

The Changing Concept of Aesthetics and Canon-formation in a Globalized Era

Partha Sarathi Mondal

Abstract

The concept of a literary canon in the past allowed for discussing and evaluating works based on specific aesthetic standards. In the wake of globalisation, canon formation of literature has given way to the de-canonization of it as globalisation has brought with it a de-aestheticizing regime for literature. Aesthetics, the principles of judging a literary text on beauty and pleasure, has been replaced by the emergence of a new aesthetics in which the appeals and appraisals of literature are considerably wider than the beauty and pleasure they offer. My research aims to discourse the changing concept of canon in a globalised world, dangers of literature in the de-aestheticizing jaws of globalisation and the prospect of building a global canon with the changing concept of aesthetics.

Keywords: Aesthetics; Canon; Globalisation; Literature.

Introduction

In studies of literature the issues about established literary canons and canon formation have become a major concern in the literary circles and culture studies. Some conflicting views are obviously discerned. There are on the one hand the defenders of standard canons like Harold Bloom who hold that canons are defined by aesthetic standards and must endure the test over a period of time. They are concerned with “canonicity” of literary works, underscoring the necessity and irreplaceability, i.e., aesthetic quality of literary works. On the other hand, the opponents claim that standard canons have been determined less by artistic excellence than by the politics of power, that is, the canon “has been formed in accordance with the ideology, political interests, and values of an elite and privileged class that was white, male, and European”(Abrams 21). Today, the opponents’ demands for opening the canon and abandoning elitism are gathering momentum. So far no satisfying inferences have been reached as to the issue because of different approaches to canon formation the two sides hold, but the conflicting viewpoints reveal explicitly internal and external forces which drive canon formation. A significant transformation is perceived between the older dispensation of canon

formation and its new dispensation. Canon formation in its new dispensation has spawned such diverse areas of discussion as linguistics, politics, anthropology, psychoanalysis, gender and colonisation. Aesthetics, the sole factor of the older dispensation of canon formation, has thus given way to some new spaces. Over the years the aesthetics, the study of art forms which are artistically worthwhile, has undergone a remarkable transformation as the notion of making “standards” solely based on beauty and pleasure has included in it the social and cultural aspects as strong factors. We find aesthetics in a chaotic and complex relationship with the canon stemming from multiple readers resulting in multiple perspectives. Multiple perspectives also are found in the canon’s relationship with culture. Multidimensional cultural groups create multiple perspectives and this causes dissipative structures that continually lose equilibrium only to regain it in another form. Globalisation has most obviously brought with it some challenges to the canon formation of literature.

Emily Apter has argued about the “de-aestheticizing” jaws of globalisation (1). Edward Said too has maintained that “an autonomous aesthetic realm exists” (64). Globalisation challenges this domain. According to Said, these frameworks of studying literature need revision in the context of globalisation. As the frameworks of aesthetics, boundaries of the text and the author and the nation become eroded, the very definition of literature is being rethought. Though globalisation has engendered new paradigms of studies based on postcolonial theory, ethnic cultures, identity etc in literature, the enormity of fragments and lack of proper regulation endanger the methodologies. Many scholars of world literature, comparative studies, and subaltern and gender studies alike have voiced concerns about standardising methods practised in these fields. Globalisation has triggered standardisation and homogenisation in translation studies, world literature, and comparative methods etc, stripping literary study of its autonomy and diversity.

Despite these dangers which globalisation has effected it has elicited the scope for the scholars from the world’s different literary traditions to select the best of their works to form a canon of world literature. While literature continues to blur boundaries and dabble into hitherto unknown spaces, does recent literary study do justice to literature as a form? Can we place literature as a field of study in the older notion of aesthetics? Is a new aesthetics emerging in the context of world literature? Does literature as a field of study conform to current global paradigms? My research will examine the complex structure of canon formation especially in the era of globalisation, try to allocate the place of literature in global paradigms and argue if there is a prospect of global canon. It will alongside argue the changes in the very notion of aesthetics, leading to the prospect of building new aesthetics, and in this, the recent studies on Jacques Ranciere’s critiques on aesthetics and politics will hopefully help.

