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In 1892, the editors of the journal La Jeune Belgique – the bell-ringer of Belgian modernism – made a claim that seemingly contradicted the publication’s central role in the country’s so-called ‘literary renaissance’.¹ They asserted that their periodical had ‘never promoted a national literature, that is to say, “Belgian literature”’.² Instead, they portrayed themselves as French writers, comparable to authors in Brittany and the South of France:

Nous sommes donc des écrivains français. […] Les écrivains de souche bretonne, normande ou provençale ont leur accent particulier, nous croyons que les écrivains de Belgique ont aussi le leur. Pourquoi ces derniers, qui sont nés à Bruxelles, à Gand ou à Liège, ne seraient-ils pas des écrivains de langue française au même titre que les écrivains nés à Paimpol, à Rouen ou à Marseille?³

(The writers of Breton, Norman or Provencal origin have their particular accent, and we believe that the writers from Belgium have theirs. Why should the latter, who were born in Brussels, Ghent or Liège, not be French-language authors in the same sense as authors born in Paimpol, Rouen or Marseille?)³

Was Belgium merely a region within the French literary world? The debate on whether Francophone Belgian authors represented a national literature rather than being submerged in the wider field of French literature continued in the early twentieth century. Writing during the First World War, the English critic Jethro Bithell acknowledged this controversy, but affirmed the existence of an individual Belgian literature:

There is always the question whether ‘Belgian literature’ exists at all…[S]ome eminent Belgian writers will not hear of such a thing. And, after all, one never hears of Swiss literature… That may be, however, because there are so few Swiss
This individuality, Bithell argued, became evident in the works of Belgian Symbolists: ‘There is no distinction to be made between the Belgian Symbolists and the French Symbolists except that the Belgians, true to the doctrine of individualism which is one of the main tenets of the Symbolist school, write poetry which is unmistakably Belgian. The poetry of the Belgian Symbolists is the poetry of Belgian moods.’ These different statements draw attention to the complexities of ideas about ‘national’ literature. Francophone Symbolism in Belgium could be viewed as inherently Belgian, but it could also be represented as part of the French literary field, with shared institutions, publishers, periodicals and critics. Yet there was a third way in which authors could fashion themselves, namely as members of a ‘republic of letters’. Significantly, there was no inherent contradiction between the latter and the potential self-identification as a French author. As Pascale Casanova has argued, Paris was the centre of the ‘world republic of letters’; and while Christopher Prendergast has challenged the ‘Franco-centric’ lens, he still views Paris as a metropolis which constitutes a network of cultural exchanges.

If Belgian literature seems a complex case, similar observations apply to the concept of ‘cosmopolitanism’. Steven Vertovec and Robin Cohen have stressed its ‘multi-layered character’ and the impossibility of reducing it to a ‘single conceptualization’. They therefore offer several ‘perspectives on cosmopolitanism’ which cover its definition as a ‘socio-cultural condition’ or as a practice, but also encompass political views or projects. The latter understanding features prominently in the work of scholars such as David Held and Garrett Brown, who use the concept to discuss issues in international politics. Rather than dealing with such ‘normative’ varieties of cosmopolitanism, this article focuses on forms that can be described as ‘cultural cosmopolitanism’ and ‘cosmopolitanism as a practice’. The fin-de-siècle phenomenon that we examine relates to two particular varieties of cosmopolitanism. The first is the openness to transnational exchange and the embrace of diversity. We address the international orientation of periodicals, but also draw attention to one specific manifestation of diversity: the roles of French- and Dutch-language authors in Belgium, and of Occitan authors in France. The second variety is the recognition of allegedly universal ideals. For many nineteenth-century commentators, such principles were closely
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associated with French culture. If we interpret Paris as the centre of a cosmopolitan literary network, Belgian authors could affirm their cosmopolitanism through their engagement with French metropolitan literature.

Symbolism provides us with a test case to explore these ambiguities. As a movement, it is notoriously hard to define. As early as 1899, the British critic Arthur Symons viewed ‘self-consciousness’ as one of its overarching features. Another prominent characteristic was a well-developed periodical culture through which authors could share and disseminate their ideas. Moreover, it is clear that Symbolism was an international movement with a strong presence in France and Belgium—as reflected in the authors that Symons’s book presented to a British audience. Recently, Raphaël Ingelbien has argued that ‘there is much more to Symbolism than its supposed internationalism’, drawing attention to its regional variants. This article explores this dimension and stresses many Symbolists’ attachment to specific local and regional contexts. It examines the interplay between regional, national and cosmopolitan ideas or practices. To this end, it traces the relationships between Symbolist authors and periodicals from Belgium and southern France where a similar regional phenomenon can be observed. Our essay shows how literary fields emerged in non-metropolitan settings and how literary collaboration integrated them into the wider republic of letters.

