

<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

Shared Concepts in Arts and Literature

Nyqvist, Sanna Katariina

2018

Nyqvist, S K 2018, ' Shared Concepts in Arts and Literature ' , Folia linguistica et litteraria ,
vol. 2018 , no. 22 , pp. 23-35 . <https://doi.org/10.31902/fl.22.2018.5>

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/262545>
<https://doi.org/10.31902/fl.22.2018.5>

unspecified
publishedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

SHARED CONCEPTS IN ARTS AND LITERATURE

Sanna Nyqvist, University of Helsinki, sanna.nyqvist@helsinki.fi

10.31902/fll.22.2018.5

UDK 7.03:82

Abstract: In this paper, I argue for the usefulness of the historical study of concepts for the understanding of relations between the arts and between the different disciplines of arts research. Discussion on concepts often focuses on precision: by careful definition and delimitation we make concepts into functional “tools” that are the result of a linear, teleological formation. Such streamlining often obscures from view the multiple, fragmentary origins of concepts and their transfer across disciplinary borders. Yet it is particularly the ambiguity and discursivity of concepts that renders them their cultural and critical relevance. Taking as an example the concept of burlesque, I demonstrate the role of concepts as sites of debate that retain their edge even when they become adapted to new contexts. The case of burlesque shows how interdisciplinarity begins “at home”: much of the critical vocabulary that literary studies uses is not its own but shared with and shaped by other arts and disciplines.

Key Words: aesthetic concepts, arts discourse, interart relations, burlesque.

In order to recognise and analyse cultural phenomena we need concepts. A concept is a complicated entity that can be analysed in different ways. At a very basic level, concepts are words that can be used like ordinary words, but that also entail and evoke a wealth of often conflicting meanings, attitudes and evaluations. In *Travelling Concepts in the Humanities* (2002), Mieke Bal calls concepts “shorthand theories”: they implicate ideas and conceptions and can be used as intellectual tools, but in comparison to theories, they are more pliable and can be more easily applied to new contexts and objects (Bal 23). Their flexibility means that their meanings are constantly adjusted and altered by the new applications and that they have multiple meanings. Even when adapted to a new context, a concept carries with it its previous usages and their implications. This, together with the different ways in which individual users use a concept, can create conflicts and misunderstandings, but it is also here that the power of concepts lies. Concepts convey and generate ideas that enable discussion and exchange between different domains and disciplines (Neumann & Tygstrup 2009).

In recent years, concepts have become the focus of renewed interest in the humanities. Whereas previous scholarship emphasised the importance of

period and genre concepts as basic tools of analysis,⁶ current discussion centres on concepts that have philosophical depth, multiple usages and interdisciplinary potential. *Ästhetische Grundbegriffe* (2000–2005), the seven-volume compendium of key aesthetic concepts, analyses concepts of immediate and obvious philosophical or historical interest such as “media”, “mimesis”, “nature” or “originality”, while in cultural studies and arts research, interdisciplinary concepts are often seen as the intellectually most rewarding objects of study. Concepts such as “image”, “space”, “representation” or “performance” travel back and forth between disciplines and cultures gaining in each exchange (Bal 2002). Their concrete and metaphoric meanings enhance each other, and their broad extension makes them particularly relevant for the analysis of interdisciplinary issues and dynamics.

The current intellectual climate focuses on what I shall call “major” concepts, complex interdisciplinary concepts that can be applied to a wide range of objects or phenomena. Less attention has been paid on “minor” concepts – technical terms, discipline-specific terms, genre and period terms – that are fundamental to the teaching and analysis of arts and culture, but that are often taken simply as uncomplicated tools. The division is evident in the different attitudes towards concepts and terms: concepts are regarded as complex, dynamic and intellectually challenging, whereas terms are seen as technical aids or labels that do not require further reflection or contextualisation.⁷ Dictionaries of key terms, available in every discipline of arts studies, aim to offer authoritative and concise definitions that guide the reader in the correct use of the term. Yet, “minor” terms travel and change like “major” concepts: they acquire new meanings and change in interaction with their objects and contexts of use. Moreover, many aesthetic terms are not neutral and descriptive, but imply aesthetic and ideological preferences. For instance, the term parody was for a long time used chiefly in a derogative sense, implying servitude and low comedy, until it was recognised as a formative component of literary history by the Russian formalists. Reinterpreted again decades later, it became one of the key concepts in the politicised debate on the possibilities and forms of postmodern fiction.⁸ Yet these functions are not recorded in

⁶ E.g. René Wellek, *Concepts of Criticism* (1963); Anders Pettersson, *Realism som terminologiskt problem: några definitioner i modern litteraturvetenskap och deras giltighet* (1975).