Canon-formation- An Overview

The term ‘canon’, etymologically, denotes a “standard” or “measuring rod” (Greek ‘kanon’). It indicates a set of rules and also denotes a body of writing that is considered to be authentic. In English literature, ‘canon’ initially meant biblical writings authenticated by church authorities as genuine but later also included the works of select authors and validated selectively by critics (Kumar 148). The term ‘literary canon’ is sometimes used synonymously for classic. It encompasses those authors who, with accumulative consensus of critics, scholars, and academicians, have been considered as “major”, and their works as “classics”. These literary works achieved the status of “major” as they are discussed fully by literary critics, most kept in print, and included in anthologies and syllabi of literary courses. John Guillory, instead of taking interchangeable interpretation of the two terms, considers “canon” as a displacement of the word “classic” (Kumar 149).

Biblical canon, vested with authoritative power to sanction restriction, is a restrictive construction that allows neither addition nor deletion. On the contrary, the literary canon is loose in boundaries, suggestive rather than explicit, and always open for inclusions, and thus subject to change when needed (Abrams 20). As Frank Kermode explains, there was a time when discussion of canons was angry but simple in the manner of Dr. Leavis: should Milton be dislodged, or Shelley saved from demotion to the apocrypha? These arguments were keenly, even passionately conducted, but beneath them was a general agreement that getting the canon right was a social issue, though determined by aesthetic argument (Kermode 43). Indeed, the ‘literary canon’ highlights the politics involved in canon formation via exposing the standards followed for inclusion and exclusion.

There are a number of factors responsible for the formative process of canon formation, and they are complex and never undisputed. The most overt factors are, among other things, the wide agreement of critics, scholars and authors with diverse viewpoints and sensibilities; frequent reference of an author in the works of other authors and within the discourse of a cultural community; and the widespread allocation of an author or text in school, college and university syllabi. These factors are, however, mutually interactive, and they need to be sustained over a period of time (Abrams 20).

Canon formation in the past was solely dependent on aesthetics. Harold Bloom argues that literature “breaks into the canon only by aesthetic strength, which is constituted primarily of an amalgam; mastery of figurative language, originality, cognitive power, knowledge, exuberance of diction” (Bloom 29). As aesthetics is the strongest factor in the canon formation of the past, the term ‘aesthetics’ needs to be elaborately discussed.

The term 'Aesthetics' – Origin and Multiple Meanings

The word 'aesthetic' derived from the Greek word 'aisthetikos' means "sensitive, sentient, pertaining to sense perception". The term "aesthetics" was coined with new meaning by the German philosopher Alexander Baumgarten in his dissertation 'Meditationes philosophicae de nonnullis ad poema pertinentibus' ("Philosophical considerations of some matters pertaining the poem") in 1735; Baumgarten chose "aesthetics" because he wished to emphasize the experience of art as a means of knowing.

Aesthetics is a branch of philosophy; it is a species of 'value theory' or 'axiology', which is the study of sensory or sensori-emotional values, sometimes called 'judgments of sentiment and taste'. Aesthetics is closely associated with the philosophy of art. Aesthetics is sometimes called "the study of beauty," but that proposed definition will not do because some of the things that many people find aesthetically valuable or good or noteworthy are not beautiful in any usual or reasonable sense of the term "beautiful."

For Immanuel Kant (Critique of Judgment, 1790), "enjoyment" is the result when pleasure arises from sensation, but judging something to be "beautiful" has a third requirement: sensation must give rise to pleasure by engaging our capacities of reflective contemplation. Judgments of beauty are sensory, emotional and intellectual all at once. According to Kant, aesthetic pleasure lies in our judging a thing as beautiful; it is not that we judge a thing beautiful because we find pleasure in it. Kant argues that our feelings about beauty differ from our feelings about moral goodness because we seek to promote moral goodness but when we appreciate a thing of beauty, we hardly bother to consider its utility. Our judgments of a thing as beautiful are based in an individual's subjective feelings, still they claim universal validity. Kant observed of a man "If he proclaims something to be beautiful, then he requires the same liking from others; he then judges not just for himself but for everyone, and speaks of beauty as if it were a property of things" (Moran 67).

