

Modern and Non-Modern Conservativism: Comparative Approaches and Identifying Modernism

MÁRIA BÁTOROVÁ

Institute of World Literature SAS

‘Literature is a place on the border, somewhere to cross boundaries.’

*A. Compagnon*¹

In this paper I have in mind what art, especially literature, means for the modern person — whether and how literature can influence the direction and development of a human life, and thus in turn of humankind. Whether literature is something written by an author and then interpreted by the theorist; or whether the author is simultaneously writer and interpreter in one. The approach I take — one of permanent comparing and of looking to the context of individual items — is based on Ďurišin’s theory of typological and genetic comparison. I have dealt with the theory elsewhere and I have also developed aspects of it in relation to interdisciplinary analysis and studies of discourse. For a more comprehensive discussion, see the introductory chapter, ‘Kontextualisierung des literarischen Werkes’, of my monograph.²

My speculations follow the direction of A. Compagnon whose work draws on the research of the past two decades to do with the meaning of art and the notion of mimesis as recognition.

Compagnon weaves threads from the works of Frey, Ricoeur and Ginzburg, whose convoluted theoretical questions are elaborated in the third chapter, ‘Svet’ (The World) of his book, *Démon teórie* (Literature, Theory, and Common Sense). In the earlier chapters Compagnon has tried to come to a definition of literature, focusing mainly on the subject of the author and his or her intention. Compagnon examines theories that have questioned or displaced the idea of authorial intention and that, putting aside the cultural, historical and social context of a work of literature, gave pre-eminence to the narrative value of the text itself. Compagnon distances himself from these theories, writing: ‘I would like to step out of the trap of this absurd alternative between objectivism/subjectivism and demonstrate that the only possible criterion for the validity of the interpretation is definitely the intention, which, however, cannot be identified with ‘the clear and prescient purpose’ (ibid., p. 84). Compagnon attempts to escape the objectivist/subjectivist dichotomy with an appeal to a more complex understanding of what art is and of the function of literature in society in his discussion of the most prominent theorists of the second half of the 20th century.

The last two decades of the period for which Compagnon outlines the major

trends in theories of literary research correspond with the majority of my research and published monographs. The research that I draw on here, enlarged by the works of the authors quoted (Ricoeur, Habermas, Levy- Strauss, Foucault, Marcel, Guardini, and others) also points to the breadth, and anthropological and interdisciplinary leanings, of my research methods.

I should state at the outset that the timeframe of literary modernism assumed by this paper deviates from the views of other academics. It stands in contrast to previous studies and thus requires an explanation. The fundamentals of my previous studies (except from the sixth chapter, 'Medzi náboženstvom a umením' (Between Religion and Art) in my monograph on Pavol Strauss, *Paradoxy* (Paradoxes, from 2006) stem from the theories of Wolfgang Iser. Here, I located an essential milestone in the perception of the starting point of literary modernism at the turn of the 19th century — prompted mainly by the absolute loss of the idea of God in the thinking and works of Kafka and its modification in the works of Rilke.³ These two figures are key personalities in most paradigms of literary modernism. And the idea of God, his presence, absence or partial presence, was interesting as a value of traditional-conservative thinking. I also referred in previous studies to the views of the art theorist, Werner Iser, mostly in his later works where he seeks a definition of literary modernism and explores its symptoms.⁴

In August 2007 Iser delivered a lecture (which features in an upcoming book on this theme), 'Was ist das Neue und wie neu ist das Neue der Moderne?', at the Wiener Vorlesungen at Forum Alpbach.⁵ In it he imparted an idea that I am in total agreement with and which I have since shared in a number of publications, most recently in analyses of Pavol Strauss's thinking and work.⁶

According to W. Iser's lecture, literary modernism is characterised by: 'multivocality, image in image, irregularity in regularity, the odour of corpse and the smell of lemon at the same time, as felt by Flaubert'. Although Iser was not the first to place the start of modernism in the 16th century, he calls it, interestingly, "einträchtige Zwietracht" (harmonious discord) — thus assigning the continuing central characteristic of modernity.⁷

I consider this definition important for my research, since it includes something crucial to the intentions of the works of European literary modernism I have analysed. Iser's characteristic of modernism ('einträchtige Zwietracht') intensely evokes ideas of early Christianity as perceived by Graham Greene⁸. The ideal of a person who does not distinguish; is life-giving; does not see what is unreal; and thus dogmatically pursues his vision that he actualizes, regardless of the circumstances. This is exemplified by the story of Jesus eating among the publicans because he did not come for those who were healthy, but for those in need. This existence 'on the border, in the zone of the poor, thieves and sinners' (Greene) and the awareness that one must account for there being evil within good and good within evil underpin the realistic evaluation of the human condition in early Christianity. Thus there is an argument for shifting the birth of modernism even as far back as the origins of Christianity.