1. DEFINING THE FIELD

Verbruggen’s earlier research has defined the Belgian literary field and its cross-connections to France by mapping the relations between Belgian and French literary periodicals. The result of his work, a sociogram, covers the relationship between fifteen Belgian and fourteen French literary periodicals for the years 1892 and 1893 (see Figure 1). It depicts every Belgian literary journal whose target audience reached beyond an individual city or club, extending to publications that were not part of the Symbolist movement. All of the French journals in this sample were read and reviewed in Belgium, and most of them were associated with Symbolism. The sociogram shows the links between Belgian and French periodicals where at least three authors wrote for each publication. Although it does not correspond with actual geographical locations, it provides a sense of spatiality, with a concentration of periodicals in Brussels (around La Jeune Belgique) and Paris (around La Plume and
Figure 1. Sociogram of Belgian and French literary journals 1892–1893 (based on at least three shared authors). The size of the line indicates the strength of the relation. Belgian journals are denoted by white circles, French journals by grey squares. The sociogram is based on multidimensional scaling (MDS), a method that facilitates the visualization of networks and represents proximities between network actors.© (Courtesy of Christophe Verbruggen.)
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Revue Blanche), but also a number of journals that were published in provincial towns and cities (notably Chimère and Saint Graal). Strikingly, the sociogram only partially reflects Belgium's socio-political divisions. The term ‘pillarization’ describes the ways in which Belgian society became structured along political-ideological lines, as reflected in the creation of distinct Catholic, liberal and socialist ‘pillars’.20 Such developments could affect literary sociabilities, yet the pluralist nature of several periodicals means that the image does not feature fully isolated Catholic, liberal or socialist journal families.

These findings allow us to draw several conclusions regarding the French and Belgian literary field. For instance, it is evident that three Belgian Symbolist publications—Le Réveil, Floréal and Le Mouvement Littéraire—assumed a central position in literary exchanges, partly reflecting the aesthetic dominance of the Symbolist movement.21 Yet other factors could also affect the positioning within the network: Le Réveil had a large number of contributors as it published many short poems; its extensive pool of authors resulted in connections with many other publications. La Wallonie, the iconic Symbolist periodical in Belgium, appears more isolated because it did not maintain links with a cluster of Catholic periodicals in Belgium (Le Magasin Littéraire, La Revue Générale, Le Drapeau).22 Instead, this periodical was situated within a cluster of periodicals that were published in Paris: in 1892, exactly fifty percent of the authors involved in La Wallonie were French and some of the journal’s Belgian authors actually lived in Paris. With Henri de Régnier, a disciple of the uncrowned king of Symbolism, Stéphane Mallarmé, La Wallonie even had a Parisian editor.

Despite their considerable ambitions, Le Réveil and Floréal never succeeded in obtaining a similarly pronounced position. The latter was based in the Walloon city of Liège, whereas the former was edited in the Flemish city of Ghent which, alongside its Dutch-speaking majority, also had French-speaking inhabitants. Both periodicals maintained strong ties with a regionalist cluster of journals from the South of France. The identification of this cluster from Occitania—‘le pays de langue d’oc’—is one of the major findings with regard to the French part of this literary field. It comprised four publications: Le Saint Graal (1892–93, successively published in Paris, Chambéry, Aix-les-Bains, Cannes and Puget-Théniers), Chimère (1891–93, edited in Montpellier), Syrinx (1892–94, edited in Aix-en-Provence) and, to a lesser extent, Essais de Jeunes (edited in Toulouse, 1892–95).23 Meanwhile, the centre of the French field was dominated by four publications that were all
Figure 2. Nationality of the contributors to French and Belgian literary periodicals, 1892–93. Belgian: grey. French: white. Other: black. (Courtesy of Christophe Verbruggen.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Name</th>
<th>Belgian</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L’Idée Libre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L’Art Littéraire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essais de Jeunes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rouen Artiste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Banquet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Saint-Graal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Syrinx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Revue indépendante</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Revue Blanche</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Revue des Lettres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Réveil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Mouvement Littéraux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L’Art Moderne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Saint-Graal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercure de France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Wallonie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floreal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Drapeau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Magasin Littéraire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brouillies d’Art</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Jeune Belgique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Société Nouvelle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Mouvement Littéraux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L’Art Moderne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Réveil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Revue Générale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revue de Belgique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Libre Critique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Revue Rouge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Revue Belge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. AN INTERNATIONAL FIELD AND ITS COSMOPOLITANISM

