

**From *Reading* to *Reading Literature*:
A Language Teaching Perspective**

Katherine Arens
Dept. of Germanic Studies
U. of Texas at Austin
MLA 2002

This discussion will focus on curricular development: on crafting a rapprochement between the elements of today's literary study in students' native language (L1) and the linguistics skills represented in typical lower-division foreign language (FL) curricula.¹

Our need to rethink this juncture -- or, in fact, to address it coherently at all -- has its own historical roots. The teaching of literature from about the 1950s into the 1970s was constructed as a largely exclusive enterprise, stressing its own structure of knowledge: the period, genre, and formal features of written texts judged to be fine art or fine writing. Familiarly, the "canon wars" of the 1980s and 1990s challenged those norms of education, as questions about cultural authority, reader empowerment, and the ethics of hegemonic culture were raised. In consequence, students' experience in studying literature at high schools and colleges shifted radically. Earlier generations were trained in various forms of textual exegesis, in the kinds of systematic pedagogy associated with New Criticism ("close readings," *explication des textes*), often formalist in inspiration. Now, however, literature classrooms have shifted away from such system-based "training" imperatives to classroom management strategies stressing student-centered approaches, critical writing, and critical thinking. Where poetics and linguistics once ruled as the tools to be taught to students, then, today's classrooms focus around cultural studies and various reader-centered approaches (the most

¹ The core of this presentation was delivered in a 2002 MLA workshop on "Integrating Language Learning and Literature Learning," organized by the Forum for Language and Composition in Literature Teaching, Literature in Language and Composition Teaching (29 December 2002).

familiar of which appeared under the rubric of the "Pedagogy of the Oppressed," by Paulo Freire, but which can, arguably, encompass even much current work in composition theory).

I leave it to others to describe the more detailed impact of this scholarly shift on the classroom dedicated to "teaching literature" in students' first or native language.² The result seems perhaps much more clear-cut for those of us trying to teach literatures in various languages foreign to the students (in students' first foreign language, or L2³). Given that the clear rationale for including "great literature" in a secondary- or post-secondary-level curriculum has faded, or at least remains seriously under challenge by those seeking a redefinition of what makes any piece of literature "great," teaching FL literature seems daunting at best, undesirable or impossible at worst, to many FL teaching professionals.⁴ The consequences are dire: FL curricula no longer have any clear mandates about the teaching of literature (why, how, when, to whom?), nor any clear points of connection between their own classroom practices and those represented in the teaching of L1 literatures and cultures.⁵

² A forum on "Why Major in Literature -- What Do We Tell Our Students?" from the *PMLA* is ample documentation of that question. Les Essif says the clock is ticking on the literature major, in "The Literature of Foreign Language Programs: The Road to Cultural Studies Is Not Paved with Literary History Tick Tock ... Tick Tock . . . ," pointing out that the teaching of literary periods might be passé, but that the radical focus on the present that seems to be shifting departments' employment patterns will not sufficient, either.

³ David Bartholomae, in "Literacy and Departments of Language and Literature," argues from the point of view of an English department that FL and English departments have many of the same problems, which emerge in both places because of cross-listing. He also notes that lower divisions have much in common. Byrnes and Kord, in "Developing Literacy and Literary Competence," talk about the literacies involved in great detail. Jean M. Fallon describes "On Foreign Ground: One Attempt at Attracting Non-French Majors to a French Studies Course," which fostered "multicultural collaboration" (411) and changed the climate, but within something like a traditional French major.

⁴ Susan Kirkpatrick, "E Pluribus Unum?," points out how a department unifying several foreign languages will even cause a loss of status for teachers, and that English majors that require FLs can be threatened with losses of numbers. Mary Louise Pratt, "What's Foreign and What's Familiar?," also calls boundaries between departments questionable. Werner Sollors, in "Cooperation between English and Foreign Languages in the Area of Multilingual Literature," argues in another way that department boundaries make little sense to use our students' existing FL abilities, or to heighten awareness of their importance.

⁵ Perhaps the best source for an overview of specific teaching techniques that have been introduced to fill this gap in the curriculum is an anthology edited by Virginia M. Scott and Holly Tucker, *SLA and the Literature Classroom: Fostering Dialogues*. For practical expositions, see particularly: William Berg and Laurey K. Martin-Berg, "A Stylistic Approach to Foreign Language Acquisition and Literary Analysis"; Diana Frantzen, "Rethinking Foreign Language Literature: Towards an Integration of Literature and Language at All Levels"; and

To suggest both how a new *rapprochement* between the L1 and FL curricula might be conceived and how a return to literature in the FL curriculum might be effected, the bulk of this paper is devoted to outlining how "learning to read" and "learning to read literature" can be put on a continuum, as part of the kind of constructivist and multi-layered approach to language and literature learning in cultural context that is privileged today.⁶ More specifically, I want to argue here how the study of genre is a particular loss to the curriculum, since the very notion of "genre" itself can offer a framework which can anchor our scholarship into our pedagogies in new ways, principally in the FL classroom, but also (at least) for the "world literature" wing of the L1 curriculum. Genre can be redefined to accommodate both older and newer forms of cultural knowledge, foster cultural and multi-cultural literacies for our students, and close the gap between our roles and teachers and scholars.

"Pedagogy" in Literature Teaching: The Need to Redefine Genre

The reasons for arguing the place of literature in the undergraduate curriculum are straightforward: literary scholarship has over the last two decades called traditional assumptions about canonicity into question, but the result for the classroom has yielded few, if any, new approaches to teaching literature as anything but ideology. This is a bald statement, but one that needs to be made and considered as at least an outsider's view of the collective enterprises of literature departments. Much has been done in composition theory particularly to tie critical reading to critical writing and to empower our students as authorized consumers and producers of cultural knowledge. But at the same time, in assertions like those responding to Stanley Fish's long-hackneyed question "Is there a Text in This Class?" (the answer

Stacey Katz, "Teaching Literary Texts at the Intermediate Level: A Structured Input Approach." Jean Marie Schultz, "The Gordian Knot: Language, Literature, and Critical Thinking," underscores the need to teach the complexity of literature as furthering complex student learning outcomes.

⁶ Heidi Byrnes and Susanne Kord. "Developing Literacy and Literary Competence: Challenges for Foreign Language Departments," report on one department's curricular revision to include literature at all levels. Janet Swaffar, "Reading the Patterns of Literary Works," offers detailed practical approaches to teaching literature in the FL across levels. Joanne Burnett and

originally given was, "No, only readings"), literature departments, L1 and FL alike have lost a more generous access to the specific content of literary studies.

Scholars of earlier days in literary studies traditionally defined their areas of specialization in terms of period, genre, and problems, themes, or approaches, taking the traditional high canon as their materials of choice. Each of these implies a specific content literacy that can be studied and taught; each suggests specific elements that can be incorporated into curricula designed to teach this literacy. Periodization is a fact of literary history, often defined through stylistic preferences of an epoch or group; the study of themes ties literary texts into aesthetics or other historical debates and can lead students most directly to today's ideology-driven approach to literary studies ("the *other* in literature"); genres were arguably the most complicated frameworks for traditional literary studies, dealing with formal features of texts and artist-on-artist dialogues carried on using them.

