

## Coping With Canon/Canons: Women Poets and the Literary Context

*Aleksandra Nikčević-Batričević*  
*University of Montenegro*  
*Miloš D. Đurić*  
*University of Belgrade*

*Literary history and the present are dark with silences: some the silences for years by our acknowledged great; some silences hidden; some the ceasing to publish after one work appears; some the never coming to book form at all.* (T. Olsen "Silences", 1962)

*The Modern Language Association is both marketplace and funeral parlor for the professional study of Western literature in North America. Like all gatherings of the professions, it has been and remains a "procession of the sons of educated men" (Virginia Woolf): a congeries of old-boys' networks, academicians rehearsing their numb canons in sessions dedicated to the literature of white males, junior scholars under the lash of "publish or perish" delivering papers in the bizarrely lit drawing rooms of immense hotels: a ritual competition veering between cynicism and desperation.*

(A. Rich "When We Dead Awaken: Writing as Re-Vision", 1971)

*I want to draw a map, so to speak, of a critical geography and use that map to open as much space for discovery, intellectual adventure and close exploration as did the original charting of the New World – without the mandate for conquest.* (T. Morrison "Playing in the Dark", 1992)

### Abstract

The aim of this paper is to revisit literary canon, focusing on some of the most relevant texts and books that have been published within the corpus of Anglo-American studies. Then our attention is shifted to the works of American women authors and their views on the literary canon. Different generations of Montenegrin women poets and their reflections on their status in the literary canon, as well as on the advantages of applying feminist literary theory and criticism in improving their position in the aforementioned literary tradition have also been discussed.

**Key words:** literary canon, literary texts, poetry, American women poets, Montenegrin women poets.

### Introduction

Our paper takes another look at some of the most relevant books/texts that have been published about the literary canon and that emerged during different but significantly overlapping periods. We have decided to give attention to this type of perception derived from B. Herrenstein Smith's view in "Contingencies of Value", published in Hallberg's *Canons* (1984). On the one hand, she located the concept of the literary canon within the framework of literary studies and, on the other hand she described it as "[...] one of the most venerable, central, theoretically significant, and pragmatically inescapable set of problems relating to literature [that] has not been a subject of serious inquiry for the past fifty years" (1984:5). While contributing to the mesmeric discussion about the literary canon, J. Guillory, author of *Cultural Capital: The Problem of Literary Canon Formation* (1993), remarks that it is hard to render the notion of canon formation to the foreground as this is particularly true due to the situation in which much work that recovered past writers with minority social identities has been done.

Surpassing his awareness of the abovementioned notion that focuses on minor identities, and aiming at contemplating diverse aspects of literacy, aesthetics, etc., Guillory calls attention to transferring the argumentation to contemplating over schools, institutions, language, literary and critical discourses. Simultaneously, this author leaves out the term "identity" mainly for the reason that one may revert on the more pertinent position that is taken by educational institutions regulating literary production access. Nevertheless, he does not neglect necessary practices of reading and writing. Thus, according to Guillory, one may see the primary role of schools in the (re)production process within literary studies program as the one that establishes cultural capital in two distinct ways: the first is linguistic capital, that is the manner in which one is driven to a socially valued speech, while the second is symbolic capital the possession of which may be displayed upon request thereby entitling its possessor to both cultural and material resources (2004). This author wants to provide a more detailed account of his observation and states that, "[...] I wanted to bring in these other terms about the driving force of canonization, at least up to the point in the later twentieth century when the discourse of social identity emerged by way of reflection on the relation of literary criticism to the new social movements. I thought those identity concepts were the wrong terms for thinking about the long history of canon formation, because they emerged only at the end of a long historical process. That way of thinking about canon formation and the history of literature in relation to the category of social identity had actually effaced the real historical conditions for that process" (2004).