⁷ Sometimes “concept” is used to refer to the content of a concept and “term” to refer to the verbal form of a concept. However, I use the two words interchangeably, and while I evoke the hierarchical notion of “complex concepts” and “simple terms”, the aim of my paper is precisely to problematise such distinctions.

⁸ For the debate on postmodernism and parody, see e.g. Hutcheon (93-117); Jameson (1984). For the history and different interpretations of parody, see e.g. Rose (2000); Dentith (2000); Nyqvist (2010, 186-194).

typical dictionary definitions of parody, which only cover its imitative function and tendency to ridicule through exaggeration.⁹

Is parody therefore a “simple” term or a “complex” concept? As parts of natural language, words like ‘parody’ can be used in multiple ways: as uncomplicated labels, solid categories, heuristic tools, theoretical concepts, weapons of intellectual debate. In that respect, it does not differ from the so called “major” concepts that are likewise used in different ways and for many ends. If we wish to understand the functioning of critical discourse and initiate our students to critical terminology in a way which avoids unnecessary rigorousness and dogmatism, we need to recognise and analyse this flexibility of uses and acknowledge also the conceptual dimension of the “minor” concepts or terms. “Minor” concepts are sometimes more revealing of their users’ intentions and values than the more prominent “major” concepts that are used within a wider theoretical framework or to a particular argumentative end. Moreover, “minor” concepts are often closely associated with artistic practices in their specific historical contexts. These concepts are, for instance, often used in titles and paratexts by the authors/artists, or they occur in contemporary criticism. They are part of the everyday discourse about the arts, and thus reflect the changes in artistic practices and reception.

Such changes are not confined within one art form, which is reflected in the transmission of concepts across arts. Many technical terms (such as “local colour”, “point of view”) and concepts of style and genre (“satire”, “romance”) are common to two or more art forms. Sometimes their content remains more or less the same regardless of the medium. Satire, for instance, has a similar meaning in literature, theatre and cinema, and its meaning has remained more or less stable over centuries. Local colour, by contrast, began as a technical term of art history, denoting the natural colour of the painted object which distinguishes it from its surroundings, but when adapted to literature, it began to mean those elements which situate a literary work to a particular spatiotemporal setting. This meaning was in turn borrowed back to visual arts (and adapted to music), rendering the original 17th-century art-historical meaning obsolete. As Vladimir Kapor (2009) has argued, the “travels” of local colour from one culture and art domain to others demonstrate historical shifts in the relationships and comparability of the arts, as well as a general shift of emphasis in arts discourse from structural elements to the content of art works. Through this “minor” concept it is possible to trace how cultural and linguistic matrices affect the dissemination of a term. Moreover, changes in how “local” has been understood contribute to a deeper understanding of how “space” (a

⁹ For instance, according to the popular *Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*, parody is “a mocking imitation of the style of a literary work or works, ridiculing the stylistic habits of an author or school by exaggerated mimicry.”

“major” concept in today’s interdisciplinary cultural studies) has been understood in different times and in different arts, thus blurring the problematic distinction between “minor” and “major” concepts.

Concepts as case studies: the example of burlesque

In this article, I argue that the “minor” concepts can offer valuable insights into the history of critical thought and artistic practices. Of special interest is what I call shared concepts, or concepts that are used in different arts, but have diverse meanings. Shared concepts can be approached as real-world case studies of interart dynamics and phenomena. Such concepts often cause misunderstandings and impose hierarchical relations between art domains, cultures and disciplines, as when etymologies are evoked to justify a particular meaning or when the meaning in one domain is taken as the definitive, general meaning imposed on others.¹⁰ However, tracing the history of interart concepts can also build connections between seemingly separate domains and enrich understanding of complex phenomena in their historical contexts, as the example of my case study, burlesque, illustrates.

