

Modernism and Gender Trouble

Juan Antonio Suárez
Dpto. de Filología Inglesa
Universidad de Murcia
Murcia - 30071

ABSTRACT

This essay provides a historical and theoretical frame for the more specific inquiries that follow. It examines the gender ascription of modern art and culture and contextualizes such gender ascription in relation to the emergence of gender and sexuality as crucial features in the definition of individual and collective identities in modernity. At a later moment, it situates the study of modernist textuality within this historical and conceptual framework and outlines recent developments in modernist gender studies. It proposes throughout that contextual awareness in the study of literary modernism demands a revision of traditional notions of the modern and of its relations with the postmodern.

KEY WORDS: Modernism, modernity, textuality, sexuality, gender studies.

RESUMEN

Este artículo busca establecer un marco histórico y teórico para las investigaciones más específicas que le siguen. En primer lugar se exploran las estrategias de adscripción de género en la literatura y cultura modernistas y relaciona estas estrategias con la emergencia del género y la sexualidad como factores definidores de la identidad individual y social a lo largo de la modernidad. En una segunda parte se ofrece una discusión metateórica de los estudios de la textualidad modernista y se describen y evalúan las tendencias más recientes en el estudio del modernismo literario. Por último se muestra que el estudio de la textualidad modernista en relación con el género hace necesaria la revisión de nociones tradicionales del modernismo y de sus relaciones con la postmodernidad.

PALABRAS CLAVE: modernismo, modernidad, textualidad, sexualidad, estudios de género.

I. MODERNITY AND MODERNISM: CULTURAL WORK AND CULTURAL MEANING

The take on the modern announced by the title of this essay presupposes a fairly recent turn within studies on modernism -and within literary and cultural studies at large- toward analysis of the gender-filiation and gender-structuring of cultural production. Schematically speaking, this perspective can be seen as a "fourth wave" of writing and thinking about modernism, a wave which has succeeded earlier political (Lukács 1979, Benjamin 1982, Adorno 1982, Brecht 1979), humanist (Sartre 1971, Trilling 1979, Rhav and Phillips 1937), and formalist (Wellek and Warren 1956, Genette 1980) assessments while subsuming some of their reading and interpreting strategies.¹ That this particular approach has taken long to emerge indicates that there is nothing "natural" or unmediated about it. We will not then try to present it as the most conclusive critical view on the modern, but as one that, in our historical juncture (for some, an a-historical, homogeneous post-modernity; for others a highly history-minded and contestedly multicultural one) appears particularly yielding to the stresses and interests we bring to bear on literary and cultural texts.

As was the case with previous views of the culture of modernity, gender criticism required certain conditions, both intra- and extra-academic, to become a legitimate pursuit. Crucial in this respect have been the forceful presence of women studies within the academy since the early 1970s and the more recent development of ethnic and minority studies. The growing presence of these discourses in universities and scholarly forums has been motivated by the political

1. The political value of modernism was object of heated debate in Weimar Germany. It pitted Georg Lukács, defender of realism, against Theodor Adorno, Ernst Bloch, Walter Benjamin, and Bertolt Brecht, defenders of the progressive imposition of new forms. The essential texts of these debates are in Ronald Taylor (ed.) *Aesthetics and Politics*. In the 1930s and 1940s American critics Philip Rhav, William Phillips, and Lionel Trilling, together with others associated to the journal *Partisan Review*, defended modernist art and writing as only realm of transcendence and critique in an unauthentic society devoid of political and cultural alternatives to accommodating bourgeois liberalism. From a perspective evocative of Lukács's theses, French philosopher Jean-Paul Sartre rebuked modernism in a series of essays written in the 1940s and proclaimed engaged realism as the soundest political and existential alternative at the time. Formal explorations of modern textuality focused on matters of structure and technique; their theoretical armature was most often provided by structuralism and New Criticism. For an example of structuralist analysis of a central modernist text see Gerard Genette's extended discussion of Marcel Proust's *Remembrance of Things Past* in *Narrative Discourse*; for a New Criticism approach, see, for example Rene Wellek's "Henry James's Literary Theory and Criticism," *American Literature* XXX (November 1958): 293-321; and Wellek and Warren's "The Nature and Modes of Narrative Fiction," in their *Theory of Literature*.

urgency accruing to race and gender in the last twenty years or so, a time characterized in the West by a schizophrenic split between conservative institutional politics and circumscribed but polarized grassroots activism (Gilroy 1989: 223-47). With their differing methodologies and agendas, feminist and minority perspectives practice a symptomatic approach to textuality. They examine cultural production in terms of its complicitness with Eurocentric, racist, patriarchal, or heterosexist ideologies and, at the same time, they aim to discover alternative forms of sociality, agency, and desire. These biases have brought about a renewed political impetus in scholarship and have prompted, in turn, a critical, not merely taxonomical or descriptive, study of culture.

While the juxtaposition of "gender trouble" and "modernism" is the product of contingent historical conditions, it is undeniable that the two concepts are singularly akin, mutually implicated. For one, they both combine a certain conceptual breadth with considerable cultural and rhetorical force. The choice of the phrase "gender trouble" for the title of this piece is directly indebted to Judith Butler's recent conceptualization of gender as troublesome and performative, inimical to conceptual closure and clear-cut definition (1990 *passim*). Yet we have tried to project her suggestive phrase beyond this theoretical context and into the historical arena of modernity in the West (particularly the English-speaking West), where many of our current ideas of gender, sexuality, subjectivity, and sociality initially took shape.

The concepts "modernity" and "modernism" have much larger historical and conceptual scope than "gender trouble." The meaning of "modernity" as the historical stage inaugurated by the discovery of the New World, the Reformation, and the Renaissance crystallized around the 1800s (Habermas 1987: 5-7). As is well known, this stage was characterized by the spread of instrumental rationality, centralized state powers, the advance of capitalism, and by the progressive dissolution of religious and traditional worldviews--what Max Weber called *Entzauberung der Welt*. It is worth noting that even this, seemingly most commonsensical, use of modernity has been hotly contested. For some modernity cannot be unproblematically equated with rationalization, as, during the period of the Enlightenment, traditional beliefs, together with religious and superstitious practices, persisted across all social orders (Corbin 1990). For this reason, some radical historians of science such as Bruno Latour (1990) argue that modernity as a wholesale project of transformation driven by rationality never actually took place--all we actually had were flashes of reason streaked with distinctly non-modern procedures and practices and only in retrospect can we assume a sweeping, uniform surge of enlightenment. In a more contemporary use, "modernity" often refers to the cluster of social, historical and cultural developments stretching from the late nineteenth century to the late 1920s. These

developments include the second industrial revolution, the growth of Western metropolitan centers, the **emergence** of consumer culture, imperialism, the consolidation of modern European states, and the different waves of experimental art--from symbolism, to futurism, to dada, to surrealism--that swept the cultural horizon at the time. This conception of modernity fuses the cultural and historical meanings of the term, two uses that, according to Matei Calinescu, first split off a holistic notion of the modern in the early nineteenth-century and were subsequently differentiated by the twin concepts of modernism and modernity (1987: 41-42).