Some separate aesthetics and philosophy of art, claiming that the former is the study of beauty while the latter is the study of works of art. However, most commonly Aesthetics encompasses both questions around beauty as well as questions about art. For some, aesthetics is considered a synonym for the philosophy of art since Hegel, while others insist that there is a significant distinction between these closely related fields. In its more technical epistemological perspective, it is defined as the study of subjective and sensori-emotional values, or sometimes called judgments of sentiment and taste. Aesthetics studies how artists imagine, create and perform works of art; how people use, enjoy, and criticize art; and

what happens in their minds when they look at paintings, listen to music, or read poetry, and understand what they see and hear. It also studies how they feel about art—why they like some works and not others, and how art can affect their moods, beliefs, and attitude toward life. The term ‘aesthetics’, therefore, can be defined as critical reflection on art, culture and nature.

Canon-formation and its Complex Fractal Structure

The primary component of the structure of literary canon is aesthetic judgment. Aestheticizing literature fundamentally denotes evaluating literature from the point of view of its artistic excellence. Aesthetic judgment— a judgment based on the artistic excellence of a literary work— is the most frequent point of discussion in evaluating the quality of a literary work and whether it is deserving of placement within the literary canon. The defenders of a traditional canon generally argue that the ‘art’ of a work contains within it a beauty that surpasses other works and so hold aesthetic value as the critical element of a piece of literature that creates its uniqueness. For example, Andrew Delbanco shows his favour to the critics who “celebrate books as sources of aesthetic delight” rather than those critics who explore a literary work’s political dimensions (ix). This contrast in word-choice between critics who celebrate and critics who explore suggests that the former help bring out all the emotions of joy and feelings of wonder found in literature whereas other critics focus on a book’s relationship with a world outside of itself. The role of aesthetics is so powerful that it is the central value for determining a literary work’s placement in the canon.

For the defenders of traditional canon, beauty within literature arises from its originality in execution of its form and its use of language. The placement of Shakespeare at the head of the canon by them occurs because of the quality of his writing in these areas. Daniel Burt lays Shakespeare at the head due to his “creation of fully realized characters, in the genius of his dramatic storytelling, and, most magnificently, in his supreme mastery of language” (2). Bloom places Shakespeare and Dante, “at the center of the Canon because they excel all other Western writers in cognitive acuity, linguistic energy, and power of invention” (46). This placement of Shakespeare at the top of the canon reinforces the perception that the canon is a hierarchical pyramid. In this way, there exists a linear ordering of the canon starting from the top with Shakespeare and moving through various ranks of aesthetic quality. The idea that the placement within the canon can be calculated comes through in Bloom’s discussion of the aesthetic quality of works and his evaluation of the combination of language usage and originality. However, when we explore the nature of aesthetics, the traditional approach’s description of aesthetics inadequately explains its role in canon formation (Meadows 19).

Traditional aesthetics holds a literary work as possessing an objective value knowable and quantifiable through the application of an analysis of a text's structure and language. In this manner, all work can be assessed and evaluated in a linear format, and the traditional critic attempts to determine placement of a particular piece of literature in comparison with its predecessors. The traditional critics view aesthetic value as existing within the text free from time and reader. Aesthetics as such takes on the aspect of a singularity, an objective reality, existing apart from the reader of which only a few readers are refined enough to perceive, and when it is perceived, the experience is always the same and always repeatable. For the traditional critic, a literary canonical work awes the reader with the beauty of its language; the understanding of the beauty of literary works develops from critics' analyses, and readers depend upon critics for developing their responses to the works' dynamics. In this perspective, the critic's role is crucial to understanding and experiencing literature, and it is due to critics' influence whether a work is lost forever or brought to the light of day.

Traditional aesthetics is only one aspect of aesthetics; it is a process which is arguably reductive because the process focuses on features of the text without any reference to human emotion or to the world outside of the text. The process reduces the concept of aesthetics to only one facet, that of aesthetic value, and creates a linear and hierarchical world. Instead, aesthetics is a chaotic system of variables interconnected and interdependent. The ability to recognize a relationship between readers and the text makes aesthetics multifaceted. Instead of a linear experience, aesthetics of value and of experience creates a recursive interaction where the reader affects the value found within the literature even as the reader is affected by the aesthetic value of the work.