While the sociogram clearly suggests that French and Belgian literary periodicals were related to each other via shared authors, it is worth considering the implications for individual periodicals. Figure 2 shows the extent to which journals from both countries published the work of foreign authors. The figures for 1892–1893 suggest that the two Symbolist journals from Paris—*Le Mercure de France* and *La Revue Blanche*—had the most international cast of contributors. The foreign connections of the former have also been noted by Robert Jouanny. As a whole, the number of Belgian contributors to French literary journals may seem relatively low (3.3 per cent; 28 authors), yet Belgians
French and Belgian Symbolists nonetheless provided the largest group of foreign authors. Meanwhile, Belgian periodicals contained a significant number of contributions from French authors (15.9 per cent; 120 French authors). Most Belgian journals sought and attracted a considerable number of foreign authors, with *La Revue Belge* being an exception to this rule: it explicitly set itself apart from any French influence. In contrast to the prominent Franco-Belgian links, very few German authors published in Symbolist journals. *Floréal*, edited by the French and German-speaking author and cultural broker Paul Gérardy, did not have a single German collaborator.25

As Verbruggen has shown elsewhere, one can distinguish between two different groups of Belgian authors who published in French periodicals.26 The first comprised 14 authors below the age of 26, who edited Belgian periodicals and could thus draw on contacts with France. Their principal connection was with the cluster of periodicals in the South of France, rather than with the Parisian publications. The second group included 14 authors who were older than 26 but still relatively young in literary terms (namely below 38 years of age). This group was linked to Parisian periodicals and included prominent figures such as Emile Verhaeren and Maurice Maeterlinck, recipient of the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1911. Age-wise, there were two exceptions in this cohort: one was the famous poet and critic Camille Lemonnier, born in 1844, whose work covered both Symbolism and Realism. The other was the lawyer, socialist senator and patron of the arts Edmond Picard, born in 1836. Picard is a controversial figure because of his anti-Semitic writings.27 However, as founder of the periodicals *La Société Nouvelle*, *La Revue Moderne* and *L’Art Moderne*, and as supporter of many young artists, he was a key figure in fin-de-siècle Belgium. Despite his anti-Dreyfusard stance, he has even been described as the nearest equivalent to a ‘French-style’ intellectual.28

The interactions between French and Belgian authors can be interpreted as a cosmopolitan practice in terms of their involvement in a transnational literary field. However, did the actors themselves assess their practices as ‘cosmopolitan’? The negative connotations that ‘cosmopolitanism’ held for many fin-de-siècle observers are well known: ‘Un cosmopolite est un dilettante qui voyage’ (‘A cosmopolitan is a dilettante who travels’), as the Catholic critic Charles Recollin put it.29 In the last quarter of the nineteenth century, cosmopolitanism became increasingly juxtaposed with traditional national values—in cultural and political debates, cosmopolitanism was often portrayed as ‘anti-national’. Yet not every cultural commentator suggested an opposition
between cosmopolitanism on the one hand, and regionalism, nationalism or patriotism on the other. In ‘La Querelle des Nationalistes et des Cosmopolites’ (‘The quarrel between nationalists and cosmopolitans’), an article published in *Le Figaro* in 1892, Maurice Barrès observed that ‘cela est certain, nous allons vers une culture qui sera plus cosmopolite que nationale’ (‘it is certain that we are moving towards a culture that will be more cosmopolitan than national’). According to Barrès, even his friend Charles Maurras was not afraid of foreign influences, which would offer spice and flavour to French national culture. Both Barrès (a native from the Vosges) and Maurras (from the South of France) were authors, journalists and activists. During the Dreyfus affair, they represented the anti-Dreyfusard camp and became ardent French nationalists. In 1898, Maurras founded the right-wing *Action Française*, while Barrès became associated with ‘Anti-Enlightenment’ nationalist and anti-Semitic politics in the French Third Republic.