Reality understood in this way is presented by what are viewed as modernist works of art. We will point to this conception later in the works of Slovak authors of liter-

ary modernism that I have been exploring over the last two decades, namely J. Cíger Hronský and Pavol Strauss, as well as their parallels in world literature.

If the world is perceived in this complex way, always in a concrete situation, it is psychologically exhausting in reference to the individual and socio-politically ungovernable in reference to structures of power.⁹ Therefore secular, and gradually also religious, power have manipulated and transformed themselves in order to solidify their status. An awareness of heterogeneity has been weakened and narrowed by dogmas and schemas in a process repeated by various different totalitarian systems.

Only a handful of spectres remain. Those who have carried the torch for independence and variety have often paid with their lives or been marginalized — paradoxically turning them even more passionately to artistic creation, leaving an immortal testimony to freedom and independence.

Those who refuse to live according to the schemes and dogmas that would narrow their strains of diversity and their thinking might talk of there being a ‘labyrinth of modernity’. A labyrinth — an architecturally solid structure and so distinguished from chaos, which is amorphous — serves as a symbol of a searching for secular as well as spiritual contexts, appearing as the classical construction of King Minos in Crete through to the drawings of mazes on the floors behind the portals of medieval churches.

In modernism, there is a spiritual trend that emphasizes clearly distinguishable conservative values. I ask in this paper whether these conservative values, as represented in the works of art, are helpful in searching for positive points of departure from everyday dilemmas and for ways out of the labyrinth.¹⁰ What type of conservative values can reconcile the apparent paradox of value — in a positive sense, meaning life-sustaining thinking, ethics and truth — versus freedom of art?

I will try to answer this question through an analysis of the works of two striking personalities of Slovak literary modernism and their modernist counterparts in world literature. The first is Jozef Cíger Hronský, one of Slovakia’s most prolific and best-known authors, whose work between the wars encompassed a number of genres. And second, Pavol Strauss, who wrote poetry in German but who, after being forced into ‘internal emigration’ in Slovakia after the war, turned to writing, in diary and aphorism form, in Slovak.¹¹ The comparative methods used differ: it is typological for Hronský, there being an absence of dairies or other proofs of links to the war, genetic for Strauss.¹²

My comparative method is inspired by the work of Pierre Bourdieu, whose theory of “space of possibilities” points to the mechanisms of structuring the field of typological analogies among the authors of different national literatures with the help of thematic transposition and reflection on social context and literary criticism.¹³ Another cornerstone of my approach is provided by Foucault (who was Bourdieu’s teacher) and his theory of the ‘the author function’.

It would be possible to examine the chronology of the works and authors in question and compare motives and intentions, not least because their works transmit social sentiments, experiences of the two world wars and corresponding desires to find certainties, and so forth. But let us take a more cross-sectioned approach to the problems, themes and motives of the individual works and their context.

Dealing with these questions one can speak of the ‘tectonics’ of the psychological make-up of literary modernism, which is very complex, but its analysis — effected by deconstruction with the help of scientific methods of the period such as psychoanalysis¹⁴, early sociology and the intellectual and philosophical views of the times — yields a picture of the hierarchy of values and impulses, treated in the works of art.

Of primary importance, naturally, is a focus on the character of individual man. Man is perceived in these works in a twofold way. On the one hand, we are given representations of a man who moves history, is a demiurge, a free renaissance human being who destroys the old and replaces it with the new. Hronský’s character, Andreas Búr Majster, is, in this sense, an avant-garde character, closely connected with Knut Hamsun’s pioneering and inventive characters, such as Rolandsen, the telegraph operator in his short novel, *Dreamers*. Búr, and Pontus in Hamsun’s *Hunger*, both at first appeal to God, but both in an ‘inappropriate’ way, such that their efforts come to nothing.¹⁵ Here their paths diverge: Hamsun leaves Pontus in the void, and although *Hunger* is interlaced with biblical allusions and tone, he remains in denial of God. This emptiness and sense of a world without any transcendental dimension is taken up by Franz Kafka, who uses Hamsun’s novel as one of his sources.¹⁶ While Pontus allegorically parts from God forever, Búr realizes his guilt in rebelling against God. He then hopes to atone with God by giving himself to the people, taking him down a sacrificial path by which he achieves his aim — he suffers a martyr’s death, stoned by those he had wanted to help, but ‘white’ and redeemed.