Aesthetics, to the traditional critics, exists only as a value inherent within only the text itself. However, aesthetics cannot exist independently of the reader but must exist as an interaction between reader and text. Recent studies of literature involve a process in which a great range of variables interact. The characteristics of readers create multiple variables that affect the meaning that develops from the text. The variables include, but are not limited to, the reader's knowledge and use of reading strategies as well as the reader's sex and age. These variables do influence what the reader finds as artistic and beautiful.

The Czech critic Jan Mukařovský argued that the poetic object might be studied with Formalist severity as artefact, but that its aesthetic purpose is achieved only by the action of a responsive reader (Kermode 46). This response will certainly be conditioned by the norms and values of the reader's community, but also by individual choices and characteristics—by what gives him or her pleasure. Mukařovský further believed that part of the pleasure and the value its presence

indicates and measures is likely to lie in the power of the object to transgress, to depart, interestingly and revealingly, from the accepted ways of such artefacts. Thus, to qualify as possessing an aesthetic function, the work must give pleasure, and it must also be new. Mukařovský believed that such works had value because they gave pleasure to the individual and were at the same time socially valuable because of the common element in the response of serious readers. Mukařovský took account of the changingness in time of poetic works that continues long after their first serious readers are dead. He did not doubt that aesthetic value changed, might possibly disappear; the important point was that since its source is in the reader it will in any case be different from one epoch to another. That is an important issue for believers in canonicity.

Apart from aesthetics there are two other essential facets of canon formation- culture and history. The word 'culture' is essentially an evasive term capable of multiple meanings. Culture generally pertains to ethnic, racial, and gender groups; however, culture is often used to represent the values, beliefs, customs, and tastes of the aforementioned groups. The traditional canon, for its defenders, expresses the culture's essential values as a form of ideology, and, as a result, the canon functions as a curriculum for educating its young members. This is a canon which is "pre-selected by culture, laid down like fossils in the sedimented layers of institutional tradition" (Scholes 58). Guillory views it as a "fictional cultural entity" (42). It is pertinent to argue that as cultural shifts occur in the population, it is reasonable to expect changes occurring not only in the culture's identity but also in the literary canon. Guillory notes that "social identities are themselves historically constructed; they mean different things at different historical moments" (18). Guillory suggests that canon formation can be a process of "reevaluation of particular authors [which] alters the set of terms by which literature as a whole, or what we like to now call the canon, is represented to its constituency, to literary culture, at a particular historical moment" (135). The culture represented then is not the culture that originally generated the literature, but the culture that currently evaluates the literature. Thus, the canon is always an image of the culture of the past, not of the present.

The literary canon can reasonably be described as a shifting shape; the "changes in the canon obviously reflect change in ourselves and our culture. It is a register of how our historical self-understandings are formed and modified" (Kermode 36). These changes are bidirectional in nature. The literature changes our perception of ourselves, but the changes in our culture work to change our perception of the literary canon. The canon cannot represent absolute cultural values because what the canon represents undergoes changes as critics and readers dissect and digest literary works. Nor does the value represented by culture stay the same.

In the cultural domain, literary canon means recognition of the artistic quality of certain literary works, on the one hand; and on the other, it means the way certain writers and genres, through socialization and institutionalization, are accepted by all the society and acquire legal status and become part of the mainstream culture. Socialization and institutionalization, according to Pierre Bourdieu, is an inevitable process for canon formation- cultural familiarization (Ping 62).

The history of canon formation never involves a linear process as the canon is not a fixed form and not developed from an unchanging standard and as there is no one definitive list of great works and authors now nor in the past. Instead, its form is in perpetual flux and change constantly trying to achieve equilibrium. The canon changes due to random as well as reasoned influences. The canon represents not a single purpose, but a variety of purposes throughout history. In addition, the canon even when used for a specific purpose, such as literature curriculums within colleges and universities, changes over time (Meadows 53).

