

Loreta Georgievska-Jakovleva

Ss Cyril and Methodius University, Skopje, Macedonia

Kosta Solev Racin: Inside the Context of Macedonian Culture, as the Anticipator of the Future

Abstract: This text will focus on a particular segment of Kocho Racin's (Кочо Рацин) overall literary production, otherwise the founder of contemporary Macedonian literature, i.e., it will focus on the following premise, namely that Racin, through his vocal views and convictions about literature and social relations, in both his poetry and prose output, was quite ahead of his time. Henceforth, the aim of this paper is to point out the aspects deemed significant to any future theoretical, literary, cultural paradigms which may emerge from a Racin reading. Along those lines, Racin's writings on Bogomilism, as well as his poems "Tatuncho" (Татунчо) and "Pechal" (Печал), are analyzed closely, thus examining Kocho Racin as a rather sophisticated thinker who had anticipated the coming of future discourses, such as Antonio Gramsci's theoretical concept of hegemony, also, in part, Jacques Derrida's deconstruction theory, as well as postcolonial criticism; whereas his poetry would come to serve as an illustration of what Kenneth White terms geopoetics and nomadism. Racin's poetry, that is to say, its definite belonging to the poetics of social realism, seems to link the two otherwise disjointed relations, particularly through the unification the collection *White Dawns* (Бели мугри) puts forth: the concept of cosmopolitanism, on the one hand, and the Macedonian folk tradition, on the other, thus, to a degree, anticipating the coming of the new.

Key words: *Racin, the concept of hegemony, postcolonial theory, deconstruction, geopoetics, nomadism, cosmopolitanism*

In the history of each nation there are key places, people and dates without which the said people, state, and/or nation could not exist. One such event, certainly, is the publication in Samobor (Croatia), in 1939, of a slim volume, yet one of an exceeding significance for the Macedonian language, literature, culture and historical continuity; namely, a collection of poems by the bard from Veles, the poet Kosta Solev Racin (Коста Солев Рацин). Since, as Aleksandar Spasov (Александар Спасов), one of the most prolific researchers of Racin's work, puts it, this collection marks "a meeting between tradition and modern sensibility" (1977: 56), an encounter which marks the cultural renaissance in Macedonia, and with that, the beginning of contemporary Macedonian literature.

The publication of the poetry collection *White Dawns* is a cultural event of exceptional significance towards the legitimization of the Macedonian identity, an event which in the most striking way presents the needed proof for the centuries-long continuity of the Macedonian people. This fact is quite well-known and celebrated by the Macedonian cultural and scientific public. However, what seems less than familiar or for that matter researched, at least in my own understanding, is the question regarding the entire body of work pro-

duced by Racin, namely his poetry as well as his prose, and how it can be viewed through the prism of today's social and artistic theories? My own thesis runs along the following premise: that Racin, through his opinions and convictions, both in regards to literature and social relations, stood ahead of his own time. Henceforth, the aim of this study is not to give a detailed description of his entire work, but rather to point out, as a kind of an impetus, towards certain aspects which I find significant to any future theoretical, literary and cultural paradigms.

The selection of the materials I use in this paper towards such a premise came to me without any premeditation. The story about how I came to use as my analysis material Racin's essay on the Bogomils is quite personal in nature, yet I wish to share it at this stage since I do not think of it as just trite or rather insignificant. The writing of this study coincided with my receiving a copy of the French edition of Jordan Plevnesh's and Maja Jakimovska-Toshic[®], novel, *A Novel for the Secret Book*. Although I do not know the contents of the novel in great detail, since, unfortunately, there isn't a Macedonian publication of the text, whereas my own working knowledge of French is slim, I am quite familiar with the novel's overall subject matter. Namely, during a joint travel to Los Angeles

with the authors of the novel I bore witness to the process of its creation, and with that, to the authors' thoughts vis-à-vis Bogomilism. That is to say, the novel deals with the imaginary but probable mis-en-scene of *The Secret Book of the Bogomils*, from Golem Grad in Prespa all the way to Carcassonne in France. I can recall my surprise at Plevnesh's conclusion that Bogomilism is "the first intellectual revolution in Europe". This thought seemed rather provocative, and truth be told, I believe that I was a bit jealous at the fact that I had not come up with a similar interpretative tactic when it came to Bogomilism.

