

Sequencing Teaching Literature and Culture: Constructing a Framework for Building Multiple Literacies

The last chapter addressed what the literacy of genres can add as a framework to the language and literature curriculum. To implement these principles into a curriculum, however, requires a broader sense of what it means to teach literature within a developmental context of levels for language and culture teaching and learning.¹

Not just genres, but all language and cultural materials must be sequenced within an individual curriculum, so that steps lead learners from defining the learning, setting learning goals, and identifying contents that fill the goals set for the curriculum. The difference between the disjunct curricula we now accept and ones that can promote coherent learning lies in taking the humanities as a coherent field of knowledge production in which "reading literature" need not be equated as reading for personal purposes or reading for practical goals -- there *is* a "text in this class."² In designing the levels of such a course, it is, as the last chapter discussed, crucial to distinguish "high status" cultural learning (i.e. the best in *any* medium or genre, literature or otherwise) from "high culture" (the genres preferred by hegemonic classes). Yet at the same time, such a curriculum must accommodate individual institutions' students and learning goals, but, if it is to focus on teaching literature, it will necessarily attend to levels of teaching culture and to advanced study of literature *has to be configured as a professional or technical dialogue relating to canonical, professional, and cognitive norms for teaching as learning, as related to the "credentials" of a professional scholar as any bar exam might be*. That is, the curriculum fostering study of literature must encompass predictable and necessary stages of development in "reading," extended to include not only the study of genre, as

¹ Part of this chapter is based on a presentation given in a Session on "Literature and Culture or Cultural Studies," organized by the American Association of Teachers of German for the 2002 Modern Language Association Convention in New York (30 December 2002).

outlined above, but the study of multiple literacies -- linguistic, cultural, and literary alike -
- within a developmental hierarchy.

This section will introduce the question of teaching literature as part of today's general stress on cultural studies, and on multi-literacies of culture. First, it will expand on the notions of teaching literature introduced above, and then it will move out to how the teaching of literature is a model for the teaching of culture in general -- an expansion on the theory imperatives which are themselves just as homeless in the curriculum as genre theory is.

Task Levels for Teaching Literature

Deciding to teach literature as genre is only the first step in developing a curriculum that will take students through a set of coherent level fostering their linguistic and literary knowledge at the same time. Even within the high culture literacy associated with the teaching and learning of literature, genres must be isolated and taught individually, within general patterns of literacy. As was argued above, students of literature must grow through levels of linguistic and formal practice, if they are to build up to literacy in genres. Genres are not strictly isolated from one another: once one masters the historical evolution of the novel, for example, the patterns of the drama become clearer, since they overlap on what they can define as dialogue. But as "literacy," each genre presents a set of *sine qua nons* that define it and help to condition its specific meanings. "General education" classes can be satisfied with the basic cultural literacy about genres -- their fundamental organizations of form and content that tell readers how they speak. In contrast, majors, graduate students, and scholars have a more specialized literacy, when they understand genres in their historical and cultural contexts.

If learners are to be introduced to specific genres, as opposed to genre in general, they must do so in terms of each genre's specific content and form -- in terms of the literacy each

² Pace Stanley Fish, *Is There a Text in This Class?*, who would assert that there are only readings.

requires of its audience. The following chart may serve to introduce the differentiations among genres, as specific forms of literacy:

Suggested Task Stages for Specific Genres

<p>STAGE 1: Generating competent readings off systems of markers *****</p> <p>Internal to texts: Who What Where When</p> <p>External to texts: Cultural Historical Gestural Institutional Thematic</p>	<p>POETRY (& advertising) Verbal Markers</p> <p>Attention to norm/deviance patterns built off of ordinary language syntax and semantics</p> <p>Special semantics: figures, tropes, etc</p>	<p>LONGER PROSE (fictional or non-fictional) Verbal Markers</p> <p>Attention to narrative point of view</p> <p>Special organizing chains: episodes, settings, verbal figures, historical references, etc.</p>	<p>FILM Visual and Verbal Markers</p> <p>Attention to narrative point of view in TWO channels (verbal/aural and visual) that might not coincide</p> <p>Identifying special point of view devices: camera angle, color, other sound and framing issues</p>	<p>DRAMA Behavioral and Verbal Markers</p> <p>Attention to sequence, presence and absences in story-telling, behavior interpolations. Scene connections</p> <p>Systematizing special stylization in drama (e.g. third wall, non-realistic space, telescoped time)</p>
<p>STAGE 2: Joining communities (comparing 2 readings -- making types out of tokens) *****</p> <p>Internal to texts: Conventional forms Prototypes (canons)</p> <p>External to texts: History of the forms Sociology of the forms</p>	<p>Identifying conventional poetry types; using reference materials; Style and aesthetics analysis</p> <p>*****</p> <p>Content/media analysis: analysis vis-a-vis prototype</p> <p>Analysis of lyrical "I" and probable audience</p>	<p>Taking genre prototype (e.g. <i>Don Quixote</i>) and comparing another member of the genre against it</p> <p>-as form</p> <p>-as members of genre from two different epochs</p> <p>*****</p> <p>Reception explanations (culture) Modifications of genre</p>	<p>Taking genre prototype (e.g. <i>Gone with the Wind</i>) and comparing another member of the genre against it</p> <p>-as form</p> <p>-as members of genre from two different epochs</p> <p>*****</p> <p>Reception, remakes</p>	<p>Taking genre prototype (e.g. <i>Inherit the Wind</i>) and comparing another member of the genre against it</p> <p>-as form</p> <p>-as members of genre from two different epochs</p> <p>*****</p> <p>Restagings, reviews</p>
				Performance

STAGE 3: Expert knowledge (generating genre and period knowledge)	Application of theory texts to genre; periodization	Application of theory texts to genre; Periodization CULTURAL STUDIES	Screenplay versus film versus technical systems -- analyses of interrelations	versus textuality study; application of theory texts to genre; periodization
---	--	---	--	---

At the first stage of learning any genre -- or, in fact, of any codified cultural practice, verbal, visual, or behavioral in inspiration --, learners need to be alerted to the text's elements that build into patterns. They are cognitively and linguistically overloaded, in most cases, and so need to be alerted and directed toward building cognitive patterns that are central to the text's meaning. Thus in reading a lyric poem, the novice reader will profit from learning to trace shifts of tense, for example, as indicator of steps within the poem's logic. If that same reader is led to collect word fields (colors, objects, place indicators), then initial patterns of the text's context become clear. If that reader is trying to approach prose, then point of view and narrator become important, which are marked by tenses and adverbial expressions of place, time, or sequence ("early that morning," "earlier").

In all these cases, initial level exercises need to help students learn-to-learn the advance organizers for genre types -- to perform the kinds of mental bookkeeping that first language readers do as they read texts. The structures of meaning that learners practice are those which help them make sense of their world: cognitive patterns used to understand everyday life, basic vocabulary and syntax patterns. That is, the *literacy* involved here, as represented in literary texts, is basic cultural literacy and FL literacy. The work of comprehension to be done by the learners lies within the realm of everyday life; when they produce language about what they read, see, or hear, that production will similarly be in the register of everyday speech and writing.

When a greater degree of literacy about genre is required (or posited as the necessary outcome of a curriculum and learning sequence, the learners' tasks must take them in two directions. First, the cognitive dimension of their engagement with the texts involved becomes more complex. Each text type is treated not only as a concrete engagement with an environment, but as a concrete token of an abstract type that literate readers need to learn to negotiate. That

is, in Piagetian terms, the cognitive challenge to be met by the learner is to move towards abstract thought -- to be able to compare two or more texts against a set of criteria, all of which must be defined by reference to concrete specifics. That act of comparison requires a commensurately more nuanced group of linguistic material.