### Anglo-American Context

What is more, other literary theorists and literary critics, who map the expansion and progress of newly born literary canon overviews, conform to the aforementioned, particularly since they focus on the reconsideration of including women's status voices, which were excluded due to the assumptions that the "great" text transcended its conditions of production and reception (Robbins 1999:50), thus demonstrating structural inequalities between male and female writers. Additionally, it was suggested that literary value could

befittingly be positioned in other places, "far from male-dominated tradition" more precisely.

This position also commends other aspects of reconsidering literature. To put it simply, for example, L. Robinson points out that "it is probably quite accurate to think of the canon as an entirely gentlemanly artifact, considering how few works by nonmembers of that class and sex make it into the informal agglomeration of course syllabi, anthologies, and widely commented-upon 'standard authors' that constitutes the canon as it is generally understood. For, beyond their availability on bookshelves, it is through the teaching and study – of certain works that they become institutionalized as canonical literature" (Robinson 1997:3). As can be seen from the previous quotation, and in conjunction with the doubt that follows the critical elaborations and discussions revolving around the notion of the literary canon, it is evident that once the stress is placed upon disbelief, it is difficult to recollect a traditionally formulated comprehension of the canon, as Robinson writes. In addition, in Altieri's inspiring analysis in "An Idea and Ideal of a Literary Canon" he focuses, among other aspects of this notion, on women authors as victims of the canon's ideal. In a nutshell, the canon's ideal forces us to let our imagination run riot about the best existence that should be revealed in our historical being. While searching for such a scheme we give authority to the other one. In this manner, we express disapproval of ourselves while inviting unavoidable remoteness from our own being. This is followed by Altieri's political lesson that remains unambiguous: every desire to transform literature into sort of force for humanity would require one to consciously set up canons serving our concrete "political" determination. In view of the fact that the assessment's critical dimension is inexorably ideological, on the one hand, we may hope that we shall implement a unique canon that would materialize our interests. On the other hand, we may take an even more complex position that would emphasize the liberal action of interest in society. If there are no central stories unifying the society, then our vision of the canon should follow social reality. In other words, it should melt down this destruction and convert it into a fixed otherness (1984:41-65).

The quest to unwrap the canon has been the feminist writers' focal point. In addition to these writers, theorists and critics commenced their activities in the period of cultural pluralist movements, and started informing about their own activities sometimes in straightforward and sometimes in unpredictable or illegible format. While exploring the time of "a radical critique of literature, feminist in its impulse", that is, a "time of change in the concept of sexual identity", A. Rich concluded that we must pick out "the writing of the past, and know it differently than we have ever known it; not to pass on a tradition but to break its hold over us" (1971). Correspondingly, at the very end of the twentieth century, Robbins contemplated on "the swift and yet meticulous interference", and construed it as the text-world interrelationship revelation thereby remonstrating against the apparent disregard of female experience in the literary canon that transforms itself into the distorted image and erroneous processing of several attested women authors. Nevertheless, the question posed by Robinson and other feminist theorists is one pertaining to the canon, the presence of which is not questioned. Moreover, this seems to be a canon in which the male authors' depiction of female characters seems to be prevalent,

as well as that canon that gives a picture of the interrelationship of the sexes. In so doing, it contributes to “the ideology of sexism”, which is one phase in resetting the feminist literary theory mapped by T. Moi in her *Sexual/Textual Politics*, in which she explicitly stresses that the “Images of Women” approach to literature has proved to be a fertile branch of feminist criticism, at least in terms of the actual number of works it has generated (2002:42). Furthermore, Moi indicates that, “though it is impossible not to deplore the wholesale lack of theoretical (or even literary) awareness of these early feminist critics, their enthusiasm and commitment to the feminist cause are exemplary. For a generation educated within the ahistorical, estheticizing discourse of New Criticism, the feminists’ insistence on the *political* nature of any critical discourse, and their will to take historical and sociological factors into account must have seemed both fresh and exciting; to a large extent those are precisely the qualities present-day feminist critics still strive to preserve” (Moi 2002:48).