Given their political trajectory, it is all the more striking that Barrès’s *Figaro* article praised the way in which Picard’s left-wing periodical *La Société Nouvelle*, founded in 1884, had fashioned itself as cosmopolitan: ‘Il se publie en Belgique un magazine, *La Société Nouvelle*, de reproductions internationales, en effet, qui est bien le plus intéressant […] les Belges offensent souvent notre goûт, mais ils ont l’intelligence hospitalière. C’est une grande vertu intellectuelle’ (‘In Belgium, a magazine with international circulation, *La Société Nouvelle*, is being published which, in fact, is most interesting […] The Belgians often offend our taste, but they have a hospitable intelligence. This is a great intellectual virtue’). Barrès’s assessment of *La Société Nouvelle* was certainly correct in that the journal had pronounced cosmopolitan features. It had, for instance, by far the largest number of foreign contributors. Yet its cosmopolitanism was also reflected in its contents, which included translations of Romantic English authors and writers close to William Morris and the Arts and Crafts movement. Apart from English authors, the publication featured articles on German, Dutch, medieval Flemish, Russian and Scandinavian literature. It also covered contemporary Dutch-language literature produced in Flanders. The journal was simultaneously published in Paris and Brussels and was sold in many cities outside France and Belgium. Such openness to foreign influences and engagement with literary life in other countries did not imply a rejection of national culture. Belgian intellectuals such as the historian Henri Pirenne portrayed their country as a ‘microcosm’, a ‘syncreticism’ and an embodiment of the intersection between Latin and
Germanic civilizations. In other words, representations of the Belgian nation frequently stressed the country’s inherent ‘cosmopolitanism’. Thus, the practices of Belgian literary periodicals fed into a discourse about the cosmopolitan qualities of Belgian culture. However, such claims must not be taken at face value. *La Jeune Belgique* is a case in point. As figure 2 has shown, it featured various contributors from abroad. It also covered international literary developments, for instance discussing Russian naturalism. Nonetheless, it was also a forum in which—in reference to Walt Whitman—the poet Iwan Gilkin deplored the ‘invasion of the barbarians’. His focus was not Belgian literature; as a Francophone author, he was concerned with the Graeco-Latin roots of French literature. Meanwhile, other contributors to the periodical expressed their concern about German influences. Such dimensions stress that potential cosmopolitan outlooks or practices stood in constant tension with apprehensions regarding cultural integrity.

3. BETWEEN COSMOPOLITANISM AND REGIONALISM

Both in the Belgian and the French case, cosmopolitanism did not only maintain an ambivalent relationship with concepts of nationhood: it went hand in hand with regionalism. Indeed, it has been argued that regionalism—rather than being a peripheral variant of Symbolism—was at the very heart of the movement. In the Belgian case, this was particularly evident in the representation of the Flemish region. Whilst publishing in French, authors such as Emile Verhaeren, Maurice Maeterlinck and Georges Rodenbach celebrated Flanders, whose population was overwhelmingly Dutch-speaking. Francophone Belgian Symbolists used Flemish characters, history and the topography in their poetry. The *terroir* was both a source of inspiration and part of the Symbolist aesthetics.

Even though Belgium’s literary revival was initially associated with Francophone authors, in the early 1890s, a small group of Dutch-speaking Flemish writers took their cue both from the Francophone pioneers and from writers in the Netherlands around the journal *De Nieuwe Gids* (‘The New Guide’, 1885–1943). These Flemish intellectuals launched their own periodical, *Van Nu en Straks* (‘Of Now and Later’, 1893–1901), in which they sought to reconcile the concept of the autonomy of literature with the edification and education of the people. In doing so, they could build on existing associations and cultural links. While the overall response to this initiative was favourable, there was
little exchange – as represented by translated articles or poems – between French- and Dutch-language journals. The leading theorist of *Van Nu en Straks* was August Vermeylen, who published his influential ‘Critiek der Vlaamsche beweging’ (‘Critique of the Flemish Movement’) in 1895. In this essay, he argued that international modernism should be integrated into new national expressions in which the Flemish region and language were to take centre stage. In doing so, Vermeylen fostered an image of Flanders that placed it at the heart of European cultural life, an argument which he developed further in his essay ‘Vlaamsche en Europeesche beweging’, published in 1901. Nele Bemong, Raphaël Ingelbien and others have interpreted these developments as a shift to ‘literary nationalism’ in the late nineteenth century, partly triggered by intellectuals who sought both to distinguish themselves from their Romantic predecessors and to establish themselves as part of an international literary field.

