

## Conference Paper

# Towards the Understanding of the Concepts "Modernity," "Modernism" and "Avant-Gardism" in (Post)-Soviet and German Literary Theory (An Attempt of Terminological Unification)

Tigran Simyan<sup>1</sup> and Ilze Kačāne<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Yerevan State University, Armenia

<sup>2</sup>Daugavpils University, Latvia

## Abstract

The paper is concerned with the analysis of the key concepts "Modernity", "Modernism" and "Avant-gardism". This analysis reveals the ambiguity in the perception of these concepts in (Post)-Soviet and German literary theory. The mentioned problem is discussed on the example of the "central" texts (encyclopedia, literary encyclopedia, literary dictionaries, textbooks etc.) of the Soviet, post-Soviet and German literary criticism. The problem is relevant owing to the existence in the Soviet times of the so-called "Iron Curtain" and ideological differences. Western and Soviet literary theories were on different sides of the barricades, which resulted in the terminological "noise" in the scientific literature of the USSR. Besides, the post-Soviet Russian literary criticism has not yet revised the Soviet-era training manuals, dictionaries, encyclopedia, and consequently, the semantic "noise" about those terms penetrates into the post-Soviet scientific literature written in Russian as well. During the analysis of the understanding of the selected terms, those sources of the conceptual "noise" in the Soviet times, which have affected and are still partly affecting as stereotypes the understanding of the above-mentioned concepts, were identified.

**Keywords:** modernity, modernism, avant-gardism, Soviet literary criticism, post-Soviet literary criticism in Russian

## 1. Introduction

The meaning interpretations of the terms "Modernity", "Modernism" used in the textbooks, dictionaries, literary dictionaries of the Soviet and post-Soviet epoch are not accepted unequivocally among the Russian-speaking scientific community. Up to this

Corresponding Author:

Tigran Simyan  
 tsimyan@ysu.com  
 Ilze Kačāne  
 ilze.kacane@du.lv

Received: 26 April 2018

Accepted: 25 May 2018

Published: 7 June 2018

Publishing services provided by  
 Knowledge E

© Tigran Simyan and Ilze Kačāne. This article is distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use and redistribution provided that the original author and source are credited.

Selection and Peer-review under the responsibility of the ISPS Convention 2017 Conference Committee.

 OPEN ACCESS

time, semantic “noises” (in a semiotic sense), “assonances” are being heard. Unreflective reading of teaching-methodological aids of the Soviet epoch and research works by post-Soviet Russian-writing researchers, estrangement between the Russian and West European discourses on this topic, together, as it seems to us, are the reason for a “different reading”, arbitrary and non-arbitrary use and interpretation of these concepts. Unfortunately, the terminological “noises” are still “active” and like echo of the past, or in other words, like stereotypes live and quite often penetrate not only into the post-Soviet Russian teaching-methodological literature, but also into the scientific literature of a small format (articles). Though lately within the Russian-speaking space quite a lot of articles have been written on the problem of the meaning of the concepts “Modernity”, “Modernism” (Halizev (Here and hereafter all surnames and bibliographical sources originally written in Cyrillic have been converted to Latin alphabet via online Cyrillic converter translit.cc) 2005, 374-376; Ushakova 2010, 109-114; Branskaja, Panfilova 2015, 264-267 a. o.), still in the Russian scientific literature, to our mind, this problem remains unresolved as yet. In her article «Модернизм: о границах понятия» [“Modernizm: o granicah ponjatija / Modernism: on the Borderlines of the Concept], Ushakova, writing about the concept of “modernism”, says that “‘modernism’ has to be treated not as a scientific term with a distinct semantics and a concrete field of application, but rather as a mythologeme <...>” ([87], 113).

The material for this article is basically collected from textbooks, training manuals and dictionary paragraphs (literature studies) in encyclopedias, since this type of literature is the “central”, basic mediator of knowledge for the rising scientific generation (students, postgraduates, doctoral students a. o.).

This article is an attempt to fill in the gap as to this problem, to analyze and describe the semantic network of concepts “Modernity”, “Modernism” and to demythologize the concept of “Modernity and the mythologeme “modernism”.

The principal thesis of this article is as follows: owing to the so-called “Iron Curtain” and ideological differences, Western and Soviet literary criticisms were on different sides of the barricades, which resulted in a terminological “noise” in the scientific literature of the USSR, and since the post-Soviet Russian literary criticism has not conducted a revision to Soviet textbooks and training manuals the semantic “noise” about these terms is penetrating also the post-Soviet Russian scientific literature.

## 2. The Concept “Modernity”

In German, the word “modern” used as the adjective implies belonging to the present time, (from Latin *modernus* – contemporary). Diachronically, “the picture of the world”, culture, and values change, the old is replaced by the new denoted by the words “*modernus*”, “modern” (Realism and Naturalism in respect to Romanticism are perceived in the same way. This does not imply that Realism and Naturalism must be perceived as “isms” of Modernism, but they can be perceived as “isms” of the epoch of Modernity (Modern Times, *modern, temps modernes*), which, as Jurgen Habermas has pointed out, relates to the concepts of “revolution, progress, emancipation, development, crisis, spirit” [Habermas] 2005: 235]). For instance, in the 5<sup>th</sup> century, the word “*modernus*” was contrasted with “*antiquus*” in order to “mark the difference between the contemporaneity which had become Christian and the pagan past of Rome” ([41], 235). The word itself can denote everything that appears instead of the old.

During the generally known disputes over “the ancient ones and the new ones” (*Querelle des Anciens et des Modernes*) between the apologists of classicism and romanticists in 1687, Charles Perrault, speaking in the French Academy, used the word “*modernus*” to denote the beginning of Enlightenment. Thus the new times (*Moderne, die*) gained the upper hand over the antique times and traditions of the past ([57], 508) («Mit wechselndem Inhalten drückt “Modernität” immer wieder das Bewußtsein einer Epoche aus, die sich zur Vergangenheit der Antike in Beziehung setzt, um sich selbst als Resultat eines Übergangs vom Alten zum Neuen zu begreifen» [Habermas 1980: online]). The above said shows that Hans-Ulrich Sieber interprets the term “*Moderne*” in a broad sense of a word as an indicator of historical processes (secularization, technologization / industrialization, individualization), which is quite acceptable.

In relation to this Habermas mentions that “*modernitas*” always expresses consciousness of the epochs which correlate themselves with the past and the ancient times and which interpret themselves as the result of the transition from “the old’ to “the new” ([41], 8). In his reflections, the German philosopher uses two words to denote the epoch of modernity – “*Moderne, Modernität*” (Attention should be paid to the fact that Russian translator B. M. Skuratov has changed the term “*Modernität*”, used by Habermas, to “*modernitas*”. The note runs: “This term is most often translated into Russian as *sovremennost’* [Habermas] 2005: 341]. We fully agree with the translation, but it is not clear why “*Modernität*” (*sovremennost’*) has been changed to “*modernitas*”. From the context it is obvious that by using the word “*Modernität*” Habermas does not mean simply contemporaneity in its everyday understanding but

in the sense of an epoch (“Moderne”). In his poem “Le Siecle de Louis le Grand” [The Century of Louis the Great] (1687), and in the dialogue “Parallèle des Anciens et des Modernes” [Parallel between Ancients and Moderns] (1688) ([4], 7-40), Charles Perrault, being the apologist of the contemporaneity, emphasizes the invention of the telescope, pendulum, “the mechanism of a clock replacing the pendulum”, the fact of blood circulation (“circulation of blood in animals and juice in plants”) described by the English physician William Harvey in 1628 as scientific achievements of contemporary scientists (Spor o drevnih i novyh 1985, 42, 87, 91).

In other words, starting with the 17<sup>th</sup> century the New Times begin. It is worth mentioning that the explicitly new things in art in all their glory are “triumphantly” described by Charles Baudelaire: “The pleasure we gain from the depiction of the present comes not only from the beauty it is enveloped in, but also from its contemporary nature” ([6], 283). This quotation shows that the representation of what is new in art (mimesis) is treated as the givenness. Though the opposition of the old and the new was still “active” for generating meanings. In his poem “J’aime le souvenir de ces époques nues” / [“I Love the Thought of Those Old Naked Days”], Baudelaire idealizes the ancient times describing them as an epoch of harmony rather than that of lies, as the epoch of moral principles and symmetric relationships (I love the thought of those old naked days // When Phoebus gilded torsos with his rays, // When men and women sported, strong and fleet, // Without anxiety or base deceit, // And heaven caressed them, amorously keen // To prove the health of each superb machine. // Cybele then was lavish of her guerdon // And did not find her sons too gross a burden: // But, like a she-wolf, in her love great-hearted, // Her full brown teats to all the world imparted. // Bold, handsome, strong, Man, rightly, might evince // Pride in the glories that proclaimed him prince – // Fruits pure of outrage, by the blight unsmitten, // With firm, smooth flesh that cried out to be bitten. (Translation by Roy Campbell)) to counterbalance the contemporaneity, contemporary spirit, vice, laxity of morals, ugliness of body, roughness of skin. One of the central antithesis in the poem is a body: the cold marble of statues of the antique times is contrasted with the ugliness of the naked, twisted, swollen and flat bodies unknown for the ancients.