In her texts, Robbins also highlighted that “modern feminist literary theory began as a critique of images, especially as a critique of the stereotypical images of femininity that literary texts present” (2000:50-51), and that such criticism limited the female subject to the status of object that is not often congruent with reality, transforming itself into power ideological tools for the control of women, proving also that such literary representations analysis of women in addition to their differences from real women’s lives might well be a rewarding position for a politicized analysis of that reality. Furthermore, N. Armstrong (2006) concentrates concretely on the process by pointing to the example of novel analysis wherein what is identified is the lack of protagonist model, which is supplied at the point during the story when a protagonist can rise above the barrier that keeps her from improving topography of her life: “During the 1980s this way of reading changed not only the novels read and taught in classrooms but also the imagined relationship between individual and nation that compels the identification of reader with protagonist. Feminist critics began to read Daniel Defoe’s *Moll Flanders* in place of his *Robinson Crusoe*, Samuel Richardson’s *Pamela* for Henry Fielding’s *Tom Jones*, and Jane Austen’s *Emma* rather than Walter Scott’s *Waverley*” (2006:99).

As has been already anticipated in Rich’s explanation of revisions and confrontations to the authorized literary canon, “the methods of teaching it, and at the biased and astigmatic view of male ‘literary scholarship’ still has not diminished in the decade since the first Women’s Forum; it has become broadened and intensified more recently by the challenges of black and lesbian feminists pointing out that feminist literary criticism itself has overlooked or held back from examining the work of black women and lesbians” (Rich: 1971). Furthermore, this research echoes the view of B. Zimmerman, who calls for an expansion of the feminist literary canon, both black and white, that would embrace even the work of lesbian authors. In order to lend weight to her observations she reread the so-called great canon of literature from a lesbian perspective, broadening thus feminist literary-critical projects of the 1980s and also examining what could be called the “canon” of feminist *criticism*, to argue that the most influential feminist projects of the 1970s were themselves based on heterosexist assumptions and suppressed or overlooked lesbian writers and texts (Warhol, Herndl 2007:73-96), confirming in a sense J. Gallop’s goal

mapped in her *Around 1981*: “[...] to chip away at certain reigning myths of what has gone on in feminist criticism. As such [she has] been involved in an act of demystification. Yet [her] hope is that what [she uncovers] should be taken as not shameful but instructive. The necessary assumption for this is that we are all inevitably symptomatic, we are all subjects and thus speak from within a field of conflict” (2012).

In the context that constantly promotes redefining and assessing of ideas and intellectual efforts, it is useful to mention *Feminisms: An Anthology of Literary Theory and Criticism* in which one of the difficulties encountered in revisiting and re-evaluating that field of study is encountered. Since “the ‘canon’ of literature – those literary works recognized as ‘great’ or at least recognized as worthy to be read and studied in an academic setting” (1997:73), the authors map, among others, the voices and visions of J. Russ, who is of the opinion that the literary canon is connected with being different, while the lack of the literary context for women’s writing is self-perpetuating, mainly “because it can continue to make women’s writings seem too ‘different’ to include in the canon of literature” (1997:74). It should be mentioned that T. Morrison also highlighted the white feminist views’ limitations in her essay “Unspeakable Things Unspoken: The Afro-American Presence in American Literature”, in which she pointed out that “[...] serious scholarship has moved from silencing the witnesses and erasing their meaningful place in and contribution to American culture, it is no longer acceptable merely to imagine us and to imagine for us. We have always been imagining ourselves” (1989).

