

第五期

# 比较文学与世界文学



总主编 乐黛云 杨慧林

Comparative Literature &  
World Literature



北京大学出版社  
PEKING UNIVERSITY PRESS

014059548

10  
159  
V5

# 比较文学与世界文学

## 第五期

主编 陈跃红 张 辉



北京大学出版社  
PEKING UNIVERSITY PRESS



北航

C1746654

I0 / 159  
V5

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

比较文学与世界文学. 第5期/陈跃红,张辉主编. —北京:北京大学出版社,2014.9  
ISBN 978-7-301-24677-1

I. ①比… II. ①陈…②张… III. ①比较文学—文学研究—中国②世界文学—文学研究  
IV. ①I206②I106

中国版本图书馆CIP数据核字(2014)第189590号

书 名: 比较文学与世界文学(第五期)

著作责任者: 陈跃红 张 辉 主编

责任编辑: 黄瑞明

标准书号: ISBN 978-7-301-24677-1/I·2802

出版发行: 北京大学出版社

地 址: 北京市海淀区成府路205号 100871

网 址: <http://www.pup.cn> 新浪官方微博: @北京大学出版社

电子信箱: [zbing@pup.pku.edu.cn](mailto:zbing@pup.pku.edu.cn)

电 话: 邮购部 62752015 发行部 62750672 编辑部 62754382 出版部 62754962

印 刷 者: 三河市博文印刷有限公司

经 销 者: 新华书店

787毫米×1092毫米 16开本 12.25印张 300千字

2014年9月第1版 2014年9月第1次印刷

定 价: 32.00元

---

未经许可,不得以任何方式复制或抄袭本书之部分或全部内容。

版权所有,侵权必究

举报电话: 010-62752024 电子信箱: [fd@pup.pku.edu.cn](mailto:fd@pup.pku.edu.cn)

主 办 中国比较文学学会  
承 办 中国比较文学学会秘书处

合 办 (排名不分先后):  
北京大学  
中国人民大学  
北京语言大学  
北京第二外国语学院  
四川外国语学院英语学院  
北京外国语大学中文学院

总 主 编 乐黛云 杨慧林

#### 学术委员会

乐黛云 杨慧林 饶芃子 严绍盪 曹顺庆 谢天振 钱林森  
王 宁 叶舒宪 陈跃红 高旭东 张文定 刘小枫

主 编 陈跃红 张 辉

副 主 编 张 冰 张 华

#### 编辑委员会

陈跃红 程爱民 耿幼壮 胡继华 刘耘华 秦立彦 宋炳辉  
魏崇新 王柯平 王宇根 徐新建 张冰 张华 张辉 张沛  
张旭春

#### 海外编委

Rodulf G. Wagner(海德堡大学) Haun Saussy(芝加哥大学)  
David Jasper(格拉斯哥大学) Federico Masini(罗马智慧大学)  
Galim Tihanov(伦敦大学)

编辑部主任 张 冰

编 辑 黄瑞明 初艳红 杨 果 靳成诚 徐 超 高华鑫

## 编者的话

陈跃红 张 辉

3年前,中国比较文学学会第10届(上海)年会期间,《比较文学与世界文学》开始立项、筹划与编辑,并于次年(2012年)出版第一期。当这新一期(第五期)杂志与读者见面时,中国比较文学学会第11届(延边)年会已开幕在即。3岁,对一个孩子而言,意味着刚刚开始牙牙学语、蹒跚学步;对一本杂志而言,也同样仅仅是初露端倪。

值此本刊3岁生日之际,对海内外诸位同仁,对合办杂志的各合作单位,对支持这本新杂志的各位作者、译者、编者以及参与编务和校对工作的各位同学,我们最想表达的是我们由衷的谢意。

从创办这份杂志开始,我们就试图努力把它建立成为一个跨文化、跨语言、跨学科的学术与信息平台——一个开放的平台,既在实质上推进现有研究范式走向纵深,也始终关注本学科新的生长点。通过3年的努力,这一双重构想,慢慢落到实处。

在“学术焦点”栏目,我们已经陆续刊发了涉及“世界文学”“口传文学”“古典学”“乔伊斯与东方”等的专题文章。通过这些专题文章,一方面,我们试图呈现海内外学人的最新研究成果;另一方面,也期望以此方式有效吸收相邻学科的营养,进一步拓展比较文学研究的既有边界。本期“焦点”所发表的四篇文章,则继续延伸上述学术构想,从跨越时间与地理限制角度来讨论文学问题。这是《比较文学与世界文学》和《加拿大比较文学评论》的联合特刊,也是一次跨文化学术出版的尝试。