This terminological distinction between socio-historical and cultural-aesthetic spheres, however, **does** not help tame the multiplication of often incommensurable and contradictory meanings attached to modernity and modernism by generation after generation of writers and critics. For example, for poet Charles Baudelaire the modern was characterized by its responsiveness to the present, its attempt to capture what he called "the intermittent heroism of everyday life"--fleeting lyrical moments and shocking juxtapositions purveyed by the heterogeneous life of contemporary cities (1955: 147-49). More than a century later, German theorist Peter Bürger described modernism in almost opposite terms as the consolidation of the institution of art as a realm of praxis separate from the quotidian (1984: 20-27, 35-54). Contradicting the present-day orientation of most theorizing on the modern, other critics **have** regarded modernity and modernism as transhistorical categories. Hence in his lecture "The Modern Element in Literature", first delivered in 1857, Matthew Arnold defined as "modern" those societies where material well-being propitiated the exercise of independent reason in the attainment of goodness, **truth**, and beauty; and "modern literature" as that capable of depicting civic modernity in its "completest and most harmonious" fashion. These qualities Arnold found more easily in Greek Antiquity than in any subsequent historical period, including his contemporary England. Paul de Man, in turn, explained modernity as "one of the concepts by which the distinctive nature of literature can be revealed in **all** its intricacy," regardless of historical context. (1983: 161) It consisted in the impossible yet ever-renewed attempts to escape history and tradition, and to capture and convey presentness and "**immediacy**." While these aspirations seemed more urgent in the late nineteenth century, they also informed much post-Renaissance literary production. The conceptual instabilities of the pair "modernity/modernism" that these examples illustrate is further aggravated when trying to **ascertain** the attitude--affirmative or critical--of cultural modernism towards modernity, to synthesize the precise meanings and periodizations of these terms in other realms of inquiry (such as philosophy, sociology, or anthropology), to differentiate modernism from the

avant-garde, or to define the relationship of modernism to the postmodern--an equally conflictive and polysemous label.²

This schematic review of notions of modernity and modernism is not done as a preamble to adjudicating among the terms of this conceptual tangle, but in order to call attention to the unsteady terrain we tread on. Modernity and modernism are changing, multi-faceted notions, as are the wealth of their manifestations and the plurality of perspectives, investments, and interpretive tools routinely imported into their analysis. In this essay, as in the rest of the issue, modernity will refer to the period starting roughly around the 1880s, when some historians date the beginning of the second industrial revolution, and stretching into the social and economic crises of the late 1920s. At this time, incidentally, experimentalism in the arts started to be superseded by a left-inspired social realism and the first wholesale assessments of the modern movement were drawn--usually under pressure from the polarized politics of the time. In turn, modernism will designate, in our use, the cultural epiphenomena of modernity, which include both the experimental culture of the period as well as non-experimental manifestations such as mass and consumer culture, kitsch, and late naturalism.

Thus the goal of the present article is not so much to establish a clear-cut definition of modernity and modernism, but to trace the cultural work they perform, that is, the forces and imagery they mobilize; the value systems, ideologies, and behaviors they encourage, particularly in relation to gender. The impulse behind this bid is the awareness that the specific cultural valences and rhetorical force of a concept may have nothing to do with (may in fact be inversely proportional to) its univocalness and coherence (Sedgwick 1990: 18-22, Žižek 1989: *passim*). Or, to put it in a different fashion, mobile, unstable concepts which lend themselves to multiple readings and inflections are often the ones that circulate most widely and fulfil the most complex cultural functions. This inquiry is then concerned not with what modernism and modernity are but rather with how *they* work in the culture, particularly as they brush against contemporary conceptions of gender. Such exploration (perforce general and schematic) is proffered here in the hope that it will provide some sort of historical and theoretical frame for the more specific essays enclosed.

2. For good overviews of the meanings and uses of these terms, see, for example, Calinescu (1987: 265-312), Huyssen (1986: 179-221), Harper (1992: 3-29), Harvey (1989: *passim*, esp. 39-118).

II. GENDERING THE MODERN

Unlike earlier periods and movements, modernity and modernism were from the start insistently identified in terms of **gender**. This is most noticeable in the explicit gender ascriptions of many key traits and developments of modernity: scientific rationality, instrumental reason, the public sphere, and corporate capitalism were, for the most **part**, provinces of male activity. And equally masculine **have been** emblematic modern social and cultural types: the *flaneur*, the man of the crowd, the dandy, the aestheticist, the avant-garde debunker. These developments and types constitute the public side of Western modernity, a **side** which has relegated (and still continues to do so) women and disenfranchised minorities to the **private** realms of the home and interpersonal relations, and to the margins of sociality and visibility.

An analogous **erasure** of femininity took place in aesthetic and cultural terrains. The modern ethos of technological rationality had its artistic counterpart in a cult of functionalism, of the machine form, and of the artist-as-engineer that swept through the arts in the early decades of the century. This vogue, which rejected **all** forms of ornamentation and decorativism, was emphatically encoded as male by its earliest and most **influential** theorist. Viennese architect Alfred Loos. The central thesis of his manifesto-like "Ornament and Crime" (first published in 1908) defended that "the evolution of culture marches with the elimination of ornament from useful objects." (1970: 32) Ornamentation was **primitive** and atavistic, hence Loos had not trouble associating it with women and archaic cultures; its **persistence** in the contemporary world threatened to dam up the flow of history and led to degeneration and crime. Loos's doctrines informed various artistic movements such as Russian constructivism, Bauhaus, De Stijl, and purism. In these, however, Loos's Eurocentrism and misogyny were often toned down, and the machine aesthetic was defended instead on (pseudo-)scientific and socio-political grounds. Loos's uneasy rapport with femininity foreshadowed the gender politics of much dadaist and futurist work, where body parts and sexual couplings were represented as cogs, wheels, camshafts, and well-greased engines. Particularly famous in this connection are Francis Picabia's mechanical **portraits**, Man Ray's objects and photographs, and Marcel Duchamp's ready-mades, paintings, and assemblages (such as *The Bride Laid Bare by Her Bachelors, Even*). While these can be read as parodies of traditional gender roles and relations, they also evidence an **anxious desire** to evacuate the messiness of the flesh and of sexual--particularly female--difference. (Penley 1989: 57-80) In literature, new aesthetic forms were similarly gendered. T. E. Hulme's and Ezra Pound's Imagism, for example, expressly opposed what they regarded as Romantic emotionalism and Symbolist "softness" and championed a poetry of