In canon formation a complex relationship is discernible among aesthetics, culture and history. Each facet, aesthetics, culture, and literary history, interacts with the canon in a dynamic relationship. There is a complex relationship between aesthetics and canon formation as the latter is built from multiple readers resulting in multiple perspectives and creating a self-similarity of experiences. Multidimensional cultural groups create multiple perspectives and this causes dissipative structures that continually lose equilibrium only to regain it in another form. Instead of a sequential development of literary history, we find chaotic and complex relationship existing between the past and the present and recursive processes creating self-similar fractal images in the development of the canon. Instead of the canon forming three different systems, the canon itself is a single system with aesthetics, culture, and its literary history interacting among one another in a chaotic and complex way. This description allows for the interplay that each facet exerts upon the other as it interacts with the canon (Meadows 78). According to Monroe C. Beardsley, “. . . even if literary works do have aesthetic value, it is inevitably so mixed with other values as to permit no clear discrimination and identification; therefore, it cannot be sensibly discussed or play any significant role in our systematic study or cultural treatment of those works” (238).

Aesthetics in Canon-formation and the Context of Globalisation

A decisive change is perceptible between the literature before globalisation and the post-globalisation literature. The frameworks of aesthetics which were the sole standards in canon formation of the past have been eroded by the effects of globalisation. In the field of literary studies the past and history is understood through a national framework, and until recently, literature has been, to some

extent, seen as a stable object with a special language of its own. Globalisation, however, has brought with it a concept of the singularity of literature- literature as an entity of its own, as being stripped of its national, authorial, temporal and textual boundaries. Literature and the literary canon tap into some hitherto unknown spaces as aesthetics, the measuring parameter of determining ‘art’ or ‘artistically beautiful’ in literature, loses its hold in literary studies. In the past canon of literature was formed out of aesthetic standards and cultural familiarization. In the globalised era there is a shift in this paradigm as the frameworks of aesthetics, boundaries of the text and the author and the nation become eroded. De-aesthetizing literature implies the erosion of aesthetic standards which globalisation has brought with it. As a result the possibility of studying literature as a form has considerably waned, and due to a dearth of proper revision of the methodologies of research and study, some discursive splits are noticeable in research areas. To homogenise these discursive splits in literary fields, standardised methods emerge to take control, and margins become increasingly ignored. Standardisations are perceived in translation studies, world literature, and comparative methods etc, stripping literary study of its autonomy and diversity; the standardising methods of study have created a lack of diversity in literary studies with similar methods becoming assessments through which literary texts have to pass in order to prove their worth. According to Edward Said, “. . . because English is a world language, several regional languages become marginal dialects; this further enables the homogenisation of cultural products, which are seen as dominating cultural ‘markets’.” (67) Thus, literature which used to qualify as “authentic” and “testimonial” a decade or two ago is now put to new test in global context.

Globalised situation has engendered the spread of the social structures of modernity across the world, and thus cast ambivalent impacts on literary studies. It is good to see that globalisation has spawned such diverse fields of studies as postcolonial theory, ethnic cultures, identity etc in literature; but the inadequate regulation of methodologies in research and literary studies is not good. “Many scholars of world literature, comparative studies, and subaltern and gender studies alike have voiced concerns about standardising methods practised in these fields” (Nganthoi and Devi 268).

The structure of globalisation develops through technologies and their increasing relations with corporations. It demands practical skills from its citizens. The dynamics of reading have drastically changed; the reading and discourses of literature have been replaced by various discourses on the internet. The global field has placed literary studies only in academic circles; literary readership and practice are mostly restricted in academic circles while the internet takes over the general media. With the easy availability of large number of contents on the internet indulgence in literature has substantially decreased. It can be argued that the value

of literature is lessened by globalisation. Whether it is in aesthetic terms or in another sense is another matter. Rationalisation and practical skills as the staunch demands of globalisation have endangered art and aesthetics which, although prominent, fail to find efficiency in the job market.