同样,本期“批评空间”也既有“经典”的比较文学研究专论,如刘锋教授等的《外国文学流派研究六十年》,同时也有叶隽研究员关于“侨易学”的新见。而犹家仲教授和张哲俊教授的两篇文章,则不约而同地讨论了植物意象的文学表达,可谓别开生面。

“异邦新声”栏目以发表译文为主。此前发表的文章,涉及《安提戈涅》、文艺复兴、翻译理论的谱系等“老”文本和“老问题”;同时也注意追踪了如詹明信、斯皮瓦克等当代思想者的最新思想动向。本期特别刊发了天津师范大学郝岚教授对达姆罗什教授的访谈,饶有意味的是,他们谈论的是一个看似“简单”却异常重要的问题:在全球化的语境中,如何进行比较文学与世界文学教育。同期刊发的华生(Janell Watson)的文章,则使我们又回到后现代主义的理论语境中重新思考21世纪生态智慧家园问题,同样是一个兹事体大的关键难题;而葡语文学的著名译者和研究者闵雪飞教授翻译的《〈星辰时刻〉:如何渴求富有与贫穷?》,乃是文学作品解释的又一个精彩个案。说到底,无论我们期望回归传统还是以先锋的姿态探究未来,对文学文本的解读能力,乃是比较文学学术基础之基础!

而作为中国比较文学学会主办、学会秘书处承办的刊物,及时反映本学会乃至兄弟学会

的相关学术动态,乃是我们义不容辞的职责和义务。在新一届年会即将召开之际,我们特别再次吁请各位同仁继续支持这个栏目,也一如既往地支持这个新杂志。希望通过这个我们全体比较文学学人的公共媒介,让更多的读者了解大家的最新成果:我们的讲演、我们的著作、我们的学术活动,以及我们的困惑和我们的思考。

## 目 录

编者的话 ..... 陈跃红 张 辉( 1 )

### 学术焦点

主持人语 ..... 秦立彦 傅云博( 1 )

Modernism after the Postmodern: *Other Modernisms* ..... Tamara Hundorova ( 2 )

Reading the Novel East and West: *Dream of the Red Chamber*  
and *Jacques the Fatalist* ..... Massimo Verdicchio ( 14 )

Jacques Derrida's Origin of Literature,  
with Impossible Filiations ..... Sergiy Yakovenko ( 28 )

Sage-centric Creation Myths and the  
Transcendental Ethos of Chinese Literature ..... 蔡 崢( 37 )

### 批评空间

外国文学流派研究六十年 ..... 刘 锋 林丰民( 50 )

思想形成的人文底蕴、社会场域与文化地理  
——若干个案的侨易学简析 ..... 叶 隽( 57 )

“书写型”传承人研究 ..... 高荷红( 75 )

文化类同视角下的莲花意象 ..... 犹家仲( 83 )

《高丽人参赞》与中韩人参诗 ..... 张哲俊( 90 )

### 异邦新声

新时代的世界文学教材编写与人才培养  
——大卫·达姆罗什教授访谈录 ..... 达姆罗什 郝 岚( 99 )

《星辰时刻》:如何渴求富有与贫穷? ..... 埃莲娜·西苏( 105 )

文化作为存在之域: 21 世纪的生态智慧家园  
——以法国批评理论家菲力克斯·加塔利  
的文化思想为中心 ..... 华 生( 120 )

## 学术动态

- 提哈诺夫教授北京大学系列讲座纪要 ..... 李树春 华 星(135)  
“中国与西方:1950年以及其后的经典翻译”中美双边学术研讨会纪要 ..... 张 华(139)  
“比较文学与世界文学学术讲座”第十二至十九讲纪要 ..... 高华鑫(142)  
“当代外国文论及其跨文化旅行”学术研讨会  
暨第七届全国“外国文论与比较诗学研究会”年会纪要 ..... 杜常婧(148)  
上海市比较文学研究会第11届会员大会暨学术年会纪要 ..... 张书圣 邓艳艳(150)  
北京师范大学文学院成立“文学与思想史研究中心” ..... 符 鹏(154)

## 青年园地

### 战火中的精神家园

- 犹太流亡剧场在上海 ..... 李 茜(155)  
布洛赫艺术乌托邦中的“期待启明” ..... 陈 影(166)