However, a mere personal association with the choice of theme is certainly not enough to weave out a text, hence the instant doubt: do I have the right to address the thus postulated working hypothesis, and what new things could I bring to the conversation in regards to this essay of Racin's? If nothing else, I had recently read the text of Goran Kalodjera, entitled "Racin's Scientifically-Essayistic Pearl in the Dawn of Recent Macedonian Literature" which contains all of the factography, all the accumulated reflections on it, starting with Blazhe Koneski, Haralampie Polenakovic, Gane Torodovski, Vera Antic, etc., not to mention the biographic details surrounding the coming into being of this text, the implicit polemic with

Otokar Keršovani, etc.

In such a state of unresolved, for an author, perhaps the best solution would be to re-read the text he or she plans to make the subject of their study/research. Thus, even though I thought that I remembered the text quite well, I was entirely surprised: yet I now do realize that a good deal of time had passed from my first encounter with it. I am not the same person I was twenty odd years ago, and neither is Racin's essay the same text as I tend to remember it. For instance, I was taken by the fact that my memory had not recollected what perhaps, as far as I am now concerned, is this text's most significant line of thought, right there at the onset of the essay: "запе таја земја (се мисли на Македонија, заб. моја), уште у никое време на европејскиот Среден век (се мисли на 10 век), да даде претечи на оние бунтовници од XVII век, што зборуваат за некое „природно право“ на човека, за равноправие на сичките лугје, и сакале, „бездржавно“ уредение на светов? ... Ете, со такви свои идеи богомилите станале вистински претечи на оние европејски мислителите, што после, тргнати по трагата на богомилските мисли, се ослободиле од верската догматика и ги удриле темелите на европејскиот Ренесанс. А што значење имаше тоа за народите, се знае". (Рацин, 1966)¹⁰

This sudden revelation of mine, that Plevnesh's thought, as the Croatian theoretician Dubravka Oraić-Tolić would say, is an unmarked quotation which I did not recognize, did indeed overwhelm me. This miss perhaps is the best answer to the question about how we remember the past and what factors influence the process of remembrance. Today the current studies on memory clearly ascertain that we remember selectively, in accordance with our ideological stances and cultural needs at a given time in history. Henceforth, memory changes, the same way we change. Doesn't Racín say the very same thing when he writes: "Арно ама, ако далечното минало ги скри во темно тиа наши славни лугје, ако огинот и ножот, па пакосот и бесот на православните калугери и славјанските феодали ргна да го сотре споменот за ним — останала пак, во историата на човечката борба, светлата истина за богомилите." (Рацин, 1966).¹ Racín

¹ Jordan Plevnesh (1953) is a poet, dramatist, prose author. His plays, *Erigon*, *Yugoslav Antithesis*, *R*, *Happiness is a New Idea in Europe*, etc., are known to the wider European public. He is the author of two novels, *The Eight Wonder* and *The Path of the Secret Book*, which have been translated into several languages. Maja Jakimovska-Toshic is a researcher with the Institute of Macedonian Literature and has published numerous in the field of Macedonian Medieval Literature. This is her first time co-authoring a novel.

has not only implicitly pointed at the meaning memory possesses, but rather to the time when the past was clearly distinguished from the present and history was defined as "the schoolteacher of life", for he, in accordance with what the most current theories suggest, emphasizes the way we remember and henceforth, anticipates the future theoretical framework on memory as "the interplay of present and past in socio-cultural contexts" (ErlI, 2008: 2 1)

If, in terms of the novel *The Secret Book*, I can only assume that it is a continuation on Racín's thoughts on Bogomilism, then in regards to the novel by Dragi Mihajlovski (Драги Михајловски), *The Prophet of Diskantrija* (in the Macedonian original, *Пророкот од Дискантрија*) I can with a great degree of certainty claim that it indeed is a continuation of Racín's reasoning on the topic. In order to further clarify my topic, I'd like to remind us of Blazhe Koneski's words on the topic: "The real value of *the Bogomils* does not lie in their own contributions towards the study of Bogomilism. Their true value consists of the fact that we find in them an energetic ancestor who wishes to resurrect the past in the name of the present. Seen thusly their value is immense." (Koneski) If Racín saw Christianity as the extended hand of the imperialist goals of