At the second level of a curriculum, therefore, the focus needs to be on building larger patterns in cultural-historical contents that specific genres answer to. Two mystery stories - - Poe and Agatha Christie -- share some characteristics and differ in others. The shared forms and contents are defining of their genre identities; the different lies in other cultural, sociological, or historical factors, such as what social problems motivate the "evil" of the plot (espionage or smuggled art), what national conventions motivate style decisions (*noir* or police procedurals), or sheer shifts in time and audience. Thus the class exercises must force comparisons: after establishing the patterns *within* one text, then others must be treated in and of themselves (their "difference" from the genre norm), and in comparison to others of its type (the "sameness" that defines the genre type). This ability to work in different patterns is critical to establishing more formal patterns of social and cultural literacy than the simple logical work of the first level instruction.

Finally, when learners join professional or elite communities through the highly formalized literacy of technical language, these patterns in individual texts must not only be contrasted with each other, but also described and manipulated in terminology appropriate to the professional registers involved. Thus the detective novels that are understood as members of genres such as *noir* or police procedurals in earlier stages of learning must now be described in more stylized terms: as "naturalist" or possessing omniscient narrators, or the like. Thus the comprehension problem has gotten more complex in that two tokens of a particular text type are not only compared against each other, but also against various more abstract technical terminology.

The literacy of high-status texts is thus very important for learners to cultivate, since principally there they will be forced to write and oral production with complex syntax and

context, since they will for the first time be juggling not only a comparison, but also an evaluation ("a good representation of a police procedural") -- judging the items compared against some outside norm. This is the full discourse literacy that lifts the speaker or writer of a language into a true authority position vis-à-vis the materials spoken or written about.

But elite-status texts put the burden of comprehension on semiotics -- on the linguistics or visual materials manipulated in texts that learners need to understand and manipulate as culturally high status production. There are other kinds of cultural literacy that build up around text genres, as well.

Learning Literature, Learning Culture

Heidi Byrnes talks of "The Cultural Turn in Foreign Language Departments" in a linguistic and sociolinguistic sense, stressing that recent generations stress other kinds of literacy than that of traditional genres. Cultural studies theory has brought to the humanities a sociological or anthropological approach to teaching culture into our classrooms. As she sees it, this shift has added to "familiar debates about which literary-cultural content areas should be added, reduced or foregrounded in the replacement of canonical literature by previously marginalized materials and authors" (114-115). Those "previously marginalized materials and authors" are often the non-elite cultural forms: TV instead of the *auteur* film; romance novels instead of the classics. Yet most, if not all, department curricula have not managed to build systematic practice in such literacy into their curricula, just as little as they still teach genre. Yet Byrnes stresses that the kind of literacy prioritized in Cultural Studies still requires the "creation of an intellectual foundation that can truly accommodate as aspects of a department's work and determination of a suitable goal" (115). That foundation has not yet been developed to supplement or replace the cultural literacy of genres outlined in the last section. .

Traditionally, the teaching of culture was represented as a difference between "big C" and "little c" culture. With the advent of post-structuralist and marxist ideas of culture,

especially theories like the Birmingham School (Stuart Hall, etc.), sociological and anthropological approaches to cultural critique emerged, but few or no systematic approaches to curricula for culture teaching. We still do not know what it means to "teach culture," if that culture is beyond the sociology of language or outside the bounds of canonicity.

In fact, Byrnes is not alone in critiquing curricula for not linking the whole idea of cultural studies to a solid notion of cultural literacy. Despite complex critical engagement with cultural forms, most cultural studies practitioners are not informed about how their theories might be used as the basis for a curriculum with clear developmental stages.³ From the point of view of the theory represented in her own institution, Byrnes suggests how a "social literacy" concept can be used as a responsible and accountable goal for a department program; her own department's program attempts to implement that kind of responsible curricular planning, with sufficient teaching practices to realize the goal

More commonly, however, the teaching of culture has fared little better than the teaching of literature as a curricular framework. As the earlier discussion of genre in this chapter has already argued in its way, "culture" cannot be defined monolithically, or even in a single dimension. Even within traditional notions of "high culture," there are many culture groups with claims to coherence and to the value of tradition, aside from the cultures of marginalized groups; there are very many material forms of elite cultural expression, from books and art theory music and rhetoric. Thus "teaching culture" implies an outcome potentially even more cognitively complex than the simpler cultural literacy about genre, but not necessarily as linguistically stylized. Nonetheless, cultural literacy requires the same kinds of understanding how text function within cultural units (not just within the more linguistically oriented groups in elite culture).