## 新书快递

- 写在《伊卡洛斯之翼：英国十八世纪文学伪作研究》出版之际 ..... 刘意青(172)  
东方古典文学研究的新成果  
——《东南亚古典文学翻译与研究丛书》简评 ..... 陈 明(175)  
擎天之树，必有其根，浩瀚之水，必有其源  
——郝田虎教授《缪斯的花园：早期现代  
英国札记书研究》的困难及意义 ..... 潘家云(178)

## 稿约

- 《比较文学与世界文学》(中国比较文学学会学术集刊)稿件体例 ..... (183)



## Contents

- Preface ..... Chen Yuehong & Zhang Hui ( 1 )
- Prologue of the Section Editor ..... Qin Liyan & Daniel Fried ( 1 )
- Modernism after the Postmodern; *Other Modernisms* ..... Tamara Hundorova ( 2 )
- Reading the Novel East and West; *Dream of the Red Chamber*  
and *Jacques the Fatalist* ..... Massimo Verdicchio ( 14 )
- Jacques Derrida's Origin of Literature,  
with Impossible Filiations ..... Sergiy Yakovenko ( 28 )
- Sage-centric Creation Myths and the  
Transcendental Ethos of Chinese Literature ..... Cai Zheng ( 37 )
- Studies of Various Schools of Foreign  
Literature over the Past Six Decades ..... Liu Feng & Lin Fengmin ( 50 )
- Humanitarian Implications, Societal Fields  
and Cultural Geography Regarding Ideological Formation;  
A Kiao-Iological Analysis of Some Individual Cases ..... Ye Jun ( 57 )
- Literary Storyteller; A Study of Tradition Bearers ..... Gao Hehong ( 75 )
- Lotus Image from the Perspective of Culture Equivalence ..... You Jiazhong ( 83 )
- The Praise of Korean Ginseng* with  
China and Korea Ginseng Poem ..... Zhang Zhejun ( 90 )
- The Composing of Textbooks and Training of Students of  
World Literature in a New Age; An Interview  
with David Damrosch ..... David Damrosch & Hao Lan ( 99 )
- A Hora Da Estrela*; How to  
Desire Prosperity and Poverty ..... Hélène Cixous (105)
- Culture as Existential Territory; Ecosophic Homelands for the 21st  
Century—A Study Centered upon Felix Guattari's  
Cultural Thinking ..... Janell Watson (120)
- Information**
- Summary of a Series of Lectures by Professor  
G. Tihanov in Peking University ..... Li Shuchun & Hua Xing (135)

- China and the West: Translation of Classics after 1950—Summary  
of a Sino-American Bilateral Academic Symposium ..... Zhang Hua (139)
- Summary of the 12th—19th “Comparative Literature and World  
Literature” Lectures Held in Peking University ..... Gao Huaxin (142)
- Summary of the 7th National Annual Meeting of Association of  
Foreign Literary Theory and Comparative Poetics ..... Du Changjing (148)
- The 11th Annual Conference of CCLA Shanghai  
Branch Held on July 5th ..... Zhang Shusheng & Deng Yanyan (150)
- Research Center of Literature and History of Ideas  
Is Founded in Beijing Normal University ..... Fu Peng (154)
- The Spiritual Home in Wartime: Jewish Exile Theater in Shanghai ..... Li Qian (155)
- A Study of “Vor-Schein” in Ernst Bloch’s Artistic Utopia ..... Chen Ying (166)

### Book Reviews

- Preface to *The Wings of Icaros: Studies on the Literary  
Forgeries in 18th Century Britain* ..... Li qing (172)
- A New Achievement of Oriental Classical Literary Research:  
Review of *Classical South-eastern Asian  
Literature—Translations and Studies* ..... Chen Ming (175)
- Review on *Muses’ Garden: A Study on Early  
Modern English Commonplace Book* ..... Pan Jiayun (178)
- Call for Papers ..... Editorial Board (183)

## 主持人语

秦立彦(北京大学)

傅云博(Daniel Fried,加拿大阿尔伯塔大学)

这一单元的文章在某种程度上都与时间有关,或聚焦于某个时间节点上,有事实联系或无事实联系的跨文化文学现象,或涉及“起源”问题。

Tamara Hundorova 的论文在后现代主义的理论框架下,对 19 世纪末 20 世纪上半叶的欧洲现代主义进行了梳理,重新思考了其既定范式,尤其将现代主义“经典”(canon)形成的过程历史化,揭示了对现代主义的传统理解所遮蔽的多个维度,勾勒出欧洲现代主义在地理、文化、国别、时间上的丰富性。

