European Identities, American Theories

Theo D'haen
Universiteit Leuven/Leiden

My starting point may strike you as provocative, yet I think it is undeniably true: while economically and politically Europe is steadily moving towards ever greater integration, and apparently in this way aims eventually to emancipate itself from the present hegemony the United States exerts in these domains (the military domain remains a totally different matter for the time being, even though here too we occasionally hear timid sounds advocating a greater European role), in cultural matters the various countries making up the greater European space seem to remain shackled to American paradigms. I think this is particularly true of the study of literature as it has been practised over the last fifty years or so. In what follows I will try and demonstrate this with regard to two of the most frequently used terms and concepts in our current literary-technical toolkit when it comes to the discussion of twentieth-century European literature(s): postmodernism and modernism. Most of what I have to say is very tentative, and in a way marks a new departure also for myself, as I am here explicitly arguing against much of what I have spent the past twenty years propagating.

The case of postmodernism is clearest, so that is where I will start. Because of obvious limitations of time and space, I will here suffice with the barest outline – a fuller discussion is to be found in D'haen 1999. The terms "postmodern" and "postmodernism" date from before World War II, and during the 40s and 50s they are used, covering various contents, but

>>

usually in a denigrating sense, by such luminaries as the English historian Arnold Toynbee and the American literary critic and historian Irving Howe (Bertens, 1986). The term only gains its present meaning as of 1970 approximately, first with reference to American literature – primarily through the critical and literary-historical work of Ihab Hassan and Leslie Fiedler (Bertens, 1995), and subsequently – and this primarily through the publications of Charles Jencks (1977, 1986, 1992) – with regard to architecture. After that it spreads to the other arts, and finally also to other literatures than American literature
288>289 (Bertens and Fokkema, 1997). Though Fiedler initially tried to deal with postmodernism from a broad social perspective, and though Hassan certainly did not shun wider philosophical issues, in practice it was the more literary-technical part of Hassan's approach (1971, 1975, 1980a, 1980b, 1983), and after him that of David Lodge (1977), that carried the day in the early phase of the study of literary postmodernism. With the publication of Jean-François Lyotard's *La condition postmoderne* (The postmodern condition) in 1979, Jürgen Habermas's 1980 Frankfurt lecture "Modernity versus Postmodernity" as "Modernity – An Incomplete Project" in 1981 (Habermas, 1992), and Fredric Jameson's essay "Postmodernism, Or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism" in 1984, attention shifted from literary postmodernism as a phenomenon or a category all by itself, to "postmodernity" as a global philosophical, political and social phenomenon (Bertens, 1995).

In 1991, Jameson used his essay as the title-piece to a volume gathering most of what he had written on postmodernism till then, and effectively proposing what amounts to an integrated theory of cultural postmodernism. For Jameson postmodern literature serves as a symptom of the disease affecting our era: it is representative of contemporary society to the degree it represents the gap that obtains between reality and representation. In addition, postmodern literature is accessory to the creation and perpetuation of this society: as it

does not suceed in re-connecting the reader to any underlying "real" reality, this literature merely further ensnares him in the Baudrillardian (1993) simulacral universe of late capitalism. Since 1991, Jameson's view has largely dominated further discussion of postmodernism in the United States, and to a certain extent abroad. As such, it displaced intervening attempts, such as those by Brian McHale, in *Postmodernist Fiction* (1987) and Linda Hutcheon, in *A Poetics of Postmodernism* (1988), to both summarize and culminate the earlier discussions with regard to postmodern techniques, while at the same time transcending it by also evaluating the social and political implications these techniques carry. A subsequent volume by McHale, *Constructing Postmodernism* (1992), went almost unnoticed. For most European, or at least "Continental", scholars of postmodernism, though, Linda Hutcheon's book to a large extent remained the initial point of entry into the field, with attention for the technical side of the phenomenon continuing to outweigh its political implications (see e.g. Vervaeck, 1999; and Fokkema and Bertens, 1997).