³ Heidi Byrnes and Susanne Kord show how this plays out across the curriculum. Virginia M. Scott and Julie A. Huntington, "Reading Culture: Using Literature to Develop C2 Competence," did a study that suggests that students who learned about the Ivory Coast from a poem showed richer, less stereotyped understanding than those who learned it from fact sheet, as evidenced by the more nuanced questions they asked about the culture (622). David A. Wright, "Culture

In this sense, "cultural literacy" is a set of multiple literacies, including the literacy of literacy and other text genres, but not restricted to the conventional books or movies. That is, the multiple literacies that are conventionally designated as cultural literacy requires what can be called the "semiotic mechanisms of culture," as Lotman and Uspensky term it -- the same sorts of systems of cultural meaning that were explored by Foucault, Barthes, and Eco, with Julia Kristeva being perhaps the most familiar name in the subsequent generation. These systems of cultural meaning, moreover, resemble linguistic systems, as the theory debates of the last quarter century have stressed. They are systems of signs, or representations, sustaining and sustained in the materialities of cultures, that can be historicized, as systems of expression that take on particular forms in an era. Because of this, "teaching culture" may be constructed in parallel to teaching language and teaching literature, as one of the multiple literacies of culture, involving both a set of forms and a content group from a particular cultural locus.

Yet here again, the question of outcomes for learning become crucial. "Teaching culture" requires an instructor or program to specify what sphere or spheres of culture will be the content within the literacy to be taught. Each culture has in it not only a historical tradition of cultural representations, but also various contemporary contents and contexts that have the potential to be invoked as part of learning outcomes: sociological, community, ideological, historical, aesthetic/high culture contents, for example. Thus to describe the learning outcomes of a course or sequence of cultures means to specify a system or set of systems of meanings to be taught -- not individual items, but as patterns in creating orders of complexity

This point can be exemplified profitably by looking at the *National Standards for History*, a parallel initiative to the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning*. Where the *FL Standards* are a single list, the *History Standards* have two separate sets of criteria: one is a set of major concepts that are central in an understanding of an era, and the second is a list of

as Information and Culture as Affective Process: A Comparative Study," also supports the

distinctive cognitive strategies involved in historical analysis -- one set of contents, and one of cognitive acts. These *Standards* work toward the specific literacies required for "knowing history," for being literate in historical thinking.

These *Standards* can help in defining what it means to "teach culture," but does not exhaust them as potential learning goals for a course or curriculum. To "teach culture" from the perspective of a language/literature department is not just an issue of concepts and cognitive acts, but also a systematic accounting for context and evaluation. To the knowledge and analytic skills specified in the *History Standards*, a language/literature courses needs to add linguistic, anthropological and sociological knowledge which Byrnes describes. Yet cultural literacies include knowledge of other fundamental systems involving content and contexts, such as:

- Media through which communication happens
- Identity markers for groups involved in communication
- Institutions conditioning culture
- Contents/preoccupations of particular cultures, and the communities which support them (Birmingham

School/Stuart Hall kinds of issues).

- Text types and functions within the culture
- Sociological and linguistic markers for authorized speaking.

Thus teaching and understanding culture is more multi-faceted than understanding history or language alone. If we want to "teach culture," for example, we have to first define what kinds of culture we are teaching: "official," "high," "popular"? Once that decision is made, then a course or curriculum needs to decide on the distinctive contents and contexts of the literacies that are being taught -- as a set of accountability criteria, evaluating "competence" in the culture learned. Thus "teaching culture" must also include literature as part of its literacy, as one of its specific contents. In the cultures of the West, literature has particular roles in each era, often (but not always) aligned with hegemonic cultural groups, and sharing the interest of high and popular culture groups alongside TV, radio, and films.