Byzantium and its appointed ruler Teofilakt, then Dragi Mihajlovski extends this idea and articulates it within the contemporary context, tying it to the name problem of The Republic of Macedonia. Particular to his time, Racin views Bogomilism as the opportunity to establish continuity with the resistance of the Macedonian people set within the context of the socio-political conditions of that time. “На Балканот живееше едно гнило Византијско царство и неколку нови славјански. Но славјаните, каде што се појави богомилството, уште немаја свое царство, и си живеаја по старославјанскиот, аграрно-демократски начин на животот. И ете зошто кога ги завладаја славјанските феодали и кога тија почнаја да им го газат тој демократизам, да ги поробујат, да им ја зимајат земјата и учат после како се тоа стануе со некоа виша сила – ете кога богомилството се јави како опозиција спроти ним”. (Рацин, 1966)² This

² “for that land [he’s referring to Macedonia, my note], even in the olden days of the European Middle Ages [he’s referring to the 10th century], to produce the antecedents of those 17th century rebels, who talked about a certain “natural right” of man, about equality between all men, and wished for a “stateless” order in the world?...Thus, with such ideas of their own, the Bogomils became the real antecedents of those European thinkers, who afterwards, following the lead

line of thinking is continued also by Mihajlovski in the aforementioned novel, actualizing Bogomilism in the contemporary social-political conditions.

It seems to me that the key point of Racin’s text on the Bogomils is his answer to the question as to why the Bogomils were persecuted by the official church. While searching for answers, he points out something which today we are already familiar with due to postcolonial studies, however, in Racin’s time, it was virtually impossible to conceive of. He writes: “Чунки пак се навогја по некоа трага нимна! Останале клеветите и лагите на црковните отци, кои со тоа го бранеле мракот и власта на своите господари. Останале анатемите, повелите и законите, и индексите на забранените богомилски книги. (...) И останале, уште се живи некои спомени во самата Македонија. (...) И откаде ни се оние наши чудесни стари сказни, што скажуат за борбата на доброто и злото, и за онаја врасната вера, оној силен надеж, што не крепеше и крепи — до победата крајна? Живи се, живи, нашите чудесни богомилски легенди и бас-

of the Bogomils’ thoughts, freed themselves from the religious dogma and established the foundations of the European Renaissance. And we all know the kind of significance it had on the people.” (Racin, 1966)

ни, нашиот вечен културен имот, татковнина от нашите богомили!“ (Рацин, 1966)³

This reasoning of Racin’s we usually tend to connect to what postcolonial theory terms the condition of the subaltern. Although the subaltern does not have the right to speak, or as Racin calls it “ргнаа да го сотрат споменот на ними,”⁴ his language leaves an imprint: onto the collective memory, or even more so, onto the hegemonic discourse, which in the case of the Bogomils has its representative through Cosmas the Priest (also known as Cosmas the Presbyter or Presbyter Cosmas) and his anti-Bogomil text, *Sermon Against the Heretics*. Obviously, Racin was quite familiar with this text.

³ “However, if the distant past veiled those celebrated people of ours, if the fire and the knife, and the spite and the rage of the Orthodox monks and the Slavic feudal lords, smited our memory of them – what had remained still, in the history of the human struggle, is the bright truth of the Bogomils.” (Racin, 1966)

⁴ “In the Balkans, there lived a rotten Byzantium empire and a few new Slavic ones. But the Slavs, amongst whom Bogomilism was born, did not have a kingdom of their own and thus lived in accordance with their Old Slavic, Agrarian-Democratic way of living. Which is why when the Slavic feudal lords established their dominion, and when they started to stifle that democratic lifestyle, to enslave the people, to rob them of their land, and then learn about how to become a supreme force – that is when Bogomilism came to pass as their opposition.” (Racin, 1966)

