passages devoted to the ‘intermediary function of the artistic translation’, writing that Ďurišin’s

approach is in many ways similar to Lefevere and Toury in focusing on function and relation of literary translation in the target or recipient culture... He like the other two theorists discussed, considers the translation procedure as well as the selection of the text being ‘primarily determined by the internal need of the recipient literature, by its capacity for absorbing the literary phenomenon of a different national literature, work, etc. and for reacting in a specific manner (integrational or differential) to its aesthetic features.’<sup>32</sup>

Well-known translologist, José Lambert, in his essay, “‘Weltliteratur’ et les études littéraires actuelles”<sup>33</sup>, notes the notion of World literature as formulated in Ďurišin’s book, and similarly, Marko Juvan, the Slovene theorist, in treating the same problem as Sachin Ketkar, wrote that Ďurišin ‘claimed that the traditional comparative studies had ignored the significance of the receiver’s selective acts (which should have been treated as creative as well) and the importance of the receive elements’ transformations called forth by writing strategies obeying the habits or needs of the receiver’s native literary process.’<sup>34</sup>

Recently, greater attention has been paid to questions of the interliterary process, to its functional forms as ‘interliterary communities’, and, in lesser measure, also to the so-called ‘literary centrism’. In the six volumes of the *Osobitné medziliterárne spoločenstvá*<sup>35</sup>, produced in Slovak and in French, essays are concerned with ‘specific interliterary communities’, that is to say, those national or single literatures characterized by the ‘intermediate, very intensive measure of their developmental action’<sup>36</sup> (as is the case of the Czech and Slovak literatures, and the Russian, Ukrainian, Byelorussian literatures), but also with ‘standard interliterary communities’ characterized by a common or very near ethnic, geographic, or political background (as is the case of Slavic, German-speaking nations, or English and American literatures).<sup>37</sup>

Since coming into contact with Armando Gnisci and Franca Sinopoli around 1994, Ďurišin started to ponder ‘interliterary centrism’.<sup>38</sup> According to Ďurišin, interliterary centrism is ‘a prolongation of the interliterary community’.<sup>39</sup> A. Gnisci and his colleagues from the University “La Sapienza” (Rome) found in Ďurišin’s theory of interliterary centrism a good pendant to the ‘decolonization’ of comparative lit-

erature. The outcome of their collaboration is an impressive volume entitled, *Il mediterraneo. Una rete interliteraria (Mediterranean: an Interliterary Net)*, published in Italian, French and Slovak.<sup>40</sup> With some exceptions, not many scholars agreed with Ďurišin's concept of 'interliterary centrism'. Ďurišin does not distinguish clearly between literary communities and literary centrism. Personally, I regard the category of 'interliterary centrism' as superfluous in the context of the world interliterary process.



As already mentioned, only two of Ďurišin's books were successful amongst his readers abroad, both of these from the earlier stage of his theoretical activities. Earl Miner complained in his essay, 'Possible Canons of Literary Transmittals and Appropriation', that scholars did not pay enough attention to Ďurišin's work that remained 'unjustly neglected'. Was it only the 'woody translation'?<sup>41</sup> I suppose that there were more reasons for the situation. One crucial factor was that it was impossible to buy these books in the world outside the former Czechoslovakia. A second reason was Ďurišin's shyness with anyone who tried to speak with him in western languages that he could not speak. A third reason was his uncompromising attitude to the view of others who had different opinions. At a time when Remak's broad conception of comparative literature as 'the comparison of one literature with other spheres of human expression', found many admirers, Ďurišin started to propagate his new theory of 'interliterary process' and 'specific interliterary communities'. He promulgated this unknown theory at the same time that the leading authorities of the AILC/ICLA, after the Paris and Munich Congresses of the 1980s, began flirting with the idea of comparative 'literature and culture' studies. Ďurišin was fighting a losing battle.

Since the Tokyo Congress, the name of the discipline has been 'Comparative Literature and Culture'. The crisis of the theory of comparative literature was characterized by Ulrich Weisstein, Remak's colleague from Bloomington, with the words of Dante: 'Lasciate ogni speranza'.<sup>42</sup> Remak could not have foreseen the invasion of all-too-often, all-too-shallow cultural studies, although, with his definition, he opened Pandora's box in 1961. In 1994, Harold Bloom, one of the greatest literary scholars of our time, complained that those who brought this crisis about were 'pseudo-Marxists, pseudo-feminists, watery disciples of Foucault and other French theorists'. Literary studies, and I think that he had in mind also comparative literary studies, have recently been overtaken 'by the garbage called cultural criticism'.<sup>43</sup> Maybe Bloom's criticism was too strong. But Weisstein's *From Ecstasy to Agony: The Rise and Fall of Comparative literature*<sup>44</sup> shows us that comparative literary theory had its times of ecstasy (from the end of the 1950s onwards) and its agony in the 1990s. Is it better now? Does hope still remain?