According to Baudelaire, the spirit of contemporaneity can be seen in loneliness: “he who is tirelessly wandering *around the vast human desert*, undoubtedly, pursues a loftier aim than that by which is attracted an idle loungeur (flâneur), and much more important one than a quickly transient pleasure of a minute’s impression. He seeks for something that we will take the liberty to call *the spirit of contemporaneity* [.]” ([6], 291-292). Actually, Baudelaire gives the diagnosis to the epoch of Modernity, where,

though being amidst the crowd, a human will live in loneliness. The passage given above reminds of the story "The Man of the Crowd" (1840) by E. Allan Poe. In the story, the narrator studied the crowd, the phenomenon of Modernity, by examining under the "microscope" of his observation a "decrepit" sixty five – seventy-year-old man ([62], 281). During the whole day, according to the method of observation, the narrator of the story follows an old man "wandering along the vast human desert", as Baudelaire has put it. In the story, Edgar Poe was one of the first who used the method of non-formalized observation, which in the contemporary sociology is applied for a targeted non-structural exploration of the subject, the man of the crowd. Naturally, the applied observation method does not provide the opportunity of revealing deep features of the "decrepit" old man's behavior. One of the conclusions drawn from what has been revealed is a reflection of the observer himself: "This old man", I said at length, "is the type and the genius of deep crime. He refuses to be alone. He is *the man of the crowd* It will be in vain to follow; for I shall learn no more of him, nor of his deeds [...] and perhaps it is but one of the great mercies of God that 'es läßt sich nicht lesen.'" ([62], 281). The above said allows concluding that Poe has identified the symptoms of Modernity epoch by applying a *new* empirically-oriented method which is being used in the contemporary sociological science up to this time.

On the historical-social plane, in the 19<sup>th</sup> century a man gets from "a fragmentary, contradictory, individual holistic society" into the dynamic process of the Modernity epoch [25] whose indicators are individualization, differentiation, specialization, technologization, secularization, rationalization, "removing the spell cast over the world" (M. Weber) etc. ([57], 509).

In his programmatic lecture "Wissenschaft als Beruf" / "Science as a Vocation" (1919) (Weber 1919), Max Weber also asserts that "the scientific progress is part, and the most significant part besides, of that process of intellectualization which we go through during millennia and towards which at present usually an extremely negative position is taken. [...] increasing intellectualization and rationalization do not imply the growth of knowledge about the living conditions under which one has to exist. It implies something else: people know or believe that if you really wanted to, you could learn it all at any time; that, consequently, in principle there are no mysterious, unaccountable forces which act here, that, on contrary, all things in principle can be obtainable by way of calculation. The latter, in turn, implies that the spell cast over the world is broken" ([89], 713, 714).

An important role in "breaking the spell" was played by spreading the mechanical individual clocks in Western Europe, which separated time from space and provided

the opportunity to punctually structure the “zone” of a day (for example, a working day). “[.] In societies preceding the contemporaneity, space and time largely coincide, since for the majority of population and in the majority of relationships the spatial parameters of social life are occupied by “presence”, namely the activity in a definite environment. The arrival of contemporaneity separates space from time more and more, thus enhancing the development of relationships between the “absent” others, removed in the sense of their location from any given situation of personal interaction” ([27], 131, 132). It is not for nothing that clock industry started to develop in western countries (Switzerland, France, Germany, England, the USA). Just these countries were the place where the transition from the employment of extensive time to intensive time occurred. Space and time separated, but money and time “united” (“Zeit ist Geld”), in other words, time got segmented, and money became its only exchange unit.

Another important detail has to be taken into account, and namely, that the epoch (By the new epoch, we understand new sociocultural, psychological shifts away from diachrony. Alexander Neklessa says that epochs are large temporal segments during which “the order of mind, ‘great senses’, and destinations of people” change [55]) of Modernity “revealed” its nature in the Age of Enlightenment. In his article, “Konzeptionen der Moderne. Ein Rückblick auf zwei Traditionen” [Conceptions of Modernity. Retrospective of Two Tendencies] ([39], 195-231), speaking about the perception of philosophy of Modernity epoch, Habermas maintains that “philosophy perceives Modernity as the child of Enlightenment” ([41], 237). These were just the basic ideas of Enlightenment (progress, enlightenment, rationalization etc.) that laid the foundation for the technologizing and industrialization of Europe; and architecture, one of the principal branches of knowledge related to art, was obliged to satisfy the demands on building and planning of cities.

If a question is raised as to what chronological segment of time the epoch of Modernity takes, the answers of Western researchers are, with a few exceptions, almost the same. From the position of philosophy, the epoch of Modernity begins in the 18<sup>th</sup> century with the Enlightenment, while according to Habermas, the epoch of pre-Modernity (T. S.) is related to three great events (the discovery of the New World, Renaissance, Reformation) that have occurred in about 1500, and which “are a threshold of epochs between the New Times and the Middle Ages” ([40], 11). According to Elvin Toffler, the epoch of Modernity, too, lets us know about itself only after the 1600-s ([93], 15) or in about 1650 – 1750 ([85], 53). Naturally, Toffler himself does not use the term “modern” in his work “The Third Wave” (1980), however “the second

wave" (industrial) described by him actually coincides with the technological, industrial and socio-cultural transformations of the Modernity epoch. Toffler considers that after "the first wave" (agrarian) the second came into its own by destroying the codes of "the first wave" – standardization, specialization, synchronization, concentration, maximization, centralization ([85], 92-117).

In the German sociological discourse, to counterbalance "the first Modernity" ("erste Moderne" = "the second wave" according to Toffler), there exists also such a conception as "the second Modernity" ("zweite Moderne"), introduced by Ulrich Beck to label "the unfinished Modernity project" (Habermas), the global modernization project in Latin America, in Asia, in Africa and in Arab countries in the epoch of globalism, in the informational and digital era as well as to indicate the epoch of "new non-transparency" ("neue Unübersichtlichkeit") [38] and "risk societies" ("Risikogesellschaft") of our times [7, 8]. If the problem is viewed from the aspect of capitalism in its historical development, then "the first Modernity" covers the commercial-financial (the 15<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup> century) and the industrial (the 18<sup>th</sup> – 20<sup>th</sup> century) phases while "the second Modernity" – the contemporary geo-economical phase [55].

In the fourth issue of the journal "NLO", Nikolay Poselyagin focuses on the problem of understanding the term "modernity" within the Russian context. At translating "Modernity", "modern" employed by foreign participants of the discussion, he used "модерность" and "модерный" instead of "модерн" and "модернизм" (Poseljanin 2000). The term "модерный" under all conditions is unacceptable to denote the modernistic literature of the 1910–1930-s, but we consider that the designation of the Modernity epoch by the word "модерность" (Modernism) and the use of the adjective "модерный" as the equivalent of the English "modern" (instead of the word "contemporary") and also instead of the adjective "модернистический" are quite legitimate. The argument in favor of the validity of Poselyagin's statement is the example of the title of the book "The Consequences of Modernity" by Anthony Giddens mis-translated into Russian as *Posledstvija sovremennosti* (2011). The acceptable translation of the title would have been "Последствия модерна" [Posledstvija moderna]. The problem, actually, lies in the fact that in the Russian scientific discourse the concept of "(Vienna) modernity" is still active and is still interfering with an uncontaminated perception and translation of the title of the book "The Consequences of Modernity" by Anthony Giddens. G. K. Olchovikov, the translator of Giddens' book, at translating the word *sovremennost'*, did not take into consideration the theme, clearly indicated by Poselyagin, of "fluctuating of topicality" leading to ideological distortions" [63].

Thus, from the above said we may conclude that after the Middle Ages come the New Times or the epoch of Modernity (Ger. – Moderne) as an “unfinished project”, and the Russian equivalents at this stage are “модерн”, “модерность, and «модерный”. In the German philosophical, sociological discourse, the concept “Modernity” is chronologically divided into two periods: “the first Modernity” (from about 1500 up to the 1960–1980-s), “the second modernity” (from the 1990-s up to the present time). The different understanding of the concept “Modernity” relates to the different approaches, traditions, criteria and codes used by the interpreters.

### 3. The Concept “Modernism”

In Literature written in German, the term “Modernity” (Moderne, die) indicates also to new values, socio-historical, (aesthetic) concepts, poetics-related shifts in the society and literature. In German linguistic consciousness, the word “Moderne” is used to denote:

1. “the contemporary, new or the newest times (and its spirit)” (“die moderne, neue oder neueste Zeit [und ihr Geist]” (Duden (Moderne): online);
2. “a new trend in literature, art or in music” (“modern Richtung in Literatur, Kunst oder Music”). The synonymity of the concepts is explicitly fixed in the German linguistic space in 1915, since the dictionary entry of the concept “Moderne” was made in Duden spelling dictionary in 1915 (Duden 2016).

The German professor Hans-Ulrich Sieber has a definite aim when having described the epoch of Modernity in his article “Moderne, die” of “Metzler Lexikon” he describes the features of literature of Modernism. From the aforementioned we can conclude that the term “Moderne” is used also as a synonym for the Russian term “модернизм” (=Modernismus) (In the post-Soviet textbook edited by Nikolay Guskov, the term “Modernity” is used in the German tradition, as a synonym of Modernism, since the column “From the Editor” states that this edition intends to enrich “the perception about a literary process, scientific and theatrical life, about a literary way of life in the 1910–1930-s” (Literaturnyj process 2013, 3)). The German concept “Moderne” indicates also to “Modernism” (=Modernismus) as a literary trend after 1914. In German literary criticism, the synonym of Modernism is also the word combination “classical modernity” (Klassische Moderne).

If we look at the tradition of literature written in English, we see that modernists themselves did not define their activities by the term “Modernism”. Olga Ushakova,

the researcher investigating foreign literature, in order to substantiate the use of the earlier term "Modernism" employs the anthology in English "A Survey of Modernist Poetry" (1927) published by Robert Graves and Laura Riding in 1927 ([87], 109). In our opinion, instead of "Обзор модернистской поэзии" the translation into Russian ought to have been "Обзор поэзии модернистов". Such a translation would have made it clear that the actors of the literary field themselves (Graves, Riding) called themselves *modernists*, e. i. the followers of the new, the modern (=Ger. Modernität), but for the time present, the indication as to denoting the whole literary-esthetic process by the concept of "Modernism" has not occurred.