By reading the hidden trace of the Bogomils’ voice behind the apparent of this text, Racin was also able to give his own interpretation of the reasons behind the persecution of the Bogomils, not that dissimilar to what we today recognize through poststructuralist theory and the method of deconstruction. Racin succeeds in deconstructing the discourse of the official Christian dogma. His interpretation reads: “Богомилите, со „своата „нова“ наука силно го исплашиле стариот свет, „уреден така от бога“. (...) Но богомилите убаво разбрале што значи таја догма (...) И така, кога ја виде-ле другата страна на тиа религиозни догми, нимната наука добила „смртно опасен вид“ за феодалниот строј.(...) Оти противно от науката на државното христијанство, внесено во народот одозгора, от самите државни главатари и пренесено от Византиа, идејно да го закрепи славјанскиот феодализам — противно от се тоа, богомилството никна во самиот народ, ги повлече широките народни маси и во верско опозициона форма го организира народниот отпор против феодалите”.⁵

⁵ “God bless, we can still find a trace of theirs. What remains are the slanders and the lies uttered by the church fathers, who thusly defended the darkness and the authority enforced by their rulers. What has remained are the anathemas, the charters and the laws, and the indexes of the forbidden Bogomil books. (...) And

Perhaps the direct correlation between Racin's interpretation and Derrida, through the concept deconstruction the latter introduced, is a rather bold one; however, what remains true in regards to Racin's interpretation is that it belongs certainly to the context of what cultural studies today examine, and, to borrow Tony Bennett's phrase, the reformer's knowledge. This shouldn't strike us as odd if we bear in mind the influence Marxism had/has on Cultural Studies, a scholarly enquiry which Racin himself adhered to and believed in, yet what does remain striking is the power with which Racin surpasses, to a degree, the economic determinism of Marxism. He decidedly states: "Стана нужда от една јака феодална држава, а таја, за да биде приемена пред разумот човечки, требеше да се објасни со една нова наука, нова вера, нова наука за идеите — нова идеологија. Оти само таја духовно ги организира човеците — нимната воља и нимните чувства"⁶ If the word ideology

there are, still alive, some of the memories in Macedonia too. (...) And that is whence we have inherited those marvelous old tales, which speak to the fight between good and evil, and to that innate hope, and that strong faith which has kept us going – until our ultimate victory? Yes, they are indeed alive, those wondrous Bogomil legends and tales, our eternal cultural heritage, the homeland of our Bogomils!" (Racin, 1966)

⁶ "they worked hard at destroying the memory we have of them,"

is interchanged with the world culture, which is quite legitimate and in sync with the most current of research, we can reach the following conclusion, namely, that Racin anticipates the future work of the Marxist scholars Louis Althusser and Antonio Gramsci, and their respective terms "ideological state apparatuses" and "hegemony". And today's actual typology of elite culture (the culture fed from above, or, in this case, by the official representatives of the Christian hegemonies at the time of the Bogomils) and popular culture (the one from below, the folk culture) finds its apt usage with Racin. Yet, what is even more striking is the fact that Racin anticipates even the later-on, from today's perspective even considered dominant, theories by the referential names inside the humanities, which do not treat culture as a "furthering" of the economic basis, but rather as a significant factor in whose midst we find the struggle for marking the world. Which is why Racin could in fact see Bogomilism as "the first intellectual revolution in the world", as Plevnesh points out using today's lexicon.

The fact remains that Racin, without formal (official) education, but not without any education at all, was a self-taught man. Perhaps, this very fact had enabled his line of thinking to result in the aforementioned stance on Bogomilism, and with that, to anticipate future theoretical viewpoints. Although

he could not refute science, as Thomas Kunst would do so later on, the tact that he uses the term “new science” anticipates the later-on thesis about the dominant ideas which order the way we understand the world, and which later-on, through repetition have the tendency to present themselves as “the natural” condition of things. To Racin, Bogomilism is the first critique of this line of thinking which he decidedly speaks to with the following comment: “Чунки богомилите биле први наши вистински народни учители и книжовници. Тиа се соживеле со народната душа, убаво ги разбрале нимните потреби, и со своата „нова“ наука силно го исплашиле стариот свет, „уреден така от бога“. Такво учење, да е светов вака уреден от бога, се сметала тогај една света религиозна догма. На това се крепи стариот феодален свет, на това живееле јадачите. Но богомилите убаво разбрале што значи таја догма, како и сите други верски догми, и во критиката на такви догми, а со народниот отпор против феодалите, во мистична форма, направиле чудесно смели заклучения за своето време. Чунки у нивно време религијата беше и наука и философија и најголемо знаење. И така, кога ја виделе другата страна на тиа религиозни догми, нимната наука добила „смртно опасен вид“ за феодалниот строј: богомил-

ското учење сакало рамноправие за сичките лугје (...) и рамноправно општество“.⁷ And what else has been the goal of the humanist sciences ever since the world became prone to interpretation? To recognize a “new science” in Bogomilism means to anticipate future theory.