"Teaching culture" must thus range beyond teaching contents and systems of designation and communication as it sets learning goals for its learners. As in the case of a literature-driven curriculum, articulation among levels and including specific content and comprehension

necessity of using more nuance approaches to

goals becomes crucial. Language goals will help to bridge those levels of comprehension into levels of production, as well. On the rudimentary level, the lower division, of such a curriculum, basic constructivist learning must be set up, teaching learners how to build up systems of significant cultural markers, signs, practices, and facts -- the learning to learn perspective within cultural contexts. On more advanced levels, however, the problem of "teaching culture" becomes more complex (with or without the FL).

Levels in the Culture Curriculum

The chart below includes a summary of what it might mean to learn culture. The first level's goals are very parallel to those familiar from teaching literature, albeit with a broader attention to "text types" (cultural artifacts and monuments will stand next to books and art) as the basis for learners' practice in building up systems of information.

Higher levels of the curriculum, however, require more specification as to learning outcomes. The study of literature becomes very technical above the introductory level, with a significant body of elite patterns of knowledge and expression needing to be mastered by learners. In contrast, the study of culture can take on very different disciplinary characters, depending on what kinds of learning the curriculum specifies. As an overview of that problem, consider the following rough breakdown of differences between levels of learning culture:

Curricular Levels for Teaching Culture

	LEARNING GOALS	TEXT TYPES	CONTENT ISSUES
LEVEL 1	Ability to identify and assemble systems of culture (learning to learn perspective): linguistic, semiotic, behavioral, sociological; ability to correlate part to whole, transfer token to type, idea	Media appropriate to learning goals; includes longer texts with reasonable content goals	who, what, where, when: ability to locate systems in a basic network of culture/society/ history identification of basic patterns (genre, conversation, community, etc)., productive

	to practice		rules within that patterns; to realize systems predictably
LEVEL 2	Comparisons/contrasts of systems from the point of view of individuals in it; ability to discern cause and effect between systems and individual behaviors; to shift among points of view; argue within coherence of systems; replicate canonicity in any of the three domains	<p>Culture: literature, film, theater, opera, etc.</p> <p>Anthropology: popular writing, television, popular music, infotainment</p> <p>Sociology: essays, government documents, news</p> <p>Literature: as in previous section</p>	<p>Culture: aesthetics, including genre, norms of high culture; popular culture; media involved</p> <p>Anthropology: human behavior, interpersonal communication, community forms, etc.</p> <p>Sociology: power/distinction markers; praxis, correlated with economics, government, etc.</p> <p>Literature: as in previous section</p>
LEVEL 3	Professionally authorized sources of knowledge production, dissemination; power/knowledge links and channels (à la Foucault); analysis of canonicity; chart dynamics of marginalized and dominant groups; plan and organize alternatives	Primary sources versus secondary literature; theory; "official" histories of the domain; canons; bibliographies, libraries (Chartier's "order of books" and other media)	Institutions, professional structures, laws, etc. that define culture, set a culture's practices into a values structure, and hold these practices in place

Each level can take on a very different pattern of learning.

The first level (again, the introductory or lower-division letter), focuses on the concrete systems of culture learning: the "who, what, where, and when" facts of language, location, and social signification, with special emphasis on sociological/anthropological. Thus in a first-year (introductory) level course on the Enlightenment that will be discussed in some more detail below, starting with novels and films sets up the fundamental content issues whose systems of meaning frame more complicated understandings of culture. A novel like *La nouvelle Héloïse* (Rousseau) or a film like *Dangerous Liaisons*, no matter how speculative, show or tell stories of people in their environments, working through typical concerns of the era, and in

modes of behavior sanctioned (or decried) by their era, or at least in preferred representation. The character types represent significant aspects of the Enlightenment's dominant speaker types, which learners must be comfortable in identifying. The level's learning goals and necessary content focuses rest on these systems of anthropological and sociological knowledge.