Those frameworks for traditional literary studies, and hence of traditional L1 and FL curricula for teaching literature, have been downgraded as the sole hallmarks for or specializations in the "proper" study of literature.⁷ While scholars have defined for themselves new ways of what it means to "understand literature" (and other texts), almost nothing has replaced those older approaches to "teaching literature," except reader- (customer-)driven readings of "texts." Students are encouraged to read such texts as representatives of voices deserving of being heard, but their products of their labors are often otherwise undistinguishable from each other.

Earlier generations favored poetics and aesthetics, preferences that seemed to be allied fairly straight-forwardly with the linguistics-based classroom pedagogies of the Sputnik era: each stressed patterns of formal features embedded in texts, making the literary work of art a well-wrought urn that exemplified artistic handling of the linguistics and symbolic systems of

Leah Fonder-Solano, "Crossing the Boundaries Between Literature and Pedagogy," report on another approach to teaching FL literatures, in research on parallel FL and L1 reading courses.
⁷ This charge has been made for other reasons by the National Association of Scholars, which seceded from the MLA because of the loss of interest in the literary qualities of texts from high culture.

language.⁸ A student could therefore move from syntax charts to charts of other text features, working, for example, in the Northrop Frye mode of mythopoetic spaces,⁹ the poetic patterns of alliteration, rhyme, meter, and symbols, or the narrator's point of view in prose.¹⁰ Thus we have titles like "how to read a poem"¹¹ and great collections of individual interpretations of great works of art that could teach individuals and scholars alike how well-wrought these individual works of art were.¹²

But now, in the post-secondary L1 literature curricula, those kinds of formal analysis are either not taught at all, or taught only sporadically; some secondary level curricula, particularly AP English, still may, but there is no guarantee that the entering college student will have done more than write about literature they have read, not close readings. That leaves us in teaching foreign language literatures without the assurance that our students have reservoirs of familiar activities to fall back on when reading unfamiliar literature. Earlier, instructors across the curriculum could assume that students could "close read" texts.

Perhaps more importantly, when we lost the frameworks for close reading, we have also lost the security and anchor points around which the typical offerings of an undergraduate literature curriculum up into the 1980s were often organized: common modern western definitions of literary periods or movements and of genres.

In typical literature curricula (both L1 and FL), multi-cultural impetuses have been absorbed under concepts like "Francophone world literature," attempting to "teach literature" as part of critical literacies of culture, especially in relation to the students' understandings of their own positions within US culture. However, in implementing such goals into the FL curriculum, obvious gaps emerge between an L1 students' ability to assess an L1 author's

⁸ The "well-wrought urn" refers to Cleanth Brooks and his *Well Wrought Urn*, which was seminal for New Criticism; the "literary work of art" refers to two titles by Roman Ingarden about the phenomenology of reading, *The Literary Work of Art* and *The Cognition of the Literary Work of Art*, a favorite of comparative literature scholars in the late 1970s.

⁹ See Northrop Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism*.

¹⁰ See, for example, the interpretations offered by Käte Hamburger in *The Logic of Literature/*

¹¹ Most notable among several books with that title is Burton Raffel, *How to Read a Poem*, written by this *Beowulf* translator.

position and the situation of FL students or students reading about cultural positions very different from their own (including positions from other historical times). These students lack much practical information about everyday life in the countries or eras they study, quite aside from connections from the high culture represented in the literature we might still prefer to teach. In this way, even multi-cultural impetuses from the L1 curriculum seem to be unreachable goals for the literature curriculum, because we do not have clear pedagogical frameworks for their implementation into sequences of learning tasks. Teachers can lecture about missing cultural information, but providing such facts does not necessarily augment students' independent abilities to read such texts on their own. In fact, such lectures may only increase the distance between students and such readings, because they will be tempted to attribute an expert knowledge to the teacher that would, in essence, be unreachable to them.

The situation is particularly dire for the teaching of literature in today's curricular contexts. While scholarship has identified a plethora of new themes to teach using literature and other kinds of texts (including various film genres), we have not rethought traditional categories for teaching literature with cultural studies impetuses in mind (periods defined through style, themes relating to structures of literature). Nor has there been an attempt by cultural studies scholars in literature to reclaim specific established and extended patterns of communication within cultural contexts -- as genres. Thus we do not have new pedagogies for teaching periods or genres, let alone fuller versions of cultural literacies, in structured approaches to student learning and classroom practice.

The stakes are high in this omission. Remedying it is a crucial gesture for the future of literary studies in either L1 or FL contexts, since without identifying specific forms of understanding to the level of systemic importance in the study of literature, there are few (if any) distinguishing features between what is done in literary studies than what is done in cultural history or the kind of cultural studies allied to ethnic studies or even mass communication studies. While the average "literature" curriculum has expanded the variety of

¹² The literature of New Criticism is vast, but seminal were William K. Wimsatt, *The Verbal*

texts used in classrooms, scholars of literature have not even considered a redefinition of what textuality itself might mean for the classroom or for other purposes that set it apart from the other humanities. Thus in many senses, today's literary scholarship has betrayed its most cherished objects rather than bringing the idea of teaching literature into a new phase.

The new undergraduate literature curriculum has, more simply said, not bridged between new kinds of textual studies and cultural studies in any systematic way, certainly not in ways that could ground the systematic pedagogy of a curriculum. Teachers of literature have not figured out how linguistic/rhetorical markers can be taught as bridges between text structures and their cultural meaning -- what would supplement, if not supplant, traditional skills of close reading. In particular, literary scholarship has not reconfigured its own models of textuality systematically, to redefine for its students the *structures* of texts (well-wrought urns or not) as *discourse genres*, as a specific culture's patterned uses of language in use in specific communication environments.¹³ A compendium of such discourse genres, as forms familiar to particular cultural sites, would include not only written, but also oral/aural and electronic media "text" forms; the definitions of these genres would provide specific guidance about their purpose, sociology, form, and content (all situated within specific cultural contexts -- the "romance novel" is not the same in the United States as it is in Germany) to novices who wanted to approach the studies of texts in cultural contexts (arguably, our new fiat for "teaching literature"). At the same time, such definitions could provide a clear, central teaching aid which would give specific technical unity to the study of texts of all kinds, communication strategies, and their sociology. "Studying genres" would, in this redefinition, mean that students would learn to identify the psycho-semiotic concerns through which individuals gain agency through communication, learn the identity positions in a culture, or are legislated into specific social roles within a culture. These concerns would, in turn, be correlated with systematic *elements of textuality*, not just as free-floating ideologies.

Icon, Emil Staiger, *Die Kunst der Interpretation*, Wolfgang Kayser, *Das sprachliche Kunstwerk*.
¹³ The term comes from Tzvetan Todorov, who uses it in the title of his *Genres in Discourse*.

How can, then, traditional literary studies be articulated with these proposed studies of discourse genres?