Plurality of burlesques

Today, burlesque is most readily associated with “new burlesque,” the erotic and often subversive performance art that reinterprets and recycles elements of pin-up culture, striptease and cabaret. Its older association with literature still lingers on, although the term burlesque is rarely used in literary studies anymore, except in certain historical contexts. In the conservative realm of dictionaries of literary terms, it still holds on, but its meaning often overlaps with the neighbouring concepts of parody and travesty. It is commonly defined as ridiculing imitation of earlier literary models or styles, especially the lofty style of the epic. For instance, *The Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms* (2008) defines burlesque as

[a] kind of parody that ridicules some serious literary work either by treating its solemn subject in an undignified style (see travesty), or by applying its elevated style to a trivial subject, as in Pope’s mock-epic poem *The Rape of the Lock* (1712-14).

The dictionary also records the theatrical meaning of the term, but there too the scope of the term is limited to historical uses. In theatre,

¹⁰ For an example, see my analysis of the debates concerning the concept “pastiche” in Nyqvist 2010.

burlesque is usually taken to mean comic or absurd performances that mediate classics or popular contemporary plays to mixed and lower-class audiences.¹¹ French-speakers will associate the term with slapstick, the often violent non-verbal humour of early cinema, and in art history and history of music it usually means the comic depiction of peasants (e.g. J. S. Bach's *Cantate burlesque*, known also as *Peasant Cantata*).¹²

As this brief sketch of the scope of the term burlesque illustrates, the term has been applied in different arts to different phenomena and traditions. Working from a domain-specific perspective has discouraged scholars from tracing the connections and influences indicated by the shared concept. While dictionary entries might acknowledge the different meanings of the term, scholarly articles and monographs have focused on a particular art form. Moreover, some scholars and writers have actively downplayed the interart connections and the impact of conceptual changes that have shaped the term. In *Burlesque* (1972), a standard introduction to the literary tradition by that name, John D. Jump begins by denying that literary burlesque has anything to do with striptease which in American English is also called burlesque. Historians of new burlesque have in a similar manner had trouble relating the older, canonised tradition of literary burlesques to the present-day subversive performance (see e.g. Baldwin 2010; Westerling 17). Literary burlesques are too distant in the history and of the wrong kind: while subversive in their own time, they now represent a canonised form of high culture that is ill compatible with the image of alternative subculture promoted by practitioners of new burlesque. Striptease, on the other hand, represents an obvious but problematic predecessor: stripping is an important element in new burlesque, but the practitioners of new burlesque emphasise the distinction between straightforward striptease that reduces the performing women to objects of male desire, and the empowering masquerade and stripping that gives new burlesque its feminist and political twist. A more positive model for new burlesque has been found in the Victorian burlesque (burlesque extravaganza), a comic melange of music, dance and acting often performed in wildly extravagant dresses and setting.¹³ This popular form of entertainment gave women leading roles in performances that challenged existing mores and tastes.

Tradition and history are thus constructed to serve the ends of those defining burlesque from a contemporary perspective, whether their intention is

¹¹ Cf. Pavis 1998; Schoch 2006.

¹² For filmic burlesque, see Tessé 2007, and for burlesque in music, Schwandt, Woodbridge Wilson & Root (2001).

¹³ For instance Baldwin (2010), Westerling (2011) and Willson (2008) discuss Victorian burlesque as one if not the most important predecessor for contemporary new burlesque. Of special importance for them is the British dancer and comedienne Lydia Thompson, who has become the icon of Victorian burlesque.

to elevate burlesque into a literary category meriting serious attention (as in Jump's case) or to protect it from being associated with outmoded literary predecessors and preserve a sense of illegitimacy while fending off the problematic sexual politics of ordinary striptease (as is the case in many writings on new burlesque). By contrast, widening the perspective to include different traditions and distant predecessors, it is possible to trace the affinities between different arts in a dynamic historical perspective and gain a more nuanced understanding of the cultural phenomena associated with one particular travelling concept.

What's in a name?