Characters understood in this way – as exceptional types — can also take in figures with demonical characteristics, such as Adrian Leverkühn in *Doctor Faustus* by Thomas Mann.

These representations paint a picture of a powerful threat posed to humankind by a fanatical individual. In Mann’s novel it is Leverkühn’s music that subconsciously induces fanaticism in the masses, a fanaticism that Mann is comparing to fascism in Germany. In Hronský’s work, the immediately resonant and unconsciously affecting singing of Búr, by which he manipulates the crowd, proves calamitous for society.

The second form of representation of man is that of a common, ordinary man — one of many, a man who ‘grows anywhere like a grass’, a seed who is searching for its place in the world and *creates values from nothing*. It is a man as Nobody that we find in Hamsun’s Isaac in *Growth of the Soil* and in Jozef Mak, in the novel of the same name by Hronský. Both characters have no background — we know nothing of Isaac’s past and of Mak only that he is born out of wedlock, and thus from birth excluded and marginalised. Both characters work their way through a long series of everyday efforts (which contrast absolutely with the superhuman deeds of our earlier-mentioned, exceptional types) to achieve the positive values necessary for securing their posterity. To this type of character also belong old Chlebko from the novel *Chlieb* (Bread) by Hronský, an entirely unexceptional but intelligent villager, and Gráč from the novel *Pisár Gráč* (Scribe Gráč), who recovers from a lost generation marked by war and its own errors through doing deeds for others.

Questions of communication, mutual acceptance or appreciation of man’s value — and hence honour as social capital as studied by sociologists during the last century — are considered key to artistic modernism. The work of Butler and Habermas

deals with the 'greatness' of man, his importance and the meaning of his existence, and how this corresponds with the idea of man's 'greatness' that underpins democracy. Their work examines the idea that the origin of Christianity corresponds with the provision of space for the broad masses through Christ and the possibility to follow him, and looks at the modern opportunity for a man without origin to create, understood by Habermas as one of the symptoms of modernism.¹⁷

Non-communication is the source of characters' death due to the non-acceptance of an individual's otherness. William Faulkner deals in *Light in August* with racially motivated non-acceptance of otherness with the figure of Joe Christmas, whose name and initials are a clear reference. Besides addressing the history of relationships between black and white people in America, this novel from 1932 presages the forces that led to the genocide of certain races and groups in the 1930s and the 1940s. An emphasis on the individual, his right to autonomy, his otherness and difference from the norm is found in all the characters of Hronský's novels mentioned above.¹⁸

Observation as the means of bullying and violence — both psychological and physical — is a key motif in the works by Hronský, Gombrowicz and Márai.¹⁹

The theme of guilt, intricately perceived and intricately represented, its subsequent catharsis, and the consciousness of man's role in his own fate form part of many authorial conceptions, especially in connection with Christian ideology.²⁰ The differences in various environments, continents, as well as in religious confessions, are evident here, especially in connection with authorial solutions.

Literary modernism from the second half of the 19th century emancipated the female world and removed women's taboo status, granting them emotional space and a sex and marital life.²¹ Literary modernism was also responsible for the emancipation of the world of children at the turn of the nineteenth century. An emphasis is put on the upbringing of children, on the relation with everything animate, and on modern education that together mark a revolutionary moment in the evolution of literature's relationship to the human being. The appreciation of childhood as a key period that informs the future of each individual has been addressed by important authors of many cultures.

Hronský responded to the challenge in several ways. He wrote textbooks and readers for all the years of Slovak schools up to the final exams, wrote fairytales for small children and influenced generations of older readers. Film versions of his stories (*Sokoliar Tomáš*, (Hawker Tomáš)) have for years reinforced to the young the universal principles of courage, bravery and other values similar to those of the scouting movement.²²

Hronský, known in his adult novels for irony and sarcasm, effortlessly switches into childish playfulness in his fairytales, relating his animal characters' exploits with a carefree humour and joy. His characterizations of pigs from the first half of the 20th century resemble the modern American film *Babe*, still charming children's eyes. Hronský does not evade harsh reality in his children's works, but layers it with imagination and humour by contrast with children's writers that pen 'realistic' scare stories to leave their readers frightened.

While we have situated Hronský's work into the 'space of possibilities' and the net of meaning (not significations) of that work²³, we will look at the authorial intention

of another author of Slovak literary modernism, Pavol Strauss. His works provide examples of genetic connections through the author's diary entries, something not possible when looking at Hronský.