Massimo Verdicchio 的论文将 18 世纪中国与法国的两个有很大差异的文本——《红楼梦》与狄德罗的《宿命论者雅克》——并置阅读,分析两文本在一个重要方面的共同点,即它们作为对“叙事”本身的寓言(allegory)/反讽(irony)/“元小说”(meta-fiction)的特征;两个属于不同文化传统的文本的彼此映照,成为观看它们的新视角。

Sergiy Yakovenko 的论文处理德里达对文学起源问题的讨论。“起源”问题是德里达式的问题吗?他是否将表现出自己所反对的本质主义与目的论倾向?Yakovenko 的文章阐释了德里达对“文学起源”的解构,并将德里达放置在与黑格尔、弗洛伊德、伊瑟儿等理论家对话的位置,梳理出“文学起源”问题在现代理论网络中的位置。

蔡峥的论文从中西神话对比的角度,探讨中国的人类起源神话,指出其自然主义的、缺乏神的参与的特点,取代神的则是调和神人矛盾的圣人。此文同时指出,中西神话中都有“回归”的主题,但呈现出相异的样貌。

比较文学本身即为跨文化的研究,比较文学的学术活动也似乎天然地带有跨文化的性质。这一组文章为本刊与《加拿大比较文学评论》(*Canadian Review of Comparative Literature*)共同发表,是跨文化学术出版的一次尝试。北京大学与加拿大阿尔伯塔大学在比较文学研究领域有长期密切合作,2009 年在北京、2012 年在加拿大埃德蒙顿,共同举办了两次国际学术研讨会,是为此次共同出版的基础。本刊发表此四文的同时,另有 Yulia Naughton, Keyang Dou, 张沛, Rebecca Gould, Josh Stenberg, 秦立彦的六篇关于“后地理的想象”(post-geographical imagination)的文章,在《加拿大比较文学评论》2014 年第 3 期上发表。10 篇文章均通过两刊评审,为共同发表。

## Modernism after the Postmodern: *Other Modernisms*

Tamara Hundorova

Aesthetic modernism is a cult phenomenon in twentieth century literature and culture. Modernism crystallized due to the intellectual efforts of many artists and critics of the first half of the twentieth century, who craved to keep the autonomy of art itself, emphasizing its self-reflectivity, irony, and experimentalism; however, the modernist trend was drastically re-evaluated during the postmodern era. The postmodern consciousness at the end of the twentieth and the beginning of the twenty-first century not only legalizes the existence of *other*, non-modern types of thinking but also de-mythologizes the phenomenon of modernism itself. In general, the new methodological situation that postmodernism brings into the open creates a new interpretative paradigm for the understanding of aesthetic modernism. First and foremost this situation makes possible a passage from the apology of modernism or its refutation to the understanding of *other modernisms*—national, gender, race, class, colonial, geo-cultural, and its lower and marginal variants.

In one of the newest guides to the modernist literature and culture, edited by David Bradshaw and Kevin Dettmar in 2006, such *other modernisms* are allotted a whole chapter, augmenting the modernist paradigm by such aspects as “modernism and race,” “modernism and gender,” “postcolonial modernism,” “global modernism,” and “queer modernism.” From the perspective of the new century, which leaves the era of the postmodern already behind, we can talk about the comeback of interest in modernism and its discoveries in the realm of the artistic form, mythology of the present time, psychoanalysis, and the synthesis of arts. All this motivates Marjorie Perloff to maintain that modernism is not finished yet. (“Epilogue...” 571)

The postmodern situation helps, first of all, to re-examine the canons in which the national variants of modernism received a marginal part as compared to the universal European modernism. From the perspective of the so-called *great European modernism*, its Slavic variants seemed to be secondary and incomplete phenomena. But postmodernism, with its emphasis on plurality and its peculiar relationship with modernism, creates another theoretical paradigm, in which modernism itself does not look like an absolute any more and rather becomes versatile and diverse. Paradoxically, it is postmodernism that created the situation where modernism begins to be conceived as a certain homogenous and universal model. Moreover, within the postmodern discussion the modernism question becomes one of the most profound—for to deconstruct something, one needs to build something first (Helmut 233). In fact, as Peter Childs concludes, the term *modernism* starts to circulate only in the 1960s to signify the generation of authors and the literary period as a whole what had already in a sense passed out. We need to consider that the literary roots of that period go as deep as the poet and essayist Charles Baudelaire, the novelist Gustav Flaubert, and the authors of *fin de siècle*, and that the culmination the trend fell in the interwar period. (Childs, *Modernism* 15)