Redefining Genre

The answer to this question requires, first and foremost, a return to the roots of “genre theory” in the West. Since Aristotle, a huge superstructure for aesthetics was put into place that defined art texts as functioning in various mode, epic, lyric, and dramatic --, whose core identities are conceived roughly as follows, no matter how the details of individual aesthetics programs’ definitions of specific genres may vary:

EPIC	LYRIC	DRAMATIC
Historical (-ist) Story-telling	musical (I sing) expressive (praise, pain, scorn)	dialogue/monologue situations in progress
<i>3rd person</i> panoramic telling Illiad/Odyssey	<i>1st person</i> situated utterances odes, lyric poetry, etc.	<i>2nd person</i> scenes showing tragedy = Euripides Comedy = Aristophenes

It is not the place here to debate this basic framework, or the history of aesthetics. This chart is only intended to point to core distinctions that are preserved across many variations of genre theory -- distinctions at the root of most genre theories. From the Renaissance on, as literature was cultivated in progressively more rarified high culture forms, these modes of expression, these classical genre distinctions, were cultivated as specific forms of literature privileged in a particular cultures, from Petrarchan sonnets, Homeric epic, to Shakespearean tragedies. “Aristotles’ poetics” was the reference point for many discussions about the merits of these forms, the authority against which specific realizations of genre were discussed.

While the historically attested social uses of genre patterns are clear for Europe’s and European-derived high culture, how many forms of texts recognized in today’s curricula function socially and cognitively as communication is less so, since they cannot be referenced to

Aristotle. This is not, however, a new situation, given that one of the longest-running aesthetic problems surrounding genre was the justification of “prose” within a tripartite genre scheme that did not, at first glance, accommodate it: prose had difficulty in being accepted in early modern Europe, since it was epic in disposition, but not in its poetic form. In many cases, prose genres became step-children, considered as a mixed genre without the same provenance enjoyed by its more canonical siblings. When middle-class readers rose starting in the eighteenth century, the novel’s popularity freed it from utter dependence on this model and started considerations of the novel as a valid form of cultural communication in and of itself.

Such aesthetic debates about literary form seem dated, but genres were used to organize parts of the literary studies curriculum well into the 1960s and 70s: courses in “the novel,” “lyric poetry,” and “tragedy” remained mainstays of the English and FL majors alike. These debates’ embeddedness in the West and its canonical traditions have helped to cast the study of genre under suspicion, since espousing this tradition of defining genres tends to define “fine literature” normatively in Western forms. In consequence, “non-canonical” genres like Russian folk songs or story cycles like the Arabian nights can too easily be marginalized, as can other forms of texts more associated with popular culture (despite their level of artistry), such as Japanese animated films. That realization about marginalization of non-Western literary heritages is by no means new: early twentieth-century scholars of Russian literature, for example, already sought other markers of “literariness” -- a major part of the poetic projects of Russian Formalists since Boris M. Eikhbaum and subsequent generations of Prague-School-derived poetics, through Roman Ingarden and Tzvetan Todorov.¹⁴ They were specifically interested in valorizing genres that had no western European precedents, the poetics of non-Western genres, especially those at home in Slavic Languages. Today’s post-colonial theorists make that charge in other ways. No matter their cultivation, poetics and the study of genre appear as extensions of upper-class taste and the imposed power of that taste.

¹⁴ See again Ingarden; Todorov, *The Fantastic*; the standard collection is Paul L. Garvin, ed. *The Prague School Reader*.

The heritors of this formalist legacy, especially Tzvetan Todorov, can still today serve to show us the way out of such dilemmas. "Genre" in the more modern sense of a discourse genre is a "functional entity" within society without any necessary structural correlate (Todorov, 2). This means that genres can more profitably be studied as conventional forms of expression within discrete cultural communities. Each of these forms will vary according to the time and spaces in which they are used; each serves within a specific framework of defined social purposes.

That is, genres are more than the formal structures that the traditional Western discussion of epic, lyric, and dramatic modes have led us to believe. Even when traditional aesthetic discussions were at their height in the early nineteenth century, the relations between genres as specific forms and these epic-lyric-dramatic modes was up for heated debate, particularly since, as the nineteenth century proceeded, that undefined entity "prose" became for most audiences the dominant literary form, if not that always preferred in high culture. While prose narratives exist in the West at least since Roman times, the modern sense of "prose" arose in no small correlation with new forms of written text production and dissemination¹⁵ rather than from the oral performance grounding the genres more familiar to Aristotle's time.¹⁶ Without a culture of scriptoria or print, poetry, especially metered and rhymed poetry, emerges to the forefront of group interest as part of oral performance. As Albert Lord's *Singer of Tales* long ago argued, metered, formulaic verse contributes to making the verse memorable. That longer verse was connected with oral performance gives us a new vision of what this kind of verse meant as a discourse genre --as a text form that is more than just s formalism, but rather a patterns of communication that functions as a horizon of expectation between performer and listeners, a known social contract of the era.

All specific historical appearances of genres in the epic, lyric, and dramatic modes function in the same way. While each era's form of drama differs, for example, the specific

¹⁵ For the classic statement, see Ian Watt, *The Rise of the Novel*.

contract between performers and audience that is a horizon of expectation in the dramatic mode will always involve certain patterns that differ from the epic story-telling that characterizes epic poems like the *Illiad* and that, later, is taken up again as a possible description for newly emerging prose forms. The mode is dramatic when performance of dialogues is involved; whether the individual performance is a three-act play, a five-act tragedy, or a farce, and the specific form each assumes, depends on a historical period and on its particular horizon of expectations, including the stylistic values it particularly values. Each "genre" is, therefore, part of a culture's norms of communication,¹⁷ a site of cultural production based on patterns of communication and conventions that constitute acknowledged forms of literacy within that horizon.

When the traditional modes of epic, lyric, and dramatic become reified as genres in specific times and places, then, each is a specific pattern of communication. That pattern is part of its culture's horizon of expectation about its forms of communication, a horizon which includes issues like:

- the status of writer/speaker and reader/listener
- a genre's mechanisms of being public (publication, performance)
- community expectations (where, when, and how the communication is "appropriate")
- social role of each genre (high culture, like tragedy, or everyday, like ordinary conversations or "bread-and-butter notes")
- narrative strategies (is it told in the first or third person; performed in the present or told about in the past; represented as being "real" or as originating from an individual voice)
- materiality of the written word and its distribution (is it memorized and recited; printed in expensive books or inexpensive broadsheets; included in lending libraries).

The Western tradition of genre has created the illusion that the study of genre must be a study of high art -- of the genres favored by the literature elite of a culture. Yet it is equally at least as

¹⁶ Parallel situations exist for *Don Quixote*, at the crux of this development -- the novel was printed, but was more familiar to the general public from various popular performance genres, including broadsheets.

¹⁷ Todorov exemplified this in another way in *Genres in Discourse*,

correct, in the sense of modern discourse analysis, to consider all such formalized norms of communication as discourse genres. If there is to be a new "genre theory," it must include all kind of formalized communication patterns that exist within a culture, from the meeting and greeting rituals of everyday life all the way up through the forms of "literature" proper cultivated by an elite. Each such form, however, must be described as an act of communication in material space, not just as a pattern of words.¹⁸

Over the last century, literature proper has indeed been cultivated in the form of a limited number of genres, as part of elite or "high" culture; this elite literacy has had the social function of identifying elite social communities through a set of usages that had to be mastered as part of high-status and high-register cultural communication norms, part of the dominant culture. In turn, a specific literary scholarship emerged to describe the intricate forms of that literacy. From their perspective -- the perspective of literary studies before the canon wars --, the status of other spoken, written, or medialized genres was considerably less hegemonic. Films, folk ballads, rapping, or other popular forms of communication emerged after the canon wars as equivalent parts of a culture's horizon of expectation -- albeit more marginalized ones that scholars are now trying to recover in different ways.