#### 4. On the Differentiation between the Epochs of Modernity, Pre-modernism and Modernism: Specificity and Peculiarities

It is vital to draw a distinct line of demarcation between the epoch of Modernity and pre-Modernism, which acts as "a prelude" to Modernism as a literary-esthetical "ism". We will conditionally term by pre-modernism (In his textbook "Aesthetics", Yuriy Borev defines Pre-modernism as "the first (initial) period of the artistic development in the epoch of Avant-gardism; a group of artistic trends in the culture of the second half of the 19th century, opening a whole stage (a stage of the lost illusions) of the newest artistic development. During the period of Pre-modernism the special features of Modernism were just developing [...] ([12], 311). The quotation above shows that common in the understanding of the term "Pre-modernism" is that fact that it indicates to the period of time anticipating Modernism, and covering about 120–130 years) everything that is innovative in the art, aesthetics, and literature of the 19<sup>th</sup> century (e.g. impressionism, naturalism, literature of "the beautiful epoch" – Aestheticism, decadence etc.) before the literature of Modernism. Besides, in the discourse of German literary criticism, everything that is innovative in culture since the 1850–1880-s is denoted as "ästhetische Moderne" (aesthetic Modernity), but Modernism itself – as a "late self-criticism of Modernity epoch" (=spätmoderne Selbstkritik der Moderne, Reflexivwerden der Moderne) ([93]: 15, 28). Such understanding is quite valid, however in the 1990-s there was still a certain confusion in German literary criticism, for instance, the fact that in the dictionary paragraph "Modernismo" (1990) (=Modernismus), Irmgard Schweikle considers the Latin American and Spanish literary trend of the 1890–1920-s ("Generation of the 98th", "ultraism") a modernistic poetry ([70], 309). To avoid semantic "noises", it would be more appropriate to consider the

Latin American and Spanish literature of the period from the 1890-s to 1914 “a prelude” to Modernism rather than a manifestation of modernism. The strongest argument in support of the above said is the fact that modernism as a literary trend is trans-national, cosmopolitan, which in the Latin American and Spanish poetry is not yet being manifested until the beginning of WW I (Unamuno, Maestu, Barocha, brothers Machado, Himeness etc.).

Though Peter Zima thinks that the representatives of “Generation of the 98th” (Unamuno, Baroya, Ruis, Machado) were considered modernists, since the focus of their reflection was the crisis of cultural values and also the subject, inspired by works of Nietzsche, Schopenhauer and Kjerkegora ([93], 28-29). If these criteria are chosen, the palm is given to poets writing in Spanish, but Modernism as a literary-esthetic “ism” begins already from the end of the 1890-s, and for Walter Benjamin, in general, it begins from Baudelaire ([93], 27), which implies that for the authoritative scientist Zima “Modernism as a late modernity” (“Modernismus als Spätmoderne”) lasted for 100 years (1850–1950). If from the standpoint of the history of ideas (Ideengeschichte) such an approach is acceptable, from the standpoint of text building, poetics such an approach, to our mind, is not quite correct, and results in a semantic “noise”.

The dictionary paragraph “Modernism” by A. M. Zverev indirectly helps us understand that the term “Modernism” used in manifestos by R. M. del Valle Inklan, R. Dario, H. R. Himeness and other Spanish writers of the turn of centuries did not apply to Modernism of the 1920-s itself, but rather to modernization, to the renewal of literary problems as striving for overcoming provincialism of Spanish literature, as a call for drawing closer to the new trends of European literature, emphasizing simultaneously the specific features of Latin American literatures (LJeS 1987, 226).

Spanish Modernism – ultraism (from Latin “ultra” – “ultra”, “beyond”), as it is known, starts in Madrid in 1919 after WW I already and quits the stage in 1922 when the publication of the journal “Ultra” stops. Having defined the 1890–1920-s as the period of the appearance of Modernism in Latin American and Spanish literature, Schweikle is partly right, since the “initiator” of Spanish Modernism is the programmatic text “Ultra (Manifesto of Young Writers)” (Ultraism, in fact, is a “hybrid” “ism”, since it proclaims itself loudly and programmatically in the literary field through the favorite genre of avant-gardists – manifesto) signed by Havjers Boveda, Sesar A. Kometa, Guillermo de Topper, Fernando Iglesias, Pedro Iglesias Kabalje, Pedro Garsias a. o. and also the manifesto “Manifesto vertical ultraísta” (1920) ([54], 236-243). Along with ultraism, Chilean poet Vicente Huidobro (1893–1948), being a founder of “Creacionismo” – “Creationism”, played an essential role in the movement of Latin American and Spanish

Modernism. For the followers of "creationism" (H. Diego, H. Lappea, G. de Topper) the language is a material for building subjectivistic poetic worlds by means of associative images, metaphors, wordplay, vowels and letters ([70], 90), but since 1924 Spanish modernistic trends ultraism and creationism "develop into" an avant-garde "ism" – surrealism ([70], 90).

It is worth mentioning that in the post-Soviet textbook edited by V. M. Tolmachev, ultraism and creationism are described in the second chapter "Horizons of European Avant-Gardism" along with avant-garde "isms" (futurism, Dadaism, surrealism) ([56], 110-116). The same problems can be demonstrated on the example of the textbook by Yuriy Borev ([11], 235-322; [12], 309-366). Examples show that the discourse of the post-Soviet Russian literary criticism still has the "atavisms" of the Soviet literary criticism. The problem lies in the fact that, for the time being, no distinct differentiation between Modernism and Avant-gardism has been made yet (See about it below).

In the discourse of German literary criticism modernistic literature is denoted by the concept "late modernity" (Spatmoderne) (Zima 2013, 36), "Klassische Moderne" (classical modernity = modernism), thus distinctly differentiating and not confusing "classical modernity" with avant-garde "isms" (futurism, Dadaism, surrealism). In the German literary criticism the concept "Klassische Moderne" (Detler Peukert) covers the German literature of the 1918–1933-s [16, 61]. Viewed from the position of the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> and beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the use of the adjective "classical" is quite reasonable, since the literature created by modernists has already become classical and its authors – "old" classics (Kästner, Hesse, T. Mann, Döblin, Brecht, Zuckmayer, Piskator etc.). If for the German literary specialists and the discourse of literary criticism modernists have become classical long ago and the chronology of modernism has been distinctly marked, then Branskaja perceives the concept "modernism" as a "mythologeme, the word- "mythos", involving syncretism, metaphoric character, semantic stratifications, universalism, and broad area of application characteristic of it. However, Modernism as an artistic phenomenon, though it strongly resists a scientific analysis, is neither a myth nor an illusion; mythologized are our perceptions about it and our methods of its use, manipulating the term" (Branskaja, Panfilova 2015, 113).

The "spirit" of Modernity epoch is displayed in the subjectivization of literature. Habermas referred to the ideas of Friedrich Schlegel, and quite justly related the art of Modernity epoch to German romanticism ([40], 19). And indeed, almost the whole text corpus of German romanticists is actually the "presentation" of the spirit of Modernity epoch (Schlegel brothers, Wackenroder, Novalis, Kleist, Hofmann, Heine etc.). The above said may be substantiated also by what the "predecessor of modernists" Charles

Baudelaire has said: "According to my understanding, – Baudelaire writes in "Salone de 1846" – Romanticism is the most modern, the most vital expression of the beautiful. [...] Romanticism is the art of contemporaneity [...]" ([6], 65, 66). Baudelaire simply states the fact that romanticism is the product of the epoch of Modernity, while Ortega-y-Gasset "genetically" derives it from the political rumblings of the 18<sup>th</sup> century: "Romanticism is one of the many off-springs of political and ideological revolutions of the 18<sup>th</sup> century" ([58], 168).

In Ortega-y-Gasset's opinion, just on the turn of the 18<sup>th</sup> – 19<sup>th</sup> century "color and warmth" emerge in poetry. Goethe and Chateaubriand are good examples to illustrate the above said: "Goethe and Chateaubriand imparted to the art of word the ability to feel the heroic enthusiasts, they cut their veins, and the invigorating stream of their blood through a poetic channel rushed towards the ramified mouth of the new era" ([58], 170). Of course, "the new era" implies the epoch of Modernity, but the subjectivism of poetry is one of the constituent natures of the epoch of Modernity.

Within this context interesting are Goethe's statements, who in 1813 perceives Modernity epoch as a "moral-psychological" category, which is defined by human freedom and wish: "Wish that derives from the forces of an individual is the Modernity" (In this connection, another Goethe's expression is interesting: "If I were to define what I had been for the Germans, and especially for the young German poets, I could surely call myself a liberator, since I served as an example for them to see that just like a man lives from oneself to outside, the artist must create from oneself to outside, because whatever he does, he is able to express only himself" ([58], 170)) ([57], 508). In fact, the "generator" of this epoch is a human, his inner resources. Man becomes the "center" of everything, "the main criterion of all things", and the "center" of cognition. The "central" authors of the Modernity epoch in a (literary) philosophical discourse are Kierkegaard and, within the context of modernism already, his followers Sartre, Camus a. o.

In the epoch of Modernity, such esthetic categories as beauty, sublimity are no longer "absolute" categories. Baudelaire, one of the most significant representatives of the Modernity epoch and "predecessor of Modernism" (N. K. 1970, 8), speaks about ugliness and pain in an esthetic way ("Flowers of the Evil"). It seems natural that at the very height of Modernity epoch, Karl Rosenkranz, the pupil of Hegel, studies the esthetics of the ugly (*Ästhetik des Häßlichen*, 1853) [68]. The "products" of the epoch of Modernity are also, as mentioned by Theodore Adorno, "'parties' performed in the stories by Poe, in the novel "The Tired of America" by Kurenberg and et cetera, up to

the treatise "Mine-Haha or On the Bodily Education of Young Girls" by Wedekind". ([2], 32).