Pavol Strauss experienced two of the 20th century's totalitarian systems: fascism and communism. And he underwent two conversions: first to Marxism and then to Catholicism, the latter staying with him for the rest of his life. Whereas Hronský emigrated after the Second World War, Strauss remained in 'internal emigration' in Slovakia.

He commented on both totalitarian regimes in his diaries and aphorisms. The key phrases in his reflections are: freedom of speech; the right and ability to publish, the right to public presence; the means of survival, even in the face of professional and spiritual ostracism. Affinities with modernist authors include: Rilke (the theme of death), Werfel (the theme of childhood), Kafka (the theme of helplessness in the face of power), Marcel (an individualist approach to reality), Proust (a psychology of phenomena), Guardini (sociology and Christian universalism), Greene (the paradox of Christianity), and de Chardin (reflections about the meaning of life).

Strauss's poetry from the mid-Thirties, which was written in German and published in Prague, was a precursor to the Slovak poetry of the 1960s in its discursive, reflexive and meditative character. It is realistic and expressive in its depiction. This type of poetry differs from Surrealism, overlaps only slightly with Poetism, and the author cannot even be said to be a part of Catholic modernism.²⁴

The two authors I have presented as representatives of Slovak literary modernism more generally had completely different lives. One became famous in his homeland but, at the cost of his professional existence, emigrated. The other was a globetrotter by disposition and the languages he spoke might have inclined him to travel — yet he lived all his life in Slovakia.

The pair are also distinguished by different genres. But they share a common approach to reality, regarding it as paradoxical, discursive and real rather than referential. They have an ethos in common²⁵, one that is characterized by a desire for truth. This complementary disparity and similarity enables one to see the multilayered character of Slovak literary modernism more precisely.

Conclusion: Modern and non-modern types of conservatism

We pointed, by looking at Hronský and Strauss, to two separate structures of existence.²⁶ These two authors are key figures in that each is responsible for placing a progressive milestone, both ideological as well as poetological. This dualism determines not just the place of two non-mainstream authors in the evolution of the Slovak literary modernism, but demonstrates that the pair are strongly endowed with modern conservative values, something that can be said of few of their contemporaries.²⁷

The term modern conservative values leads to the task of differentiating **modern conservative values and non-modern conservative values**. Modernity and conservatism need not each exclude the other. They exclude each other if conservatism is nonmodern, that is to say undifferentiated, dogmatic and rigid. The result of non-modern conservatism is the elimination of variety through definiteness and ideas of absolute truths. Non-modern conservatism does not link to the variety of modernity

and it seeks a homogenized certainty through absolute values. Non-modern conservative thinking is totalitarian and presents an exclusive and rigid concept of truth and reality.

The two authors we have looked at — both personalities of alternative Slovak culture and literature in the 20th century — are not to be seen in this way. Rather, Christian conservative values are visible, the value system of the ‘old’ continent. The essence of their creation, as we have shown, comes from variety. It is not the relativist claim that one sets one’s values and duties oneself, as pointed to by J. H. Matlár in his newest book.²⁸ It is the real perception of being as variable.

Modern Christianity accounts for evil. Modern conservative thought preserves **acceptance of the variety of the real**, which brings it closer still, in the form of artworks through the power of authorial conception, to the real image of reality. Thus it stands as the cornerstone for learning about ways through the labyrinth of life.

Returning to the central question of this study, modern conservative values in thought and art do not obstruct the freedom of artistic creation. Non-modern conservative thinking, however, closes art into schemas and promotes totalitarianism and dangerous values for humankind.

Literary modernism, accounting for the resulting value split of modern and non-modern types of literary modernism (according to the conservative type of author), offers a brand new image and progressive division of Slovak literary modernism.