This is the insight that a new genre studies may rest on: even less hegemonic forms of cultural communication, if they play recognized communicative roles within a culture's horizon of expectation, all need to be considered genres. Each genre, new or old, remains part of the materialities of communication in the era, are attached to specific communication groups within the larger community, and have specific "obligatory moves" that are part of their formal descriptions, as patterns that members of the community recognize as their own, and use as part of their own performance of identity.

From the point of view of traditional literacy studies, the redefinitions of genre that are required to accommodate these less traditional cultural forms are straightforward. From this

¹⁸ In another heuristic that would allow one to rethink genre more explicitly as a cultural literacy, the *Standards for Foreign Language Teaching* identify under rubrics like "culture,

perspective, "genre" can be redefined as a set of communication conventions, encompassing (as in the list above) a specific knowledge about who can speak, write, or communicate using that form, with what status, how and where, and about what topics. To complete the redefinition of literary studies, the culture's "horizon of expectation" about such acts of communication can constructively be defined as the horizon of expectation of a historical era or "period" of culture -- the set of issues highlighted for a specific group, and the language-based conventions preferred to deal with them. Finally, the aesthetic "movements" so cherished by traditional literary scholarship can be defined as linguistic-stylistic or cultural-philosophical programs used to justify very specific speech acts within a given cultural context, privileging certain language or topic markers -- they are aesthetic ideologies applied to the general culture's horizon of expectation to define certain elite communication gestures.

In these redefinitions of traditional categories of literary knowledge, we can find a new bridge between the teaching of language in its newer forms and the teaching of literature. "Teaching literature," as the canon wars have told us need not be associated with the dominant culture's norms. Taking literature as one subset of the discourse genres of a horizon of expectation in a culture, one can then extend the definition of genre to include various materialities and literacies of communication, in all its forms. "Teaching language," "teaching culture," and "teaching genres" become three faces of what must be seen as essentially one activity -- teaching patterns of communication in their material and cultural contexts, as marks of membership in a culture. "Teaching genre," therefore, involves teaching students how to learn language with specific reference to elements of the communication situation in which each genre is involved, as those elements become formalized into patterns -- literary or otherwise. The kind of cultural literacy that has now been identified as crucial for both language learning and the study of literature thus implicates students' ability to comprehend, create, maintain, or negotiate the specialized discourses that are being defined here as genres. And thus literature, alongside other complex genre formalizations of a culture, need to form

communication, communities . . ." the various kinds of knowledge within a culture's "horizon of

part of a language-learning curriculum, as examples of those patterns of social communication which are consciously set apart from "ordinary" ones, but which actually represent extensions of the more familiar genres of everyday communication.

Preparing to Teach New Genres: From Definitions to Curricula

Teaching literature by teaching genres in this way will require a redefinition of what it means to learn any genres. Remember that, in this redefinition, genres are not only formalisms that are based on specific linguistic forms (twelve stresses per line, iambic pentameter, three acts, or the like). The Birmingham School¹⁹ can help us in expanding that notion of cultural literacy (here, the literacy of a culture's discourse genres) by stressing that genre is not just a function of high culture, since all groups and subgroups, cultures and subcultures operate with such forms of communication.

To be sure, in the West, reading literature constitutes a particular kind of high culture literacy. Yet other patterns of literacy can be cultivated by particular groups, oppositional or otherwise. For example: graphic novels appeal to one subgroup of readers, in a variant of mass market printing; films, in turn, often take on the mass market to similar ends. Rap music, epic poetry, sports reports, or comedy-variety shows on TV -- each is a genre that is historically attested in a cultural era, part of that era's horizon of expectation for communication. Each reader/hearer/consumer proves him- or herself a member of that community by understanding how such narrative or language acts are structured, what status they have, what mechanisms and media they occupy and which disseminates them, and what the

expectation" that could be used to define each genre.

¹⁹ For an example of the Birmingham School's approach, see Stuart Hall and Tony Jefferson, eds., *Resistance through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Post-War Britain*. The importance of such cultural literacy in fluency has also been established in FL reading. See, for example, the classic study by Steffensen et al., "A Cross-Cultural Perspective on Reading Comprehension," which shows the influence of cultural knowledge on the correct interpretation of texts (in this case, a report on a wedding. Virginia M. Scott and Julie A. Huntington. "Reading Culture: Using Literature to Develop C2 Competence," found that students who learned about the Ivory Coast from a poem showed richer, less stereotyped understanding than those who learned it from fact sheet (622). David A. Wright, "Culture as Information and Culture as Affective Process," makes a similar case for understanding culture more comprehensively.

details are of various valuative debates about the role and value of each in the community.

Certain genres become identified with distinct user groups; certain genres become associated with certain themes and social functions within their own historical contexts (such as when, in the late 1960s, folk music became almost identical with protest music, or when the “movie of the week” on TV in the 1980s became, as many of the audience knew, the “disease of the week” movie).

To take a more formal example: the novel has had very parallel forms for over a hundred years. Yet the eighteenth-century novel throughout Europe often advocates for social structures acknowledging human rights and new definitions of human values, in an era where new class formations were developing; the nineteenth-century novel specializes in human interest and justice stories, interested in the self-actualization of humans, especially of women and the marginalized classes. Finally, most twentieth-century novels in the Western canon stress psychology and perception, not epics. Yet all are novels, with roughly parallel economics, author status, and sociological values. And once one becomes a reader of novels, each century’s details of focus are accessible -- one literary form takes on different thematics in different cultural locuses, and hence play somewhat different ideological functions in the European cultures.

This shift between a genre’s form, its specific cultural uses, and the themes which its communication community uses become the key question for teaching the cultural literacy of genres. Described as sophisticated patterns of cultural literacy, the task seems daunting, not possible within the average literature curriculum, let alone in a FL curriculum. Yet the assumption that this is too difficult for the adult readers met by teachers in college classrooms is simply erroneous: they are already readers of novels, watchers of soap operas, fluent communicators in conversations of various sorts. Thus the actual problem for teaching is to identify what the *elements* of such genre literacy -- the building blocks of learning formalized patterns of genres. The goal in so doing is to help learners get used to recognizing and dealing with genre formalizations, beyond the simple literacy of the “correct sentence” or “correct

paragraph" that has been the norm of all too much reading and writing in the FLs up to this point. Students must learn to move from the "who, what, where, when" of ordinary texts, to the specific discipline of genres -- their forms, contents, social positions and purposes. The tool to make that bridge is a single equation: each genre -- high or popular -- is a stylized or extended pattern of communication in a particular medium, and thus straightforwardly connected with basic linguistic and/or semiotic components (albeit often with very complex collocations of such basic linguistic facts). The dominant linguistic/semiotic markers for each genre are different, not in the least because of the different communication media and social conventions involved, and each of these "linguistic elements" has a technical description (in linguistics, studies of film semiotics, poetics, or mass communication studies).