Although it makes an impact on our mind as the imperative of the feminist studies in the last three decades of the twentieth century, the notion of literary canon has remained the focal point in the first decades of the twenty-first century, or more precisely after the second wave catharsis, as can be seen in some of the collections of papers published at the very end of the twentieth century or in the first decade of the twenty-first. Mapping the new century’s voices and visions within the framework of the notion of literary canon, E. Rooney in *The Cambridge Companion to Feminist Literary Theory* includes more than one paper that is concerned with the notion of canon, by exemplifying “[...] additional forms and types of exclusion, by making connection between difference and textuality, and the threat represented by their loss” (2006:3). In that collection of papers the notion of “literary canon” is perceived in the context of anxious history and the rise of the black feminist literary studies. Subsequently, its author confirms that even the black feminist critics in the seventies failed fully to acknowledge a “lengthy history of black feminist agitation and writing”, as “these early writer-activists conceptualized race and gender together, understanding “the political empowerment of the negro race” as a “feminist as well as antiracist imperative”, and demonstrates that feminism still contends with the “notion of separable gender and racial identities” (Ducille 2006:35). In the same collection of papers the feminist-medievalist *as reader* is in the spotlight. Namely, the feminist critic is involved in convoluted dance in which political critique, pleasure, and a historical conception of the text produce a unique aesthetic that combines “acquiescence” and “resistance” (2006:53-72).

We have seen so far different critics and their criticism. In the part that follows we shall try to analyze the Montenegrin literary female voices in detail.

### Post-Yugoslav/Montenegrin Context

In an attempt to map the female voices in the Montenegrin literary context as well as their reflections on their status in the literary canon, questions have been formulated and emailed to women poets belonging to different generations:

What is the status of women poets in contemporary literature? Are women poets left out of literary histories, anthologies and critical reviews? How do you define a literary canon: is it a “political construct” or do you consider it devoid of political influences? Do you think the creation of a women’s canon is justified? What is your attitude towards feminist (literary) theory and criticism, its function to increase awareness of the women authors’ works and its ability to undermine patriarchal recidivisms that are still overtly affecting the status of women authors in general worldwide?

In her answer to these questions E. Dabižinović (activist, poet, novelist, essayist; she is a member of feminist organization ANIMA, who advocates the feminist spaces of literature and thinks that they would enrich the culture, causing it to change) emphasizes that women authors are left out and that there is a long history of resistance to the poetic works of women poets in Montenegro. She describes literary canon as a political construct founded on patriarchal thought and culture, adding one more insurmountable difficulty to this issue – it has been monopolized by elites that include or exclude any thought that is inappropriate or disobedient. “The literary canon in Montenegro is ‘suffering’ from severe illness”, Dabižinović adds. She emphasizes also the importance of G. Spivak’s strategic essentialism: “It sounds dangerous, but it is a policy to clearly define for a certain time a female tradition whose aim is to make women more visible and to insert a woman’s contribution where its place is in civilization. Not every woman is a feminist, nor is every women poet a feminist poet and that is fine. Not every text written by women is feminist. It is recognized as feminist inasmuch as it has grown out of the politics of feminism and those women who carry it out into public define themselves as advocates of that politics and literature. For me it would be extremely worthwhile for a collection of works by women poets in Montenegro to be made. I would like the culture of Montenegro to open up to this mass of voices because nowadays the modern world and literature is buzzing from the masses. It would be particularly important to me to find a place for those women who speak ‘the truth of power to the face’ (S. Felman).” (2013)

According to another author, B. Pušić (novelist and poet), the position of women authors today is more than pathetic: “Forty years ago, when I published my first book of poetry, editors of literary journals, literary critics, anthologists, commentators on literary happenings in the daily papers were amazingly kind towards the female pen. However, I was for a long time the only female member of the Association of Writers and so that attention was directed exclusively towards me. At that time I found my way into many anthologies, and I was a delegate at many poetry events all over the former Yugoslavia. Today the helm of editing journals and putting together anthologies has been taken by a crew of young males, who to my great astonishment, have closed their ranks and become

pretty much an armored bunker which hardly any female literary voice can approach. Maybe the fact that literary criticism has all but died is also to blame. It all boils down to friends writing reviews about friends, and they are of course affirmative, so a critical attitude towards the current vibrant literary trend is non-existent. Without critical discussion there is no highlighting and fair evaluation of what is being published. The situation for women writers in Montenegro is truly more than desperate" (2013).