As Adorno has neatly mentioned, the art of Modernity epoch "modernized" the aspiration for novelty. The German sociologist supports this idea by giving a simple Schenberg's phrase "who does not seek, does not find", which is "one of the mottos of novelty; everything that does not comply with this motto is immanent, and in the context of a literary work, becomes a shortcoming of the work" ([2], 36). If a seeker seeks, it does not imply that he will find something new. For this, the genetic predisposition to a creative activity, originality, the ability to form peculiar chains (semantic, plot), syntagms, the skill of finding new methods (the level of designators), means of expressing something new (the designated) are needed.

According to Adorno, the art of Modernity becomes contemporary "through mimesis in relation to what is inert and alien" ([2], 36). The example of the said is the collection of poems "Flowers of the Evil" ("Les Fleurs du Mal", 1957) by Baudelaire representing "flowers" with a negative connotation. In French, the word "fleurs" in plural may have a negative, unaesthetic connotation denoting "mould (on drinks); mustiness (of wine)" ([1]: fleur).

Already in the 1910–1920-s, the non-mimetic is the dominant principle in the art and literature of modernists. Attention should be paid to Adorno's warning concerning "emphasizing Modernism as a frame of mind of supporters of the original "Modernity", of the original contemporaneity is unconvincing" ([2], 41). Of course, to completely exclude modernistic literature from the Modernity epoch would be unjust, but the epoch itself implicitly influenced the intellectual "aura" of the beginning of the 1910–1930-s. In other words, the epoch of Modernity became a fertile soil for a still greater subjectivization of human nature, which, in turn, became the prerequisite for the development of a literary-aesthetic "ism" – Modernism.

However, we would like to underline the fact that common for the epoch of Modernity and modernists is rejecting the dominance of tradition, traditionalism, ceasing to be engaged in pursuit of the contemporary, of the new. Arthur Rimbaud, one of the most outstanding poets of the Modernity epoch (1854–1891), in the poem "Farewell" of his last passage "A Season in Hell" writes about his creative work as:

- about **an attempt** "to invent a new flesh, and flowers, and new stars, and a new language/ J'ai essayé d'inventer de nouvelles fleurs, de nouveaux astres, de nouvelles chairs, de nouvelles langues",

- about **a project**, directions to the next generation: “to be modern in absolutely everything / Il faut etre absolument modern” ([65], 181; [67], 342, 344).

Rimbaud’s project on seeking for innovations was implemented by modernists in the 1910-1920-s. In his “Theory of the Novel”, Milan Kundera, speaking about the creative work of Musil, Gombrowicz, and Broch, says that they were filled with “passion for a new form, different words oriented towards modernism” ([49], 100). Being innovative involves reaching a qualitatively new level of (artistic) production, but this requires searching for new languages (in a semiotic sense), which, in turn, implies a conflict with the past.

The limits and nature of modernistic literature become obvious also thanks to its “enemies”. In the 1920-1930-s, the enemies of Modernism were the traditionalism and (kitsch) art of totalitarian regimes (On the change of the paradigm of German culture and the Nazi literature see in detail: ([74], 256-266)). In his essay “Eternal Fascism” (1995), Umberto Eco unmasks Italian fascism and German nationalism: “Traditionalism inevitably leads to the rejection of Modernism / Il tradizionalismo implica il rifiuto del modernism” ([21], 70; [20]). In the USSR, too, Modernism was announced “heresy”, since it was a continuation of the capitalist world (political plane) and Anti-Semitism.

In the introduction to his book “On Modernism”, Nikolay Malakhov writes: “For decades, Modernism has cultivated in people a bad habit to impart aesthetically pleasant features to ugliness, and perversion, because perversion as if were a part of a human’s nature. In this way, the most vulgar and rudest taste to perceive the new, “revolutionary” culture was cultivated, which rejected everything that was good and beautiful, elevated and heroic, and which testified to a different, so to say, “contemporary” development of classical art” ([51], 6). In the passage, Malakhov performs the role of a moralist, of a protector of the aesthetic “channels” of Soviet people, but his attitude to “the rebellion of modernists against humanistic culture” was as to “a disguised pseudo-revolutionary method aimed at overthrowing realistic art” ([51], 6).

The attitude of Soviet literary criticism towards the methods (Due to the political character of the Soviet literary criticism, two senses were distinguished in the concept of “Modernism”: “a literary trend and a method” (Zatonskij 1975, 149)) used by modernists was especially hostile, and it delivered an “uncompromising verdict” on them, since the “method [was] regressive and the “purer” it was, the clearer its illness became evident” (Zatonskij 1975, 149). Such an intolerance towards a method, i.e. towards complicated compositional structures and the excessive encoding of artistic text, was related to the fact that the Soviet readers and even scientists were not

ready to perceive such texts ([50], 19-31, 207-220). The generation of Soviet readers (and even the professionals – literary critics) educated on kitsch and social realism sometimes did not understand “the products” of modernists and avant-garde “isms”. They could not understand “the process of modernistic creation, [...] the process of converting real phenomena, events, problems into idioms, symbols, signs – i.e. into abstract forms which do not reflect reality but only symbolically model it [...]” (Zatonskij 1975, 156). In fact, the Soviet readers did not have any special professional, cultural and conceptual preparedness enabling them to decode such texts. This is why the Soviet literary criticism considered modernism incomprehensible for viewers and “poorly-communicative” (Kulikova 2013, 201-202).

In general, the hostile attitude to Modernism in the USSR was determined by ideological-political factors, since Modernism was directly opposed to realistic art, to social realism [50]. The problem lay in the fact that in the USSR the literary-aesthetic field depended on the political one ([71], 467-473; [72], 478-490), (“There is no and there cannot be any neutral art in the class society. [...] The party must emphasize the necessity of creating the fiction oriented towards a really mass reader, workers and peasants; we must boldly break down the prejudices of arrogance in literature and, by employing all technical achievements of the old mastery, to develop a proper form understandable for millions” ([59], 62, 63)), and many who believed in “avant-garde” ideology became their ideological “victims”. Kundera quotes Vladislav Vanchura, a well-known Czech novel writer, who wrote in 1920: “New, new, new is the star of communism, and outside it there is no novelty and contemporaneity. [...] Its generation strived to join the communist party not to lag behind the contemporaneity. The historical decline of the communist party became unavoidable as soon as it became clear that it is everywhere “outside the contemporaneity”” ([49], 201-202).

In the West, modernistic literature was politically independent, autonomous from the political field and from the financial capital, and was far from mass consumption (“A modernistic work – Terry Eagleton writes – puts outside the brackets the referent or a historical reality, compresses the structure and complicates the form in order to prevent it from the immediate use, as well as envelops a literary work in a peculiar protective language so that it would be perceived as an incomprehensible object whose aim is only in itself, the object that is unblemished by being in touch with reality” ([44], 303)). This is why modernists did not get into the ideological “turbulent” zones, as it happened to the followers of social realism, but occupied the indispensable place (for the time being (“For the time being”, because we do not know how the texts of

modernists will be perceived by the coming generations of the end of the 21st, 22nd century)) in the literary canon having become classics.

## 5. "Modernity", "Modernism" and "Avant-gardism" in the Soviet and Post-Soviet Epoch

Now we will specifically focus on the concepts "Modernity" and "Modernism" used in the Soviet and post-Soviet scientific and scientific-methodological literature written in Russian, as well as on the understanding of terms "Modernity", "Modernism" and "Avant-gardism" in the Soviet and post-Soviet epoch.

In today's Western European scientific discourse there is hardly any terminological misunderstanding, nevertheless in Soviet and post-Soviet literary studies semantic "noises" frequently appear.

In the "Soviet Encyclopedic Dictionary", the term "Modernity" in Russian tradition, without providing any explanations, is used as a synonym of "art nouveau": "Art nouveau" is the name of the style of Modernity, accepted in French-speaking and English-speaking countries"; "Jugendstil" is a German name for the modernity style, derived from the title of Munich journal "Jugend" ([64], 68, 830, 1585). In the dictionary "Aesthetics", the term is already provided explanations involving certain reflection, i.e. modernity is perceived as "a Russian name for the style in the European and American art of the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> and beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century ("art nouveau" in France and Great Britain, "Jugendstil" in Germany, "secession" in Austria, respectively)" ([10], 210). A question arises: why should a contaminated term "modernity" (In the article "Moderne und postmoderne Architektur" (The Architecture of Modernity and Post-Modernity) by Habermas, the word combination "modernistic architecture" (modernistische Architektur) is used several times ([41], 45, 53], indicating to the architects of modernity style (in the interpretation of Russian tradition), in other words, to architects of "Jugendstil", "art nouveau" as a derivative of the Modernity epoch. This architectural innovation occurred during the second industrial wave in 1871–1914 (railways, turbines, metro in Paris (1900), aeroplane flights (1902)). In the German discourse, this period is called "the beautiful epoch" ("Belle Epoque") (See in detail (Belle Epoque). Actually, within the cultural-aesthetic discourse, the whole "beautiful epoch" can be treated as a period of pre-modernism, and within the historical-technological – as a continuation of the Modernity epoch with new diversifications (in 1900 – the civil code comes into force, in 1901 – women are admitted to the university life in Baden, in 1911 – introduction of the insurance for the employees etc.) ([34], 12-13)) be used to

denote such art trends as “art nouveau”, “Jugendstil”, “secession”, if a semantic “noise” could be avoided?

In the discourse of art and literary criticism of the post-Soviet epoch, the literary critics, as far as we know, do not have any established and precise use of the concepts “Modernity” and “Modernism”, while Habermas’ translator Skuratov has explicitly formulated it in his “Commentaries”: “Russian “Modernity” too obviously associates with what in German is called “Jugendstil”, but in French – “art nouveau”. If in a translation the word “Modernity” is replaced by “Modernism”, it would narrow the problem, since Habermas has implied not only art, but also sense of time, politics etc.” ([41], 341). This quotation shows that the translator has a clear understanding about the semantic and discourse differences of Modernity as a socio-historical epoch, as a literary-aesthetic “ism” (Modernism), as well as a terminological problem in the linguistic space of the Russian language: “Modernity” as the style denoting “Jugendstil”, “art nouveau” and as an epoch.