The question of "text types" to be represented, however, become more complex. Culture learning requires input on more than the verbal level, and in more than one form, since natives in a culture move freely between oral and visual representation, aural, visual, and symbolic comprehension, and the like. So it becomes crucial not only what Rousseau's Julie says, but also what she might wear (as documented in the art of the era, or in a film that purports a degree of historical fidelity in its costuming), the tone of voice in which she says it, and in what locations -- the information that is more comprehensively presented by a film than by prose fiction.

Moreover, a decision about genre must be made: certain forms of expression, behavior, and writing are favored in the Enlightenment (e.g. travel writing, open letters), which are not necessarily used with the same cultural weight today. So the learning of content must be sensitive to what kinds of cultural literacy are sought as the outcome. It is one thing to be able to understand the concepts in Rousseau's novel (concepts also represented in the philosophy that was such an integral part of high culture in the era), and quite another to see the social nuances implied in the author's use of the epistolary novel form (an aesthetic problem), or the significance of the locations and character names as cultural references (a more popular culture issue). Which kind of learning is defined as the appropriate outcome will condition what text types need to be done.

This attention to text types might profitably be seen as an attention to building up appropriate contexts of understanding -- as answers to the problem of what kinds of knowledge are required of the specific habits of the Enlightenment in order for a learner to have access to more complex forms of social expression, anthropological knowledge, and cultural understanding. What does one need to understand, for example, the signs that Enlightenment

people used to determine and reinforce class boundaries? And where did those people learn those markers of in-groups -- did they read newspapers, visit the theater, or hear popular songs? The genres through which particular communities learned to identify themselves within the greater culture should, therefore, be represented as the texts chosen to stage learners' engagement with the systems of cultural meaning and expression that will ground their learning and on the basis of which they will be evaluated. Those "texts," in addition, may be institutions, pictures, social practices, or any system of expression that bears investigation as seminal to cultural identity.

When the second level of the curriculum is constructed (including upper-division courses in the FLs, critical writing/critical thinking classes, major classes), the learning situation requires a more complex set-up of understanding and expression.

The text types that are represented have to work toward typologies of cultural systems, communities, institutions, or discourses within a particular cultural setting (including considerations of the markers that differentiate among sub-cultures, institutions, high and popular culture). Those texts must be longer and more nuanced, as was the case of literature curricula based on genre literacy, and they must be in more than a single medium. These texts, moreover, need to be studied within the culture's contexts, that is, within its chosen patterns of social and anthropological meaning.

The most difficult issue, however, is specifying the content of the learning sought. The *content* of that learning within cultural context becomes critical. Are we interested in having learners master the anthropological facts of a culture (the way Rousseau's Julie would behave, and the values she would have), or sociological facts about status, power, and distinction (the question of birth class versus ability that distinguishes people in *Dangerous Liaisons*)? Or more facts about high culture (manners, mores, dress, law), or about official structures of society (a post-structural analysis of institutions). Sociological questions specifying content learning force learners to practice *comparisons* and *contrasts* between points of view (e.g. what men and women would deal with the situation); aesthetic or political knowledge requires

knowledge of how high culture is made, put into circulation, supported by institutions, and the like. Each such domain of content, moreover, has its own space of discourse: its own preferred genres, loci of communication, and patterns of information, behavior, and signs, which need to be represented as texts, if that learning is to be possible. Learners cannot learn the nuances of clothing and status, for example, simply from novels, but instead must see the clothing in context, possibly in paintings.

At the level of senior seminars or basic graduate teaching and learning, the staging for cultural teaching and learning becomes even more complex. Most critically, however, it must respect not only the contexts of the culture learned about, but also content and context issues *from the point of view of the learners*. Said another way: the learner must not only comprehend the culture on its own terms, in a field-dependent way (dependent on the specific cultural context), but also be able to move towards a field-independent understanding of such cultural artifacts, reflecting in various ways on how the cultural systems at play in a context represent conscious strategies of knowledge- production, power, and self-assertion on the part of individual and groups. These tasks are more synthetic, complex, and reflective than the more immediate tasks of understanding of intermediate levels.