Following the conceptual signposts in this manner attaches great significance to the name. The processes in which concepts become attached to objects depend on many contingent factors that reveal the multiple and conflicting ideas, associations and evaluations that contribute to the collective understanding of a new phenomenon. That new burlesque is called burlesque at all is somewhat of a coincidence. Until quite recently, these new kinds of erotic and subversive shows were advertised in the US under different names that brought up a range of associations: "vintage" referred to the retro fashions favoured by many performers, "follies" drew attention to the entertaining quality and female performers, and "comic erotic performance" offered a blunt description. "Drag show" was also used, although in distinction to the conventional drag shows, in burlesque women dress up as women (Baldwin 48-55). None of these terms or descriptions singled out new burlesque as a distinct phenomenon or a genre of its own. The adoption of the older, but now practically vacant term burlesque brought together like-minded performers and helped to launch the new phenomenon into wider consciousness. The adoption and establishing of a name created an aesthetic and political movement out of separate instances of performances. The name also rendered it with a tradition that it actively began to reinterpret.

Choosing burlesque out of the other possible terms – travesty would have been an option¹⁴ – also meant activating the connotations of embedded in the French form of the name: the auditorially sensuous term calls forth the stereotype of France as the culture of eroticism and lasciviousness. Although new burlesque largely stems from Anglo-American popular culture, it has

¹⁴ Travesty has the benefit of referring to ridicule in the form of dressing up as someone else. However, it has the same limitation as the term drag: travesty role conventionally refers to "a role designed to be played by a performer of the sex opposite to that of the character represented" (*OED*). Contrary to travesty, the ethos of new burlesque rather lies in discovering, not disguising oneself.

appropriated the Frenchness of its name, as is apparent for instance in the launching of the Hootchy Kootchy burlesque club in Stockholm, Sweden, in 2006. While the name of the club is in English, the opening night of the club was titled “Est-ce que vous êtes burlesque?”¹⁵ This French phrase encapsulates the ethos of new burlesque – a sense of community that blurs the distinction between performers and audience – and defines burlesque as an identity. The choice of the French language also heightens the sense of foreign exoticism and allure of burlesque.

The French context of the term also alleviated the rapid international success of new burlesque. Deriving from the Italian *burla* (meaning ridicule or mockery), the term was adopted to European languages through French in the 18th and 19th centuries. Hence no translation or conceptual domestication was needed when the new kind of burlesque began to spread to Europe from the US and UK at the beginning of the 21st century. The local variants – like the Swedish “burlesk” – were effortlessly adapted to the new purpose, and burlesque became an international phenomenon and community, googleable in any language.

Literary history provides another example of the power of naming. In the late 1630s, the French Academy discussed the recent literary trend that borrows its name from the Italian *burla*. In the protocols of the Academy, it was complained that

we may say that it [burlesque] not onely passed in France, but that it has overrun it, and made strange havock there. Is it not plain that for these last yeares we have played at this game, where he that wins, loses? and is it not the opinion of most men, that to write well in this kind, ‘tis sufficient to speake things that have neither sense nor reason. Every one thinks himself able enough for it, of what sex soever, from the Ladies and Lords at Court to the Chambermaides and Pages. This madnesse of Burlesque, which at last we begin to be cured of, went so far, that the Stationers would meddle with nothing that had not [t]his name in the front [page]. (quoted from Pellison 1657, 72)

To the dismay of the Academy, they had seen only the beginning: the burlesque mania reigned for several decades, producing some of the most memorable works of the century, such as Scarron’s *Virgile travesti* (1648-1653) and *Les Murs de Troie ou l’origine de burlesque* (1653) by the Perrault brothers. Like in the case of new burlesque, where the adoption of a catchy term spurred

¹⁵ In the film *Tournée* (2010), Mathieu Amalric deliberately thwarts the stereotype of France as a culture of sophisticated eroticism by transplanting a group of glamorous American new burlesque performers in the setting of shabby clubs in inhospitable France.

its success, in 17th-century France the appearance of the word burlesque on the title page of a manuscript or book ignited publishers and audiences. It promised “surprising absurdity” (to borrow the words of an 18th-century burlesque writer, Henry Fielding¹⁶) that contrasted starkly with the classicist norms of the era. The report of the French Academy cited above traces the word to Italy, but it was through French cultural influence that the term and the subversive literary phenomenon were mediated to other European languages and literatures. The early French influence and the present-day American dominance in new burlesque attest to shifts in the geography of cultural hegemony. Centres of cultural capital disseminate concepts and ideas, which might, in due time, return to them in different form, as is the case in France. The current entry for burlesque in the French Wikipedia concentrates on filmic burlesque and cites many American examples, and there is also a separate entry for “new burlesque” (not “nouveau burlesque”).