"hard," concrete images which grappled directly with the objectual world. Pound's emphatic advocacy of these principles often modulated into a defense of modern writing as essentially masculine ("hard", spare, precise) against "feminized" (soft, vague, sentimental) nineteenth-century aesthetics. (Burke 1987: 103-06) His rejection of (what he saw as) "femininity" partly underlay his repudiation of the Imagist poets ("Amygists", as he called them) who had strayed from his strict poetic precepts and later regrouped under Amy Lowell's leadership.

While these social and cultural developments contributed to masculinize the image of modernity and its culture, it is important to note that the modern was also insistently feminized, most often by detractors who viewed it as a stage of cultural and physical decay. Ideas about modernity as degeneration were roughly contemporary the discourses of scientific racism, amply deployed to legitimate the horrors of colonialism by "proving" the intellectual and physiological superiority of the Western white races. One of the first widely read works on contemporary "degenerescence" was B. A. Morel's *Traité des dégénérescences physiques, intellectuelles, et morales de l'espece humaine*, first published in Paris in 1857, translated into several languages soon after, and reedited several times before the end of the century. It was quickly followed by a spate of similar texts, including Cesare Lombroso's extremely popular treatises *The Female Offender* and *Criminal Man* (first English editions 1895 and 1911, respectively). (Pick 1989: 24-28) Basing their arguments on physiological studies, these treatises sought to expose the steady decay of the West, a decline precipitated by the forces unleashed by industrialized modernity -pollution, speed, noise, urban overcrowding, routinized work- by the progressive loss of touch with nature and, in the case of the members of the growing managerial and clerical classes, by lack of physical exertion. The most influential formulation of these ideas was Max Nordau's *Degeneration* (first published in English in 1895), a relentlessly pessimistic work which spotted in late-Victorian cultural manifestations -from naturalism, decadentism, and neo-mysticism. to the "morbid" aestheticism of Verlaine, Swinburne, and Mallarmé, not to mention the oversentimental women's domestic fiction and melodrama- widespread evidence of racial decay. This condition was invariably described as loss of virility and vigor, or what is the same, as downright feminization. As they degenerated, women became "even more" enfeebled and fragile; men lost physical prowess and turned hysterical, morbid, and neurasthenic -a symptomatology powerfully associated with femininity. (Chamberlain and Gilman 1985: 45-48)

Prescriptions against this state of things passed through the re-masculinization of the culture, and were frequently directed towards middle-class men. Some of these regenerative attempts were the popular back-to-nature

movements, from Boy Scouts to youth groups and camping associations, and the vogue of (male) body-building and physical culture -whose most vocal guru in turn-of-the-century America was Bernarr Macfadden, editor of the best-selling magazine *Physical Culture* and author of such titles as *Superb Virility of Manhood: Giving the Causes and Simple Home Methods of Curing the Weaknesses of Men* (1904). (Rotundo 1993: 236-248; Jackson-Lears 1994: 47-60) Obviously linked to the recovery of lost realms of nature and physicality was the vogue of adventure literature (by Zane Grey, Jack London, and Jules Verne, among others), which granted enervated city-dwellers vicarious enjoyment of the manly life of the wilderness. It is then no coincidence that, in the United States, for example, the life of the frontier becomes romanticized in popular culture precisely in the wake of its disappearance under the advance of industrialism and urbanization (Nash Smith 1978: 80-92). And, in the light of the preceding, it is hardly surprising that this imaginary life of romance and adventure was predominantly a theater of male self-affirmation.

Such masculine reassertions, however, could not simply revert to an untainted, prelapsarian maleness. Theories of degeneration highlighted the ever-present and disturbing possibility of a scandalous gap between "biological" and "social" gender -this latter defined by individual behavior, style, and history. Hence, despite their undeniable biological maleness, some modern men often swooned, overdressed, overperfumed, never engaged in manual toil, and were prey to all sorts of nervous prostrations. This possibility had the effect of denaturalizing masculinity, which, far from a given, became a detachable trait that had to be produced, put on -like make-up or drag. With the specter of the unmanly man haunting the culture, the excessive physiques of Macfadden's body-builders or the broad swagger of the frontiersmen could not be regarded as "natural" and inevitable incarnations of biological maleness. They appeared tinged by a slight anxiety about their reality. Since they were the product of careful cultivation, the masculine avowal they enacted unwittingly partook of the cosmetic and ornamental.

The insistence with which gender is bandied about in these cultural manifestations is symptomatic of what philosopher Michel Foucault has viewed as a distinctively modern development: the emergence of gender, gender-related behavior, and sexuality as crucial features in the definition of collective and individual identity. Foucault considered this emergence contemporary with the consolidation of the bourgeoisie as hegemonic class during the late eighteenth-century and the first half of the nineteenth century. According to his influential formulation, health, sexuality, and gender behavior became important means of class differentiation during the bourgeois era. While in former times the aristocracy had based its claims to superiority on its blood -the "antiquity of its

ancestry"- the bourgeoisie did so through an optimization of its body and its sex. (Foucault 1978: 122-27) As Ed Cohen, following Foucault, has recently observed, the bonus placed on health served to legitimate and reproduce privilege as "naturally" emanating from well-functioning organisms. (1993: 18) Health and sexuality appeared full of consequences not only for the present well-being of the bourgeoisie, but also for its future propagation and survival. In this regime, the bodies which were to bear the signs of class privilege, and therefore the ones most intensely policed for normality, were male bodies. Manliness was to become a central factor in middle-class claims to social and cultural leadership. In turn middle-class belonging was evidenced through the standards of property and propriety -self-discipline, physical hardiness, and restrained, reproductive sexual behavior. (Cohen 1993: 19-26) Hence the good bourgeois was encouraged to manage with the same wisdom and care his cash and his spermatic flows. In this connection, historian G. J. Barker-Benfield has coined the term "spermatic economy" to explain the "functional equivalent between the financial and the somatic economies: the body, like the society generally, was defined as a closed system with limited energies and resources that could be put into circulation." (1978: 379) From this perspective, luxury and profligacy were commonly aligned with women and with people of questionable sexualities -feminized dandies such as Oscar Wilde's Dorian Gray or Joris-Karl Huysmans's Des Esseintes. At the same time, lack of material success was traced to sexual pathology, what had the effect of naturalizing social inequality. For many contemporary reform and philanthropical movements, from settlement houses to the Salvation Army, the destitution of the urban working classes was somehow a natural result of their promiscuity, proneness to vice, and general lack of self-restraint, rather than of economic oppression and historical dispossession. Social change thus required moral education -i.e., Bible schooling and prohibition- rather than redistribution of economic resources.³