And thus we reach the crux of the difficulty of teaching culture: Building sequences of courses. It is easy to conceive of individual level two and level three courses (see appendix for some thumbnails and their rationales), but not sequences. Because the focus of such a sequence or curriculum would be culture, "literature" and "film" would likely have to be in almost any of them -- but used differently. If such courses were set alone in a curriculum, they will be too hard for students, because they require determinate kinds of background knowledge: some content knowledge, some familiarity with text types, and practice in building up semiotic systems representing the complex symbolizing acts of culture, and comparing artifacts on the first two levels.

IN CONCLUSION

Learning culture requires not only structured for linguistic arguments, but also structures for content knowledge. That learning goal necessarily involves literature, *for those outcomes that have to do with the cultural identities of dominant groups within a culture*, albeit not exclusively. Yet equally, that "literature" which is included in a culture course probably needs to take more varied forms in the average culture course, including high-end media not tailored for the general public, but showing more semiotic innovation.

"Cultural Studies," however, needs to deal with more canons than those of high culture or literature, including popular culture, government documents, and mass media, along with the critical reading and analysis skills necessary to dealing with them. Teaching culture is a content-based activity, but one which must move toward patterns of content. Starting with categories of cultural information is crucial, because of the possible diffusion or even diffusiveness of the contents and contexts involved. The accountability of the culture classroom comes from setting clear benchmarks for what is learnable.

We stand at a crossroads. Cultural studies as pre-set analyses of marginalization, of particular resistant groups without reference to the larger context of dominant groups, and of popular culture isolated from "high" or "resistant" culture can become as vacuous as l'art pour l'art studies of literature. Literacy is built up systematically, and consists of individuals learning to negotiate systems as authorized and self-authorizing subjects -- not trivia, or propagation of opinions.

Appendix: Culture Course Thumbnails

ONE: POLITICAL STUDIES:

1) Literature and Politics: Courses that acknowledge authors' national politics: politics are elided in canonicity (e.g. considerations of Virginia Woolf's politics have little to do with her novels), unless literature is perceived as a dialogue for on-going politics *among* the cultural spheres of the era, different from national literature canon.

2) Hyphenated Germans: isolating the specific politics of asserting, for example, a German-Turkish writers. Adapting *1001 nights* in the nineteenth century is not the same gesture as it is in the

twentieth. And what about the possibility of two *different* germanophone politics for German-Turkish writers, given Germany's work with the Ottoman empire before WWI, long before the 60s guest workers? The "ethnic other" as plural (e.g. *Showing Our Colors* anthology).

TWO: PUBLIC SPHERE AND PUBLIC CONSCIOUSNESS

Courses using Jürgen Habermas and his *Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*. His "public sphere" is defined as a group's sense of the practices or survival activities that an individual needs to be able to act publicly: a representation of public consciousness about what is appropriate as public and private acts in a particular culture, "a natural basis for the public sphere that would in principle guarantee an autonomous and basically harmonious course of social reproduction" (Habermas 130).

1) Courses structured following this principle will require the scholar-teacher to identify the particular form of mass media, their viewers, and those represented in it as an analysis of cultural work. Yet has anyone traced EU legislation for the new film, subventions guiding the *new German Cinema*, etc? The model requires an economic and institutional approach that again abrogates national borders as an organizing principle, since institutions (Althusser's *ideological state apparatuses*) ground its account of the reproduction of the consciousness of the group, and the othering of non-dominants.

2) But what about censorship in nineteenth-century "Germany" (many different legislations, corresponding with regional politics), Switzerland, and Austria? Or in the United States or the Netherlands, where German books were also published, sometimes imported back into Germany? In another vein, a united Germanophone cultural sphere is found in the fact that actors were trained in Austria but had to leave for Berlin and/or the movies from WW1 until WW2.