Gaps, breaks and continuities

The reappropriation of the term burlesque at the turn of the 21st century was possible because its older meanings were no longer current. As a literary genre, burlesque relied on the epic, its main target of ridicule, and on the strict distinction of styles. With the emergence of modern genres and the loss of stylistic hierarchies, burlesque was left without a target and method, and the use of the term withered. By the end of the 18th century, only a few contemporary literary works were titled or discussed as burlesques. Cut from an existing literary tradition, the term however lived on, and due to the massive popularity and literary historical impact of earlier literary burlesques, burlesque remained a gauge for other kind of comic imitations and appropriations long into the 20th century, as the the influential Critical Idiom series illustrates. Introducing key concepts of literary study, the original Critical Idiom series (1969-1985) included the aforementioned volume of burlesque written by John D. Jump (1972). One of its subchapters was devoted to parody, treated as a minor variant of burlesque. By contrast, the New Critical Idiom series (from mid-1990s onwards) has a volume on parody (Dentith 2000), where burlesque is discussed as a historical mode of literary parody (17th and 18th centuries) and a type of comic theatre. The shift of the main category of comic and subversive literature from burlesque to parody testifies to the success of the concept of parody in 20th-century literary criticism and theory, where it has become an umbrella term for all kinds of critical and/or humorous textual relations. The theoretical debates of postmodernism highlighted parody and pastiche, which gave these concepts complexity and acuteness that the related historical

¹⁶ See Fielding’s introduction to *The Adventures of Joseph Andrews* (1742) (Fielding 1965, xviii).

concepts of burlesque and travesty seemed to be lacking. Even as a term of performance, burlesque had more or less become redundant. The witty variety burlesque had died out before the Second World War, and the ban on burlesque clubs of the striptease kind in the US in 1940s further marginalised the phenomenon. At the turn of the millennium, burlesque was a concept loaded with a controversial and complex history but largely devoid of contemporary uses. Its reactivation thus attests to the power of concepts to forge links between the past and the present, and convey models and ideas to new contexts.

Analysing the historical changes in concepts can help to identify “hinge moments” in the history of arts, when art forms and/or discourses take new turns. Yet, they can also signal gaps or omissions. John D. Jump’s bracketing of striptease as completely separate and irrelevant to literary burlesque, and the unease at which the literary origins of burlesque are treated in contemporary analyses of new burlesque, hint at a disjunction in the history of the term. While the established status of literary burlesque and the current media attention to new burlesque have foregrounded these two forms of burlesque in the popular imagination, the perhaps most enduring tradition of burlesque belongs to theatre. Spanning over three hundred years, from mid-17th century to early 20th century, theatrical burlesque was able to adjust to the substantial changes in culture and society and to continue attracting audiences. Earlier theatrical burlesques, like literary burlesques, took as their targets established classics, but soon the applications of subversive treatment expanded, and virtually any dominant cultural narrative, myth or stereotype could function as material for burlesque. Music was from early on an important element in burlesque, which often indulged in radical eclecticism as a source of humour. *The Beggar’s Opera* (1728) by John Gay and Johann Christoph Pepusch, one of the most enduring classic of the genre, took the melodies of its musical numbers from established composers such as George Frideric Handel as well as from popular ditties of the time. Victorian burlesques were often melanges of elements from ballet, comic opera, pantomime and *commedia dell’arte*. Their protean forms, low status as well as the relative lack of surviving manuscripts means that theatrical burlesque has been somewhat marginalised in theatre history and is only partially acknowledged in interart contexts.¹⁷

Yet theatrical burlesque is vital in understanding the gap between the literary and performance traditions of burlesque and in explaining how a mode of predominantly verbal subversive comedy turned into (non-verbal) physical performance, such as slapstick and the new burlesque. When literary and theatrical burlesques gradually lost their ability to mock the elevated styles of serious epic and drama, verbal means of subversion were complemented and

¹⁷ For the historical study of theatrical burlesque, see e.g. Schoch 2006.

later replaced by other means capable of producing the characteristic mixture of laughter and indignation in its audiences. Props, special effects, nudity and violence (the latter especially in slapstick) are more immediate and striking methods for conveying a message or creating a comic effect than verbal imitation which moreover requires particular cultural literacy from its audiences.