»

However different they may finally have turned out to be, then, the opinions of Lyotard, Habermas, Jameson and Hutcheon not only arose from a close dialogue with one another, genealogically they also all can be traced back to Hassan, and therefore to the relatively small corpus of American fictions from the 60s and 70s which served as the starting point for Hassan's early essays and monographs on postmodernism. In the opening paragraph of *La condition postmoderne* Lyotard specifically refers to earlier American discussions on sociology and literature as having inspired him — at least in part — in the elaboration of his own views on postmodernism (Lyotard, 1993: 71). The earlier discussions of American literature, Lyotard mentions (Bertens, 1994: 17), refer to Hassan's work on a number of then "experimental" American novelists such as John Barth, Donald Barthelme, Richard Brautigan, Robert Coover, Don DeLillo, E. L. Doctorow, Raymond Federman,

William Gaddis, William Gass, John Hawkes, Thomas McGuane, Thomas Pynchon, Richard Sukenick, and Kurt Vonnegut. Habermas reacts to Lyotard, but likewise to the postmodernism-debate conducted during the 70s in Germany by German scholars of American literature. This debate was triggered by a series of lectures on (then) recent American literature by American visitors, most prominent among them Ihab Hassan and Leslie Fiedler (Neubauer, 1991 and 1997). Jameson reacts to Lyotard and Habermas, and to the postmodernism-debate raging in the United States. Hutcheon, finally, most immediately reacts to Jameson, but does so from a specific interest in postmodern techniques which in itself can also be traced back to Hassan.

The postmodernism of Lyotard, Habermas, Jameson, and Hutcheon (1988a, 1988b, 1989, 1991a, 1991b), then, initially grafts onto a specifically American corpus of texts limited both as to size and period of origin. Yet, all theoreticians concerned, but even more so their numerous epigones, consider this "postmodernism" as of universal validity and application. We might well wonder whether hypotheses with regard to "postmodernism" rooted in such a specific American corpus can so easily be generalized and extended to other linguistic- or geographical entities and to later periods? From the late 80s, resistance towards such universalism has been gathering momentum, particularly from so-called "postcolonial quarters" (Spivak, 1987, 1990, 1993, Sangari 1990, Slemon 1991). Yet, does the postmodernism sketched by Lyotard, Habermas and Jameson indeed embody a crisis in Western thinking, a deconstruction of the legacy of the Enlightenment (Bertens, 1995)? Or does this crisis rather pertain to the nation from which originate the texts that provided the initial frame of reference for the work of Hassan, a nation that traces its own origins to the ideals of the Enlightenment: the United States in the 50s, 60s and 70s? After all, this is when the easy self-assurance with which "America" situated itself with regard to the world was rocked by the Cuba-

crisis, the assassinations of John and Bobby Kennedy, the Vietnam-war, the civil rights struggle, race riots, Black Power and Black Panther movements, and the Watergate-scandal. The crisis in national identity all this occasioned, in the field of literature then took the form of deconstructing, by way of "postmodern" techniques, America's cultural identity as embodied in what Donald Pease has called the American "national narrative" via the traditional literary canon (Pease, 1994).

Even if, as Hutcheon (1988), Bertens and D'haen (1988), and the numerous contributors to Bertens and Fokkema (1997) argue, postmodern techniques today are ubiquitous in most Western literatures, the question remains whether the use of these techniques in all cases should lead to an identical interpretation. Just as Pease's American "national narrative" constitutes a particularized realization of Enlightenment thinking, so the "national narratives" of other, and in our particular case European, nations are equally particularized versions. It therefore does not seem unreasonable to surmise that outside of the United States postmodernism will react to the specific form Enlightenment thinking took in the various "national narratives" in question. Precisely how various these reactions can be may be gauged from juxtaposing the French *nouveau roman* of the 50s and 60s, the *nouveau nouveau roman* of the 70s and 80s, and the *écriture minimaliste* (Schoots, 1997) of the 80s and 90s. One might also think of contemporary German and Austrian variations on the regional novel or the war novel (Künne, 1991), of Dutch "different prose" (ander proza) and the numerous variations on the war novel in Dutch literature, of the Flemish (Belgian Dutch-language) so-called opus-authors and writer-performers, of the host of British authors, active since the 50s and 60s, that only now are being recognized as postmodern (D'haen, 1993a), of the Irish variations on the Big House-novel (D'haen, 1993b), as well as of the Scots variants of the city-novel and the proletarian novel, and finally of Latin-American magic realism (D'haen, 1995 and 1997b). The truth,