If sexuality was more and more a signifier of proper social insertion, it

3. This view of the working classes as (and as having) an excessive body is ever-present in late nineteenth century culture, spilling into our century. It informs much writing and politics regarding "the immigrant question" in the United States. In England, even generally civil critics like Matthew Arnold bristle with indignation at what they take as examples of working class brutality and anarchy -i.e., the Hyde Park Riots of 1866: "The rough [working-class individual] has not yet quite found his groove and settled down to his work, so he is just asserting his personal liberty a little, going where he likes, assembling where he likes, bawling as he likes, hustling as he likes." (Arnold 1988: 80-81). In a interesting case of somatic reinscription, the working class and Irish "threats" were occasionally represented in late nineteenth-century cartoons and political journalism in Britain as Frankenstein's monsters--that is, as abject, excessive, unnatural, uncontrollable bodies haunting the security of "the nation", which presumably didn't include them (Brantlinger and Boyle 1987).

was also progressively turned into a key to individual identity, the realm where the truth about the subject seemed to reside. This can be seen as a consequence of the increasing individualization of culture, a development historians have related to the widespread dissolution of traditional communities -whether religious, geographical, or familial- and to the uncertainty and tenuousness of new ones based on property or social status (particularly in the crisis-ridden last quarter of the nineteenth century). As traditional markers of collective identity were erased in new industrial living and working environments, individuality and personal authenticity seemed relegated to the private realm. One of the most perceptive theorists of these changes was German sociologist Georg Simmel. He observed in relation to modern metropolitan life that the impersonality of the city environment "tended to displace personal colorations and incomparabilities." Yet this displacement also prompted the individual to summon "the utmost in uniqueness and particularization in order to preserve his most personal core." (1971: 422) For Simmel, this was preserved in one's personal style, relations, and in the cultivation of private peculiarities. And although the German thinker did not go this far himself, sexuality appears in this context as an obvious stage for the exercise of one's lifestyle choices -indeed, as one of the latest shelters of individuality in modernity.

Whether signifier of class identities or last refuge of individuality, sexuality becomes charged with a "general and highly diffuse causality." (Foucault 1978: 65) Specific sexual behaviors became indexes of defective physiology, social maladjustment, or insanity and it was therefore imperative to police them. Sexuality became the focus of a whole array of technologies of observation, measurement, tabulation, and interpretation whose ultimate goal was to ensure optimal functioning, in a sort of capilar penetration of scientific management and police surveillance into the remotest recesses of desire, feeling, and pleasure. This was the function of a growing *scientia sexualis*, whose goal was not necessarily to repress sexual behaviors, but to let them speak, to observe them, discriminate between them, put them into discourse, and ultimately control and confine them. (Foucault 1978: 127-39) And because, according to Foucault, power and knowledge are implacably intertwined -with all developments in knowledge multiplying the surfaces, conditions, and variables to be managed by the panoptic eye of power- a measure of social control was at stake even when the overt purpose of particular sexual discourses was therapeutic and liberating, as was the case with psychoanalysis.

It would be one-sided, however, to see sexuality exclusively as an arena of surveillance, normalization, and control. Once made the seat of individual and social identity, it could also function as a ground on which to build up social and political claims in the name of these identities. It may not be accidental that the

suffragist movement in England and the United States gathered momentum in the last two decades of the nineteenth century, when the shifts in the conception of sexuality sketched above were largely complete and gender and sexual behaviors were **seen** to contribute an important share of who one was. It is certainly no coincidence that the so-called homophile movement, ancestor of the contemporary gay rights movements, emerged on the tracks of **medical** descriptions of "the homosexual" as a deviant type of identity. As Jeffrey Weeks and Foucault **have** shown, homosexuality was largely a nineteenth-century invention. Its **basis** was the reconceptualization of same-sex eroticism from random deviant *behavior* - legally akin to bestiality and masturbation- into a **principle of identity**, a defining trait of **some** individuals. This remapping brings into **existence** a social collective that cuts across class and geographical difference, a collective prosecuted not for **some** accidental slip into **prurience**, but for an **innate** personal trait. All the homophile movement had to do to defend its **claims** was to **reverse** the direction of the arguments for pathologization and oppression. (Foucault 1978: 100-102) Because homosexuality was an inalienable core of identity, homophiles reclaimed it as natural, legitimate, and deserving of civil rights protection. The justification of homosexuality on the grounds of naturalness and authenticity informs, for example, much of André Gide's work, where it functions as a critical counterpoint to the corseted, hypocritical middle-class mores (Dollimore 1991: 13-45). But it was particularly in early twentieth-century Germany where budding homosexual subcultures stressed their association with nature. They went so far as to proclaim male homoeroticism (women's homosexuality went largely unaddressed) as closer to the "essence of man", and to more authentic **pre-industrial** societies (Greek Antiquity was repeatedly invoked in this context). (Steakley 1975: 48-54) These ideologies gave rise to the colorful *Wandervögel*, a mendicant (pre-hippie type of) movement made up mostly of young men who **rejected** industrialized modernity and often lived in rural **communes** devoted to nature, physical exercise, and each other. (Mosse 1985: 45-65)

In European modernity, **desire**, sexuality, and gender appear then increasingly resonant as seats of personal and social identity, and as potential sites of normalization and dissidence, oppression and affirmation. Their fraught status makes them critical and trouble-ridden, capable of **underpinning** and undermining modern identities and, as we will see, modernist textuality.