The celebration of the region among both French- and Dutch-speaking Belgian authors was mirrored by the separate literary cluster that we have identified in the South of France. Several editors of these periodicals were active in the Occitan revival movement known as the ‘Félibrige’. *Le Saint Graal*, and to a lesser extent, *Chimère* combined regionalism with Catholic mysticism and occult Symbolism. By focusing on their origins in their writings and defining themselves as a group, authors from Provence represented themselves in and vis-à-vis Paris. *Chimère*, published in Montpellier, had been founded and edited by Paul Redonnel, a former classmate of Jean Charles-Brun. Charles-Brun was a Catholic Dreyfusard who in 1900 founded the Fédération Régionaliste Française in opposition to the Action Française. In the early 1890s, however, Redonnel, Charles-Brun and Charles Maurras still collaborated in and around the (mostly Paris-based) Félibrige movement. As the secretary of *La Plume*, Redonnel positioned himself at the core of the Symbolist movement. In those years he also befriended the young André Gide, who eventually published a few poems in *Chimère* under the pseudonym of André Walter. Redonnel left Paris in 1892 and settled in Montpellier to devote himself fully to occultism and regionalism by editing a journal. He asked Léon Durocher from Brittany to act as his assistant. The latter was unable to combine his editorial duties with his engagement in the travelling cabaret *Le Chat Noir* (which also performed in Belgium the same year). Durocher was replaced by two other ‘disciples of Félibrige’, Joseph Loubet and Pierre Devoluy. When he was asked about the mission statement of *Chimère*, Redonnel described it as ‘eclectic’: 
Nous essayâmes de prouver que l’art moderne et le catholicisme ne sont conciliables, que le patriotism est beau en dehors de toute intellectualité; et sans trop approfondir, comme il seyait, nous formulâmes notre socialisme, notre positivisme et notre idealisme, nullement incompatible entre eux [...] On sait que la Revue naquit à Montpellier, ville de réputation très haute, à cause de son université; et par l’organe de quelques jeunes d’élite, nous suscita, en secondant, une tentative décentralisatrice

(We tried to prove that modern art and Catholicism can be combined, that patriotism is beautiful without any intellectualism, [...] we formulated our socialism, our positivism and our idealism, none of them incompatible with each other [...] People know that the review was born in Montpellier, a city of very high reputation because of its university; and through the publication of a young elite, a decentralizing attempt emerged.)

Chimère sought bonds with Paris, fitting in with the idea of ‘literary federalism’—a notion coined by the Félibrige movement’s founding father, Fredéric Mistral. The mother tongue (Occitan) would sit side by side with the national language (French). Such a view was echoed by Barrès, to whom it seemed obvious that national identities were composed of ‘nationalités provinciales’. The discussion of literary federalism in Chimère was a direct reaction against the growing ‘integrism’ of Charles Maurras, who developed an ambivalent relationship with the ‘Nordic’ (and non-French) Maeterlinck. In Maurras’s view, Nordic influences could not be an integral part of the French nation and the country’s political organization, contrary to the Catholic religion, French language and traditions. The underlying rifts—which were thus not only of a cultural but also an ideological nature—had become evident with the foundation of the École Romane in 1891. The École was a group of young poets (including Maurras and Jean Moréas) who reacted to the dominance of Symbolism by promoting a return to classicism, without breaking completely with their Symbolist peers. However, inevitably a request for literary federalism—that is to say the coexistence of provincial languages with an official language—would always coincide with political requests, as one observer commented on the ‘félibrige littéraire’ and the ‘félibrige social’ (i.e. political) in 1910. This point invites comparison with the role of the Flemish region and language in Vermeylen’s work: the Flemish author’s focus was not a political statement against the Belgian state—even though it was later used and read as an expression of Flemish political nationalism.

The Occitan and Belgian periodicals did not merely share an attachment to their respective regions. As Figure 1 demonstrates, there
were clear links between the Occitan and the Flemish clusters. The strongest relation between a French and a Belgian periodical was the one between *Chimère* and the Ghent-based *Le Réveil*, both of which placed the region at the core of their aesthetics. The two publications shared 24 authors, which is a stronger relation than *Le Réveil* had with any other journal. *Le Réveil* was not the only Belgian journal to maintain close relations with *Chimère*. *Les Jeunes* (1890–91) was founded by students and a publisher in Namur, a provincial administrative town. Again, the periodical was characterized by an attachment to a particular region— in this case Wallonia. Supporters of the Walloon dialect, for instance the ‘fumiste wallon’ Charles Frappart and the journalist Auguste Vierset, published in it, alongside various occultist writers. Due to its short-lived nature, we know little about the founders and protagonists of *Les Jeunes*. We do know that Geo Mauvère, alias Georges Angelroth, represented the journal at literary events in Brussels, where he studied. After only two years of existence, *Les Jeunes* announced its merger with *Chimère*. Mauvère collected the contributions of Belgian authors and sent them to *Chimère*’s offices in Montpellier. The collaboration between the French and the Belgian periodicals was enabled by personal friendships and shared experiences: students involved in *Chimère* and *Les Jeunes* took part in exchange programmes and international conferences of student societies in Brussels, Ghent, Montpellier and Paris.