»

however, is that most of these European developments only with difficulty, that is to say not without a lot of re-definition and theory-bending, can be made to fit the categories devised initially for what is in essence an American postmodernism.

The question then becomes whether we, as Europeans, should allow our literary research agendas to be set by what at heart are American pre-occupations? If European literature of the post-War II era is indeed as diverse, and apparently as different from its American counterpart, as my previous paragraph suggests, why not bypass the American "search engine" of postmodernism altogether, and look for "European" matrices? I will return to this in a minute, after I have argued my case also for a literary movement or period which is much less frequently, and easily, experienced as under the sway of American literary scholarship, but which is seen rather as "quintessentially" European: modernism. After all, the texts from which postmodernism traces its inception are undeniably American. With modernism, they are equally undeniably European.

It is my contention that "Modernism", as we traditionally conceive of it, is a construct in retrospect, conjured to serve a specific purpose in a specific place and at a specific time. As a catalyst, I am going to use Harry Levin's 1960 article "What was Modernism" (Levin, 1966) which for various reasons can be called "seminal". First of all, it marks the take-off point for discussions of early twentieth-century literature under the summary terminological heading of "Modernism", while at the same time firmly establishing the literary movement or current so defined as past. Secondly, under the heading "Modernism" it not only foregrounds a particular cross-section of European literature, but also values that kind of literature over concurrent literary movements or currents. Third, it marks the emergence of a particularly contemporary American hegemony in literary matters. Let me briefly expatiate on these points.

The principal works detailing Modernism, at least in English, such as Kenner 1971, Bradbury and McFarlane 1976,

Faulkner 1977, Levenson 1984, Quinones 1985, Menand 1987, Longenbach 1987 and 1988, Surette 1993, Smith 1994, Butler 1994, Nicholls 1995, Rainey 1998, Miller 1999, all date from after Levin's article. The only exception could be said to be Bowra 1943 and 1949 which, however, never mention the term. Instead, Bowra categorizes the various poets he discusses in his two books, and most of whom we would now unhesitatingly label "Modernists", *viz.* Valéry, Rilke, Stefan George, Alexander Blok, Yeats, Constantine Cavafy, Guillaume Apollinaire, Vladimir Mayakovski, Boris Pasternak, T.S. Eliot, Federico García Lorca, and Rafael Alberti, as "Post-Symbolsits". »

To be sure, there are plenty of other works before 1960 that one way or another deal with one or more of the authors that eventually came to be included in the list of "Modernists", but rarely if ever were these "figures" grouped together with regard to what they had "in common" (Levin, 284) across the linguistic dividing lines, and as "Modernist". In this respect, it is surely not a coincidence that Levin was a professor of Comparative Literature, at Harvard, and well-versed in various European languages and literatures. In fact, I would argue that his codification of "Modernism" serves the need of a particular time and place, which is that of American academe of the fifties and sixties, primarily through the prism of the disciplines of Comparative Literature and "English", which in American academic parlance equals the study of English literature. The comparative approach allows Levin to link a number of American authors of the early twentieth century, primarily T.S. Eliot, Ezra Pound, William Carlos Williams, Ernest Hemingway, F. Scott Fitzgerald, Eugene O'Neill, Sinclair Lewis, Marianne Moore, Sherwood Anderson, and William Faulkner, to some of the most prestigious names from European literature of the same period: W.B. Yeats, James Joyce, D.H. Lawrence, Virginia Woolf, .M. Forster, Franz Kafka, Rainer Maria Rilke, Bertolt Brecht, Marcel Proust, Paul Valéry, and Thomas Mann.