III. GENDERING MODERNIST TEXTUALITY

The imbrication of gender, sexuality, and culture outlined above constitutes a complex intertext against which modernist writing can be profitably read. The **relevance** of this intertext stands out in particular when we consider

that, from its earliest conceptualizations, modernist literature has been defined as the "inward turning" of realistic mimesis, formerly focused on the external world. Already some modernist practitioners like Henry James (*The An d the Novel*), Ford Madox Ford ("On Impressionism"), and Virginia Woolf ("Modern Fiction", "Mr Bennett and Mrs. Brown") and historians and commentators such as Eric Auerbach (*Mimesis*), Lion Edel (*The Modern Psychological Novel*), David Daiches (*The Novel and the Modern World*), and Lionel Trilling ("On the Teaching of Modern Literature"), to name just a few, saw the distinctiveness of modernism in these terms. As the modernist techniques of free indirect discourse, interior monologue, or écriture *automatique* were employed to convey the fleeting movements of the mind, a large part of what they dredged up were the workings of desire informing sexuality and gender behaviors and identifications.

For this reason, some psychoanalytically-informed post-structuralist critics have characterized modernist textuality as closer to the workings of the unconscious than, for example, narrative realism. Fragmentation, disgregation of the individual character, the break-down of straight-forward narrative, ambiguity, and linguistic play, have been related by such critics to the unmanageable eruption of unconscious desire and sexuality into the textual surface. For Leo Bersani, for example, modernist textual systems stage a refusal, or inability, to contain these forces and they often tend to highlight their eccentric and centrifugal character. (1987: 51-88) One of the most influential theorists in this connection is Julia Kristeva, for whom modernist writing tries to voice the unrepresentable, the unbound drive, the negative dialectic moment: in sum, all that is solipsistic and a-signifying in the subject-in-language. She opposed this component (the "semiotic", associated to the maternal chora) to the symbolic: syntactically structured and communicable content aligned with (Jacques Lacan's term) the "law of the father" and characteristic of the aesthetic and cognitive regimes of traditional realism and bourgeois rationality. Close to Kristeva's postulates, Roland Barthes has repeatedly described modernism as the refusal of three interconnected realities: communicative language, orthodox sexuality, the commodity market: "Our modernity makes a constant effort to defeat the exchange: it tries to resist the market for works (by excluding itself from mass communication), the sign (by exemption from meaning, by madness), sanctioned sexuality (by perversion, which shields bliss from the finality of reproduction)." (1975: 23-24)

As Barthes's words make clear, poststructuralist psychoanalytic approaches valued modernist texts for their radical questioning of dominant ideologies. Some exemplary authors extolled for this reason were Charles Baudelaire, Antonin Artaud, Stéphane Mallarmé, James Joyce, and Celine. This line-up has prompted some feminist critics to point out that, for all their disruptive agendas, the French

poststructuralist "school" and its followers tended to confirm a largely male modernist pantheon (which occasionally made room for Virginia Woolf and Gertrude Stein) already set in place in early histories of the modern. In addition, they implicitly adhered to a restrictive equation of modernism with experimentation. This equation privileged novelty and rupture as defining traits of the modern -which was then read as the "other" of mass and popular culture- and perpetuated an agonistic, male-Oedipal understanding of literary evolution as a struggle with, and supersession of, the father's discourse, a model not always applicable to women's and other forms of minority writing.⁴ Furthermore, poststructuralist analyses were largely text-centered, neglecting to situate supposedly iconoclastic textualities in concrete socio-historical contexts. They thus had no way of accounting for the meanings that extra-textual particulars such as modes of circulation, cultural backgrounds, audiences, and reading formations infuse into literary texts. Nor could they properly explain the historical connections between Ezra Pound, T. S. Eliot, or Celine's supposedly radical experiments and the conservative cultural agendas to which they obligingly lent themselves. With regard to gender, reading in such a historical-contextual void worked to elide the specific gender politics -feminist (in its different varieties), gay, lesbian, queer, anti-homophobic, or transsexualist- of purportedly radical texts, which were construed instead as undermining nuanceless entities such as "patriarchy", "bourgeois ideology", or "Western values".

In order to redress the biases of a-historical poststructuralism, some recent studies have tried to relate modernist form to concrete cultural and gender positions. As an example of this approach, Carolyn Burke (1987: 98-122) has unveiled the gender-based critiques of culture imbuing Gertrude Stein's, Mina Loy's, and Marianne Moore's use of "logopoeia" and collage; these devices had been regarded in purely formalist terms, their feminist cultural politics ignored to fit largely male-informed conceptions of modern writing. Catharine R. Simpson (1985) has done similar revisions of Gertrude Stein's work paying particular attention to the notions of female corporeality which emerge in her writing. In the field of gay studies, Lee Edelman (1987) has traced the rhetoric of male homosexual desire in the poetry of Hart Crane. And in analogous fashion, Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick (1990) has convincingly argued for reading the poetics of indeterminacy, abstraction, and secrecy in Henry James, Oscar Wilde, and Marcel Proust in terms of what she has called the "epistemology of the closet": the

4. The male-Oedipal agonistic model is most influentially articulated in Harold Bloom's *The Anxiety of Influence*; for discussions of the (ir)relevance of experimental, rupture-driven conceptions of modernism to minority production, see Kime Scott 1992: 4-7; Schenk 1992: 317-320; Baker, Jr. 1987: *passim*; Felski 1995: 24-29, Gilroy 1993: *passim*.

oblique strategies of revelation and/as concealment cropping up around the turn-of-the-century (homosexual) subject, and around discourses and practices metonymically associated with, or structurally akin to, homosexual identities.

This son of research tends to confirm a hypothesis about the sociology of modernism: what often subtends experimentation is a disaffected rapport with the dominant culture. On the basis of this idea, the sense of connection between socio-sexual outsiders and aesthetic radicals may spring from women's and sexual minorities' "problematic relationship to the tradition of authority, as well as to the authority of tradition". (Gilben and Gubar 1988: 1) Such relationship easily translates into a peculiar "double consciousness" with regard to the dominant, a type of perception which Virginia Woolf described as follows: "If one is a woman, one is often surprised by a sudden splitting off of consciousness, say in walking down Whitehall, when from being the natural inheritor of that civilization, she becomes, on the contrary, outside of it, alien and critical." (In Stevenson 1989: 168) This paradoxical position contributes to defamiliarizing existing forms, structures, and traditions, and fosters detachment and relativism conducive to the kind of experimentation, "double coding", and ambiguity characteristic of much women's and, by extension, minority writing. (Stevenson 1989: 166-95).