Today’s standpoint that culture is a minefield where different ideas fight over domination, and the outcome to this depends on the order of the world seems to me quite logical and in sync with Racin’s line of thinking. If this is so, such reasoning would also trickle into his poetry. In the poem “Tatuncho” (“Татунчо”) we meet the following lines:

“Ако куќа не направив
со високо шимшир порти,
куќа цел свет братски ми е
братски срце што отвора,

⁷ The Bogomils, with ‘their new’ science forcefully frightened the old world, ‘as ordained by God’ (...) However, the Bogomils clearly understood the meaning behind this dogma (...) And thus so, when they saw the other side to these religious dogmas, their science became ‘a lethally dangerous kind of a science’ to the feudal mindset (...) Since unlike the science of the state-run Christianity, fed to the people from the top down, by the state rulers and conceived of Byzantium, so as to patch up idea-wise the Slavic feudalism – opposite to all this, Bogomilism sprouted from the people themselves, took the masses into a religiously oppositional form which helped organize the people’s resistance against the feudal rule.

срца - порта највисока,
срце - порта најширока.”⁸

What transpires here is a lucidly expressed thought that anticipates the spiritual profile of a much later-on (postmodern) cultural epoch, stamped with the label “nomadic culture”. Taking into account the interpretation of this poetry as foundational for the legitimizing of the Macedonian ethno-national space as a chronotope-space, i.e., not only as a realm with a simple geographical determinant, but rather as an aesthetized space with its own ethno-national identity, at a first glance, the said poem seems contradictory. Namely, unlike the principle of the hearth, the sense of being rooted in one single land (one house, one nation, one culture), the lyrical subject, the *ajduk*⁹ *Tatun-*

⁸ “There came about a strong feudal state, and for it to be actualized in front of the people’s common sense, a new science had to be fashioned, a new religion, a new ideas’ science, namely, a new ideology. For only it could organize people, their willpower and their feelings.”

⁹ “For the Bogomils were our first real folk teachers and writers. They had become one with the soul of the people, had understood truly their needs, and with ‘their new’ science forcefully frightened the old world, ‘as ordained by God’. Such a creed, that the world has been thus ordained by God, was understood at that time as a holy religious dogma. This is what the old feudal world rests on, what the misery-dwellers relish in. However, the Bogomils clearly understood the meaning behind this dogma, as all of the other religious dogmas,

cho, refuses to be enrooted in an insignificant construction-house; instead, he chooses the open spaces of the fraternal worlds, promoting the nomadic ideal. Or in other words, for him, the entire world is his home, and the sense of belonging is ushered through the wholeness of the world, a brotherly, amongst friends, well-intentioned entity. This cosmopolitan dimension with Racin refuses to become enrooted in a single culture; instead, it propagates a spiritual openness, akin to the one which Kenneth White terms *geopoetics*, which in turn is tied to an enlivening of the global concepts.

The said contradiction could best be resolved with the poetics of social realism, a poetics to which Racin doubtlessly belongs. Social realism bridges the two perhaps otherwise insoluble relations which the collection *White Dawns* unites: the global concept of cosmopolitanism and the Macedonian folklore tradi-

and in their criticism of such dogmas, with the people’s resistance against the feudal lords, in a mystical form, had come up with marvelously bold conclusions for their own time. For during their time, religion was both a science and a philosophy, the greatest knowledge there could be. And thus so, when they saw the other side to these religious dogmas, their science became ‘a lethally dangerous kind of a science’ to the feudal mindset: Bogomilism advocated for an equality for all people (...) and a class-less society.”

tion. In a sense, a rather peculiar triad: the oral folklore – socially engaged literature – global cosmopolitanism, consists of three distinct (but not entirely isolated and illogical) systems relevant to the shaping of the collection *White Dawns*.

