BULLETIN

DE LA

SOCIÉTÉ DES ANGLICISTES

DE

L'ENSEIGNEMENT SUPÉRIEUR

N° 40 - Trimestriel **Septembre 1996**

Correspondance : Jean-Louis Duchet, 4, rue Saint-Hilaire, 86000 Poitiers — Tél. 49 55 99 96. Fax 49 45 32 90. e-mail : duchet@hermes.univ-poitiers.fr

SOMMAIRE

Le mot du président

Le premier mot du président nouvellement élu que je suis n'est pas difficile à trouver : ce ne peut être que le mot "merci". Et ce "merci" je l'adresse d'abord, bien sûr, aux membres du comité de la SAES qui m'ont élu et aux membres du bureau, anciens et nouveaux, dont certains ont accepté des tâches effectivement très lourdes (je songe en particulier aux postes de secrétaire général et de trésorier). Je veux l'adresser ensuite, et avec une certaine solennité qu'une vieille amitié n'interdit pas, à Louis Roux qui, dix années durant, successivement secrétaire général (1986-1990), vice-président (1990-1992) et président (1992-1996), a consacré beaucoup de son temps, de son énergie et de sa compétence à animer et à développer notre société. Les applaudissements très chaleureux qui ont salué, à Nancy, son élection à la présidence d'honneur de la SAES étaient sans conteste mérités. Enfin, je souhaite encore dire merci à nos collègues et amis nancéiens, organisateurs d'un congrès très réussi et, me tournant vers l'avenir, à nos amis et collègues niçois, organisateurs de ce qui sera en 1997 le XXXVII^{e} congrès de la SAES.

Dans l'histoire de notre société, le premier "mot du président" a été signé par Jean Raimond. Il figure dans le numéro 1 du *Bulletin*, daté de mars 1987, et on y lit un rappel de l'origine de la SAES, officiellement fondée le 4 octobre 1960. Son premier président était Jean Loiseau et le bureau réunissait certains grands anciens aujourd'hui disparus, Louis Bonnerot, Maurice Lebreton et Pierre Legouis, et d'autres, plus jeunes et toujours actifs, Sylvère Monod, Jean Béranger et Louis Lecocq. "Au fil des ans, écrivait Jean Raimond, les bureaux se sont renouvelés, sous les présidences successives de Robert Ellrodt, de Jean Dulck et de Pierre Vitoux qui, tous, ont su maintenir le cap." Je suis certain que Jean Raimond, à qui je dois d'être entré au bureau de la SAES, sera d'accord pour que je mette sa liste à jour et pour que l'on compte désormais, au nombre des présidents qui ont su maintenir le cap, les noms de Jean Raimond, de Jacqueline Genet et de Louis Roux.

Les dix dernières années auront été marquées par la mise en place et l'amélioration constante des moyens d'information et de communication que la SAES met à la dispositon de ses adhérents, à savoir le *Bulletin* trimestriel, l'annuaire et, réalisé en collaboration avec l'Université Paul Valéry-Montpellier 3, *Répertoire*. Elles ont également été marquées, avec la création

d'ESSE, par le développement des relations internationales de la SAES au sein de la communauté des anglicistes européens. Je pense que les années à venir seront surtout marquées par le rôle croissant que vont jouer, dans le domaine de la communication, de l'information et de la recherche, les technologies nouvelles. Nous sommes déjà nombreux à utiliser quotidiennement la messagerie électronique, et le nouveau bureau a recours de plus en plus, dans son travail, aux possibilités offertes par l'échange rapide de messages électroniques et la transmission de documents déjà formatés. Le développement de ces nouveaux moyens de communication coïncide avec la disparition de la franchise postale entre universitaires, dont la SAES bénéficiait indirectement, et devrait permettre, à l'avenir, de faire de substantielles économies. Dans le numéro de décembre du *Bulletin*, Jean-Louis Duchet s'est engagé à expliquer, avec beaucoup plus de compétence que je n'en ai, l'utilisation que les anglicistes français vont pouvoir faire des instruments électroniques de communication et d'information. Il suffit que vous sachiez, pour le moment, que la SAES a déjà une liste de messagerie, ouverte le 12 juillet à titre expérimental et gratuit grâce au centre de ressources informatiques de l'Université de Poitiers, qu'elle aura bientôt une page d'accueil sur le *Web*, et qu'il vous en sera dit davantage au cours de notre prochaine assemblée générale, le samedi 5 octobre.