NOTES

- ¹ Compagnon, A., *Démon teórie. Literatúry a bežné myslenie* (French original: *Le Démon de la théorie*), trans. by Jana Truhlářová, Bratislava: Kalligram, 2006, p. 150. References relate to the Slovak translation.
- ² Bátorová, M., *Jozef Cíger Hronský und die Moderne*, Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, Bern, Bruxelles, New York, Oxford, Wien: Peter Lang, 2004.
- ³ Welsch, W., *Unsere postmoderne Moderne*, Weinheim: WCH, Acta Humaniora, 1987, pp. 65–79.
- ⁴ Hofmann, W., *Die Moderne im Rückspiegel. Hauptwerke der Kunstgeschichte*, Munich: C. H. Beck, 1998, pp. 380–381.
- ⁵ Hofmann, W., ‘Was ist das Neue und wie neu ist das Neue der Moderne?’, paper presented at the Wiener Vorlesungen, Forum Alpbach, 27th August 2007.
- ⁶ Bátorová, M., *Paradoxy Pavla Straussa*, Bratislava: Petrus, 2006.
- ⁷ Hofmann illustrates his idea in the lecture with reference to the picture by Pieter Brueghel the Elder, ‘The Tower of Babel’, 1563, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna.
- ⁸ Greene, G., *Paradox křesťanství*, Prague: Vyšehrad, 1970.
- ⁹ The development of the means of manipulation, through which man is objectified, can be seen in Machiavelli and also, for example, in Foucault (*Discipline and Punish*).
- ¹⁰ This is not a matter of an understanding of literature as ‘instructions for use’, as Compagnon ironically described R. Barthes’s approach (*ibid.*, p. 124), nor of mimesis as recognition, as described by Compagnon (*ibid.*, p. 137).
- ¹¹ See my monographs on the two writers, referred to above.
- ¹² This method is described in my study, ‘Der europäische Roman der literarischen Moderne (“Das Feld des Möglichen” in der Moderne des 20. Jhs.)’, presented in Vienna, 6⁹ December 2007. In print.
- ¹³ Bourdieu, P., *Praktische Vernunft. Zur Theorie des Handelns*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1998.

- ¹⁴ This phenomenon is noted in literary analyses of the works of Viennese modernism in connection with stream of consciousness techniques, something that significantly influences the formation of the characters of Hronský's novels. See Bátorová, M., 'Bratislava – Wien's Nachbarschaft, Unterbewusstsein, Erotik und Moderne (S. Freud, S. Zweig, A. Schnitzler, J.C. Hronský)', in *J. C. Hronský und die Moderne*, pp. 19–38.
- ¹⁵ Brynhildsvoll, K., *Sult, sprell og Altmuling. Alte und neue Studien zu Knut Hamsuns antipsychologischer Romankunst*, Frankfurt am Main, 1998, p. 92. Bátorová, M., 'Die gelbe Mühle: entmenschlichtes Rad der Geschichte', chapter 6 in *J.C. Hronský und die Moderne*, pp. 71–81.
- ¹⁶ Brynhildsvoll, *ibid.*, pp. 102–03.
- ¹⁷ Habermas, J., 'Die verzögerte Moderne', in *Philosophisch-politische Profile*, Frankfurt am Main: 1981, p. 455.
- ¹⁸ See Bátorová, M., 'Das Leben als Labyrinth oder die Suche nach einem Zuhause. (Das Motiv des Außenseiters in den Werken von W. Faulkner und J.C. Hronský)', *J.C. Hronský und die Moderne*, pp. 97–107.
- ¹⁹ 'Typologische Zusammenhänge der ungarischen, slowakischen und polnischen literarischen Moderne. (S. Márai, J.C. Hronský, W. Gombrowicz)', *ibid.*, pp. 116–129.
- ²⁰ 'Der Mensch im Kampf mit der Bestimmung (F. M. Dostojewskij und J.C. Hronský)', *ibid.*, pp. 48–65.
- ²¹ 'Die Frau als Drohung, Schicksal, Vampir (A. Strindberg, E. Munch, J.C. Hronský)', *ibid.*, pp. 65–71.
- ²² 'Die Kinderwelt: Widerstandsfähigkeit gegenüber dem Bösen. (E. Kästner, K. Čapek, J.C. Hronský)' *ibid.*, pp. 107–116.
- ²³ '...thanks to the differentiation between meaning and signification, plan and intention we have won over two most difficult obstructions of the other application of intention as a criterion for interpretation of the work: the subject of interpretation is meaning, not signification, intention, not plan [...] there is no reading of literature that would not actualize the meanings of the work, [...] (after all, the characteristic of the literary work is to have a meaning outside its original context)' Compagnon, *op. cit.*, p. 99.
- ²⁴ See Bátorová, M., *Paradoxy Pavla Straussa*.
- ²⁵ The need for catharsis was one of the existentialists' problems of the 1930s and 1940s. See Camus, A., *Mýtus o Sisyfovi, Pád, Caligula*, Bratislava: Slovenský spisovateľ, 1993, pp. 171–172.
- ²⁶ Compagnon points to the dispute between Barthes and Picard in the 1960s, in which Picard accused Barthes of searching for a deep structure of intention in the work of Racine. Compagnon's conclusion: "Structuralism, mixed with anthropology and psychoanalysis, remained a phenomenological hermeneutics." *Op. cit.*, p. 69.
- ²⁷ A comparison of Hronský's works with those of M. Urban, whose characters are definitely not psychologically elaborated to such a degree as those of Hronský's, would show that Urban's characters are neither self-contradictory nor paradoxical, and hence are not as close to reality as Hronský's characters are. Pavol Strauss's poetry, in its internal balance and in its expressionistically harsh imagery, significantly differs from canonical Slovak and Czech poetry of the interwar period. A comparison of Strauss with Kostra, Smrek and others would prove, that Strauss's discursive (thus non-Surrealistic), meditative poetry has nothing in common with the melody, rhythm and rhyme, characteristic of Slovak poetry of that period.
- ²⁸ Matlár, J. H., *Ludské práva ohrozené mocou a relativizmom*, Bratislava: Michal Vaško Publishing House, 2007.