The first component to the triad connects Racin to “the spirit of the people”, or to put it more specifically, with the culture of the people he is the descendent of. Taken from the viewpoint of the time when it appears (the days of Modernism), this component can be viewed as a kind of anachronism. However, such an evaluation does not correspond with Racin’s stance, who viewed tradition, or a return to one’s roots, as the only right path towards the creation of a national literature. This “spirit of the people” allows Racin to “take on workable models” (Kramarić, 1990: 72), which reflect the continuity, or as Iskra Nikolovska (Искра Николовска) has termed it, for Racin “only it (tradition) is capable of maintaining the freshness of the Macedonian ethnos” (Nikolovska, 1997: 69). In terms of the historical marginalization, the silencing and the invisibility at the level of the official politics, i.e., the impossibility to create a written tradition and history, orality is the key workable model which provides memory with its lasting life. Racin explicitly states that contemporary

Macedonian literature can be developed only if it “rests on the infinite linguistic and expressive richness of the Macedonian folklore.” By accepting that the Macedonian folklore as a literary tradition and the spoken Macedonian language, with/through the collection *White Dawns*, he, consciously, created the preconditions for a contemporary Macedonian poetry, or the preconditions for the official revival of the Macedonian national literature. With that, as Blazhe Koneski has said, “The name of Kocho Racin is all of ours synonym”.

The third component of the triad affirms, according to Ortega, the need to conquer the spatial destinations, the need for a nomadic life as an anthropological constant, not only literally speaking, but also innately, from a metaphysical standpoint. According to Arnold Toynbee, the true nomads are those who take on a spiritual dislocation, internally speaking, an inside journey into and through the cultural and spiritual trajectory of the dialogue with tradition. (It is no accident that the story “Силјан Штркот”¹⁰, in English: “Siljan The Stork”, has been identified as part of the genre of the nomadic narrative which relativizes the

¹⁰ (my own translation) “If I didn’t build a house/with high arching gates,/ let the entire world be that brotherly house/ brotherly opening my heart,/ the heart – the highest gate, / the heart – the roomiest house.”

borders, understood not only as state borders but borders of any/all kinds). In a contemporary context, nomadism in the 1980s became a theme which helped undermine the tyranny of the subjugating identity, which, on the one hand, creates a value difference between the cultured (the West) and the invisible, or “the untouchable”, as the Ancient Greeks would call the tribes of the Balkans, whereas on the other hand, it is tied to the socio-historical phenomenon of de-territorialization due to the unhindered movement and self-impregnation of capital in conditions of globalization which unify the world.

The reconciliation of those two, provisionally put, oppositional tendencies in the poetry by Racin, has been made possible by the idea-driven positionality of social poetics as the place of resistance towards the systems which create inequality, subjugation and marginalization. The very poetics of social literature, which is a hybrid consisting of the realist tradition of the 19th century, the avant-garde approaches and the ideological participation of Marxism, allows for the aesthetics of resistance and the deconstruction of the narrative of the dominant class, or the culture of maintaining the practices of domination. In the pursuit of solutions against exploitation, marginalization, subjugation, it is irrelevant if it deals with the

worker or the nation, Racin’s sentiments reside with the leftist-oriented, engaged writers, thus initiating new social relations and a new outlook on the world and on life. And the folk tradition and cosmopolitanism for Racin are both engaged, in the way Sartre understood the term – to discover (or we could say, to deconstruct) the present through the projection of changes. To further this context, let’s ponder over a few more lines, this time from the poem “Pechal” (“Печал”):

“срцето пука обрачи
и плиска знаме алово
срцето што се отвора
и шири широко широко
целиот свет да зрне”.¹¹

The phrase “a heart dripped in red” without a doubt points towards the vocabulary of socialism, but at the same time gains a larger meaning of resistance through the context of the heart metaphor and the verbs “open up” and “engulf” (a vocabulary which could also point out to nomadism and globalization), against all that Racin had deemed unjust, exploitative, and subjugating, and thus becomes a vision in accordance with the time of its inception, namely, the new, more just relations. Re-