Thus to teach literature means to teach advanced forms of literacy -- to teach the formalized structures of communication recognizable as genres within a culture's horizon of expectation. For readers to turn into competent readers of a genre, that reader must learn, in stages, to approach both its language, its cultural context and purposes, and its reference of contexts. Said more abstractly, that reader must enter into the horizon of expectation of a culture, into the cognitive and expressive worlds of the culture's "usual" novel, conversation, play, or poem. What needs to be learned, automatized, are the linguistic, cultural, and pattern dominants of each genre.

All genres deal with narration on one level or another -- as performed in the here and now (as a conversation or play), as a retrospective narrative (various prose forms), as a series of events and their hearer/readers' concomitant reactions (lyric poetry, song lyrics). In this sense, *any* genre has, as its cognitive foundation, some configuration of "who, what, where, and when." Yet each specific genre also has its own distinctive formalization: a pattern that distinguishes it from the other genres at play in its cultural context.

To offer an example: the basic patterns of cultural and linguistic knowledge defining the genres of high culture can be summarized straight-forwardly, as basic patterns of cultural

knowledge, logic, and linguistic markers that define the genres within a group's horizon of expectation:

**Genre Formalizations
within the Horizon of Expectation
for High-Profile Cultural Forms**

FOR A NOVEL:

Setting: narrated details, purported reality behind
Character: gender, status, communication norms
Plots: problems, markers of language, timeline
Narrative point of view: narrative as logic pattern (before, after, because, etc)

FOR DRAMA:

Setting: time held constant, or at least linear/clearly marked
Character: conversation, performatives, dialogues, behavioral norms
Conflict/resolution structures (logical relationships between scenes)
Conversational norms for various sociological groups
Conventional act structures (3- and 5-act forms, etc.)
Acceptable plots (tragedy and fate, downfalls, moral censure, for example)

FOR POETRY:

Epic: formal story-telling connections, represented stereotypes and scene figures
Lyric: grammar/mind links to POV of a speaking subject
General: norm/deviance/patterns of usage (semantics, syntax, figures, dictionaries)

FOR FILM:

Setting: who what where when -- visual and verbal
Character: gender, status, communication norms
Plots: problems, markers transition (cuts, dissolves), timeline
Visual logic and point of view:
 camera focus, depth of field, framing, lighting, soundtrack
Sound and spatial logics: foregrounding, backgrounding, cutting strategies and effects

FOR ADVERTISING:

Visual semantics as correlate to verbal semantics

This chart summarizes elements defining of genres, the key to their individual acts of communication. Each has characteristic language markers and patterns, its specific stylistic and formal patterns, and its specific patterns of cultural reference and appeal. Novels traditionally exploit their setting and narrative points of view; they exploit degrees of realism, be they psychological or referential. Dramas, in contrast, are structured principally around characters and their interactions, with setting less important in and of itself (in a drama written for the proscenium stage, with its distinct limitations on scenery, setting acts simply

as a logical connection). Poetry has many forms: epic tells story in meter, while lyric expresses individuality. All poetry, however, deforms standard language into poetic language,²⁰ and thus manipulate standard expectations about usage. Film shares the narrative realism of many kinds of novels, but with the additional ability to tell a story on several threads at once: not only through the verbal playbook, but also through visuals and the soundtrack, all of which can be manipulated fairly independently of each other. What characters say to each other can be contradicted by the visual settings in which utterances are made; the soundtrack may contradict both of them. Advertising, in contrast, must generally have visuals and verbals that support each other, or confusion may easily result.

Taking these definitions of genre as formalized patterns of communication or discourse opens up profoundly important teaching strategies. Learning these “genres” becomes not a matter of high culture preference, but of a deeper kind of cultural literacy, stressing how the learner must use these patterns to tap into various literacies inherent in the culture’s horizons of expectation. More importantly, defining genres as systematic discourse genres within a communicative framework opens up a strategy to solve one of the most vexing problems of the undergraduate curriculum: the well-acknowledged disconnects between lower and upper division FL courses, and between writing and content courses in English.

Divisions or programs in rhetoric and composition have the mission of “teaching writing” to the in-coming college freshmen and may even “teach writing about literature” to sophomores. But such courses’ focus in such activities is all too often the writer’s own literacy, the mechanics and ethics of *self-expression*, rather than a move out of one’s own horizon of expectation into that of a particular cultural locus. That is, the writing that results focuses on itself, not as part of a more general cultural literacy, or as addressed to the specific literacies of the genres (as outlined above). That divide between “writing” and “writing for specific purposes” like literature only gets worse when, for administrative reasons, rhetoric and composition teaching is removed from the purview of the English department proper. That

²⁰ The term refers to an essay by Jan Mukarovsky, “Standard Language and Poetic Language.”

removal does indeed solve certain curricular problems, since in these cases the lower division writing curriculum no longer has to even pretend that it can be synchronized with the demands of the literature major. However, such an administrative solution also puts the rhetoric and composition program into a position equivalent to that of lower-division L2 programs: as essentially removed from the high-status content of the major. In both cases, there has been no practice of reconciling the content of the curriculum across this divide: the student considered to be a potential major is presumed to have to "write well enough" or "have enough ability in the FL" *before* reaching the content areas of the major.

Continued acceptance of this disjunction will, however, cost departments of modern literatures and cultures dearly, since such divisions isolate students' writing or basic language competence from cultural literacy, especially from the kinds of critical literacy, critical thinking, and critical writing that are now valued as countermeasures to traditional canonicity. Without learning such systematic approaches to literacy rather than to writing or criticism divorced from the more general question of cultural literacy, students will not be able to empower themselves as writers and speakers within a cultural context, because that empowerment requires the ability to read and comprehend that context critically. All acts of communication within such a context that are familiar to the community are parts of that literacy, parts of the culture's horizon of expectation.

Each such act of communication has a specific pattern of where and when it is appropriately enacted, by whom, what is in it, and how it is to be marked. More crucially, this definition of genre offers a way around the "divide and conquer" mentality of today's curriculum -- the assumption that one level of the curriculum can be isolated from another. The study of basic patterns leads up to a more detailed knowledge of socio-cultural practices -- the study of genre, therefore, like that of all other linguistic practices, must be developmental. Teaching and learning the elements of these acts of communication, therefore, must be staged across levels within the classroom.

included in Garvin, ed., *A Prague School Reader*.

Stages in Learning Genres

“Staging” learning, in this sense, requires the establishment of an accountability hierarchy, a set of stages through which a student’s learning is to progress, stages to which both the student and the program can be held accountable. Those stages are straightforwardly defined through attention to how the specific formalisms of genres are built up from the individual elements of communication.

In gross terms, there are three levels that students will have to negotiate as they learn to “read genres” in the culturally literate sense: an initial stage, in which the principle organizing elements within a genre are introduced as significant data points for students to attend to and build into systems; a genre stage whose focus is establishing the patterns on which individual genres rest and which are defined as the obligatory moves in their communication patterns; and finally, what Piaget might call a “formal operation” phase, beyond a learner’s ability to read or enact single examples of genre fluently, where the abstract, formal rules and issues around genre can be discussed in more professional terms.