At the same time, we have to underline the fact that on the level of *genesis* the use of the term “modernity” to denote Jugendstil might have been valid, but since at present this word is used as the indicator of epoch (Moderne, Modernity) its use for denoting the architectural style is not desirable from the point of view of logic, homonymy and semantic “noises”. For instance, in his guide to the contemporary art Amy Dempsey does not use the concept “modernity”; in some chapters provides the description of “Jugendstil”, “Vienna Secession” ([17], 57-58, 59-61). This example may serve as a basis for further approaches to describing in Russian the culture of the last quarter of the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

It is worth noting that the term modernity as an indicator of the epoch is not to be found either in the Soviet or post-Soviet literary dictionaries and encyclopedias (KLJe 1967; SLT 1974; LJeS 1987; SZL 1999; Pojetika: slovar’ 2008). The things are quite different with the concept “Modernism”.

In Soviet times the term “Modernism” had several meanings:

- in the “Soviet Encyclopedic Dictionary” the second meaning of the concept “Modernism” is: “a trend in Catholicism at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, oriented towards the renewal of the Catholic preaching, towards “aligning” it with a contemporary scientific and philosophical thinking” (SJeS 1989, 830) (The same meaning (the 2nd meaning of the dictionary item) is expressed in German by the word “Modernismus, der” (Duden: online (Modernismus, der))). We find almost the same meaning in the “Dictionary

of Foreign Words”: “one of the forms for adapting religion to new conditions of existence; modernism revises obsolete traditional religious perceptions and concepts which have come in obvious conflict with the new scientific perception of the faithful, with their changed consciousness; the principal aim of modernism is strengthening the position of religion under the conditions of the crisis of religious ideology” (SIS 1983, 318). In the post-Soviet scientific literature this problem of conceptual muddle is resolved by means of the adjective “religious” (religious modernism) (Hristianstvo: slovar’ 1994, 286-287; Religiovedenie 2002, 414-415) (See about this problem in detail: ([18], 91-98; [30], 87-97; [31], 210-217)) or “Catholic modernism” ([18], 91).

- The concept of “Modernism” was used in the Soviet time as “a general designation of the trends in art and literature at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> and beginning the 20<sup>th</sup> century (cubism, Dadaism, surrealism, futurism, expressionism, abstract art and the like), which expressed the crisis of bourgeois culture and characterized breaking with the traditions of realism” (SJeS 1989, 830). A similar interpretation is given in the post-Soviet dictionary of culture compiled by Vadim Rudnev: “Modernism is quite a relative designation of the period of culture at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> and middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, i.e. from impressionism up to the new novel and absurd theatre” ([69], 177).

The quotations given above show that Modernism:

1. is a hyperonym for all “isms” of the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> and the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century,
2. expresses the crisis of bourgeois culture (explicitly),
3. is the antipode to Realism (implicitly) (In the dictionary paragraph of SIS, surrealism is also explicitly indicated as the antipode of Modernism (SIS 1983, 318)).

Such understanding of the first deduction was popular also in the scientific articles in the Soviet times. In his article “Literary Trends as an International Phenomenon” (1967), Viktor Zhirmunsky writes that the term “Modernism”, popular in the Soviet literary criticism, is used as “the most voluminous and objective term for denoting all the phenomena in the latest literature of the 80-ies of the previous century up to nowadays, which has emerged as the reaction against Realism: the word “Symbolism” denotes a narrower circle of phenomena within Modernism, “decadence”, as it was said at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> – the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, contains an element implying lower standards (epoch of “decline”)” ([92], 145).

We would not agree with V. Zhirmunsky concerning the chronology of Modernism. It was already mentioned above that we have agreed upon denoting all the innovative “isms” of the 1880-s by the term “pre-modernism”. From the present perspective, we consider the extension of the period of Modernism up to the 1960-s ([92], 145) as not quite accurate, since it was only in the 1970-s, more specifically in 1978, that there appeared in fine arts a distinctly identifiable “ism” – Postmodernism – to counterbalance “purism, rationality of minimalism art and analytical painting”, as well as pop-art expressed in trans-avant-garde (Arte cifra), “new fauvists” (Neue Wilde), New image painting and graffiti ([66], 266).

In Soviet times, Modernism also identified “directly with decadence to which all the non-realistic art of the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> and beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century was attributed” (SLT 1974, 233). As it was mentioned by V. Zhirmunsky, through the concept of “decadence” the politicized Soviet literary criticism belittled Modernism, imparting to it and emphasizing a contemptuous attitude to the concept of Modernism itself. Following the same logic, everything that was advanced, progressive was branded as national socialists in “Völkisher Beobachter”; avant-gardism was called “decadent”, “perverse”, “cynical”, “nihilistic”, “sickly” ([22], 404-405). The attitude of Stalin and German regimes to Modernism and avant-gardism was similar, since in both countries the cultural policy was analogous ([71], 467-473; Simyan 2011, 478-490). We will note that the hybrid manifestation of the Nazi art (from the artifact to life and vice versa) allows assuming that the Nazi cultural policy functioned according to the logic of avant-gardists, since its “gene” already contained a previous avant-garde “ism” (futurism – fascism). In his essay, Enzensberger revealed the relationship between surrealists and Hitler, having taken Breton’s metaphorical words literally: “The most surrealist act is – Andre Breton writes – to go out into the street with a revolver and as long as possible shoot blind at the crowd” ([22], 422).

In his article “Что такое модернизм?” (“Chto takoe modernism?” / “What is Modernism?”) (1975), Dmitry Zatonsky partly names the sources of the confusion between the concepts of “Modernism” and “Avant-gardism” in the Soviet epoch. The author argues that the Soviet literary criticism has echoed French sources, in which the concepts of “Modernism” and “Avant-gardism” have been regarded as synonymous from the very beginning already (Zatonskij 1975, 146), however a distinct differentiation between these phenomena has not been made. D. Zatonsky emphasizes their dissimilarity: “to confuse this phenomenon (i.e. avant-gardism – T. S.; I. K.) with Modernism would be a fatal error” (Zatonskij 1975, 147). And just at that time in Europe a distinct line of demarcation between Modernism and Avant-gardism was drawn (However,

what is common between Modernism and Avant-gardism should also be pointed out ([28], 91-109)).

In his research work on "Die Theorie der Avantgarde" (Theory of Avant-Garde) (1974), Peter Bürger, the German theoretician, drew a distinct line of demarcation between Modernism and Avant-gardism by applying the principle of a change from *art and aesthetic "isms" to life* ([15], 29) (We have to note that before the 1970-s there was no explicit criterion of this kind, it cannot be observed even in the article "Avant-garde and Kitsch" (1939) by the well-known American expert and theoretician on Avant-gardism Clement Greenberg (1909-2000) (Grinberg 1939)). The same position can to be traced in the article by E. P. Korotchenko. This is the only article known to us in the post-Soviet encyclopedic discourse written in Russian in which Modernism and Avant-gardism are distinctly differentiated ("The problem of correlation between A. and Modernism has several dimensions. On the one hand, from the aspect of its conceptual basis A. is tightly related to Modernism since it rejects realistic aesthetics, and in its artistic dimension is, practically, represented by the same schools as Modernism, however, in respect of functioning A. can be specified as the trend reducing the tendencies of social protest more distinctly than Modernism. [...] the specific feature of A. is its programmatic epatage aimed at exerting an active influence on the crowd in order to awaken the latter from the sleep of common sense" ([46], 12-14)).

Just due to the ignorance about this criterion, such hyponyms of Avant-gardism as Dadaism, constructionism (KLJe 1967, 905), futurism and surrealism (SLT 1974, 222) fell under the hyperonym modernism, while such hyponyms of modernism as expressionism, "theatrical system of Brecht" (SLT 1974, 8; Pavlova 2004, 182; Sirotkin 2006, 820) (About the criticism on attributing expressionists to avant-gardists see more in detail in the essay "The Aporias of Avant-gard" by Enzensberger. In his essay, the German author criticizes historians of literature and art for their insufficient study of the empirical material. Georg Heim and Georg Trakl had not heard about the word "expressionism" introduced by Herman Barr in 1914, since they were already dead by that time. Gotfried Benn did not understand in 1955 what expressionism implied, Brecht, Kafka, Döblin had not joined any literary movement ([22], 421).), absurd theatre (Ionesco, Beckett a.o.), "the new novel" (Sarrot, Robbe-Grillet, Butor a.o.) (LJeS 1987, 9) – under the hyperonym of Avant-gardism. The problem lies in the fact that the above mentioned hyponyms were the manifestations of modernism and they did not focus on the change from art to life.

The distinctive criteria of the Avant-garde "isms" are:

- group manifestation (futurism, Dadaism, surrealism);

- internationalism of the movement ([28], 89);
- manifesto as a communicative channel ([73], 130-148);
- “natural renewal: forms of sound and visual poems”;
- “reference [...] is reduced to minimum; the aesthetic sign [...] does not have any denotatum” (the abstruse poetry of Russian futurists, poems by Dadaists, abstractionism in painting) ([76], 36);
- a radical renewal of artistic expressions [23];
- the entertaining character of poetry during literary parties (Dada);
- imparting carnival features to poetry, which opened the way to the world of nonsense;
- meta-semiotic character of practices ([45], 103-110);
- self-criticism with self-denial (for example, Dadaism) ([74, 75], 384-396);
- explicit political engagement (futurism, Dadaism etc.) ([29], 15-36).