The gain is threefold. First of all, it establishes the

discipline of Comparative Literature as also useful to American learning by creating a continuum between what is, or has been, going on in Europe and the United States as far as the literary realm is concerned. On the rebound, it relocates American literature from the literary periphery, where as far as "orthodox" academe it had been lurking from its very first inception as a discipline in the 1920s, to being part of the center. Third, it recuperates American literature, which almost from its institution as a discipline had been under the sway of the more "sociologically" oriented so-called "myth and symbol" school
294>295 (Nash Smith, R.W.B Lewis, Charles Feidelson, Richard Chase, Leslie Fiedler, Leo Marx) for the more technically oriented approach usually associated with more orthodox departments of literature, such as English. The respectability of "Modernism" thus defined is even enhanced by declaring the movement in question definitively "past", thereby carefully insulating it from tendencies then prevalent in American literature, but decidedly unpalatable to all advocates of orthodoxy – mainly the Beats and what Levin by way of the title of the poet Karl Shapiro's then celebrated book of criticism calls "the rallying cry [of] In Defence of Ignorance" – but also the work of contemporaries such as Saul Bellow, John Updike, and J. D. Salinger in the United States, and in Europe that of Samuel Beckett, as well as the more commercial work characteristic of what Levin condescendingly calls "middlebrow" culture, all of which he labels, with a term borrowed from Arnold Toynbee, "Post-Modernist".

The point I am intent on making, of course, is that what Levin serves us as "Modernism" tout court is in fact a very American take on twentieth-century literature in some of the major European languages. Specifically, it is a take inspired by mid-century American academe's desire for the affirmation of a humanist culture. In this respect, it is not a coincidence that Levin, when sneering at Shapiro's In Defence of Ignorance, blights the latter in particular for his "patricidal attacks ... against modernism in general and Mr. Eliot in particular"

(Levin, 276). It is Eliot who had inspired the dominant academic approach or methodology to literature in the United States from, roughly speaking, the thirties through the sixties: the New Criticism. Levin's article resounds with one of the favourite catchwords of the New Criticism: unity, in structure, but also, and perhaps even more so, in underlying world vision. The prose writer who comes in for highest praise is Joyce, who, Levin says, in his Ulysses was "trying to rehumanize his characters" in the face of the "dehumanization of art" rampant at the time (Levin, 288). To this end, Joyce employed what Eliot famously termed the "mythic method". Eliot, of course, equally famously did the same in what often is seen as the Bible of Anglo-American Modernism: *The Waste Land*. For Levin, "in that least heroic and most fragmentary of epics, [Eliot] exorcized the blight of contemporaneous London by tracing through it the outline of a quest for the Holy Grail" (Levin, 290-91). With Picasso and Stravinsky, Eliot also stands as Levin's quintessential Modernist. In other words, what Levin sees Eliot as doing in *The Waste Land*, he also sees Picasso as doing in painting, and Stravinsky in music – to borrow Eliot's own famous words, they all build "fragments" against their "ruins", the ruins of their inner unitary self, as detailed by contemporary psychology, and of their civilisation, as evidenced in the decade leading up to, and the outbreak and aftermath of, World War I. ››

Eliot, when envisaging the unity he sees lost in his own times, turns not only to myth, but also to authors that, in their works, for him encompass earlier moments of unity: Virgil, Dante, Shakespeare. He deliberately opposes the fragments he salvages from these "high" literary writers to the vulgarity of early twentieth-century popular culture, in both its material and aesthetic manifestations, thereby underwriting the elitist claims of the later New Criticism which, even if it started from the avowed ambition to make literature accessible to the student masses it set out to educate, did so with the express purpose of raising them to a true appreciation of "high" literature. These same elitist claims,

not just in the literary but likewise in the political and social realm, were shared by many authors– if not all, Joyce and William Carlos Williams being two notable exceptions – eventually labelled Modernists, leading some of them into dangerous political waters in the period between the two World Wars.