These levels may be summarized as follows:

STAGES OF TEACHING LITERATURE

(e.g. after the first 1000 words in a FL course, after general reading for gist in basic English courses)

STAGE 1: Learning Patterns in Context

(lower-division or introductory courses)

TEXTS TO ESTABLISH CONTEXT: longer prose, film, drama, poetry; film

ORGANIZERS TO LEARN:

longer-arc structures (form); issues anchoring an era’s concerns (content)

-GENERAL STORY/NARRATIVE MARKERS: grammar/syntax marking
who, what, where, when

-CULTURAL MARKERS: facts, themes/concerns, institutions

-FIRST GENRE MARKERS:

Grammar Markers: normal uses versus “literary” uses as patterns of norm/deviance

POV -- conversations, verbal, visual, semantic and syntax markers

Story grammars: action/rhythms, behavior clues

PRIMARY LEARNING GOAL: learners’ mastery of organizers around which single texts are built
PROTOTYPE TASKS:

-follow one or more patterns running through a discourse genre, to trace its system and see what the long arc does to the cultural and language material of individual parts.

-enact one kind of communication in its correct register, with correct language and cultural markers

STAGE 2: Reading Discourse Genres

(upper division, specialty or major courses)

TEXTS: pairs or longer series of texts in particular genres, read against materials on the historical setting of each

ORGANIZERS TO MASTER:

- Typologies of or standard strategies for storytelling
- Specific formal patterns defining genres (e.g. three-act or five-act plays, 14-line sonnets, "realist" narrators).
- Institutional and material conditions through which these norms become familiar, and their effects (e.g. chapter length for serial novels)

LEARNING GOALS: Building communities of genre readers, familiar with the aesthetic and cultural markers that mark genres as part of cultural production, in various locuses (high or popular culture, formal or informal conversations, business letters versus "bread-and-butter" notes)

PROTOTYPE TASKS:

- compare two versions of one genre, in light of the "prototype" for the genre (e.g. *Don Quixote* as a picaresque novel; *The Bell Jar* as prototype feminist novel; playing master of ceremonies at a prize gathering, or at a roast)
- perform an act of communication in more than one way (e.g. one popular, and one formal)

STAGE 3: Theories of/Formal Descriptions of Genre

(capstone seminar for majors; graduate studies)

TEXTS: primary literature as above; secondary literature and reference materials

ORGANIZERS TO MASTER:

- technical vocabulary describing systems, as key to organization of knowledge in the field (e.g. bibliographies and reference books).

LEARNING GOALS:

- learning to negotiate problems and ethics of cultural/literary/genre studies, social stratification
- study of the social uses of literature and patterns of exclusion using artificial distinctions as value structures
- access to technical discussions among experts, and expert knowledge.

PROTOTYPE TASK:

- Critique the poles in a professional debate
- Bring a primary and a secondary text to bear on each other

This chart defines in very loose terms what must be the goals for these three major stages in the conventional undergraduate curriculum.

The first element in the entry for each state states what kinds of "texts" need to be integrated into a curriculum, if the curriculum's goal is to produce students who are culturally literate readers of text genres, comprehenders of films, audio, or the interactions common to social forms. Critical for such cultural literacy in the first stage of learning to read literature

is that the learner is forced to account for discourse patterns that extend over longer sequences: scenes, not individual dialogues; books, not short stories; speeches, not responses.

In the second stage, texts must be considered in sets -- as tokens of known cultural discourse types that "native speakers" or comprehenders know to associate with each other. Readers within their own cultures almost automatically reference soap operas against each other, as they do conversations, films, and speeches. Finally, in a capstone literacy -- a literacy of high culture, or of professional groups --, the meta-discourses about discourse genres come into play: the cultural stereotypes about how cultural forms are used, what they reveal about the status of their users, what cultural purposes they serve. Thus "secondary literature" such as popular or scholarly reviews, scholarly discourses, and the like, must be considered in relation to the discourse genres they evaluate, qualify, or manage. This is the critical cultural literacy desired by those who have over the last decades challenged canonicity and its cultural purposes.

In each stage, the second listing is a set of "organizers to master": systems or patterns which lead individual readers, writers, or speakers to the kind of understanding necessary at that level. In the first stage, learners must see what elements of texts can be combined into patterns of meaning -- individual points of grammar, narrative point of view, behaviors, themes, clothing or space descriptions, and the like. That is, the mass of largely unarticulated data must be sorted into categories, and understood as patterns by the reader/hearer who may achieve a degree of social literacy.

At the second stage, that general sense of pattern at work in individual texts (novels, films, conversations, letters) must be given more contour, especially by decisions about what point of view that the texts may be considered from (as aesthetic objects, as examples of cultural norms and values, as examples of successful or unsuccessful social acts). Texts must therefore be compared with each other, and with the performance norms that the culture uses to decide them. The "Organizers to Master" in the third stage are correspondingly more complex:

not only the norms against which discourse genres are evaluated need to be considered, but also the social uses (professional, class-bound, regional) to which these norms are applied.

Thus each stage has its own learning goals, as well as a typical set of tasks that could be used to assess that competence. For the first stage, a learner must be able to generate a "reading" of a text or film, a successful performance of a conversation, speech, or act of letter writing. For the second, that learner must have mastered, almost to the point of routine or automaticity, how to build patterns of meaning from various patterns of textual literacy, so that s/he can move to make generalizations about discourse genres. What distinguishes a successful speech from an unsuccessful one; an artistic novel from a popular one; a mass-market film from an art film? Or more simply: which text would please a male audience more than a female one; a youthful audience from an older one; an upper class reader from a working class one? In the third stage, the learners move from such simple comparisons to more complex arguments about cultural norms -- about how specific text types, discourse genres, and communicative acts are managed, evaluated, and circulated as reflections of cultural values.

This chart, then, summarizes a set of curricular benchmarks for a learning sequence specifically tailored toward teaching literature. In most curricula today, literature is approached as cultural studies -- as related to social, political, and cultural concerns, not to aesthetic or formal ones, as is suggested here. Moreover, the chart is not a template for any particular curriculum, since what genres will be studied differs for various student bodies, within the confines of varying institution types, and with respect to resources and background literacy of the learners themselves. This chart simply summarizes the general degrees of competency for learners who will be moved to a cultural literacy of genre by the end of four or more years of study. In all cases, the individual learner must move from being a competent reader of a single text, to taking each text type or discourse genre as a token in terms of the type they represent (comparison of tokens against each other), and then, finally, to analyzing both the tokens and their types as artifacts of their cultures, in proper technical vocabularies. These learners move from building blocks, to patterns, to evaluations of literacy patterns.

Conclusions: A Literacy Curriculum for Genre Study

This discussion has argued that it is not only possible, but necessary to put the question of reading literature on a continuum with other kinds of genre knowledge, with genres defined as discourse genres -- formalizations that function within a culture's horizon of expectation, guiding comprehension and production alike. These kinds of formal learning need to be accommodated at every stage of a curriculum, as part of the fundamental cultural literacies inherent in a culture. Since the study of literary genres has more or less disappeared from the secondary school curriculum, such a reconceptualization of genres is a key to integrating the teaching and learning of fundamental literacy skills into a continuum that can lead to the study of literature and other high-status cultural forms.