Establishing this “lost” connection between the historical and contemporary forms of burlesque challenges the received notion of their disparity and offers points of departure for comparative analysis that can draw attention to previously underestimated or unnoticed aspects of these cultural forms. For instance, the dominance of women and feminist problematic in new burlesque draws attention to the prominence of similar issues in earlier burlesques. Victorian burlesques already discussed the “woman question”, but even in the earlier literary and dramatic burlesques topics related to women’s rights (to inheritance, to choose their husbands or even sexual partners) or fashions (how women were supposed to dress and look like) are strikingly common. Shifting the focus from one art form to the continuities and gaps between several art forms calls forth new questions. If burlesque is a comic form that foregrounds women in its different manifestations, how does its subversiveness function in different contexts? Does the transposition of styles and cultural norms counteract the constructive critical edge that many burlesques about and/or by women can be seen to have? To put the question in another way, does the daring and liberating ethos of burlesque backfire in its (deliberately) conservative treatment of the subject?

Layers of ambivalence

The concept of burlesque thus relates to the problematic of “ambivalence”, a “major” concept with wide interdisciplinary relevance. Not only are burlesque works and performances often fundamentally ambivalent; also the meaning of the term vacillates. Burlesque is seldom used as a neutral, descriptive term. Despite its canonised versions, such as Scarron’s *Virgil travesti* or Gay and Pepusch’s *The Beggar’s Opera*, it connotes excessiveness or bad taste, ridicule for ridicule’s sake only. The negative sense has been elaborated on by Kenneth Burke, who in *Attitudes toward History* (1937) applied the term to a new sphere, politics, attesting to its potential to “travel.” According to Burke, burlesque is a mode of political criticism that is partisan and unproductive, not aiming to find the necessary balance between rights and duties. Referring to the literary meaning of the term, Burke writes that “though we enjoy burlesque as an occasional dish, no critic has ever been inclined to select it as the *pièce de résistance* for a steady diet” (Burke 54). Burke’s remark

explains the apologetic tone of those who nevertheless seek to discuss burlesque as a relevant phenomenon in literature and in other arts.

Following Mieke Bal's seminal *Travelling Concepts in the Humanities*, discussions on conceptual change have focused on the adaptation and transmission of concepts between different disciplines. However, it is equally important to bear in mind that art research shares its vocabulary with another important discourse, art criticism. Reviewers and researchers operate with the same, often value-laden terms, but they might use them differently. Whereas academic criticism aims at neutrality, art criticism is normative, seeking to differentiate between performances and works on the basis of their artistic quality (and possibly also other characteristics, such as social and political relevance). Comparing the analytic and normative uses of an inherently ambivalent and value-laden concept can be a valuable contribution to the analysis of how aesthetic concepts travel in history and between the different domains of art, as well as between academic study and critical discourse.

Conclusion: interdisciplinary highways and winding paths

My chosen object of study, burlesque, is not an exceptional concept. Many concepts of arts discourse are either interdisciplinary or have interdisciplinary potential. They have emerged in the context of one art form, but have since been applied (or are waiting to be applied) to other arts. Thus they offer natural foci for an interdisciplinary study of the shaping forces of tradition and innovation, adaptation and (mis)interpretation in the arts and arts discourse. A concept-based comparative analysis of artistic phenomena calls for a critical attitude that goes beyond simple juxtaposition. By offering insights into the transformative power of concepts, it serves to highlight the creative potential of concepts in criticism: as there are no definitive definitions, concepts can be (and should be) put to innovative and challenging uses that generate new forms, ideas and contacts. Even seemingly marginal concepts raise, in closer analysis, fundamental questions about the functions, value and ethics of arts, and prompt reflections upon the methodology of arts research. Interesting conceptual travels thus do not take place only in the trodden interdisciplinary highways, but in also in the narrower paths of historical terminology that forms a dense network of connections between arts and their disciplines.