Considering the issue of feminist literary theory and criticism and its possibility of helping to improve women authors' position, she writes about having for a long resisted the idea that women writing should be separated from male writing, "because we all live under the same sky and struggle with the same problems" (2013). In relation to her own poetics she states that "the themes of my prose works (novels) are not written at all from the aspect of a woman, but from the aspect of a being who lives in the geographical crosswinds exposed to the turbulence of war, where social and historical events model the equally dark destinies of the male and female world. Those who have analyzed my novels have really touched on that as a feature of my poetry and my prose" (2013). She further explains that since it is evident that male writers do not have the same yardsticks for measuring what women write against what they write themselves, the situation forces the thinking female to rebel in some way, and not with a whisper but with a scream: "And this means applying everything that has proved to be effective elsewhere in the world, here too in Montenegro. The doors and windows need to be opened up to let fresh air into the room. I do not know how the male writing world would react, although I can make a fairly good guess, if a journal were started which in several languages affirmed exclusively poetry written by women" (2013).

S. Kalezić-Radonjić, a poet and university professor, states how, in relation to women poets in the broader geographic context, there exists an unusual phenomenon connected to the productivity of women poets in certain phases of life which is particularly significant, as "after secondary school, when this number decreases, as in that period, when women poets should polish their poetic maturity, they slowly cease writing, only to silence themselves thoroughly till the end of their university years. In contrast to this, male poets start profiling themselves exactly at that period" (2013). She stresses that her understanding concerning these issues is accompanied by the impression that all women poets resemble the Little Mermaid – "in order to be able to dance with their true love, it is necessary to renounce their voice" (2013). The status of women poets may be reconsidered in accordance with that – those of them who succeeded in overcoming their own silence, are regarded by their male peers as those composing in-between domestic duties at home and if it so happened that some of them should write, it was most often lobbying, which as the main impulse was not based on gender but on ideology. As a result, in the context of the above stated, it is considered that the creation of a women's canon itself would be politically incriminated: "It would be good to launch the creation of a women's canon, although in the context of what has been said before, I think that this too would be politically incriminated. I see the story of women as a universal theme regardless of meridians (since all our experiences are bounded the experiences of the female body), and I see gender identity as more basic than national identity – the former is part of our

skin, the latter is the dress that others make us wear" (2013). Therefore, she concludes, the consideration of women writers as a separate group would not be radically different to other female national groups, but it would be an act of justice given that literature is predominantly male: "Such a revision of the canon would not be necessary but I am very skeptical about this because it seems to me that the Balkans is the only place in the world where political identity is more basic than gender identity it is not important who you are, actually, but rather which 'dress' you wear" (2013). In her attempt to define the literary canon, she adds that in the Montenegrin context it is divided into the social and historical reality in which we live – with the unifying side being the fact that both are equally "immersed" in politics: on the one hand, there is a quasi-urbanism that is artificially grafted from foreign literature, while, on the other hand, there is the patriarchal and traditional model that is modernized by force.

J. Nelević-Martinović stresses that the critical reception that follows the development of women's writing commenced in the mid-nineties of the twentieth century. Still she maintains that, "sometimes, I think that the existence of women's writing is an excuse, which is desirable when one goes beyond the border of Montenegro, that we do have contemporary women who write openly without self-censorship about topics that are 'stronger' than lyrical moments, and dealing with sexuality, society, politics, women status, violence, eroticism, men, the state, money, war... I think that the status of women poets' does not differ from the status of female politicians, female doctors, female scientists... We are necessary to satisfy the European "30 percent." If the publishers, editors and critics warmly praise the new generation of women authors, then one poses the question why women are still significantly absent from anthologies when compared with men." (2013)

She further explains that the canon is not excluded from the influence of politics as it remains the creator of our space and capabilities, and finally of our emotions and memories and the events that emerge. Evidently, "the treatment of the society and emotions directly depends on the impact of politics on human beings who, here it comes, writes about love, flowers, or her town or homeland. The influence is more visible in the context of engaged literature when the artist consciously writes and does not express (dis)satisfaction and her own relationship. And that is the other aspect of the political construct that has been selected and obligatory for an artist. For, without reflecting on the aspects of society that makes us as we are, I wonder what the role of an artist may be, if not to write about the world as she sees it" (2013).