The discussion has to this point elided differences between the general literature curriculum and the specifics of teaching FL literature. That choice is conscious, because the same framework of understanding the literacy of discourse genres will apply equally to FL frameworks, albeit with a stronger reliance on the *cognitive* staging of these stages of learning, in order to anchor students' weaker language abilities. In both frameworks, learners need to see explicitly how to approach longer texts (prose, film), and stylized ones (drama, poetry), through the systems of meaning that operate in them. For longer prose stories, students have to learn tactics to orient themselves in unfamiliar situations, historical eras, and narrative logics. They can thus learn to use advance organizers, previewing the "who, what, where, when" that set the stage for a story, and then working to build up patterns in the text. How are episodes marked? Shifts of tense, of place? Explicit time markers ("two weeks later," "subsequently")? How are narrative elements like clothes, places, characters' actions, or events strung together in larger chains of meaning?

At the same time, however, one cannot stop with prose, if one is teaching the literacy of literature, in addition to that of other high-culture forms. Poetry -- including rap and song lyrics --, for example, is familiar to expert readers as manipulating syntactic markers to

establish points of view and to evoke states of mind and spirit. Thus as learning continues, textuality in and of itself becomes important. Texts need to be inserted into their contexts: historical, aesthetic, social, and others -- the contexts that are shared knowledge from a community of readers, within the text's and their own horizons of expectation. Thus "to know genre" begins to mean paying attention to different historical forms of each genre: how lyric poetry in the Romantic era may differ from today's, how novelists from two eras told stories about women, using different narrative strategies, and showing different ideologies about what women are, and what their place in society was and ought to be. The act of comparing two texts is thus the core activity that has to be built into an upper-division curriculum.

The specific *literary* aspects of these comparisons, however, also need to be addressed. Within a Western culture's horizon of expectation about literature, for example, specific texts are given privileged or canonical status as prototypes within literary history and in the community of writers for their speech genres (*Don Quixote* as the prototype for the picaresque novel; Tolstoy for the realist novel of history). Such texts set norms for the horizon of expectation of readers in their eras and create the obligatory moves that later authors react to or react against. They also set stylistic, philosophical, and formal markers into place that others must follow.

Again, these descriptions apply to every genre, written as well as those in other media. Films like *Fatal Attraction* redefined the expectations of the mass audience in other ways: since its release, all horror movies have two endings, the villain or monster has to be killed twice before the film is really over. Speeches like Lincoln's Gettysburg Address or Churchill's war addresses set new standards for speechifying. From another perspective, the materiality of these speech genres comes into play, as well. The Realist novel's form is influenced by the facts of its serialization or its publication in multiple volumes; it makes a difference whether poetry was written as part of a society's notion of general cultivation (often in the form of individual poems, as in the eighteenth century), or to win poetry prizes (often as collections, in the twentieth century). Finally, the valuative discourses of elite culture set genres into plays of

power -- as part of a particular historical moment's attention to specific groups, standards, or utterances.

Not all literature students will move to the third stage of specifically aesthetic literacy about genres. The standard "English major" who will become a high school teacher will be a competent reader who can introduce the facts of literary history, taste, and reception systematically (stage 2 literacy outcomes), but not necessarily critical interpretations and discussions of the genres they take. FL students, however, are rarely challenged to reach these levels at all: many, if not most, undergraduate FL programs lack any systematic training in literature -- and hence in the high-culture or high-status group literacies that would enhance their own critical thinking about cultures. Yet the tasks of comparison being suggested here would be perfect set-ups for production activities that require more sophisticated uses of language than the conversations and opinions that exhaust student production in most FL classes.²¹

But the third stage of literacy about genres is completely appropriate to undergraduate literature curricula that have capstone courses for the undergraduate sequence, and necessary for all graduate curricula. The materials to be treated in this level of instruction must now include more than primary literature, more than the texts themselves and the material facts of their contexts and circulation. Secondary literature and reference materials that contribute to professional understanding of the primary texts need to be drawn in; a technical vocabulary needs to be attached to the students' systems of understanding texts. The student has to learn not only how to track the point of view of the narrator, and to compare that point of view in two different novels, but also how and why scholars have differentiated between omniscient narrators and participant narrators, between jump cuts and dissolves. The student has to learn not only to track detailed patterns of sound and rhythm in poems, but why Petrarchan sonnets

²¹ Students could easily move toward debates about which is the better novel, book reviews of poetry collections, character sketches of people in drama, poems and song lyrics drawn from exemplars, analyses of the relation of a text and its audience (a kind of market-research analysis, drawn from reception theory). This has been argued in more detail, and especially

are not Shakespearean sonnets. That is, the students need to be introduced to perhaps the most technical context of genres: scholars, who generate their own practices, beyond those inherent in texts' general social contexts.

Said another way, in post-structuralist terms, the learner has to be initiated into the discipline of language scholarship: the technical discussions, the organization of knowledge of the field (the forms in which it is produced, archived, and distributed, and what each is valued as), and the practices of the field, from bibliographic and research norms, through conference and professional organizations and the like. In the case of literature, this also includes a critical reappropriation of literary history and scholarship, the kind of knowledge that allows a scholar to establish or question canonicity, to advance discussions, or to question ethics and uses of professional practice and expert knowledge. This is the task of the graduate program. Note, too, that the study of these professional norms require a historical dimension, since so many of the practices of a profession reach back to older historical setting and imperatives.

This outline of curriculum-building is based on the conviction that the study of genres in this sense is a necessary key to cultural literacy. In defining genre as dominant forms of literacy within cultural groups, one creates a bridge between the formal language learning of the lower division (in rhetoric and composition, or in FLs) and more extended forms of comprehension and production in cultural contexts.

Such a bridge is, however, anything but a rear-guard action to "save literary studies." Instead, it is an affirmation of the study of texts, textuality, and genre as part of cultural communication -- as documents involved in various systems of cultural production and consumption, and in the identity politics within cultures. Taking genre in the way I have outlined here, moreover, points to a productive way through (not around) today's still-fashionable questions of canonicity and cultural production, because *any* form of communication that is practiced within a group can be defined as a genre, a pattern of communication that constitutes part of a culture's literacy. After all, the native speaker's horizon of expectation

(but not exclusively, by Janet Swaffar, Katherine Arens, and Heidi Byrnes in *Reading for*

includes knowledge about the compulsory moves in a genre, the sociology of use as part of that horizon, and the various intertextual problems that tie into the materiality of culture.

Without taking such issues seriously as cultural literacy (a literacy of linguistic/semiotic form as well as of cultural content), the beginning and novice student learner, as comprehender or producer, will not (be motivated to) gain the kinds of cultural insight necessary to move towards advanced levels of language use and of cross-cultural understanding.²² Just as seriously, the advanced student, particularly the graduate student, will be cut off from 200 years of professional discourse if they are not forced into dialogue with existing and prior scholarly communities -- either to espouse them, or to refute them successfully, as a possible community epistemology instead of an opinion.

In the form of such a reconceived "genre" study, the study of "literature" will be the study of cultural forms, what Julia Kristeva called a *sémanalyse*, a semanalysis, a critical study of complex verbal forms of a culture, their power relations, and their ability to create, mediate, and recreate forms of subjectivity for individuals within the culture. And, just as importantly, teaching literature will bring undergraduate study closer to our own mainstreams of scholarship, as a vital intellectual enterprise.²³

Meaning.

²² Kimberly Nance, "'Authentic and Surprising News of Themselves': Engaging Students' Preexisting Competencies in the Introductory Literature Course," makes the case that "very few students enter the literature classroom with the expectation of full participation" (31) and that we do not, in general, take pains to accommodate them; she suggests one way to doing so, by changing classroom management schemes.