Another important corrective to poststructuralist gender analysis has been archeological work intent on rediscovering and revaluing the work of writers displaced by the male modernist canon (Pondrum 1986; Kime Scott 1992: 1-17). "Archeological" and "archeology" are used here in the idiosyncratic sense given to these terms by Michel Foucault when he proposed alternatives to the conventional history of ideas. In its traditional form, the history of ideas is mainly concerned with establishing continuities, regularities, and transitions between currents of thought, and with reconstructing past discourses as systemic wholes. Foucault's archeology of knowledge, for its part, treats specific discursive regimes as fundamentally fractured and asymmetrical, that is, as irregular products of power-driven practices, not as organic, well-fitting, coherent systems. The coherence that historical analysis discovers in past regimes of thought is often purchased at the price of clearing out what does not fit the systemic. Archeological research formalizes the succession of discourses in terms of breaks, not of smooth transitions, since consecutive discursive regimes are often radically incommensurable, obeying vastly different scientific and power agendas.

5. In Cyrena N. Pondrum's words, "We have too much shaped [current definitions of modernism] to describe Eliot, Pound, Joyce, and Yeats alone, without accounting, in these broader definitions of literary history, for what modernism meant in the hands of Stein, H.D., Sitwell, Woolf. . . ." (1986: 113)

Archeology highlights the opaque traits of each discursive regime, those particularly resilient to interpretation through present-day optics. For this reason, it considers the texts of the past in their full "externality" and immanence -extant "monuments" endowed with "their own volume" and form. (Foucault 1972: *passim*, esp. 135-40) Applied to our subject, the term archeology implies that what is at stake in archival and historical exploration is not the attempt to "complete" the picture of modernism as archeologists reassemble a mosaic from dispersed tesserae, because wholeness and organicity are forborne from the start; nor the discovery of a missing systematicity in modernism's (aesthetic, social, political) postulates; nor the establishment of precise dates for the emergence and disappearance of different varieties and subvarieties of the modern. The archeology of the modern is ruled by awareness of fundamental heterogeneity, asymmetry, and irregularity in cultural practices. The goal of research is then the analysis and delineation (as rigorously as possible) of these irregularities, opacities, and heterogeneities as productive of discourse.

Scrupulous historical research has recovered the work of writers such as Dorothy M. Richardson, May Sinclair, Jean Rhys, Zora Neale Hurston, Nella Larsen, Charlotte Mew, Antonia White, and Anna Wickham, among others. Likewise, recent interest in lesbian and gay textuality has promoted a reappraisal of canonical figures such as James, Proust, Wilde, Crane, and Stein and has also rediscovered others like Radcliffe Hall, author of the polemical *The Well of Loneliness*, Parker Tyler, Charles Henri Ford, or Carl Van Vechten. As the historical panorama widens and more figures and their work come up for reappraisal, the emerging picture of modernism is not one of all-out experimentation, but a motley, uneven growth where formal invention coexists with the more traditional vocabularies of kitsch, melodrama, and realism. Many women and lesbian and gay writers remained faithful to these seemingly outdated modes in their explorations of gender issues. In fact, the camp novels of Ronald Firbank or Van Vechten, for example, which garnered some following among urban gay coteries, were fairly traditional in form, closer to the precious, ironic realism of Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, for example, than to Joyce's or Artaud's glossolalia. However, the cultivation of a less adventurous literary idiom should not be read as accommodating and non-critical; the availability of modernist forms makes the voluntary embracing of realism or sentimentality a self-conscious option, one often accompanied by a certain degree of critical distance. Such "anachronistic" preferences in the face of rabid novelty have the effect of relativizing style as construction and choice, rather than as transparent medium for content or inevitable incarnation of the *Zeitgeist*. This is particularly the case in hybrid works which combine popular and experimental expression--

such as Parker Tyler and Charles Henri Ford's gay novel *The Young and Evil*, or some of Jean Rhys's and Katherine Mansfield's fictions.

Together with traditional or kitsch forms, distinctly "non-literary" or borderline genres were also significant arenas for modernist expression and critique; think, for instance, of Djuna Barnes's and Nancy Cunard's journalistic work, or of Zora Neale Hurston's writings on African-American anthropology and folklore. These texts demand that we reconsider modernism not only in terms of literature and aesthetics, but as a whole epistemology which spilled into such areas as anthropology, folklore, psychoanalysis, and sociology. In these burgeoning discourses, where an important number of women were active, the aesthetics of fragmentation, indeterminacy, and linguistic self-referentiality became instruments for the scientific exploration of society. Authors such as James Clifford have recently revisited the cross-breedings of modernist aesthetics and science -particularly what he has called "ethnographic surrealism"- in order to rescue from them non-essentialist ways of conceptualizing culture (Clifford 1988: 117-148). Explorations of the function and figuration of gender and sexuality in these discourses might tell us much about gender interpellation in the social sciences and, at the same time, they might help us discover in them empowering positions of discourse for women and minorities.

Influenced by cultural studies methodologies, historical and archeological research has sought to decenter textuality as the exclusive ground of cultural practice and influence, and has highlighted the importance of salon-holders, agents, booksellers, publishers, and maecenas in the emergence and transformation of the contexts of modernism. Women, minorities and sexual "dissidents" functioned as important catalysts in these roles. In addition to the already known cases of Woolf and Stein, social and intellectual centers of their respective milieus, some notable examples are Mabel Dodge Luhan, salon-keeper and Greenwich Village radical; Nancy Cunard, translator, editor and publisher; Sylvia Beach, editor and bookseller of Shakespeare and Co. fame; Margaret Anderson and Jane Heap, long-standing couple and editors of *The Little Review*; and Harriet Monroe, editor of Chicago-based *Poetry*, main organ of the early American modernism. According to Shari Benstock, in most of these circles lesbian and gay sexuality was amply tolerated, and sometimes even celebrated, as an extension into "life" of the new artistic modes. Reminiscing about his literary beginnings in New York in the early 1930s, for example, Charles Henri Ford wrote: "We were dreadfully impressed with modern poetry, and we were trying to create our own brand of it. What we didn't realize too consciously is that we [young men living the gay life] were modern poetry" (In Watson 1989: n.p.n.).