Translated by Z. Husárová

MODERNÝ A NEMODERNÝ TYP KONZERVATIVIZMU

Literárna moderna. Komparatistika. Pozitívne a negatívne konzervatívne hodnoty.

Výskumom Hronského a Straussa sme poukázali na koherentné štruktúry dvoch existencií. Z vývinového aspektu slovenskej literárnej moderny sú tieto dve postavy kľúčové a výnimočné, pretože každá svojím spôsobom znamená **vývinový medzník, ideový aj poetologický**. Tento poznatok určuje nielen miesto dvoch tabuizovaných autorov vo vývine slovenskej literárnej moderny, ale ukazuje tento smer, zastúpený práve uvedenými dvoma autormi, ako hodnotovo silne dotovaný **modernými konzervatívnymi hodnotami**, čo nemožno tvrdiť o mnohých súčasníkoch spomínaných autorov.

Pojmom modernej konzervatívnej hodnoty sa dostávam ku kľúčovej otázke, kvôli ktorej som v tomto príspevku rekonštruovala výskum niekoľkých desaťročí: k rozlíšeniu konzervatívnych hodnôt na **moderné konzervatívne hodnoty a nemoderné konzervatívne hodnoty**. V základe treba povedať, že modernita a konzervativizmus sa nemusia vylučovať. Vylučujú sa v prípade, ak je konzervativizmus nemoderný, t. j. nediferencovaný, dogmatický, jednoliaty. Nemoderný konzervativizmus má recepty na elimináciu mnohorakosti cez jednoznačnosť a absolútne pravdy, nenadväzuje na mnohorakosť modernity, hľadá istotu v totálnych hodnotách. Nemoderné konzervatívne myslenie je totalitné, vníma len svoju pravdu a skutočnosť ako jednoliatu.

U obidvoch autorov, dvoch postáv alternatívnej slovenskej kultúry a literatúry 20. storočia, to nemožno nevidieť, ide o kresťanské konzervatívne hodnoty, teda hodnotový systém „starého“ kontinentu. Podstata ich tvorby, ako sme si ukázali, však spočíva skôr na báze mnohorakosti. Nie je to samoúčelný relativizmus všetkých hodnôt, ako na to upozorňuje vo svojej najnovšej knihe J. H. Matláry. Je to reálne vnímanie bytia ako rozmanitého. Moderné kresťanstvo predpokladá zlo. Moderné konzervatívne myslenie **konzervuje akceptáciu mnohorakosti skutočnosti**, tým sa približuje aj v podobe umeleckých diel práve cez silu autorskej koncepcie k reálnemu obrazu skutočnosti a môže byť východiskom poznania ciest labyrintom života.

Ak sa teda na záver vrátíme k centrálnej otázke tejto štúdie, dalo by sa tvrdiť, že moderné konzervatívne hodnoty v myslení a umení neprekážajú slobode umeleckej tvorby. Naopak, nemoderné konzervatívne myslenie zatvára umenie do schém a má tendenciu šíriť totalitné a pre existenciu ľudstva nebezpečné hodnoty.

Literárna moderna obsahujúca v sebe výslednú hodnotovú diádu moderného a nemoderného typu literárnej moderny (podľa konzervatívneho typu autora) takto ponúka celkom nový obraz a vývinové členenie aj slovenskej literárnej moderny.

*Prof. PhDr. Mária Bátorová, DrSc.
Institute of World Literature SAS
Konventná 13
813 64 Bratislava
m.batorova@mail.t-com.sk*