Peter Anderson, on the other hand, states that modernism is the emptiest of all categories and notions of culture, since in truth it points to the variable heterogeneity of relations within the bourgeois modernity. Hence modernism as integral object, in his view, does not exist; the anti-telic nature of modernist doctrines and practices is opposed to any definitive *Stimmung*, supposed to determine the classic modernist attitude to modernity. That is why, as Anderson pinpoints, modernism could rather be defined as a linking signification

of the broad array of different aesthetic practices such as symbolism, cubism, constructivism, expressionism, surrealism, etc. (103–4)

Michael Whitworth, from his perspective, in an anthology of modernism (2007) underlines that modernism is less an object but rather an answer to the problems, posed by the situation of modernity, and this reaction to modernity can be aggressive, protective, or ambivalent. All in all, the recognition that modernism and modernity are things interconnected but not identical belongs to the most important discoveries of the postmodern era.

Triggered by the birth of postmodernist discourse in the West, the process of deconstruction of the great European modernism causes re-evaluation of the whole modernist theoretical and historical paradigm and extends onto the experience of Slavic literatures. In particular, the crisis of Westerneurologocentrism allows us to pose a question about the change of the formula *European modernism* to *European modernisms*. This becomes important particularly with respect to the search for the local and national models of cultural development, especially in the literatures of the Central- and Eastern-European region as well as the Third World countries. This search has marked a radical shift in the models of self-consciousness that unfold themselves in Slavic literatures at the end of the twentieth century, where the question of modernity and modernism becomes one of the most salient.

The purpose of this essay is to examine the wide spectrum of discussions around modernism in the contemporary Western literary theory and cultural studies, with a special emphasis on the experience of Slavic literatures.

## Modernist Canon

It is a common knowledge that European modernism appeared as early as in the 1890s with symbolism in French literature, neoromanticism and secessionism in German literature and the literatures of the Central-European region, and imagism in British literature; it spreads all over Europe and establishes itself as a particular aesthetic and philosophical paradigm at the beginning of the twentieth century. Step by step in the European theoretical discourse modernism becomes associated with high culture, especially under the influence of the emerging modernist canon. Such a canon is created first and foremost on the basis of the opposition of the elite and mass culture.

The emergence of the modernist canon was particularly facilitated by New Criticism (Eliot, Leavis, Wimsatt, Beardsley, and Blackmur), which developed the technique of the “close reading” of the text in its self-sufficiency and particularly valued the texts difficult from the formal point of view, with prevailing paradox, irony, and ambivalence. In fact, the notion of modernism emerges as an autotelic term within New Criticism. As is generally known, the methodology of New Criticism is oriented toward the analysis of a work as an accomplished linguistic object, different and independent from both the author and society. New Criticism also establishes an aesthetic concept of interdependency between a work and its critic by means of the process of closed reading. The emphasis shifts from the inward personality of the author and historical-cultural process to the analysis of the textured, well-written and hard-written work.

Allison Pease underlines that such modernist criticism appears during the first decades of the twentieth century as a part of literary criticism that focuses on English literature; by that time English literature is already included in university curricula, that is, acquires an institutional status. Such literary critics as Leavis, Richards, and Eliot saw their main task not only in making English literature an object of serious studies but also in turning it into the moral focus of public debates about the individual sensuality and “health” of culture in general. (Anderson 103)

The variations of the theoretical assumptions of the critics belonging to that school can roughly be described as focusing on the particular role of the critic as interpreter. The interpretation, in its turn, is supported by the seamless and complication of the form (Eliot), which, according to the theory of John Crowe Ransom, is an "open logic structure" that unfolds itself due to the augmenting of the content potential of a work. In time, within university syllabi, under the influence of New Criticism the modernist movement becomes reduced to a certain list of authors and selective texts that appear difficult and thereby interesting for interpretation. Thus a distinctive feature of canon creation is the passage from the aesthetic practice to the aesthetic value comes to fruition.