The key factor for drawing the line of demarcation between Modernism and Avant-gardism seems to be also a scandalous character of the latter. In the article “Скандал как механизм культуры” [“Skandal kak mehanizm kul’turny” / “Scandal as a Mechanism of Culture”] Nora Books describes the semantics of scandalousness represented “in challenging the established norms”, in “intentional violation of the accepted system of meanings”, in “the given impropriety of behavior or a text” etc. ([14], 7-8). Of course, scandalousness can be seen in modernist literature as well, for instance in novels by David Herbert Lawrence – “Women in Love” (1920), “Lady Chatterley’s Lover” (1928), however scandal cannot be seen in the behavior (habitus) of the author.

Avant-gardists, actually, radically changed the paradigm of the 19<sup>th</sup> century literature – from the radical conception “art for art’s sake” towards closer to life, but literary-aesthetic scandals become part of social life.

The idea that both Decadence and Modernism (SLT 1974, 8) also fall under the hyperonym avant-garde is another mythologeme of the Soviet literary criticism. Decadence and Modernism should be distinctly differentiated (In the Soviet literary criticism, Dmitry Zatonksy (Zatonksij 1975, 135-146) has written about the problem of differentiating between Decadence and Modernism, emphasizing that in about 1957 “the tendency to differentiate the meaning of “Decadence” from that of “Modernism” is displayed clearer and clearer” in the Soviet literary criticism” (Zatonksij 1975, 135)). Decadence is the “product” of the Modernity epoch (the last quarter of the 19<sup>th</sup> century), “a world view involving “the disintegration of the whole”” ([3], 7), the state of mind of Charles

Baudelaire, Paul Verlaine, Stéphane Mallarmé, Oscar Wilde, Hugo von Hofmannsthal, Stefan George, Maurice Maeterlinck, Tomas Mann etc.

The corpus of texts by decadents should not be identified and confused with the literature created by modernists in the 1910–1920-s. (Proust, Kafka, Joyce, Brecht, Faulkner, Becket etc.) (Branskaja, Panfilova 2015, 265). If the term “avant-garde” is perceived in a broad sense of the word, then the hyperonym avant-garde may involve everything that is invariant or opposite to the tradition of the authors’ writings ([76], 820). Such interpretation of avant-garde allows including in it those writers and poets of world literary classics who were innovative and went against the literary tradition and discourse of their time, of their epoch. Can we consider Giovanni Boccaccio, Francois Villon, Francois Rabelais, Miguel de Cervantes, Shakespeare avant-gardists? Of course, academic Y. S. Stepanov has narrowed the chronology and has marked the beginning of avant-gardists as the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century (“By Avant-garde we will understand, first of all, the period of European cultural life from the middle of the 19th century;” not only the time, but above all cultural phenomena are characterized by avant-garde”; Avant-garde is no “pure chronology”, but rather a style, a type of cultural life” ([78], 19)). This is why the anthology incorporates all the innovative philosophers, authors belonging to this period (Sade, Lautreamont, Rimbaud, Verlaine, Mallarme, Apollinaire). We would like to note that in the “Introduction” by Y. S. Stepanov we may implicitly feel that the selection of authors has been made according to the principle of innovativeness (“We, really, are going to write neither literature in general, nor an essay on French literature in particular. Our aim – the introduction to the active quest (underlined. – T. S., I. K.) of the French. In the mirror of the Russians” ([79], 602)). This selection shows that all the authors are representatives of the Modernity epoch, or in other words, pre-modernists, those who were not devoid of the spirit of novelty and innovative quest. As E. P. Korotchenko has pointed out, the understanding of avant-gardism in a broad sense results in the situation that any innovative thing in culture can appeal to any epoch, even to the late-Roman culture ([46], 12). The authors of this article support the narrow understanding of the term “avant-gardism”, otherwise avant-gardism will become an eternal “ism” and will live forever.

We should not also confuse avant-gardists with modernists ([53], 11; [33]; Branskaja, Panfilova 2015, 264). In Soviet time avant-garde was considered the extreme manifestation of modernism (LJeS 1987, 9; Zima 2014, 30), but in the post-Soviet time – “the leading force of Modernism preparing its arrival by its extreme nihilism, by its rejection of traditions, of classical artistic experience” ([3], 10). The mentioned viewpoints are partially true, however it is better to differentiate Avant-gardism from Modernism,

because the latter is a purely literary phenomenon, while Avant-gardism is a “beside-literary” phenomenon, and their difference lies in the fact that the sense and perception of the *new* things are more manifested in Avant-garde “isms” than in literature of Modernism, although in his final book “Модернизм и постмодернизм...” (“Modernism i postmodernism...” / “Modernism and PostModernism...”) Dimitry Zatonsky ascribes “egoism and aggressiveness” with regard to novelty just to Modernism (“[...] within the context of its own epoch, it is indeed an innovative-mutinuous force, some kind of extremist, desperate – we may even say “the final” – attempt to defend Goal and Progress. Thus, he had not borrowed the term “Modern- (ismus)” from anybody, he himself “devised” it for his own use, proceeding from the sincerest conviction about his indisputable “firstling” ([91], 29)).

We should note also that while in Avant-gardism breaking with tradition is being made radically fetish, in literature of Modernism the feature of cumulateness is evident.

If avant-gardists (futurists, Dadaists, surrealists) try to resolve or are resolving the problem with the past radically, then in his program article “Tradition and the Individual Talent” (1919), Thomas Eliot proposes the principle of a cumulative dialogue with the past: “[...] novelty is better than repetition. Tradition is a matter of much wider significance. It cannot be inherited, and if you want it you must obtain it by great labour. It involves, in the first place, the historical sense [...]; and the historical sense involves a perception, not only of the pastness of the past, but of its presence; the historical sense compels a man to write not merely with his own generation in his bones, but with a feeling that the whole of the literature of Europe from Homer and within it the whole of the literature of his own country has a simultaneous existence and composes a simultaneous order. This historical sense, which is a sense of the timeless as well as of the temporal and of the timeless and of the temporal together, is what makes a writer traditional. And it is at the same time what makes a writer most acutely conscious of his place in time, of his contemporaneity.” (Eliot 1986, 477).

Actually, Eliot considers that author’s innovativeness is possible only by acquiring, interiorizing the historical and cultural memory. Novelty in author’s creative work is seen when contrasted with the textual corpus of the past: “his (the poet’s – T. S., I. K.) significance, his evaluation is the evaluation of his attitude towards poets and artists of the past” (Eliot 1986, 477; [86], 34-37). Novelty conceals also the pragmatic aspect of the literary work. The author-innovator plays with reader’s “expectations”, since in his thesaurus there has not been any text with such a composition, structure. Cumulateness can be shown also on the empirical material. For example, how old myths are

“revised” by new codes (“Ulysses”), Aragon (“The Adventures of Telemachus”, 1924), Camus (“The Myth of Sisyphus”, 1942) Broch (“The Death of Virgil”, 1945 etc.).

In his essay “Die Aporien der Avantgarde” (The Aporias of Avant-garde) (1962), the German writer, poet Hans Magnus Enzensberger mentions the fierce criticism of social axiology and literary-aesthetic field as one of the demarcation criteria for differentiating Modernism from Avant-gardism ([22], 401-424), i.e. Avant-garde becomes a critic of the production of Modernism.

## 6. Conclusion

Consequently, the above said allows concluding that in the discourse of literary criticism written in Russian the problem of a possible unification of understanding the terms “Modernity”, “Modernism” and “Avant-gardism” still remains unresolved. As far as the empirical material on the level of literary-critical dictionaries, encyclopedias and manuals on theory and history of literatures shows, there still exists a semantic “noise” not only between the concepts of “Modernity” and “Modernism”, but also between “Modernism” and “Avant-gardism”. The post-soviet Russian and Western literary criticisms have not entered into a “dialogue” as yet. It is clearly evident that the understanding of the significant (the content plane) “Modernity”, “Modernism” and “Avant-gardism” depends also on the criteria according to which the temporal extension of Modernity, Modernism and Avant-gardism is differentiated. If, for instance, subjectivism or revealing the inner world of a lyrical hero or protagonist of a novel in the area of literature is taken as a criterion, even Dostoyevsky and Nietzsche become modernists ([93], 251). In turn, the confusion arises also from the fact that the Russian scientific discourse often does not specify in which sense (narrow or broad) the terms “Modernity”, “Modernism” and “Avant-gardism” are used. On the basis of the analysis of the empiric material the authors of this article suggest using these terms in a narrow sense to avoid the semantic “noises”.

## References

- [1] Abbyy, Lingvo. 2011. *Bol'shoj francuzsko-russkij slovar'* [Big French-Russian Dictionary]. ABBYY Lingvo: Fleur.
- [2] Adorno, A. 2001. *Jesteticheskaja teorija* [Aesthetic theory]. Moscow: Respublika.
- [3] Andreev, L. G. 2004. “Vvedenie” [Foreword]. In *Zarubezhnaja literatura XX veka*. Moscow: Vysshaja shkola.