Most archeological work on the social dynamics of modernist cliques has

focused on women, and much remains to be done on the gay male inflections and circulation of modernism. Some interesting research has appeared on the homosexual overtones of Victorian aestheticism (Dellamora 1990, Cohen 1993) and, from a less theoretical perspective, on the World War I generation in England (Fussell 1975), yet other areas, like gay American modernism, are still largely uncharted. Ekbert Faas's biography of Robert Duncan (1982) and Lee Edelman's analysis of Hart Crane (1987) are steps in this direction, but many other crucial figures await to be thoroughly studied. This is the case, for example, of Carl Van Vechten, fairly openly gay man, successful novelist and music critic, protector and promoter of many writers and artists of the Harlem Renaissance during the 1920s and 1930s; of Charles Henri Ford and Parker Tyler, writers, editors of the surrealist magazine *View* (1941-47), and important presences in the New York art world of the 1940s; and of Lincoln Kirstein, editor of *Hound and Horn* (prestigious literary review of the late 1920s and 1930s, which also published pieces on film and popular culture) and later coeditor of *Dance Index*. In addition, the important gay and lesbian presence in the Harlem Renaissance calls for a thorough reassessment of the entanglement of sexuality, race, and modernism in this group. Social historians Eric Garber (1989) and George Chauncey (1993: 263-65) have described the Harlem homosexual world contemporary with the Renaissance; for their part, some historians of African-American literary modernism have recently produced interesting readings of individual figures. (Avi-Ram 1990, Reimonenq 1993, and Gates, Jr. 1993)

In general, post-poststructuralist gender scholarship has moved toward the progressive contextualization of modernism in relation to socio-sexual subcultures; toward contesting the lines between high and low art, and between literary and non-literary discourses; and toward decentering the text as sole object of inquiry. The composite picture these investigations yield shows that modernism was an enormously supple artistic culture which integrated widely diverging perspectives and discourses, one whose very plurality makes its analysis interminable. Such proliferating condition is not limited to our topic; on the contrary, it affects all forms of knowledge. In perverse Tristram-Shandy-esque logic, the more new horizons, entanglements, and conflicts we uncover, the more we will have to describe, theorize, account for in future work. In addition, all reading and theorizing proceeds from a fleeting, unfinished, contested present whose evolving strictures and interests multiply the available constructs of, and points of entry into, the texts of the past. This is particularly visible in modernist studies. As we mentioned at the outset, the current volatility of gender and sexuality has prompted research into the emergence of our sex-gender economies in recent modernity. The hybridity of modernism becomes more detectable from our present perspective, where the high art-popular art and center-periphery interfaces

have become norm. And finally, concern with the extra-textual is projected from a culture -ours- based less and less on the authority of immutable, self-present texts than on fragmentation, mutation, performance, electronic circulation, and the forms of social presence and agency arising from these.

Under these twin pressures (of present concerns, of ever growing commentary), our understanding of modernism will continue to metamorphose, not least because, as the critical fortune of the terms postmodern and postmodernity attests to, it remains central to our self-understanding and self-definition. For almost three decades now, we have been imagining ourselves ahead of the modern, immersed in a substantially new cultural regime that turned its back on modernism's aloofness and aesthetic purity and plunged into popular pleasures and all forms of hybridity and subcultural production. The present essay, in line with recent contributions by Peter Wollen (1993) and Rita Felski (1995), among others, has tried to suggest that the rush to the postmodern may spring from the unquestioning acceptance of an institutionalized type of modernism and the oversight of modernist hybridity, performativeness, and subcultural and minority inflections. We may just be living an extended modernism where many of the original tensions and struggles connecting gender, sexuality, social identity, and cultural form are still amply operative. Because of this, study of the modern and its textualizations of gender trouble can help us uncover the historical filiation of present-day conflicts. And in the process, we may find critical ways of inhabiting a modernity that, for better or worse, is still fully ours.

Fecha de recepción: 5 - 11 - 1996

WORKS CITED

- Adorno, Theodor W. (1982 [1962]) «Commitment» *The Essential Frankfurt School Reader*. A. Arato and E. Gebhardt (eds.) New York: Continuum: 300-18.
- Arnold, Matthew (1988 [1932]) *Culture and Anarchy*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP
- Avi-Ram, F. Amitai (1990) «The Unreadable Black Body: 'Conventional' Poetic Form in the Harlem Renaissance.. *Genders* 7: 32-45
- Auerbach, Eric (1953) *Mimesis*. Trans. W. R. Trask. Princeton: Princeton UP
- Baker, Jr., Houston (1987) *Modernism and the Harlem Renaissance*. U of Chicago P
- Barker-Benfield, G. J. (1978) «The Spermatic Economy: A Nineteenth-Century View of Sexuality.» *The American Family in Social and Historical Perspective*. Michael Gordon (ed.) New York: St Martin's Press.
- Barthes, Roland (1975) *The Pleasure of the Text*. Trans. Richard Miller. New York: Noonday Press.
- Baudelaire, Charles (1955) *The Mirror of Art*. Trans. Jonathan Mayne. New York: Phaidon.
- Benjamin, Walter (1982 [1937]) «The Author as Producer». *The Essential Frankfurt School Reader*. A. Arato and E. Gebhardt (eds.) New York: Continuum: 254-69.
- Benstock, Shari (1986) *Women on the Left Bank, Paris 1900-1940*. Austin: U of Texas P.
- Bersani, Leo (1987) *A Future for Asyntax: Character and Desire in Literature*. New York: Columbia UP.
- Brantlinger, Patrick and Robert Boyle (1987) «The Education of Edward Hyde: Stevenson's Gothic Gnome and the Mass Readership of Late-Victorian England.» *Jekyll and Hyde After 100 Years*. W Veeder (ed.) Austin: U of Texas P.
- Brecht, Bertolt (1979) «Against Georg Lukács.» in Taylor (ed.)
- Burke, Carolyn (1987) «Getting Spliced: Modernism and Sexual Difference». *American Quarterly*, 39 (no. 1): 98-121.
- Bürger, Peter (1984 [1974]) *Theory of the Avant-Garde*. Trans. Michael Shaw. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P.

- Butler, Judith (1990) *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Calinescu, Matei (1987) *The Five Faces of Modernity: Modernism, Avant-Garde, Decadence, Kitsch, Postmodernism*. Duke UP.
- Chamberlain, J. Edward and Sander Gilman (eds.) (1985) *Degeneration: The Dark Side of Progress*. New York: Columbia UP.
- Chauncey, George (1994) *Gay New York: Gender, Urban Culture, and the Making of the Gay Male World, 1890-1940*. New York: Basic.
- Clifford, James (1988) *lñe Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature and Art*. Cambridge: Harvard UP.
- Cohen, Ed (1993) *Talk on the Wilde Side: Towards a Genealogy of a Discourse on Male Sexualities*. New York: Routledge.
- Corbin, Alain (1990) «Backstage,» *A Histon of Private Life*, vol 4. *From the Fires of the Revolution to the Great War*. ed. Michelle Perrot. Cambridge: Harvard UP.
- Daiches, David (1960) *The Novel and the Modern World*. Chicago: U of Chicago P
- de Man, Paul (1983) «Literary History and Literary Modernity.» *Blindness and Insight: Essays on the Rhetoric of Literary Criticism*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P.
- Dellamora, Richard (1990) *Masculine Desire: The Sexual Politics of Victorian Aestheticism*. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: U of North Carolina P.
- Dollimore, Jonathan (1991) *Sexual Dissidence; Augustine to Wilde, Freud to Foucault*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Edel, Lion (1964) *The Modern Psychological Novel*. New York: Norton
- Edelman, Lee (1987) *Transmemberment of Song: Hart Crane's Anatomies of Rhetoric and Desire*. Stanford U P.
- Faas, Ekbert (1982) *Robert Duncan*. Santa Barbara, California: Black Sparrow Press
- Felski, Rita (1995) *The Gender of Modernity*. Cambridge: Massachusetts, Harvard UP.
- Ford, Charles Henri and Parker Tyler (1989) *The Young and Evil*. London: GMP.
- Ford, Ford Madox (1964) «On Impressionism» *The Critical Writings of Ford Madox Ford*. F. MacShane (ed.) Lincoln: U of Nebraska P: 35-71.