In the context of the possible formation of a women's canon, she considers it all right to separate women from men in literary studies, theory or history, in order to show how it is done by men, and how it is by women in one period or movement, as in that way we may better understand ourselves as unique human beings, she emphasizes. Still, when it comes to *écriture féminine* or *masculine*, "it is not possible to separate Tsvetaeva, Akhmatova or Plath from the male authors of their time, as art needs this fluid, endless and uninterrupted direction between sexes that unifies the little we have constituting the consciousness of the whole civilization" (2013). Moreover, she also adds that femininity is not a notion connected with women: "Femininity is part of one's personality, creativi-



ty regardless of the author's sex. I like my femininity and the femininity of all people, from whom I make my poems. Femininity is strong and independent, cruel" (2013), while feminist literary theory and criticism may help the affirmation of creativity. In Montenegro, she further emphasizes, literary studies follow contemporary literature to a certain extent, but she also poses the following questions: will contemporary writers and women writers be found in the textbooks after 20 years? should literary criticism and theory and criticism deal with them now? literary studies inspire curiosity. have we ceased being curious? are we waiting for science to iron things out so that we put on the obsolete context more easily? (2013)

According to T. Bakić, women poets have no proper status in contemporary Montenegrin literature, which is caused by the fact that they are dealing with a literary genre that is observed with a lack of interest, and partly because the publishing houses' marketing activities are such that they are incapable of properly offering their products in the market, and that this can be attributed to the fact that women writers emerging in Montenegro, whenever they offer their first literary fruit, try to force themselves upon the public as fiction writers. For they believe that by this commercially driven genre choice they will gain greater public recognition. While giving careful thought to such issues, she claims that publications dealing with the condition and analysis of Montenegrin literature have been deprived of women authors. She interprets this as the male population's conservative attitude toward the female position within Montenegrin society or, more concretely, as the societal domination of the male sex as female creative work in Montenegro is not observed through the same prism as the work of men, although there have been cases when it has surpassed male creative work in its quality: "Recent Montenegrin literary anthologies are of a mixed type, and yet male authors are predominant. I am not familiar with whether a publication, either of earlier or later origin, has been published in Montenegro so far, which deals with the creative work analysis of solely Montenegrin women authors" (2013).

Bakić believes that the contemporary literary canon is of the political provenance, as well as that the "greatest" writers in Montenegro are always men and those men, who are simultaneously the award committee members, anthology and readers' editors, and always receive the literary awards. She expresses a critical opinion while stating that revision of the literary canon is necessary so as to more visibly articulate those neglected and disregarded female voices. Furthermore, she infers that such a revision can be initiated in different ways, but adds that the more extreme types of revision, which took place in the American literary context, would be inapplicable to the public milieu, and thus would result in reactions which are opposite of what was intended: "Therefore, the revision of the women's literary canon in Montenegro should be carried out in the less 'noisy' manner that is applicable to the current society. For a start, raising the critical awareness about the women authors' significance would suffice, as well as dealing with the critical analysis and review of their creative work, promoting their work, creating regional networks, etc" (2013).