THREE: SOCIAL narratives, power narratives of social-psychological authorization:

Rejecting the simple dichotomy "public/private" (and thus rejecting Habermas' point of departure in a critique of the Enlightenment) allows historians like Negt and Kluge to stress how artificial the concept of "public sphere" is, even within one national culture. Consequently, they prefer to posit multiple public spheres, including a proletarian one, in order to help us conceptualize how production and consumption cycles have been mythologized in national and social narratives. Instead, they focus on how individuals negotiate multiple public spheres (not only relations to *Others*), as a "zone of ambiguity" (Negt 2-3). This zone, this meeting among dominant narratives, has the potential to do violence to individuals and to groups, since it tends to reify one pattern of dominance; some individuals will always be alienated, from themselves, from their own experience, and from the group (Negt 33). In this way, the narratives of the public sphere not only involve individuals in a process of self-alienation, but also force them into personal and group repression. An analysis of a germanophone public sphere would, instead, stress how *multiple* discourses create different borders for the nation -- theaters relate to different geographics than do television or cabarets, and to different groups within the nation. Popular culture may be more international -- and hence less "german" -- than high culture.

Julia Kristeva's *Nations without Nationalism* extends this critique of national narratives by underscoring its psychological dimension. Kristeva concurs that national (public-sphere) narratives limit or privilege individuals, yet *any* individual is part of a group in more than one way: each belongs as citizen, and voter, as social entity, as family member, etc. (Kristeva, *Nations* 11-13, *Strangers to Ourselves*). An individual is positioned within or vis-à-vis multiple publicly-accessible narratives, if not automatically written into those narratives of a dominant group. Such potential access to a public narrative defines that individual's status as what Kristeva calls a "speaking subject," as an individual with the ability to tap the power, authority, or agency that inheres to each narrative supported by the group (*Nations* 13).

What "germanophone" courses can this yield? A course around multiple parties having a stake in the existence of the nation, or of a particular medium. Or, as another contemporary German historian, Alf Lüdtke, argues in tying a nation or community into the *History of Everyday Life, Alltagsgeschichte*, rather than its *Öffentlichkeitssphäre*, as Jürgen Habermas defines it: a course in the sociology of European germanophone countries, paying special attention to work like Ervin Goff and his frame narratives.

FOUR: History of Ideas, *Geistesgeschichte*, or New Historicism

Finally, there might be courses organized to implement a historical corrective of the sort that Reinhart Koselleck proposes in *Futures Past*, as part of what he calls a *Begriffsgeschichte*: but which also relates to New Historicism:

For a *Begriffsgeschichte* concerns itself (primarily) with texts and words, while a social history employs texts merely as a means of deducing circumstances and movements that are not, in themselves, contained within the texts. Thus, for example, when social history investigates social formations or the construction of constitutional forms--the relations of groups, strata, and classes--it goes beyond the immediate context of action in seeing medium- or long-term structures and their change. (74)

This would open up a new generation of close readings, showing, for example, differential receptions of works across political lines -- how various praxes evolve as correlates to one set of terms.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Byrnes, Heidi. "The Cultural Turn in Foreign Language Departments: Challenge and Opportunity." *Profession* (2002), 114-29.

Byrnes, Heidi, and Susanne Kord. "Developing Literacy and Literary Competence: Challenges for Foreign Language Departments." In: Virginia M. Scott and Holly Tucker, eds. *SLA and the Literature Classroom: Fostering Dialogues*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle, 2002. 35-73

Fish, Stanley. *Is There a Text in This Class?: The Authority of Interpretive Communities*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1980

Scott, Virginia M., and Julie A. Huntington. "Reading Culture: Using Literature to Develop C2 Competence." *Foreign Language Annals*, 35, #6 (November-December 2002): 622-631.

Wright, David A. "Culture as Information and Culture as Affective Process: A Comparative Study." *Foreign Language Annals*, 33, #3 (May-June 2001): 330-341