In short, the civilisation Eliot, and Modernism in the image fashioned after Eliot by the New Criticism and American academe of the mid-twentieth century, and as codified in Levin's 1960 essay, hanker after is "high" European to the core: white, male, and upper- or at least upper middle-class. Modernism so defined
296>297
embodies the "high humanist" values that segment of the American population hitherto dominant considered peculiarly its own, and which it sought to instil also in other segments – social, racial, gender – pushing up, specifically through programmes of liberal arts education based on the methods of critical analysis and literature teaching associated with New Criticism, and the concomitant literary canon. By the same token, all European art supposedly not subscribing to these same high humanist ideals – and in particular the more "radical" avant-garde movements linked to the political Left – was kept outside the pale of "Modernism". This Modernism, then, re-grouping under one summary heading authors of the first half of the twentieth century that did not consider themselves part of any specific movement or group, yet are branded "the best" of their generation, selectively refashions early twentieth-century European literature to make it fit a specifically American purpose answering to the ideology of the early decades of the Cold War.

Perhaps not surprisingly, it is also this Modernism that as of the 1960s will serve as foil to the then emerging theorizations of postmodernism. Indeed, the very possibility of a "post"-modernism is predicated upon the existence of this construct "modernism", as the former defines itself as the very breach of everything the latter supposedly upheld. The remarkable thing, however, is how this in essence American conception of "Modernism" increasingly also seems to have come to dominate

the way we Europeans look upon our own literary past. The reasons, I think, have to do with the relative strength of American scholarship as compared to its European counterpart. At heart, the issue is very simple: American scholarship carries the day because of the language it uses and the size of the market it commands. The issue of language is banal, but crucial. English is not only the language of everyday communication in the U.S., the U.K. and much of the latter's former colonies. It is also the major language of science and scholarship, the global medium for disseminating as well as legitimising knowledge. Given the extent of its own internal educational market and the foreign markets it has access to through its use of English, and given the concomitant size of its publishing industry, American scholarship sets the norm for what goes on also in the rest of the world. American journals and American publishing houses in effect function as clearing-houses, but also as filters, for most of what passes for international scholarship – also in literature, also in Europe, where much, if not most, scholars increasingly know the work of their colleagues in other European countries only through English, most often American, translations. There is also the role of the anthology to consider, and of the reader in secondary materials. The market for both is likewise dominated by American publishers, or by British publishers catering to the American college crowd, also when it comes to European literatures, whether it be "English" literature, or any brand of "World" literature comprising samples from "European" literature. The influence of such anthologies will only grow as Europe, in an attempt to go "continental" also culturally, will start looking for teaching aids able to close the linguistic gaps separating its many peoples. Most likely, it will find only, or at least most readily, English-language, in practice American-produced or American-oriented, material to draw upon!

It is easy to see, then, how American ideas of literature come to prevail worldwide, and also in Europe. For older periods this is not so vital, as there are no specific "national" reasons why

American scholars might want to push concepts specifically subservient to American ideologies. For the twentieth century, however, matters are different, as I have tried to argue above. Specifically, the introduction of the originally American concepts of Modernism and postmodernism in the various national European literatures leads to the valorising of specific authors, works, or interpretations At its most extreme, this may result in a wholesale reshuffle of (some) national European literature canons. At its mildest, it invites the harmonization of the various national European literatures under common terminological umbrellas. As

these umbrellas answer to a specifically American agenda, however, this has the result of covertly bringing the study of modern European literature(s) in line with American values, or at least lines of reasoning based upon American values, whether the breach or the observance of them. To put it crudely, all of modern European literature thus becomes in a sense "American" literature.