- [4] Bahmutskij, V. Ja. 1985. "Na rubezhe dvuh vekov" [On the Edge of Two Centuries]. In *Spor o drevnih i novyh*. Moscow: Iskusstvo.
- [5] Baudelaire, C. 1970. *Cvety zla* [Flowers of the Evil]. Moscow: Nauka.
- [6] Baudelaire, C. 1986. *Ob iskusstve* [About Art]. Moscow: Iskusstvo.
- [7] Beck, U. 2000. *Obshhestvo Riska: Na puti k drugomu modernu* [Risk Society. Towards a New Modernity]. Moscow: Progress-Tradicija.
- [8] Beck, U. 2001. *Risikogesellschaft: auf dem Weg in eine andere Moderne*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- [9] Belle Epoque. URL: <http://www.la-belle-epoque.de/beintrod.htm>
- [10] Belyaeva, A. ed. 1989. *Estetika: slovar'* [Aesthetics: Dictionary]. Moscow: Politizdat.
- [11] Borev, Ju. 2001. "Literaturnyj Process." *Teorija Literaturny*. Vol. 4. Moscow: IMLI RAN, Nasledie.
- [12] Borev, Ju. ed. 2002. *Jestetika: Uchebnik* [Aesthetics: Textbook]. Moscow: Vysshaja Shkola.
- [13] Branskaja, E. V., and M. I. Panfilova. 2016. "Modern, modernizm, postmodernizm: k opredeleniju Ponjatij" [Modernity, Modernism, Postmodernism: Definition of Concepts]. *Innovacionnaja nauka* 1(3): 264-267.
- [14] Buks, N. 2008. "Skandal kak mehanizm kul'tury" [Scandal as a Mechanism of Culture]. *Semiotika skandala*. Sbornik statej. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo «Evropa».
- [15] Bürger, P. 1974. *Theorie der Avantgarde*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- [16] Delabar, W. 2010. *Klassische Moderne. Deutschsprachige Literatur 1918-1933*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- [17] Dempsey, J. 2008. *Stili, shkoly, napravlenija. Putevoditel' po sovremennomu iskusstvu* [Styles, schools, directions. Guide to contemporary art]. Moscow: Iskusstvo 21 vek.
- [18] Dolgov, V. B. 2012. "Katolicheskij modernizm: chast' zapadnogo Moderna ili osobaja reakcija na nego" [Catholic Modernism: Part of Western Modernity or a Special Reaction to it?] *Istoricheskie, filosofskie, politicheskie i juridicheskie nauki, kul'turologija i Iskusstvovedenie: Voprosy teorii i praktiki*. Tambov: Gramota, 1(12) (26): 91-98. Retrieved from: [http://scjournal.ru/articles/issn\\_1997-292X\\_2012\\_12-1\\_22.pdf](http://scjournal.ru/articles/issn_1997-292X_2012_12-1_22.pdf)
- [19] Duden: *German Dictionary*. 2018. Modernismus. retrieved from: <https://www.duden.de/suchen/dudenonline/Modernismus>
- [20] Eco, U. 1997. "Fascismo Eterno" [Eternal Fascism]. *Cinque Scritti Morali*. Milan: Bompiani. Retrieved fom: <http://www.punk4free.org/articoli/18-politica/3087-umberto-eco-lur-fascismo-il-fascismo-eterno.html>

- [21] Eco, U. 2003. *Pjat' jesse na temy jetiki* [Five Moral Essays]. St.Peterburg: Symposium.
- [22] Enzensberger, H. M. 1962. "Die Aporien der Avantgard." *Merkur* 16(5): 401-424.
- [23] Fateeva, N. 2006. "Identichnost' lichnosti avtora i variativnost' form vyrazhenija v tekstah avangarda" [The Identity of the Author's Personality and the Variability of the Form of Expression in Avant-Garde Texts]. In *Semiotika i Avangard: Antologija*, edited by Ju. S. Stepanova, 43-53. Moscow: Akademicheskij proekt; Kul'tura.
- [24] Fedorov, I.A. 2013. "Problemy sociokul'turnoj i politicheskoj modernizacii: chelovek, kommunikacija, sreda" [Problems of Socio-cultural and Political Modernization: Humanity, Communication, Environment]. In *Materialy VII mezhdunarodnoj nauchno-prakticheskoj konferencii, posvjashhennoj 210-letiju SPbSFTU*, edited by I.A. Fedorov and A. Ja. Donin. St.Petersburg: St. Petersburg State Forest Technical University.
- [25] Gavrov, S.N. 2009. "Modernizacija: Chelovek jepohi moderna" [Modernization: Man of the Modern Age]. In *Modernizacija Rossii: postimperskij tranzit*. USA: University of Nebraska – Lincoln.
- [26] Genis, A. 2000. "Modernizm kak stil' 20 veka" [Modernism as a Style of the 20th Century]. *Zvezda* 11. Retrieved from <http://magazines.russ.ru/zvezda/2000/11/genis.html>
- [27] Giddens, Je. 2011. *Posledstvija sovremennosti* [Consequences of Modernity]. Moscow: Praksis.
- [28] Girin, Ju. S. 2002. "Avangard kak stil'" [Style Avant-Garde]. In *Hudozhestvennyje Orientiry Zarubezhnoj Literatury 20 veka*. Moscow: IMLI RAN.
- [29] Golomshtok, I. 1994. *Totalitarnoe iskusstvo* [Totalitarian Art]. Moscow: Galart.
- [30] Golovushkin, D. A. 2015a. "Religioznyj fundamentalizm / religioznyj modernizm: konceptual'nye protivniki ili ambivalentnye fenomeny?" [Religious Fundamentalism / Religious Modernism: Conceptual Opponents or Ambivalent Phenomena?]. *Vestnik Pravoslavnogo Svjato-Tihonovskogo gumanitarnogo universiteta*. Series: Bogoslovie Filosofija, 1:87-97. Retrieved from: <http://elibrary.ru/download/61385476.pdf>
- [31] Golovushkin, D. A. 2015b. "Religioznyj modernizm: granicy primenjaemosti ponjatija" [Religious modernism: concept's application purview]. *Izvestija Irkutskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta* Series: Politologija, Religiovedenie, 13: 210-217.
- [32] Grinberg, K. 2016. "Avangard i kitch" [Avant-Garde and Kitsch]. *Partisan Review*, 6(5): 34-49. Retrieved from: [http://xz.gif.ru/numbers/60/avangard-i-kitch/view\\_print/](http://xz.gif.ru/numbers/60/avangard-i-kitch/view_print/)

- [33] Gricanov, A.A. 1999. "Modernizm" [Modernism]. In *Novejšij filozofskij slovar'*, edited by A. Gricanov. Minsk: Knizhnyj dom. Retrieved from: [http://www.e-reading.club/chapter.php/149350/771/Gricanov\\_-\\_Novejšij\\_filozofskij\\_slovar%27.html](http://www.e-reading.club/chapter.php/149350/771/Gricanov_-_Novejšij_filozofskij_slovar%27.html)
- [34] Große, W. 2003. *Erläuterungen zu Thomas Mann: Tonio Kröger, Mario und der Zauberer*. 2nd ed. Hollfeld: C Bange Verlag.
- [35] Gurevich, P. 1995. "Fundamentalizm i modernizm kak kul'turnye orientacii" [Fundamentalism and modernism as cultural orientations]. *Obshhestvennye nauki i sovremennost'* 4: 154-162. Retrieved from: [http://ecsocman.hse.ru/data/790/112/1218/018G\\_urevich.pdf](http://ecsocman.hse.ru/data/790/112/1218/018G_urevich.pdf)
- [36] Gus'kova, N.A. 2013. *Literaturnyj process v Rossii ot jepohi moderna k jepohe avangarda: Nove materialy issledovanija pojetiki* [Literary process in Russia from the modern era to the era of the avant-garde: New materials research projects]. St.Peterburg: Saint Petersburg State University Philological Department.
- [37] Habermas, J. 1980. "Die Moderne – Ein unvollendetes Projekt" [Modernity – an Unfinished Project]. *Die Zeit*. Retrieved from <http://www.zeit.de/1980/39/die-moderne-ein-unvollendetes-projekt>
- [38] Habermas, J. 1985. *Die neue Unübersichtlichkeit. Kleine Politische Schriften*. 1st ed. [The New Conservatism: Cultural Criticism and the Historians' Debate]. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- [39] Habermas, J. 1998. "Konzeptionen der Moderne. Ein Rückblick auf Zwei Traditionen." In *Die Postnationale Konstellation: Politische Essays*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.
- [40] Habermas, J. 2003. *Filozofskij diskurs o moderne* [Philosophical Discourse on Modernity]. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo «Ves' Mir».
- [41] Habermas, J. 2005. *Politicheskie raboty* [Political Essays]. Moscow: Praxis.
- [42] Halizev, V.E. 2005. *Teorija Literatury: Uchebnik* [Theory of Literature: Textbook]. Moscow: Vysshaja Shkola.
- [43] Jablokova, N. I., ed. 2002. *Religiovedenie: ucheb: posobie i ucheb slovar'-Minimum po Religiovedeniju* [Religious Studies: A Schoolbook and a Minimum Dictionary of Religious Studies]. Moscow: Gardariki.
- [44] Kabanova, I.V. 2004. *Sovremennaja literaturnaja teorija: antologija* [Contemporary Literary Theory: Anthology]. Moscow: Flinta, Nauka.
- [45] Kajt, G. 2004. "Pojeticheskie jeksperimenty nemeckogo i russkogo avangarda" [German and Russian Avant-Garde Poetic Experiments]. *Baltijskij filologičeskij kur'er* 4: 102-111. Retrieved from: [https://journals.kantiana.ru/upload/iblock/102/%Do%9A%Do%Bo%Do%B9%D1%82\\_102-111.pdf](https://journals.kantiana.ru/upload/iblock/102/%Do%9A%Do%Bo%Do%B9%D1%82_102-111.pdf)