Is *Lasciate ogni speranza voi ch' intrate la letteratura comparata* really valid for the first years of the twenty-first century? Or will theorists of comparative literature in the twenty-first century be wise enough to listen to these words of Henry Remak?

Comparative Literary History, Comparative Text Criticism, and the Comparative Arts are the cornerstone of comparative literature in academia. A structured foothold in academia,



a reasonably specific curriculum are indispensable for our survival and the professional future of many of our students. In its turn, comparative literature is part of the comparative investigation of cultures. But it must play its distinct role in this larger domain. In so doing, it will not only justify its own *raison d'être* but *give substantive credibility to the amorphous orbit of culture studies* (italics mine).<sup>45</sup>

## NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1972.
- <sup>2</sup> Bratislava: Univerzita Komenského, 1974.
- <sup>3</sup> Originally appeared in Bratislava: Publishing House of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, 1967.
- <sup>4</sup> Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1968.
- <sup>5</sup> Later published in *Actes du VI-e Congrès de l'Association Internationale de Littérature Comparée*, Bordeaux, pp. 497–501.
- <sup>6</sup> In *Synthesis* (Bucharest), I, pp. 51–62.
- <sup>7</sup> Weisstein, U., 'Assessing the Assessors. An Anatomy of Comparative literature Handbooks', in Riesz, J. et al, *Sensus Communis. Contemporary Trends in Comparative literature. Festschrift für Henry Remak*, Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1986, p. 101.
- <sup>8</sup> In *Neohelicon*, Budapest, The Hague, III, 3–4, 1975, pp. 93–100.
- <sup>9</sup> Excerpts from the Discussion. *Ibid.*, p. 115.
- <sup>10</sup> *Loc. cit.*
- <sup>11</sup> Bratislava: Tatran, 1985.
- <sup>12</sup> Bratislava: Veda, 1989.
- <sup>13</sup> In *Critical Enquiry*, Vol. 5, 1979, no. 3., p. 568.
- <sup>14</sup> In *Poetics Today*, Vol. 8, 1987, no. 1.
- <sup>15</sup> Cambridge: Mass., 1993, pp. 82 and 98.
- <sup>16</sup> Kushner, E., 'Towards a Typology of Comparative literature Studies', in *ICLA'91 Tokyo. The Force of Vision 3*. Tokyo: The University of Tokyo Press 1995, pp. 508–09.
- <sup>17</sup> Cf. Antello, R. (org.), *Identidade e representação*, Florianópolis: UFSC, 1994, p. 98.
- <sup>18</sup> Bern: Peter Lang, 1981.
- <sup>19</sup> Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1980.
- <sup>20</sup> Burtscher-Bechter, B., et al. (eds.), *Grundlagentexte der Vergleichenden Literaturwissenschaft aus drei Jahrzehnten*, Innsbruck: Studien, 2000.
- <sup>21</sup> In *Études littéraires*, Vol. 7, 1974, no. 2, pp. 255–270.
- <sup>22</sup> In *Literary Research-Recherche Littéraire*, Vol. 23, 2006, no. 45–46, p. 4.
- <sup>23</sup> In *Poetics Today*, 1982, 1, pp. 181–184.
- <sup>24</sup> In Ziegenggeist, G. (ed.), *Aktuellen Probleme der vergleichenden Literaturforschung*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, pp. 47–58.
- <sup>25</sup> Swiggers, P., *op. cit.*, p. 182.
- <sup>26</sup> Leuven: Acco, 1978.
- <sup>27</sup> Shlesinger, M. (trans.), 'Interview with Gideon Toury', Tel Aviv, July 12, 2000, <<http://www.tau.ac.il/toury/interview.html>>
- <sup>28</sup> Toury, G., *In the Search of the Theory of Literary Translation*, Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 1980, p. 30.
- <sup>29</sup> Hermans, Theo (ed.), *The Manipulation of Literature. Studies in Literary Translation*, London and Sydney: Croom Helm, 1985, p. 60.
- <sup>30</sup> Toury, *ibid.*, p. 30.
- <sup>31</sup> <<http://www.translationdirectory.com/article301.htm>>
- <sup>32</sup> See <<http://www.translationdirectory.com/article301.htm>>
- <sup>33</sup> *Proceedings of the XIIth Congress of the International Comparative literature Association*, Vol. 4, Munich: Verlag, 1990, pp. 33–34.
- <sup>34</sup> Juvan, M., 'Towards A History of Intertextuality in Literature and Culture Studies', in *CLCWeb: Comparative literature and Culture*, Vol. 10, 2008, no. 3, p. 6.