In her response to the aforementioned questions, L. Ruth Stefanović first concentrates on the fact that "we suffer from an illness characteristic for many countries that had the

so-called socialist establishment in the past: some politicized literary associations have remained that are completely disconnected from professional syndicates pertaining to authors and literary translators which we desperately need. Furthermore, we need an authors' and literary translators' union that would protect our interests, authors' interests, and not the interests of the party, publisher or whomever – and all this regardless of gender, ethnicity, faith or political direction" (2013). She agrees with the creation of a women's canon. "Moreover", she states, "I am afraid that the voluntary creation of a canon would not be sufficient, but at the beginning we will have to regulate some things even in a normative way, for the presence of male authors is disproportionately huge in all media when compared to the range and quality of their work. To us, women of letters, I think, it is of great importance.... It is sad, you know, that what we do is more acknowledged in the neighboring countries than in our home country. Poetry is divided into good and bad, and not into male and female, and if it is from Montenegro and it is good, the highest probability is that it has been written by a woman. This woman has to be supported by our feminist (literary) theory and professional associations because it is in our national interest" (2013).

### Conclusion

To sum up, we have been aiming to reassess the status of women poets' in the Montenegrin literary context. Even though the canon's revision was initiated, it has remained incomplete in an attempt to contribute to the sufficient understanding of literary accomplishments of women authors, primarily due to the weak cooperation between literary historians/theorists/critics, publishing houses and the authors themselves. Based on the research of the literature, we have concluded that feminist critics cannot rely on "literary" criteria solely: the mapping of other voices and visions within the framework of the notion of literary canon can be achieved through connecting difference with textuality. Broadly speaking, we have tried to map the female voices in the Montenegrin literary context as well as their reflections on their own status in the canon by formulating a list of questions and emailing them to women authors who belong to different generations and write in diverse literary genres. Essentially, we have offered a pattern permitting the trajectory for the demarginalization of Montenegrin women poets and publication of objective critical texts about their works. Finally, in order to be able to hear the female voices of poetry, certain space should be provided for women to publish, thereby acquiring a reputation for contemporary women poets and, simultaneously, revealing the literary heritage. In this way, we might explore and shape female tradition and map the new directions of women writing in the Montenegrin context.

### References:

1. Altieri, C. (1984) *Self and Sensibility in Contemporary American Poetry*. New York: CUP.
2. Armstrong, N. (2006) *What Feminism Did to Novel Studies*. // *The Cambridge Companion to Feminist Literary Theory*. / Ed. by E. Rooney. Cambridge: CUP.