With the advent of globalisation many debates in relation to aesthetics have arisen in the realm of literary studies. Formerly, aesthetics was understood as pertaining to the kind of beauty which gives pleasure to the senses: the reader could identify the aesthetic aspects of a literary work with what would make it pleasurable to read. It is however important to note that the textual features and the aesthetic features of a particular text need not coincide. Therefore, looking only for beauty in aesthetics is not a suitable option in the face of globalisation. This older notion of aesthetics is what Edward Said calls “autonomous aesthetic realm”. While contemplating the future of literary studies in globalised context, he writes, “the more extreme the isolation of the aesthetic, the more it negatively reflects the antinomies of the social situation” (68). The frameworks of studying the constituents of aesthetic aspects in literature should be revised in the face of globalisation. The aesthetic elements should constitute and include the truth and one should find beauty in truth. Aesthetics cannot be detached from the society anymore. According to the French philosopher Jacques Ranciere, “Art can become life. Life can become art. Art and life can exchange their properties” (119). The idea of aesthetics being confined to beauty alone cannot function in today’s world. In order to truly understand the meaning of literature and its importance as a discipline in a globalised world, the very idea which defines aesthetics needs to be revised. Aesthetic appeals and appraisals are considerably wider than the beauty and pleasure they offer.

In his *The Politics of Aesthetics* Jacques Ranciere has attempted to redefine aesthetics. To Ranciere, aesthetics refers neither to art theory in general nor to the discipline that takes art as its object of study; aesthetics is a specific regime for identifying and thinking the arts that Ranciere names the aesthetic regime of art. In its broad sense, however, aesthetics refers to the distribution of the sensible that determines a mode of articulation between forms of action, production, perception and thought. This general definition extends aesthetics beyond the strict realm of art to include the conceptual coordinates and modes of visibility operative in the political domain (Ranciere 86). Aesthetics in its restricted sense is understood and explained by Ranciere as having three regimes: the ethical regime, the representative regime and the aesthetic regime. In the aesthetic regime of art, the hierarchical order of the arts and their subject matters is done away with, the boundaries between different genres are broken down and ‘art in the singular’ comes into being and with it the subject of aesthetics. The aesthetic regime “simultaneously establishes the autonomy of art and the identity of its forms with the

forms that life uses to shape itself". (Ranciere19) Thus, Ranciere tries to rescue aesthetics from the narrow confines of framework it is usually limited to.

Aesthetics Rethought and the Prospect of Global Canon

Viewed from such innovative ideas of aesthetics as Ranciere's, aesthetics cannot be defined only by form, purely linguistic features, style or structure or by just fine writing. Aesthetics should frame a world comprised of truth and involvement. The revised aesthetic ideal of literature can rightly present the antinomies of the social situation and give good purpose to the cultural domain of literature. Owing to this revised aesthetic ideal of literature, canon formation of literature has met some new criteria especially in the globalised era. There were lines once, rooted in Europe, that delineated and informed the creation of a canon of great works. Those lines are now blurred, or have disappeared altogether. Artists collaborate across countries and continents, inspiring their brethren. Art and literature live in a world without borders. It can be argued that globalisation has ushered in a new aesthetics affecting literature to evade rules, boundaries and definitions. This effect can be traced to a singular event created by readability – a moment when literature transcends temporal, authorial, textual, national and other boundaries. It is this singularity which unifies different paradigms and disciplines of study and opens itself to "reinterpretation, and recontextualization" (Attridge 63). Literature which has emerged in this context can be called world literature.

Canon formation is an important issue in the discussion of world literature, and the formation of a world literary canon must be the result of literary scholarship that explains how a particular work may appeal to readers in very different social, political, cultural, and historical conditions beyond its national origin. With the rise of world literature, scholars from the world's different literary traditions should be able to select the best of their works to form a canon of world literature. The global situation of literature provides a great opportunity for scholars of the world's various literary traditions, particularly non-Western and hitherto neglected and overlooked "minor" traditions, to introduce the best of their works to a global audience, to make their canonical works known to the world outside their limited national environment. This seems the right thing to do at the right time as the renewed interest in world literature today is based on a truly global vision beyond the biases and myopia of Eurocentrism or any other ethnocentrism.

Conclusion

The politics of canon formation is not limited merely to the politics of inclusion and exclusion, and it is rather grounded in material, ideological, and socio-cultural realities, which determine a relationship with literature and literary texts. Canon formation of literature is a dynamic system operating within the framework of chaos and complexity, making it an open system which is in constant interaction with its surroundings. The end result of recognizing the literary canon as a chaotic and complex system encourages the use of a diverse canon and the continued study of the processes of aesthetics, culture and history on the literary canon. Globalisation has unsettled the role of aesthetics in literary studies and canon formation of literature, ushering in the emergence of new aesthetics which affects literature to dispense with the authorial, textual and national boundaries.