Surely it cannot be the aim of European unification to fuel the "Americanization" of its recent literary past. Therefore, it seems fit to call upon European scholars to critically re-consider the moves they have made over the last half-century or so, to ask themselves whether the time has not come to look at European literature again with European eyes, unclouded by the veil of American theories, terms and concepts. This is not to be considered as a plea for a return to the exclusive study of national literatures from a narrowly national point of view. On the contrary, just as the study of national literatures both originated in and contributed to the growth of national identities from the era of Romanticism onward, so I believe that what our present moment calls for is the study of a "European" literature transcending both old state borders and linguistic demarcation lines. I would only hope that while doing so we do not unwittingly submit to what is in essence a paradigm inspired by another nation's continuing struggle to define its own identity. If my own present contribution helps in avoiding this pitfall, or at least drawing your attention to its existence, I will be more than satisfied. <<

WORKS CITED

Adam, Ian and Helen Tiffin (eds.) (1991), *Past the Last Post: Theorizing Post-Colonialism and Post-Modernism*, London, Harvester/Wheatsheaf.

Baudrillard, Jean (1993), "The Precession of Simulacra", *in* Natoli and Hutcheon 1993, 342-75 [1983].

Bertens, Hans (1986), "The Postmodern Weltanschauung and its Relation with Modernism: An Introductory Survey", *in* Fokkema and Bertens 1986, 9-51.

– – (1995), *The Idea of the Postmodern: A History*, London and New York, Routledge.

Bertens, Hans and Douwe Fokkema (1997), *International Postmodernism: Theory and Literary Practice*, A Comparative History of Literatures in European Languages, Amsterdam and Philadelphia, John Benjamins.

Bowra, Maurice (1943), *The Heritage of Symbolism*, London, Macmillan.

Bowra, Maurice (1967), *The Creative Experiment*, London, Macmillan [1949].

Bradbury, Malcolm and James McFarlane (eds.) (1976), *Modernism, 1890-1930*, Harmondsworth, Penguin.

Brooker, Peter, (ed.) (1992), *Modernism/Postmodernism*, London, Longman [1980].

Butler, Christopher (1994), *Early Modernism: Literature, Music and Painting in Europe 1900-1916*, London and New York, Oxford University Press.

Calinescu, Matei and Douwe Fokkema (eds.) (1987), *Exploring Postmodernism*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia, John Benjamins.

Chase, Richard (1957), *The American Novel and Its Tradition*, New York, Anchor Books.

Clark, Robert and Piero Boitani (eds.) (1993), *English Studies in Transition: Papers from the ESSE Inaugural Conference*, London and New York, Routledge.

D'haen, Theo (1993a), "Bruges Group or Common Market? Realism, Postmodernism and Postwar British Fiction", *in* Clark and Boitani 1993, 84-96.
– – (1993b), "Irish Regionalism, Postmodernism and Magic Realism", in D'haen and Bertens 1993, 33-46.
– – (1994), "Countering Postmodernism", in REAL (Yearbook of Research in English and American Literature) 10, Tübingen, Gunter Narr Verlag, 49-64.
– – (1995), "Magic Realism and Postmodernism: Decentering Privileged Centers", *in* Zamora and Faris 1995, 191-208.
– – (1997a), " 'History', Postcolonialism, and Postmodernism", *European Journal of English Studies* 1.2, 205-16.
– – (1997b), "Postmodernisms: From Fantastic to Magic Realist", in Bertens and Fokkema 1997, 283-93.
– – (1999), " 'Post-colonial' Literature and Postmodern Literary Historiography", in *Neohelicon* 26.2, 19-29.