References:

Bal, Mieke. *Travelling Concepts in the Humanities: A Rough Guide*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002.

- Baldick, Chris, ed. *Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*. 3rd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Baldwin, Michelle. *Burleskin paluu*. Original: *Burlesque and the New Bump'n'Grind* (Denver: Speck Press, 2004). Translated by Tytti Heikkilä. Helsinki: Like, 2010.
- Burke, Kenneth. *Attitudes toward History*. 3rd edition. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.
- "Burlesque". *Wikipédia – L'Encyclopédie libre*. Accessed May 9, 2018. [≤https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Burlesque>](https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Burlesque)
- Fielding, Henry. *Joseph Andrews*. London: Dent, 1965.
- Hutcheon, Linda. *The Politics of Postmodernism*. Original 1989. London & New York: Routledge, 1999.
- Kapor, Vladimir. "Couleur locale – A Pictorial Term Gone Astray?" *Word & Image* 25:1, 2009, pp. 22-32.
- Neumann, Birgit & Frederik Tygstrup. "Travelling Concepts in English Studies." *European Journal of English Studies* 13:1, 2009, pp. 1-12.
- Nyqvist, Sanna. *Double-Edged Imitation: Theories and Practices of Pastiche in Literature*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki, 2010.
- Pavis, Patrice. *Dictionary of the Theatre: Terms, Concepts, and Analysis*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998.
- Pellison, Paul [Pellison-Fontanier, Paul]. *The History of the French Academy*. London, 1657. Accessed through Early English Books Online <<https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebogroup/>>.
- Pettersson, Anders. *Realism som terminologiskt problem: några definitioner i modern litteraturvetenskap och deras giltighet*. Lund: LiberLäromedel, 1975.
- Rose, Margaret A. *Parody: Ancient, Modern, and Post-Modern*. Original 1993. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Schoch, Richard W. *Not Shakespeare: Bardolatry and Burlesque in the Nineteenth Century*. Original 2002. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Schwandt, Erich, Fredric Woodbridge Wilson & Deane L. Root. "Burlesque". In *Grove Music Online*, 2001. Accessed May 9, 2018. <<https://doi.org/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.article.04381>>
- Tessé, Jean-Philippe. *Le burlesque*. Paris: Cahiers du cinéma, 2007.
- Wellek, René. *Concepts of Criticism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.
- Westerling, Kalle. "Burleskens ingredienser." In *Burleska bastarder: sagan om HootchyKootchy Club och den udda familjen vid rengbågens ände* by Shang Imam et al. Stockholm: Voltaire Publishing, 2011, pp. 16-25.
- Willson, Jacki. *The Happy Stripper: Pleasures and Politics of the New Burlesque*. London & New York: I. B. Tauris, 2008.

ZAJEDNIČKI POJMOVI (U) UMJETNOSTI I KNJIŽEVNOSTI

U ovom radu raspravljam o koristi istorijskog proučavanja pojmova za razumijevanje odnosa između umjetnosti i između različitih područja umjetničkih istraživanja. Diskusija o pojmovima često se usmjerava na tačnost: pažljivim definisanjem i razgraničavanjem pretvaramo pojmove u funkcionalni „alat“ koji je rezultat linearnog, teleološkog oblikovanja. Ovakvo usmjeravanje često iz gledišta mnoštva zatamnjuje fragmentarne začetke pojmova i njihovih transfera kroz granice disciplina. Ipak, dvosmislenost i diskurzivnost pojmova naročito im daju njihov kulturni i kritički značaj. Uzimajući kao primjer pojam burleske pokazaću ulogu pojmova kao mjesta rasprave koji zadržavaju svoje „ivice“ čak i kada se prilagode novom kontekstu. Slučaj burleske pokazuje kako interdisciplinarnost počinje „u kući“: mnogo kritičkog vokabulara koji se koristi u proučavanju književnosti nije njen sopstveni, već zajednički, oblikovan drugim umjetnostima i disciplinama.

Ključne riječi: estetički koncepti, umjetnički diskursi, međuumjetničke relacije, burleska.