- Foucault, Michel (1972) *The Archeology of Knowledge*. Trans. Rupert Swyer. New York: Pantheon.
- , (1978) *The History of Sexuality*. Vol. 1. *An Introduction*. New York: Random House.
- Fussell, Paul (1975) *The Great War and Modern Memory*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Garber, Eric (1989) «A Spectacle in Color: The Lesbian and Gay Subculture of Jazz Age Harlem,» *Hidden from History: Reclaiming the Gay and Lesbian Past*. M. Duberman, M. Vicinus, and G. Chauncey (eds.) New York: New American Library.
- Gates, Jr., Henry Louis (1993) «The Black Man's Burden.» In *Fear of a Queer Planet: Queer Politics and Social Theory*. M. Warner (ed.) Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P.
- Genette, Gerard (1980 [1972]) *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. Trans. Jane E. Lewin. Ithaca, New York: Cornell UP.
- Gilbert, Sandra and Susan Gubar (1988) *No Man's Land: The Place of the Woman's Writer in the Twentieth Century*. Vol. 1. *The War of the Words*. New Haven: Yale UP.
- Gilroy, Paul (1989) *There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack*. Chicago: U of Chicago P.
- (1993) *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*. London: Verso.
- Habermas, Jürgen (1987) *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*. Trans. Frederick Lawrence. Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Harper, Phillip Brian (1992) *Framing the Margins: The Social Logic of Postmodern Culture*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Harvey, David (1989) *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Huyssen, Andreas (1986) «Mapping the Postmodern.» *After the Great Divide: Modernism, Avant-Garde, Postmodernism*. Bloomington: Indiana UP.
- Jackson-Lears. T. J. (1994 [1981]) *No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture, 1880-1920*. U of Chicago P.
- James, Henry (1984 [1934]) *The Art of the Novel*. R. P. Blackmur (ed.) Boston: Northeastern UP.

- Jarneson, Fredric (1992) *Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Duke UP.
- Kime Scott, Bonnie (ed) (1992) *The Gender of Modernism*. Bloomington: Indiana UP.
- Kristeva, Julia (1984) *The Revolution of Poetic Language*. Trans. Margaret Waller. Columbia UP.
- Latour, Bruno (1993) *We Have Never Been Modern*. Cambridge: Harvard UP
- Loos, Alfred (1970 [1903]) «Ornament and Crime.» In *Programmes and Manifestos on Twentieth-Century Architecture*. Ulrich Conrads (ed.) London: Lund Humphries.
- Lukács, Georg (1979 [1934]) «Realism in the Balance» in Taylor (ed.)
- Mosse, George L. (1985) *Nationalism and Sexuality: Middle Class Morality and Sexual Norms in Modern Europe*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P.
- Penley, Constance (1989) «Feminism, Film Theory, and the Bachelor Machines.» *The Future of an Illusion*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P: 57-80.
- Pick, Daniel (1989) *Faces of Degeneration: A European Disorder, 1848-1918*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Pondrum, Cyrena (1986) «Gertrude Stein: From Outlaw to Classic,» *Contemporary Literature* 27 (1).
- Reimonenq, Alden (1993) «Countee Cullen's Uranian 'Soul Windows'». *Journal of Homosexuality* 26: 143-65.
- Rhav, Philip and William Phillips (1937) «Literature in a Political Decade». *New Letters in America*. H. Gregory (ed.) New York: W. W. Norton.
- Rotundo, Anthony (1993) *American Manhood: Transformations in Masculinity from the Revolution to the Modern Era*. New York: Basic Books.
- Sartre, J-P (1971 [1947]) «Why Write?» from *What is Literature?*. Reprinted in *Critical Theory Since Plato*. H. Adams (ed.) New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.
- Schenck, Caroline (1992) «Charlotte Mew» in Kime Scott: 316-21.
- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky (1990) *The Epistemology of the Closet*. Berkeley: U of California P.
- Simmel, Georg (1971 [1902]) «The Metropolis and Mental Life.» *George Simmel: On Individuality and Social Forms*. Donald Levine (ed.) Chicago: U of Chicago P.

- Simpson, Catharine R. (1985) «The Somograms of Gertrude Stein,» *Poetics Today* 6 (nos. 1 and 2)
- Smith, Henry Nash (1978 [1950]) *The Virgin Land: The American West as Symbol and Myth*. Cambridge: Harvard UP.
- Steakley, James D. (1975) *The Early Homosexual Emancipation Movement in Germany*. New York: Arno Press.
- Stevenson, Randall (1989) *Modernist Fiction: An Introduction*. London: Harvester/Wheatsheaf.
- Taylor, Ronald (ed.) (1979) *Aesthetics and Politics*. London: New Left Review.
- Trilling, Lionel (1979 [1965]) «On the Teaching of Modern Literature.» In *Beyond Culture*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Watson, Steven (1989) «Introduction» to Ford and Tyler, *The Young and Evil*. London: Gay Men's Press (unnumbered pages).
- Wellek, Rene (1958) «Henry James's Literary Theory and Criticism,» *American Literature* XXX (November 1958): 293-321.
- Wellek, Rene and Austin Warren (1956 [1942]) *Theory of Literature*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World. Inc.
- Wollen, Peter (1993) *Raiding the Icebox: Reflections on Twentieth-Century Culture*. Bloomington: Indiana UP.
- Woolf, Virginia (1992 [1924]) «Modern Fiction» and «Mr Bennet and Mrs Brown» in Kime Scott (ed.): 628-641.
- Žižek, Slavoj (1989) *The Sublime Object of Ideology*. London: Verso