3. Đurić, D. (2011) *Teorijsko-interpretativni modeli u postjugoslovenskim pesničkim kulturama*. Available at: <<http://www.sveske.ba/bs/content/teorijsko-interpretativni-modeli-u-postjugoslovenskim-pesnickim-kulturama>> [Accessed June 2014].
4. Gallop, J. (2012) *Around 1981: Academic Feminist Literary Theory*. London and New York: Routledge. Library Editions: *Women, Feminism and Literature*. Available at: <[http://samples.sainsburysebooks.co.uk/9781136321740\\_sample\\_500442.pdf](http://samples.sainsburysebooks.co.uk/9781136321740_sample_500442.pdf)> [Accessed March 2014].
5. Gilbert, S.M.; Gubar, S. (eds) (2007) *Feminist Literary Theory and Criticism: A Norton Reader*. New York: Norton & Company.
6. Guillory, J. (1993) *Cultural Capital: The Problem of Literary Canon Formation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
7. Guillory, J.; Williams, J.J. (2004) *Toward a Sociology of Literature: An Interview with John Guillory*. Available at: <the minnesota review n.s. 61-62 (2004)> <<http://www.theminnesotareview.org/journal/ns61/guillory.htm>> [Accessed July 2014].
8. Hallberg, R. von (Ed.) (1984) *Canons*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
9. McKay, N. (1987) *Reflections on Black Women Writers: Revising the Literary Canon. // Feminisms: An Anthology of Literary Theory and Criticism.* / Ed. by R.R. Warhol and D.P. Herndl. Rutgers: The Rutgers University Press.
10. Moi, T. (2002) *Sexual/Textual Politics: Feminist Literary Theory*. London and New York: Routledge.
11. Morris, T. (1995) *Becoming Canonical in American Poetry*. University of Illinois Press: Urbana and Chicago.
12. Morrison, T. (2007) *Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and the Literary Imagination*. Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group. Available at: <<http://www.westga.edu/~jmassters/PlayingInTheDark0001.pdf>> [Accessed July 2014].
13. Morrison, T. (1989) *Unspeakable Things Unspoken: The Afro-American Presence in American Literature*. Available at: <[http://tannerlectures.utah.edu/\\_documents/a-to-z/m/morrison90.pdf](http://tannerlectures.utah.edu/_documents/a-to-z/m/morrison90.pdf)> [Accessed May 2014].
14. Olsen, T. (1962) *Excerpt from Tillie Olsen's "Silences"*. Available at: <[http://www.english.illinois.edu/maps/poets/m\\_r/olsen/silences.htm](http://www.english.illinois.edu/maps/poets/m_r/olsen/silences.htm)> [Accessed March 2014].
15. Rich, A. (1971) *When We Dead Awaken: Writing as Re-Vision*. Available at: <<http://www.westga.edu/~aellison/Other/Rich.pdf>> [Accessed March 2014].
16. Robbins, R. (2000) *Literary Feminisms*. Palgrave: Macmillan.
17. Robbins, R. (1999) *Will Real Feminist Theory Please Stand Up. // Literary Theory: A Reader and Guide.* / Ed. by J. Wolfreys. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
18. Robinson, L. (1997) *In the Canon's Mouth: Dispatches from the Culture Wars*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.
19. Rooney, E. (Ed.) (2006) *The Cambridge Companion to Feminist Literary Theory*. Cambridge: CUP.
20. Walker, A. *In Search of Our Mothers Gardens*. Retrieved from:

<[https://www.uwosh.edu/african\\_am/aas-100-canon-materials/walker\\_in\\_search.pdf](https://www.uwosh.edu/african_am/aas-100-canon-materials/walker_in_search.pdf)> [Accessed June 2012].

21. Warhol, R.R. and Herndl, D.P. (Eds) (1997) *Feminisms: An Anthology of Literary Theory and Criticism*. Rutgers: The Rutgers University Press.
22. Williams, J.J. *Toward a Sociology of Literature: An Interview with John Guillory*. Available at: <<http://www.theminnesotareview.org/journal/ns61/guillory.htm>> [Accessed June 2014].
23. Winders, J.A. (1991) *Gender, Theory and the Canon*. Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.

### **Գրական կանոն/կանոններ. կին բանաստեղծները և գրական համատեքստը**

Սույն հոդվածում ուսումնասիրվում է գրական կանոնը՝ հատկապես անգլո-ամերիկյան մի քանի առավել կարևոր հրատարակումների լույսի ներքո: Ուսումնասիրվում են նաև ամերիկացի կին հեղինակների գործերը, նրանց տեսակետները գրական կանոնի վերաբերյալ: Ջնոնքյան են առնվում նաև Մոնտենեզզոյի տարբեր ժամանակների կին բանաստեղծների դիտարկումները գրական կանոնում իրենց կարգավիճակի, ինչպես նաև վերոհիշյալ գրական ավանդույթի շրջանակներում իրենց դիրքերը ամրապնդելու գործում ֆեմինիստական գրական տեսության կիրառման առավելությունների ու դրա քննադատության վերաբերյալ:

### **Литературный канон: поэтессы и литературный контекст**

В статье исследуется литературный канон, в частности в свете некоторых наиболее важных англо-американских публикаций. Изучаются также произведения американских женщин-авторов и их взгляды на литературный канон. В статье представлены рассуждения Черногорских поэтесс разных поколений об их статусе в литературном каноне, также о преимуществе применения феминистской литературной теории и ее критики в укреплении своих позиций в рамках вышеуказанной литературной традиции.