One characteristic of the modernist canon in its emergence is a peculiar universal homogenization of the modernist movement as well as emerging hierarchy of the modernist authors. In the twentieth century, among all the discussions around the universals of the Western literary process, the most significant appears to be Harold Bloom's *The Western Canon: The Books and School of the Ages* (1994). In his book Bloom accentuates that for the Western canon "nothing is so essential as its principles of selectivity, which are elitist only to the extent that they are founded upon severely artistic criteria." (22)

Leaning on the criteria of the "severely artistic," not the ideological, level, Bloom confesses that in his book he takes into consideration not only the most celebrated authors but also the nationally canonical author: Chaucer, Shakespeare, Milton, Wordsworth, Dickens in England, Montaigne and Moliere in France, Dante in Italy, Cervantes in Spain, Tolstoy in Russia, Goethe in Germany, Borges and Neruda in Hispanic America, Whitman and Dickinson in the USA. However, not even one representative of Slavic literatures before the nineteenth century has been included into the Western canon, and from the authors of the nineteenth century only Russian authors are taken into account: Pushkin, Lermontov, Aksakov, Gertsen, Goncharov, Turgenev, Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, Leskov, Ostrovsky, Chernyshevsky, Blok, Chekhov, and, among them, also Gogol. Russian (18 authors), Serbian and Croatian (3 authors), Czech (5 authors), and Polish (6) writers have been included only to the last (chaotic) period, that of the twentieth century. In general, Bloom's Western canon presents a systematization of the high European literature, and, as the author himself observes, it resists "the backward reach of current canonical crusades, which attempt to elevate a number of sadly inadequate women writers of the nineteenth century, as well as some rudimentary narratives and verses of African-Americans" (508). With this in mind, the author does not even mention Slavic literatures.

It is worth noting, however, that discussions around "Western canon" have arisen also in the Western European scholarship—immediately following the publication of Bloom's book. For instance, the motives for the inclusion of certain names proved arguable; among 26 names, only two names of the twentieth-century poets could be found—Neruda and Pessoa. (French 118) Critics pointed to insufficient representation of some national literatures in their entirety (Martin 105–109); others debated over the very principles of canon creation. (Shaw 257–71)

Compared to the Western Canon, the modernist canon is even more closed. The significant role in its formation belongs to Eliot, who propelled an ideology of the new tradition—protective and innovative at the same time. This modernist canon was supposed to embody the simultaneousness and ahistoricity of the whole European cultural tradition, where, as Eliot maintained, "the existing monuments form an ideal order among themselves, which is modified by the introduction of the new (the really new) work of art among them." (1093) Fundamental for the understanding of modernism in Ukraine, Solomia Pavlychko's study *The Discourse of Modernism in Ukrainian Literature* (first edition 1997, second amplified edition 1999) is based on the reception of the Western modernist canon and application of its criteria such as the categories of complexity, mythologism, and critical self-consciousness (17) for the appraisal of the twentieth century literature in Ukraine. Thereby Pavlychko compiled and proposed the modernist canon of Ukrainian literature, noticing, however, that "there are no personalities of the same scale as James Joyce or Albert

Camus, or movements comparable to *Young Poland* in regard to their contribution to the national literature." (9)

One can argue against the transplantation of Western modernist canons into Ukrainian soil or against the universalist interpretation of modernism itself as "a certain aesthetic philosophy, a certain model of the literary development in our century" (Pavlychko 12); one can reproach Ukrainian literature for not having a Joyce; and nevertheless it has a modernism, and the Ukrainian *Young Muse* exerted no less influence on its national literature than did *Young Poland* on its—but this all is not essential. Thanks to Pavlychko's book Ukraine has its own modernist canon. As any canon, this one is also selective; it reflects the preferences of its creator and has its own ideology—supplementation to the so-called "*deficient culture*."

Attempts at inscribing national literatures into the Western canon or proposing alternative canons are especially interesting in our time. One of the salient events in Western academic circles has become the anthology of avant-gardes, new-avant-gardes, and post-avant-gardes in Yugoslavia in 1918–1991. (2003) Tyrus Miller reads such an edition as a problematization of "incomplete modernities." However, he perceives of the volume as an affirmative phenomenon, and specifically as a demonstration of "the fantastic national-utopian fulfillment of modern time under the sign of 'Yugoslavia' as the ultimate message of its dissonant collage of cultural, linguistic, and territorial elements—a time that has now definitively passed beyond its end." (713)