- [46] Korotchenko, E.P. 2001. *Avangardizm, Postmodernizm. Jenciklopedija* [Avant-gardism. Postmodernism. Encyclopedia]. Moscow: Interpresservis; Knizhnyj Dom.
- [47] Kozhevnikova, V.M. and P. A. Nikolaeva, eds. 1987. *Literaturnyj jenciklopedicheskij slovar'* [Literary Encyclopedic Dictionary]. Moscow: Sovetskaja Jenciklopedija.
- [48] Kulikova, I. 1980. *Filosofija i Iskusstvo modernizma*. 2nd ed. [Modernism Philosophy and Art]. Moscow: Politizdat.
- [49] Kundera, M. 2013. *Iskusstvo romana* [The Art of the Novel]. St.Peterburg: Azbuka.
- [50] Lifshic, M. 1978. *Iskusstvo i sovremennij mir*, 2nd ed. [Art and the Contemporary World]. Moscow: Izobrazitel'noe iskusstvo.
- [51] Malahov, N. O. 1975. *O modernizme* [About Modernism]. Moscow: Izobrazitel'noe Iskusstvo.
- [52] Mitorina, L. N., ed. 1994. *Hristianstvo: slovar'* [Christianity: Dictionary]. Moscow: Respublika.
- [53] Mozhnjagun, S. 1970. *O modernizme* [About Modernism]. Moscow: Iskusstvo.
- [54] *Nazyvat' veshhi svoimi imenami: programmnye vystuplenija masterov zapadno-evropejskoj literatury 20 veka*. 1986 [To Call Things by Their Proper Names: Programm Speeches by Masters of Western European Literature of the 20th Century]. Moscow: Progress.
- [55] Neklessa A. 2000. "Konec jepohi Bol'shogo Moderna" [End of the Age of the Great Modern]. *Znamja*. Retrieved from: <http://magazines.russ.ru/znamia/2000/1/nekles-pr.html>
- [56] Novikova N. K. 2017. "Ispanojazychnyj avangard. Kreas'onizm i ul'traizm" [Hispanic Avant-Garde. Creationism and ultrarism]. In *Zarubezhnaja Literatura 20 veka: Pervaja Polovina XX Veka: uchebnik dlja akademicheskogo bakalavriata*. 2nd ed., edited by V.M. Tolmachjov, 110-116. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Jurajt.
- [57] Nünning, Ansgar, ed. 2008. *Metzler lexikon literatur- und kulturtheorie: Ansätze-Personen-Grundbegriffe*. 4th ed. Stuttgart: Metzler.
- [58] Ortega, J. 2003. *Vosstanija mass* [The Revolt of the Masses]. Moscow: AST.
- [59] Osmakova, L.N, ed. 1982. *Hrestomatija po teorii literatury* [Chrestomathy on the Theory of Literature]. Moscow: Prosveshhenie.
- [60] Pavlova, N.S. 2004. Jekspressionizm [Expressionism]. In *Zarubezhnaja literatura 20 veka*. 2nd ed., edited by L.G. Andreeva, 182-194. Moscow: Vysshaja shkola.
- [61] Peukert, D.J.K. 1987. *Die Weimarer Republik. Krisenjahre der Klassischen Moderne*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.
- [62] Po, E. A. 1970. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenij* [Complete Set of Works]. Moscow: Nauka.

- [63] Poselyagin, N. 2016. "Ispytanie modernost'ju" [Testing Modernity]. *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*, 4. Retrieved from: <http://magazines.russ.ru/nlo/2016/4/ispytanie-modernostyu.html>
- [64] Prohorov, A. M., ed. 1989. *SjeS: Sovetskij jenciklopedicheskij Slovar'* [Soviet Encyclopedic Dictionary]. Moscow: Sovetskaja Jenciklopedija.
- [65] Rembo, A. 1982. *Stihi* [Poems]. Moscow: Nauka.
- [66] Richter H. 1988. *Geschichte der Malerei im 20. 7th ed.* Köln: DuMont Buchverlag.
- [67] Rimbaud, A. 1988. *Oeuvres* [Artworks]. Moscow: Radouga.
- [68] Rosenkran, K. 1996. *Ästhetik der Häßlichen*. Leibzig: Reclam Verlag.
- [69] Rudnev, V. 1997. *Slovar' kul'tury XX veka: ključevye ponjatija i teksty* [Dictionary of the 20th Century Culture: Key Concepts and Texts]. Moscow: Agraf.
- [70] Schweikle, I. 1990. "Modernismo". In *Metzler-Literatur-Lexikon: Begriffe und Definitionen*. 2nd ed., edited by Hrsg. von Günther and I. Schweikle. Stuttgart: Metzler.
- [71] Simjan, T.S. 2010. "Logika i semiotika pravlenija totalitarnyh rezhimov (Opyt Analiza Sovetskogo i Nacistskogo Rezhimov)" [Logic and Semiotics of the Totalitarian Regimes Board (Analysis of Soviet and Nazi Regimes)]. In *Totalitarianism and Literary Discourse: 20th Century Experience*. Tbilisi: Shota Rustaveli Institute of Georgian Literature.
- [72] Simjan, T.S. 2011. "Towards a typology of the nazi and soviet totalitarian regimes." In *Totalitarianism and Literary Discourse: 20th Century Experience*, edited by I. Ratiani, 478-490. Cambridge Scholar Publishing.
- [73] Simjan, T.S. 2013. "K probleme manifesta kak zhanra: genesis, ponimanie, funkcija" [To the Problem of the Manifesto as a Genre: Genesis, Comprehension, Function]. *Kritika i semiotika* 2(19): 130-148. Retrieved from: <http://www.nsu.ru/education/virtual/cso19simyan.pdf>
- [74] Simjan, T.S. 2015a. "Dadaizm v Germanii: logika, semiotika, strategija" [German Dadaism: Logic, Semiotics, Strategies]. *Kritika i semiotika*. 2: 384-398. Retrieved from: [http://philology.nsc.ru/journals/kis/pdf/CS\\_2015\\_2/28.pdf](http://philology.nsc.ru/journals/kis/pdf/CS_2015_2/28.pdf)
- [75] Simjan, T.S. 2015b. "Smena paradigmy: oppozicija «vneshnjaja» i «vnutrennjaja» Literatura, ili «distancirovannaja» kritika nacizma (na primere romana Liona Fejhtvanger «Lzhe-Neron»)" [Change of Paradigm: Opposition "External" and "Internal" Literature, or "Distant" criticism of Nazism (Using the Example of Lyon Feuchtwanger's Roman «Pseudo-Nero»)]. *Sibirskij filologicheskij zhurnal* 2: 256-266.

- [76] Sirotkin N. 2006. "Nemeckojazychnyj avangard" [German Avant-Garde]. In *Semiotika i Avangard: Antologija* [Semiotics and Avant-Garde: Anthology], edited by Ju. S. Stepanova, 820-824. Moscow: Akademicheskij Proekt; Kul'tura.
- [77] Stepanov, Ju., ed. 1985. *Spor o drevnih i novyh* [Parallel between Ancients and Moderns]. Moscow: Iskusstvo.
- [78] Stepanov, Ju., ed. 2006a. "Semiotika, Filosofija, Avangard" [Semiotics, Philosophy, Avant-Garde]. In *Semiotika i avangard: Antologija* [Semiotics and Avant-Garde: Anthology]. Moscow: Akademicheskij proekt; Kul'tura.
- [79] Stepanov, Ju., ed. 2006b. "Vvodnye zamechanija" [Introductory Remarks]. In *Semiotika i avangard: Antologija* [Semiotics and Avant-Garde: Anthology]. Moscow: Akademicheskij proekt; Kul'tura.
- [80] *SIS: Slovar' inostrannyh slov*. 1983. [Foreign Words Dictionary]. 10th Ed. Moscow: Russkij jazyk, 1983.
- [81] Surkov, Alekseĭ Aleksandrovich, ed. 1967. *Kratkaja literaturnaja jenciklopedija* [Concise Literary Encyclopedia]. Vol. 4. Moscow: Sovetskaja Jenciklopedija.
- [82] *SZL: Sovremennoe zarubezhnoe literaturovedenie (Strany zapadnoj Evropy i SShA): koncepcii, shkoly, terminy: jenciklopedicheskij spravochnik*. 1999. [Contemporary Foreign Literature Studies (Countries of Western Europe and the USA): Concepts, Schools, Terms: Encyclopedic Guide)]. Moscow: Intrada-INION.
- [83] Tamarchenko, N.D., ed. 2008. *Pojetika: slovar' sktual'nyh terminov i ponjatij* [Poetics: Dictionary of Actual Terms and Concepts]. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Kulaginoj, Intrada.
- [84] Timofeev, L.I. and S. V. Turaev, eds. 1974. *SLT: Slovar' literaturovedcheskih terminov* [Literary Terms Dictionary]. Moscow: Prosveshhenie.
- [85] Toffler, E. 2004. *Tret'ja volna* [Third Wave]. Moscow: AST, 2004.
- [86] Tolmachev, V.M. 2011. "T.S. Eliot". *Filologija* 1(23): 7-64. Retrieved from: <http://pstu.ru/download/1316536121.7-64.pdf>
- [87] Ushakova O. M. 2010. "Modernizm: o granicah ponjatija" [Modernism: on the Borderlines of the Concept]. *Vestnik Permskogo universiteta: Rossijskaja i zarubezhnaja filologija*. 6 (12): 109-114. Retrieved from: <http://www.rfp.psu.ru/archive/6.2010/ushakova.pdf>
- [88] Weber, M. 1917. *Wissenschaft als Beruf* [Science as a Vocation]. Retrieved from: <http://www.wsp-kultur.uni-bremen.de/summerschool/download%20ss%202006/Max%20Weber%20-%20Wissenschaft%20als%20Beruf.pdf>
- [89] Weber, M. 1990. *Izbrannye proizvedenija* [Selected Works]. Moscow: Progress Press.

- [90] Zaton'skij, D.V. 1974. "Chto takoe modernizm?" [What is Modernism]. *Kontekst*. Moscow: Nauka.
- [91] Zaton'skij, D.V. 2000. *Modernizm i postmodernizm: Mysli ob izvechnom kolovrashhenii izjashhnyh i neizjashhnyh iskusstv* [Modernism and Postmodernism: Thoughts about the Eternal Circumvolution of Fine and Non-Fine Arts]. Harkov: Folio; Moscow: AST.
- [92] Zhirmun'skij, V.M. 1979. *Sravnitel'noe literaturovedenie: Vostok i Zapad* [Comparative Literature Studies: East and West]. Leningrad: Nauka.
- [93] Zima, P.V. 2014. "Moderne, Postmoderne." In *Gesellschaft, Philosophie, Literatur*. Tübingen: A. Francke Verlag Tübingen