D'haen, Theo and Hans Bertens (eds.) (1988), *Postmodern Fiction in Europe and the Americas*, Postmodern Studies 1, Amsterdam and Atlanta, Rodopi.
– – (1993), *British Postmodern Fiction*, Postmodern Studies 7, Amsterdam and Atlanta, Rodopi.
– – (1997), *'Closing the Gap': American Postmodern Fiction in Germany, Italy, Spain, and the Netherlands*, Postmodern Studies 20, Amsterdam and Atlanta, Rodopi.

Faulkner, Peter (1977), *Modernism*, London/ Methuen.

Feidelson, Charles (1953), *Symbolism and American Literature*, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.

Fiedler, Leslie A. (1967), *Love and Death in the American Novel*, London, Jonathan Cape [1960].

Fokkema, Douwe (1984), *Literary History, Modernism, and Postmodernism*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia, John Benjamins.
– – (1986), "The Semantic and Syntactic Organization of Postmodernist Texts", in Fokkema and Bertens 1986, 81-98.

Fokkema, Douwe and Hans Bertens (eds.) (1986), *Approaching Postmodernism*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia, John Benjamins.

Garvin, Harry R. (1980), *Bucknell Review: Romanticism, Modernism, Postmodernism*, Lewisburg, Pa., Bucknell University Press.

Habermas, Jürgen (1990a), "Modernity's Consciousness of Time and Its Need for Self-Reassurance", in *Habermas* 1990, 1-22. [1985].
– – (1990b), *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*, Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press.
– – (1992), "Modernity – An Incomplete Project", in Brooker 1992, 125-38 [1980].

Hassan, Ihab (1982), *The Dismemberment of Orpheus: Toward a Postmodern Literature*, New York, Oxford Univerity Press [1971].
– – (1975), *Paracriticisms: Seven Speculations of the Times*, Urbana, University of Illinois Press.
– – (1980a), *The Right Promethean Fire: Imagination, Science, and Cultural Change*, Urbana, University of Illinois Press.
– – (1980b), "The Question of Postmodernism", in Garvin 1980, 117-26.
– – (1987), *The Postmodern Turn: Essays in Postmodern Theory and Culture*, Ohio State University Press.

Howe, Irving (1959), "Mass Society and Post-Modern Fiction", in *Partisan Review* 26, 420-36.

Hutcheon, Linda (1988a), *A Poetics of Postmodernism: History, Theory, Fiction*, New York and London, Routledge.
– – (1988b), *The Canadian Postmodern*, Toronto, Oxford University Press.
– – (1989), *The Politics of Postmodernism*, London and New York, Routledge.
– – (1991a), "Discourse, Power, Ideology: Humanism and Postmodernism", in Smyth 1991.
– – (1991b), "Circling the Downspout of Empire", in Adam and Tiffin 1991, 167-89.

Jameson, Fredric (1984), "Postmodernism, Or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism", *New Left Review* 146 (July-August 1984): 59-92; also in Jameson 1991, 1-54.
– – (1991), *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*, Durham, NC, Duke University Press.

JanMohamed, Abdul R. and Lloyd, David (eds.) (1990), *The Nature and Context of Minority Discourse*, New York and Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Jefferson, Ann (1980), *The Nouveau Roman and the Poetics of Fiction*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Jencks, Charles (1977), *The Language of Post-Modern Architecture*, New York, Rizzoli.
——(1986), *What is Post-Modernism?*, London, Academy Editions.

Jencks, Charles (ed.) (1992), *The Post-Modern Reader*, London, Academy editions.

Kenner, Hugh (1971), *The Pound Era*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press.

Kunne, Andrea (1991), *Heimat im Roman: Last oder Lust? Transformationen eines Genres in der österreichischen Nachkriegsliteratur*, Amsterdam and Atlanta, Rodopi.

Levenson, Michael (1984), *A Genealogy of Modernism: A Study of English Literary Doctrine*, 1908-1922, New York, Cambridge University Press.

Levin, Harry (1966), "What Was Modernism?", *in Refractions: Essays in Comparative Literature*, New York, Oxford University Press.