¹¹ (my translation): “the heart opens up/and sends out a flag dripped in red/this heart which opens up/widely and widely extending/w engulf the entire world”

lations which bear a specific direction: the red heart, not only does it “open up” and “extend”, it “opens up” by sending out a flag dripped in red, and as such without a doubt points out a revolutionary’s engagement. Hence, the until then invisible and unknown workers and disenfranchised, with Racin, gain a voice, gain a home. This voice says that the worldview of the subjugated is not just an exhibit, but to borrow from Gramsci, when speaking of folklore, “it is a serious work which needs to be taken seriously.” This voice quite necessarily plugs in the studying of the logic behind their subjugation and the search for the possible alternative in terms of dominance.

To these possibilities Racin answers through the context of his time. That which is important to us today is the question about the

places of resistance in literature and art in the era of globalization, towards the politics and practices of domination and injustice, namely what are they like today, or even if they are at all present?

Henceforth, perhaps in today’s fiction we would not have a Plevnesh, or a Mihajlovski, or several others, if we had not had Racin. That Racin is the founder of contemporary Macedonian poetry is a fact which has been until now proven and accounted for many times over. However, what his prose work means, in terms of the future Macedonian artistic and scientific thought, is a chapter that we need to dedicate ourselves to in the days to come.

(изворен научен труд)

Literature:

Astrid Erll. (2008). "Cultural Memory Studies: An Introduction", in *Cultural Memory Studies*, Edited by Astrid Erll, Ansgar Nünning in collaboration with Sara B. Young, Walter de Gruyter · Berlin · New York, http://www.amazon.com/dp/3110229986/ref=rdr_ext_tmb#reader_3110229986

Крамариќ, Златко. (1990), „Културолошки аспекти Рацинове књижевне делатности“, во: *Македонската литература меѓу двете светски војни и појавата на „Бели мугри“*, МАНУ, Скопје.

Николовска, Искра. (1997), *Функцијата на клишето во Рациновите „Бели Мугри“*, Менора, Скопје,

Спасов, Александар. (1977), „Кочо Рацин и современата македонска литература“, во: *Истражувања и коментари*, Скопје, Култура.

Рацин, Кочо. (1966), „Богомилите - кратка расправа от историјата македонска“, во: *Стихови и проза од Кочо Рацин*, Култура, Скопје.

Конески, Блаже (2010) „*Богомилите*“ од Коста Рацин, во: Тодоровски Гане *Книга за Рацин*, Штрк, Скопје.

Коста Солев Рацин: антиципатор на идното

Резиме: Преку анализа на еден од клучните есеистички текстови на Рацин, текстот посветен на Богомилите, ќе се обидеме да докажеме дека Рацин иако ја целосно ја прифатил марксистичката идеологија, сепак го надминал економскиот детерминизам. Тоа ни дава за право да тврдиме дека Рацина, основоположникот на македонската современа литература, со своите ставови и уверувања и за литературата и за општествените односи, како и во својата поезија, е далеку пред своето време. Оттука, целта на ова излагање беше да ги посочи аспектите за кои сметам дека ќе бидат значајни за идните теоретски, и литературни и културолошки парадигми. Преку анализата на текстовите на Рацин за Богомилството, како и преку анализата на песните “Татунчо” и „Печал“, се покажува дека Коста Рацин е софистициран мислител кој ќе ги антиципира идните стравови пред се на теоријата на хегемонија на Антонио Грамши, донекаде, потоа, барем во основниот дух, на деконструкцијата на Жак Дерида, како и на постколонијалната критика. Неговата поезија, пак, како да служи за илустрација на она што Кенет Вајт го нарече геопоетика и номадзам. Неспорната припадност на поезијата на Рацин на поетиката на социјалниот реализам, како да ги премостува двете навидум неспоиви релации што стихозбирката „Бели мугри“ ги обединува: глобалниот концепт на космополитизмот и македонската фолклорна традиција и тоа на начин кој партиципира во идното.

Клучни зборови: *Рацин, теорија на хегемонија, постколонијална теорија, деконструкција, геопоетика, номадизам, космополитизам.*