Nevertheless, there are not only particular authors but also literatures themselves that are excluded from the modernist canon—for example, Slavic literatures. Among the Slavic authors only several personalities could belong to the modernist canon, such as Witold Gombrowicz, Bruno Schulz or Vladimir Nabokov—and this for the most part due to their biographies and bodies of work that are particularly valuable for the modernist aesthetic situation of shifts in which internal immigration and the lack of a centre are superimposed upon the external immigration. A great role in the formation of the modernist canon is played by the values revealed in transgression, which serve for the denaturalization of national, linguistic, and gender identities. In his review of Michael Goddar's book *Gombrowicz, Polish Modernism, and the Subversion of Form* (2010), Knut Grimstad notes that the special popularity which Gombrowicz as an author enjoys can be explained by the mutual correspondence between his Western-European exile and the peculiarities of the formation of Polish nationalism. (334–36)

In its essence, the canon is an affirmative phenomenon, that is, in a general philosophical sense it affirms a certain cultural identity and at the same time is an instrument of such an identity's representation. A canon is established by means of separation and elevation of some and expulsion of the "others," "smaller," "marginal" phenomena and values. The criteria of canonization have always been the object of debates. Those moot points of the creation of the modernist canon include but are not limited to the question of the place of the female authors and national literatures, the issues of the metropolitan culture and the role of the artistic elite within it.

As Perloff notes, the awareness that we still are modernists comes belatedly, since for decades after the World War II it was generally acknowledged that the modernism of the beginning of the twentieth century had been tinged with racism, sexism and elitism, as well as with the retrograde politics and "puritan" aestheticism. ("Epilogue..." 571) Implicitly modernism was identified with strict, rational, and elitist discourse, with the bohemian way of life, masculinity and urbanism,<sup>①</sup> and predominantly male authors were considered to be the creators of the high modernism (Knut Hamsun, Thomas Sterns Eliot, Ezra Pound, David Laurence, Luigi Pirandello, James Joyce, Marcel Proust, and Tomas Mann). By contrast, styles marked by emotionalism and fragmentariness were expelled from that discourse, and since such styles were

---

<sup>①</sup> See, for example: Hawthorn, Jeremy. *A Glossary of Contemporary Literary Theory*. 2nd ed. London, New York, Melbourne, Auckland, 1994.

associated with the work of female authors, the latter were also excluded from the modernist canon. Nevertheless, recent studies have discovered a peculiarly feminine face of European modernism.<sup>①</sup>

Re-examination of the modernist canon in the contemporary Western literary studies is aided by cultural studies; in this regard such problems are made topical as the role of queer-identity in the formation of modernism or the place of Jews in modern culture in general and in the Central-European literature in particular. European modernism, as Scott Spector maintains, is a potentially historical figure that calls for research. (615—34) Tom Folland, on the other hand, states that the notion of queer-modernism aims at the problematization of the artistic category of modernism, which is predominantly associated with the formation of heterosexual identity, opposed to the closed, exclusive gay-identity. (348)

## Modernism and Mass Culture

The modernist canon was shaping itself as a counterforce to the newly-emerging mass culture, and aesthetic modernism was associated with the elitist theory of art. Thereby a permanent assumption arose that, as E. Dean Kolbas notes, for the appraisal of popular works, such as Harriet Beecher-Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, the modernist standards of evaluation—abstraction, complicacy, and political disengagement—have to be replaced by sentimentality, domesticity, popularity and efficacy. (42) In fact, the point here is not to discard the definition of modernism and its high standards but rather to accept a prejudice that popular works of art should be evaluated not by aesthetic but utilitarian categories. The question that remains open is why that particular characteristic needs be to a “standard of appraisal.” (43)

Until recently, the academic criticism viewed modernism as exclusively high, self-sufficient, and formalist art, which does not acquiesce in any associations with occasional entertainments or political propaganda. The aesthetic hard-to-reachness elevated this art above the usual understanding and contrasted it with low and mediocre culture. Even within modernism itself, as, for instance, in English literature, there was a division between “high” and “low” modernists. The authors of the new generation (Thomas Stearns Eliot, James Joyce, and Virginia Woolf) belonged to the first category, and the older generation of writers (Bernard Shaw, Herbert Wells, and John Galsworthy) was construed as the “low” modernists who wrote for a different audience. However, as Maria DiBattista notes, what united both types of modernists was their acknowledgement of low culture and entertainment—popular press, cinema, music-hall, and cabaret—as an integral part of modern life which exerted a great influence on both the form and content of their art (5).