Not everyone agreed with the intense contacts between Belgian authors and their peers from the South of France. Maurras asked for ‘la horde des belges’ (‘the hordes of Belgians’) to be stopped, in order to preserve the Latin spirit of France—a stance about which the editors of *Chimère*’s Belgian sister journal, *Le Réveil*, expressed their deep regret. For the young Francophone poets from Ghent there were no borders between poetry in the French-speaking world. Their reaction towards Maurras shows that long before Catholic writers and critics such as Henri Davignon and Pierre Nothomb fully embraced the ideas propagated by the Action Française, Maurras was well-known in Belgian intellectual circles. Probably due to financial problems, *Chimère* ceased publication in 1894. However, this did not mark the end of the intense collaboration between French and Belgian authors. Its successor *La Coupe*, also published in Montpellier, renewed the interest in a Belgian Symbolism that was rooted in Flemish clay. The journal solicited contributions from Maeterlinck, Verhaeren, Rodenbach and Van Lerberghe on various occasions.
4. CONCLUSION

The case of Belgian Symbolism had cosmopolitan features in several respects. If we view ‘cosmopolitanism’ as a manifestation of universal principles which many contemporaries associated with Parisian culture, Symbolism was certainly cosmopolitan. Belgian authors and periodicals maintained close links with their French counterparts and thus involved themselves in the ‘republic of letters’. At a different level, however, the regionalism of periodicals in Flanders, Wallonia and the South of France furthered another form of cosmopolitanism: the celebration of cultural diversity. In this respect, the case of the Occitan and Flemish Symbolists refers back to longer-standing traditions: David Damrosch has suggested that ‘global’ or ‘cosmopolitan’ regionalism was characterized by a dialogue between different and yet interrelated literary identities: local, national and international.61 In many respects, the practices and attitudes that have been discussed here were ‘micro-cosmopolitan’, as defined by Michael Cronin: they did ‘not involve the opposition of smaller political units to larger political units (national, transnational)’. Instead, a broader cosmopolitan context helped to ‘diversify or complexify the smaller unit’.62

French-speaking Belgian authors adopted a double strategy: their purpose was to enlarge and protect their market by playing both the national and the Parisian card.63 Such a duality can lead to the somewhat paradoxical situation that, with growing success, authors might be perceived as ‘French’ rather than ‘Belgian’. Dutch-speaking authors followed similar aims vis-à-vis the Netherlands.64 It is worthwhile returning to Casanova’s work, as she has acknowledged the ‘International of Small Nations’, stressing that ‘small nations—or rather the international writers of small literatures—could act in concert to challenge their domination’.65 In this context, she places particular emphasis on the way in which Belgium provided an example for authors from other small nations, including Ireland and Norway. Thus, literatures from peripheral countries were characterized by a sustained effort to construct a distinct national literary identity and by the ambition to represent themselves internationally. In this respect, cosmopolitan practices could also perform a national role.

Ingelbien’s comparative approach to Symbolism has revealed similarities between Maurice Maeterlinck and W. B. Yeats, who both operated from the periphery of modernist internationalism and Symbolism. Both authors defined themselves in opposition to metropolitan culture.
(associated with cosmopolitanism) and fell back upon folklore. This comparison has allowed Ingelbien to propose a new typology of European Symbolism, including a ‘peripheral Symbolism that was articulated round the social, cultural and linguistic tensions affecting two relatively marginal nations’. We can support this typology by adding domestic French tensions between province and metropolis. Our network approach has revealed strong transnational connections between authors and journals in Belgium and the South of France. This should not obscure the differences between the two cases: prior to the First World War, literary regionalism was not perceived as dangerous for the unity of the Belgian state. On the contrary, the integration of Flemish and Walloon regionalisms was perceived as an integral part of Belgium’s cosmopolitan master narrative. From this perspective we can discern continuities from the Romantic era. French regionalism, however, was suspected much sooner of undermining the unitary republican state. The appeal for literary federalism in France soon coincided with social and political demands and an ambition to reform or transform the Third Republic.
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