- <sup>35</sup> *Communautés interlittéraires spécifiques*, Bratislava: Veda, 1987–1993.
- <sup>36</sup> Ďurišin, D., *Teória medziliterárneho procesu, I (Theory of Interliterary Process, I)*, Bratislava: Institute of World Literature, 1995, p. 74. This book is different from the one published in 1985 and 1989.
- <sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 74–75.
- <sup>38</sup> Ďurišin, D., ‘Medziliterárny centrizmus – krok na ceste ku svetovej literatúre (Interliterary Centricism – One Step to the World Literature)’, in *Slovak Review* (Bratislava), 3, 1994, pp. 3–13.
- <sup>39</sup> Ďurišin, D., *Theory of Interliterary Process, I*, 1995, pp. 86–114.
- <sup>40</sup> Roma: Bulzoni, 2000, 588 pp.
- <sup>41</sup> *Yearbook of Comparative and General Literature* (Bloomington), Vol. 37, 1988, p. 109.
- <sup>42</sup> Weisstein, U., ‘Lasciate Ogni Speranza: Comparative literature in Search of Lost Definitions’, in *Yearbook of Comparative and General Literature*, 37, 1988, pp. 98–108.
- <sup>43</sup> Bloom, H., ‘We Have Lost the War’, in *Newsweek*, Nov. 7, 1994, p. 62.
- <sup>44</sup> In *Neohelicon*, Vol. XXIV, 1997, no. 2, pp. 95–118.
- <sup>45</sup> Remak, H.H.H., ‘Once Again: Comparative literature at the Crossroads’, in *Neohelicon*, Vol. XXVI, 1999, no. 2, p. 107.

## SLOVENSKÝ KOMPARIATISTA DIONÝZ ĎURIŠIN A JEHO PRIJÍMANIE VO SVETE

**Ohlasy. AILC. Porovnávací literárna veda. Medziliterárny proces. Vplyv.  
Medziliterárne spoločenstvo. Svetová literatúra. Teória prekladu.**

Štúdia sa zaoberá dielom Dionýza Ďurišina (1929–1997) a jeho ohlasom vo svetovej literárnej vede. D. Ďurišin bol jedným z najlepších slovenských teoretikov literatúry a komparatistom uznávaným vo svete. Mnohé z jeho diel boli preložené do cudzích jazykov vrátane čínštiny a japončiny. Stimulovali tak medziliterárny výskum v celej Európe, ako aj v USA, Kanade, Latinskej Amerike, Číne a Japonsku. Svoju koncepciu predstavil roku 1970 na VI. Medzinárodnom kongrese AILC v Bordeaux. Keď sa v marci roku 1975 uskutočnilo v Bratislave zasadanie Rady AILC, o jeho práci diskutovali odborníci ako Henry H. H. Remak, Haskell M. Block, Zoran Konstantinovič, Béla Kópeczi, Eva Kushner, György M. Vajda a ďalší. Jeho práce poznali a citovali aj René Wellek, Douwe W. Fokkema a Ulrich Weisstein, pričom Fokkema zdôrazňoval novosť a originalnosť jeho koncepcie. Earl Minner sa zmienil o jeho podstatnom prínose do diskusie o pojme vplyv. Iní (Swigger) si všimli príbuznosť jeho myslenia s výskumom prekladu, iniciovaného slovenským teoretikom prekladu A. Popovičom spolu s Jamesom Holmesom (James S. Holmes, José Lambert a najmä Gideon Toury), ako aj s izraelskou školou teórie polysystémov (Itamar Even-Zohar). V osemdesiatych rokoch Ďurišin rozpracoval teóriu medziliterárnych spoločenstiev, v rámci ktorej vyšlo šesť zborníkov štúdií v dvojjazyčných vydaniach, a v poslednom období sa venoval pojmom literárne centrizmu a svetová literatúra. Niet pochyb, že Ďurišinovo dielo zasiahlo do dejín svetovej komparatistiky a myslenia o preklade. Napriek tomu ostalo dodnes nedocenené.

*PhDr. Marián Gálik, DrSc.*  
*Institute of Oriental Studies SAS*  
*Klemensova 19*  
*813 64 Bratislava*  
*Slovak Republic*  
*galikm@inmail.sk*