Lewis, R.W.B. (1955), *The American Adam: Innocence, Tragedy, and Tradition in the Nineteenth Century*, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.

Lodge, David (1977), *The Modes of Modern Writing: Metaphor, Metonymy, and the Typology of Modern Literature*, London, Arnold.

Longenbach, James (1987), *Modernist Poetics of History: Pound, Eliot, and the Sense of the Past*, Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press.
——(1988), *Stone Cottage: Pound, Yeats & Modernism*, New York and Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Lyotard, Jean-François (1993), "Excerpts from The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge", in Natoli and Hutcheon 1993, 71-90.
——(1979), *La condition postmoderne*, Paris, Minuit.

McHale, Brian (1982), "Writing about Postmodern Writing", in *Poetics Today* 3, 2 (Summer 1982), 211-27.
——(1987), *Postmodernist Fiction*, New York and London, Methuen.
——(1992), *Constructing Postmodernism*, New York and London, Routledge.

Marx, Leo (1964), *The Machine in the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America*, New York, Oxford University Press.

Menand, Louis (1987), *Discovering Modernism: T.S. Eliot and his Context*, New York and Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Miller, Perry (1956), *Errand into the Wilderness*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.

Miller, Tyrus (1999), *Late Modernism: Politics, Fiction, and the Arts Between the World Wars*, Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, University of California Press.

Natoli, Joseph and Linda Hutcheon (eds.) (1993), *A Postmodern Reader*, Albany, State University of New York Press.

Nelson, Cary, and Lawrence Grossberg (eds.) (1988), *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, Basingstoke, Macmillan.

Neubauer, Paul (1991), *Die rezeption der US-amerikanischen Literatur der Postmoderne im deutschsprachigen Raum*, Frankfurt, Peter Lang.
– – (1997), "The Academic Reception of Postmodern American Literature in Germany", *in* D'haen and Bertens 1997, 69-147.

Nicholls, Peter (1995), *Modernism: A Literary Guide*, London, Macmillan.

Pease, Donald (1994), *National Identities and Post-Americanist Narratives*, Durham and London, Duke University Press.

Quinones, Ricardo (1985), *Mapping Literary Modernism: Time and Development*, Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press.

Rainey, Lawrence (1998), *Institutions of Modernism: Literary Elites & Public Culture*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press.

Sangari, Kumkum (1990), "The Politics of the Possible", in JanMohamed and Lloyd 1990, 216-45.

Schoots, Fieke (1997), "Passer en douce à la douane": *L'Écriture minimaliste de Minuit*, Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi.

Slemon, Stephen (1991), "Modernism's Last Post", in Adam and Tiffin 1991, 1-11.

Smith, Henry Nash (1950), *Virgin Land: The American West as Symbol and Myth*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Smith, Stan (1994), *The Origins of Modernism: Eliot, Pound, Yeats and the Rhetorics of Renewal*. New York, Londen, etc., Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Smyth, Edmund J. (1991), *Postmodernism and Contemporary Fiction*, London, Batsford.

Spivak, Gayatri C. 1987. *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics*. New York: Methuen.
– – (1990), *The Post-Colonial Critic: Interviews, Strategies, Dialogues*. Edited by Sarah Harasym. London, Routledge.
– – (1993) [1988], "Can the Subaltern Speak", in Williams and Chrisman 1993, 66-111; originally *in* Nelson and Grossberg, 1988, 271-313.

Surette, Leon (1993), *The Birth of Modernism: Ezra Pound, T.S. Eliot, W.B. Yeats and the Occult*, Montreal and Kingston, McGill-Queen's University Press.

Vervaeck, Bart (1999), *Het postmodernisme in de Nederlandse en Vlaamse roman*, Brussel; VUB Press & Vantilt.

Zamora, Lois Parkinson and Wendy B. Faris (eds.) (1995), *Magical Realism: Theory, History, Community*, Durham and London, Duke University Press.