The erosion of the national framework unifies literature as a whole globally. There is, however, “a need to look at literary studies in a way that employs systems and methods of reading world literature which defies the homogenising capitalist sweep of globalisation” (Nganthoi and Devi 274). One can notice a lack of canonical frame of reference in the production of literature recently but it is also this lack of canon that allows comparative literature and world literature to defy Eurocentrism of literary canon. The literary scholars may find difficulty with the literary field now vast after globalisation but it is globalisation which has opened up various areas of paradigm and exploration which is essential to the growth of literature. If methodologies are employed to challenge the overpowering standardisation of globalisation and its effects, then literature and literary studies can thrive long keeping amity with globalisation.

Works Cited:

- Abrams, M. H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. Prism Books, 1993, pp. 19-22.
- Apter, Emily. “Introduction.” *Against World Literature: On the Politics of Untranslatability*. Verso, 2013.
- Attridge, Derek. *The Singularity of Literature*. Routledge, 2004.
- Beardsley, Monroe C.. “Aesthetic Value in Literature”. *Comparative Literature Studies*, vol. 3, no.12, 1981, pp. 238-47. *JSTOR*, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40246261>.
- Bloom, Harold. *The Western Canon: The Books and School of the Ages*. Penguin, 1995.

- Burt, Daniel. "The literary 100: A ranking of the most influential novelists, playwrights, and poets of all time". *Facts on File Inc.*, 2001.
- Chesney, Duncan McColl. "An Essay against Global Literature: Literature and the Global Public". *Concentric: Literary and Cultural Studies*, vol. 43, no. 2, September 2017, pp. 251-74. *JSTOR*, <https://doi.org/10.6240/concentric.lit.2017.43.2.11>.
- Delbanco, Andrew. *Required Reading: Why Our American Classics Matter Now*. Noonday Pr., 1998.
- Guillory, John. *Cultural Capital: The Problem of Literary Canon Formation*. University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Judgement*. Translated by Werner Pluhar S. vol. 3. Hackett Classics, 2002.
- Kermode, Frank. "Pleasure, Change, and the Canon". University of California, Nov. 2001, pp. 41-71. 636-p.qxd, https://tannerlectures.utah.edu/_resources/documents/a-to-z/k/kermode_2001.pdf.
- Khemeri, Jonas Hassen, et al. "The Big Question: Is There a Global Canon?". *World Policy Journal*, Fall 2010, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 3-7. *JSTOR*, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40964049>.
- Khuraijam, Nganthoi, and N. Banita Devi. "Literary Study and Globalisation: Rethinking the Aesthetic Aspect of Literature". *IIS University Journal of Arts*, vol. 10, no. 3, 2022, pp. 266-75.
- Kumar, Manish. "Interrogating the Politics of Canon Formation: A Theoretical Purview". *MEJO*, vol. 5, Feb. 2021. MELOW, <https://www.melow.in/journal.html>.
- Longxi, Zhang. "Canon and World Literature". *Journal of World Literature*, vol. 1, 2016, pp. 119-27. *PMLA*, <https://brill.com/jwl>.
- Meadows, Martin Thomas. "The Literary Canon as a Dynamic System of Chaos and Complexity Theory". Oklahoma State University, 2006.
- Moran, Richard. "The Philosophical Imagination: Selected Essays". OUP, 2017.
- Ping, DU. "Canon Formation in Literary Field- A Sociological Perspective". *International Journal of Liberal Arts and Social Science*, vol. 3, no. 8, October, 2015, pp. 60-65. *JSTOR*, <https://www.ijlass.org>.
- Ranciere, Jacques. "Dissensus on Politics and Aesthetics". Ed. Steven Corcoran. Continuum International Publishing Group, 2010.

---. "Politics of Aesthetics". Translated by Gabriel Rockhill. Bloomsbury, 2017.

Said, Edward. "Globalising Literary Study." *PMLA*, vol. 116, no. 1, January 2001, pp. 64-68.

Scholes, Robert. "Textual power: Literary theory and the teaching of English". Yale UP, 1985.