“Mass culture has always been the hidden subtext of the modernist project,” says Andreas Huyssen. (214) In his turn, John Cooper in *Modernism and the Culture of Market Society* (2004) states that capitalism and the popular market culture appear as such in the modernist niche first. In particular, the soil where that culture grows is bohemia, which—in contradiction to its purported enmity toward the market values—is, in truth, a bearer and creator of such values. Interest in vogue and spurious self-modelling, faith in gender indeterminacy and the cult of a community united by a mutual taste—all these nurtured the culture of consumption, or, in other words, popular culture, and found their reflection in modernist practices.

Nevertheless, the modernist canon is based on the legitimation of high culture. John Storey, a celebrated researcher of mass culture, emphasises that the division between high and low culture has always

① See in particular: Kemp, Sandra. “‘But how to describe a world seen without a self?’ Feminism, fiction and modernism.” *Critical Quarterly* 32.1 (1990): 99—118. In regard to Ukrainian literature see: Pavlychko, Solomiya. *Dyskurs modernizmu v ukrainskij literaturi*. Kyiv: Lybid', 1997; Hundorova, Tamara. *Femina melancholica. Stat' i kultura v gendernij utopia Olhy Kobylans'koj*. Kyiv: Krytyka, 2002.



existed, but the notion of “high culture” appears only in the second half of the nineteenth century. (32) Modernism uses this idea and deploys the concept of high culture as well as facilitates a selective appropriation of certain aspects of culture by some higher social groups. Specifically, the urban elite attempts to separate institutionally a part of culture and signify it as high; for example, symphonic orchestras, opera, conservatories, and art museums. With the help of such institutions it becomes possible to execute the division between the sphere of culture and the sphere of entertainment as well as to accentuate a special, culturally acquired aesthetics of reception.

One of the paradoxes of modernism, however, is that the socio-cultural and psychological environment of the emergence and dissemination of the new modernist consciousness were by far not the higher classes but *thebohemia*, which in the middle of the nineteenth century was associated with marginal social circles. The term “bohemia” as such derives from the name of the Gypsies, who were getting to the big European cities predominantly through Bohemia (Czech). The modernist aesthetics and culture emerge in cafes, among the artists, poor students, and half-starved intellectuals, that is, in the environment of the marginal people, whose modus of life resembles that of the Gypsies’. One of the first authors who wrote on the bohemian life, Henry Murger, considers a bohemian person not only a timeless figure of artist, from Homer to Rousseau, but also a fundamental modern social type, whose very existence depends on the cultural market. (34)

*Novelty* becomes a commodity. Overall, the modernist intention to “make everything new” had not only aesthetic but also market consequences. In addition, it became obvious that the very social group that had created the concept of high culture, that is, the rich bourgeoisie, proved to be unable to appreciate the new modernist culture. Those who became the arbitrators of this new culture were the bohemians. It is worth noting that both the bohemians and modernism itself, which was arising not as high culture at all, had proximity to the popular culture; in particular, at that time an increase of the role of the so-called “plebeian arts,” especially cinema, was observed.

Thus, the lumpen-bohemia becomes both the creators and consumers of modernist culture. Shaped on the basis of the themes and images, among others the images of the Gypsy life, borrowed from the popular literature from the beginning of the nineteenth century, the topos of bohemia embodied the type of the modern artist as well as testified to the process of the re-aesthetization of popular culture, carried out by early modernism. This picture certainly undermines later identification of modernism with the forms of high culture first and foremost. However, the evolution of modernism brings about a situation where the bohemian culture gradually augments in prestige, becomes fashionable and advances in its status from marginal to high culture. In his turn, Pierre Bourdieu, a celebrated French sociologist of culture, states that it is cultural field itself, by perpetually producing an exchange of symbolic values, causes the emergence of the fashion for high culture. Supported by marginal artists, autonomous art, on the one hand, opposes to both mass culture and legitimate official culture; yet, on the other hand, it becomes a prestigious cultural capital for the bourgeois audience. Modernism also becomes such a capital during the twentieth century.

From the end of the nineteenth century, the new modernist elite directly identifies itself with high culture, which not only becomes a consolidating force for the artistic elite, thereby defining its status by its belonging to the institutions of high culture, but also receives an axiological and metaphysical interpretation in the form of “high” culture. Under the influence of the artistic metaphysics of Friedrich Nietzsche, this “high” culture undergoes a process of aesthetization, and “art for art’s sake” along with “bohemia” become fashionable models for imitation.

Discussions around the tendency—at the end of the twentieth century—to open the canon, including the modernist one, offer new possibilities for the development of theoretical models for another modernism.