²³ This also has implications for the teaching of graduate students, an issue I have not pursued here. For this discussion, see Elizabeth Bernhardt, "Research Into the Teaching of Literature in a Second Language: What It Says and How to Communicate it to Graduate Students," and Peter C. Pfeiffer, "Preparing Graduate Students to Teach Literature and Language in a Foreign Language Department," both of whom make the case for altered graduate student training in teaching literature and culture.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- "Why Major in Literature -- What Do We Tell Our Students?" Forum on "The Changing Profession." *PMLA*, 117, # 3 (May 2002): 487-521
- Bartholomae, David. "Literacy and Departments of Language and Literature." *PMLA*, 117, #5 (October 2002): 1272-78
- Berg, William, and Laurey K. Martin-Berg. "A Stylistic Approach to Foreign Language Acquisition and Literary Analysis." In: Virginia M. Scott and Holly Tucker, eds. *SLA and the Literature Classroom: Fostering Dialogues*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle, 2002. 173-191
- Bernhardt, Elizabeth. "Research Into the Teaching of Literature in a Second Language: What It Says and How to Communicate it to Graduate Students." In: Virginia M. Scott and Holly Tucker, eds. *SLA and the Literature Classroom: Fostering Dialogues*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle, 2002. 195-210
- Brooks, Cleanth. *The Well Wrought Urn: Studies in the Structure of Poetry*. New York: Reynal & Hitchcock, 1947
- Burnett, Joanne, and Leah Fonder-Solano. "Crossing the Boundaries Between Literature and Pedagogy: Perspectives on a Foreign Language Reading Course." In: Virginia M. Scott and Holly Tucker, eds. *SLA and the Literature Classroom: Fostering Dialogues*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle, 2002. 75-106
- 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
- Essif, Les. "The Literature of Foreign Language Programs: The Road to Cultural Studies Is Not Paved with Literary History Tick Tock ... Tick Tock . . ." *ADFL Bulletin*, 34, #1 (Fall 2002): 15-20

- Fallon, Jean M. "On Foreign Ground: One Attempt at Attracting Non-French Majors to a French Studies Course." *Foreign Language Annals*, 35, #4 (July/August 2002): 405-413
- Fish, Stanley. *Is There a Text in This Class?: The Authority of Interpretive Communities*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1980
- Frantzen, Diana. "Rethinking Foreign Language Literature: Towards an Integration of Literature and Language at All Levels." In: Virginia M. Scott and Holly Tucker, eds. *SLA and the Literature Classroom: Fostering Dialogues*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle, 2002. 109-130
- Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Trans. Myra Bergman Ramos. New Rev. 30th Anniversary ed. New York: Continuum, 2000
- Frye, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1957
- Garvin, Paul L., ed. *A Prague School Reader on Esthetics, Literary Structure, and Style*. Washington, DC: Georgetown UP, 1964
- Hamburger, Käte. *The Logic of Literature (= Logik der Dichtung)*. Trans. Marilyn J. Rose. 2nd, rev. ed. Bloomington, IN: Indiana UP, 1973
- Stuart Hall and Tony Jefferson, eds., *Resistance through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Post-War Britain*. London: Routledge, 1993 [1975]
- Ingarden, Roman. *The Literary Work of Art: An Investigation on the Borderlines of Ontology, Logic, and Theory of Literature*. Trans. George G. Grabowicz. Evanston, IL: Northwestern UP, 1973
- . *The Cognition of the Literary Work of Art*. Trans. Ruth Ann Crowley and Kenneth R. Olson. Evanston, IL: Northwestern UP, 1973
- Katz, Stacey. "Teaching Literary Texts at the Intermediate Level: A Structured Input Approach." In: Virginia M. Scott and Holly Tucker, eds. *SLA and the Literature Classroom: Fostering Dialogues*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle, 2002. 155-171

Kayser, Wolfgang. *Das sprachliche Kunstwerk: Eine Einführung in die Literaturwissenschaft*.
Bern: A. Francke, 1948.

Kirkpatrick, Susan. "E Pluribus Unum?" *PMLA*, 117, #5 (October 2002): 1279-83

Kristeva, Julia, and J.-Cl. Coque. "Sémanalyse: Conditions d'une sémiotique scientifique
(enretien)." *Semiotica*, 5, # 4 (1972): 324-349

Lord, Albert. *The Singer of Tales*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1960.

Mukarovsky, Jan. "Standard Language and Poetic Language." In: Paul L. Garvin, ed. *A Prague
School Reader on Esthetics, Literary Structures, and Style*. Washington, DC:
Georgetown UP, 1964: 17-30

Nance, Kimberly. "'Authentic and Surprising News of Themselves': Engaging Students'
Preexisting Competencies in the Introductory Literature Course." *ADFL Bulletin*, 34,
#1 (Fall 2002): 30-34

Pfeiffer, Peter C. "Preparing Graduate Students to Teach Literature and Language in a Foreign
Language Department." *ADFL Bulletin*, 34, #1 (Fall 2002): 11-14

Pratt, Mary Louise. "What's Foreign and What's Familiar?" *PMLA*, 117, #5 (October
2002): 1283-87

Raffel, Burton. *How to Read a Poem*. New York: New American Library, 1984

Schultz, Jean Marie. "The Gordian Knot: Language, Literature, and Critical Thinking." In:
Virginia M. Scott and Holly Tucker, eds. *SLA and the Literature Classroom: Fostering
Dialogues*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle, 2002. 3-31

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.

Scott, Virginia M., and Holly Tucker, eds. *SLA and the Literature Classroom: Fostering
Dialogues*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle, 2002.

- Sollors, Werner. "Cooperation between English and Foreign Languages in the Area of Multilingual Literature." *PMLA*, 117, #5 (October 2002): 1287-94
- Staiger, Emil. *Die Kunst der Interpretation: Studien zur deutschen Literaturgeschichte*. Zurich: Atlantis Verlag, 1955.
- Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century*. Ed. National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project. Lawrence, KS: Allen Press, Inc., 1999
- Steffensen, Margaret S., Chritra Joag-Dev, and Richard C. Anderson. "A Cross-Cultural Perspective on Reading Comprehension." *Reading Research Quarterly*, 15 (1979): 1-20
- Swaffar, Janet. "Reading the Patterns of Literary Works: Strategies and Teaching Techniques." In: Virginia M. Scott and Holly Tucker, eds. *SLA and the Literature Classroom: Fostering Dialogues*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle, 2002. 131-154
- Swaffar, Janet, Katherine Arens, and Heidi Byrnes. *Reading for Meaning: An Integrated Approach to Language Learning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1991
- Todorov, Tzvetan. *The Fantastic: A Structural Approach to a Literary Genre*. Trans Richard Howard. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1975
- . *Genres in Discourse*, Trans. Catherine Porter. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990.
- Watt, Ian P. *The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson, and Fielding*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1957.
- Wimsatt, William K. *The Verbal Icon: Studies in the Meaning of Poetry*. Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1954.
- Wright, David A. "Culture as Information and Culture as Affective Process: A Comparative Study." *Foreign Language Annals*, 33, #3 (May-June 2001): 330-341