Adolphe Haberer

D'un annuaire à l'autre

La comparaison des annuaires de 1995 et de 1996 fait apparaître les informations suivantes quant aux mouvements qui ont affecté les membres de la Société. Une partie de ces informations est sans doute déjà caduque. Ceci milite pour une parution plus tardive de l'annuaire qui prenne en compte les changements prenant effet à la rentrée universitaire. L'assemblée de la SAES sera peut-être amenée à en débattre.

Jean-Louis Duchet

Changements d'affectation

Nom	Ancienne affectation	Nouvelle affectation
BALLARD Michel	Lille 3	Artois
BERNARD Catherine	Orléans	Paris 7
BONAFOUS-MURAT Carle		Le Mans
DI MASCIO Patrick	Rouen	Nice
FINDLAY Rosemary	Pau	Paris 7
GARNER Steve	Le Mans	Paris 4
GAUDY Isabelle	Paris 3	Keele
GENTY Stéphanie		Evry
GHABRIS Maryam	Evry	Littoral
HAY Josiane	Aix 2	Grenoble 1
HEROU Josette	Paris XIII	Caen
HUMBLEY John	Nancy 2	Paris XIII
INGOUACKA Guy	Valenciennes	Littoral
ISELIN Pierre	Paris X	Paris IV
LACROIX Jean-Michel	Paris 3	Besançon (Recteur)
MANRY Marie-Agnès	Angers	Paris XIII
MELIS Gérard	Versailles	Paris VIII
MONTAGUTELLI Marie	Toulon	Paris 3
MORVAN Alain	Clermont	Amiens (Recteur)
OUESLATI Salah	Caen	Poitiers
PAYCHA Danièle	Paris XIII	Cergy
PICHLAK Martine	Troyes	Marne-la-Vallée
REVAUGER Marie-Cécile	Grenoble 3	Aix-Marseille I
REYNIER Christine	Bordeaux 3	Pau (PR)
SANCERY Arlette	Paris XIII	Paris IV
SIMARD J.-Pierre	St-Etienne	Grenoble 3
STEVANOVITCH Colette	Rouen	Amiens (PR)
STURGESS Charlotte	Angers	Tours

THERY Michèle	Montpellier 3	Paris IV

Nouveaux membres de la SAES

Nom Prénom	Fonction	Affectation
ABDERRAHIQ-LAIB Sakina	ATER	Besançon
AJI Hélène	ATER	Amiens
ANTONIN Pascale	PRAG	Bordeaux I
ATHENOT Eric	PRCE	Grenoble 3
BALLIER Nicolas	ATER	Limoges
BASSAC Christian	PRAG	Bordeaux 3
BORM Jan	ATER	Amiens
BOUCHER-RIVALAIN Odile	MCF	Cergy-Pontoise
BOURGEOIS Hélène	ATER	Amiens
BRAVARD Sophie	AMN	Lyon 2
BROUETTE Sylvie	PRAG	Littoral
CAILLATTE Claude	ATER	Paris 6
CAMPON Maria	PRAG	Paris 3
CANTONI-FORT Camille	AMN	Orléans
CELERIER Joëlle	CE	Toulouse 2
CHAMLOU Laurence	PRAG	
CHANDA Tirthankar	CE	Paris 8
CHARRAS Françoise	PRAG	Montpellier 3
CHAUSSINAND Christelle	Ass Agr	Lyon 2
COCQUIX-PEZERON Diane	ATER	Nantes
COINTRE Annie	MCF	Metz
COL Norbert	MCF	Lorient
COSTE Jacques-Henri	PRCE	Lyon 1
COULIBALY Roger	Ass	Ouagadougou
CRESCI Monique	MCF	Montbéliard
CRIGNON Hélène	ATER	Brest
DALZON Christian	PRCE	Versailles
DELMAS Catherine	PRAG	Chambéry
DELOGU Christopher	MCF	Toulouse 2
DIANA Alain	MCF	Grenoble 1
DJEBALI Taoufik	MCF	Caen
DORE Geetha	CE	Paris X
DOUMIT-EL-KHOURY Marielle		AMN Paris 3
DROMART Anne	PRAG	Lyon
DUBOIS René	PRAG	La Réunion
DUMONT Sylvie	PRCE	Rouen

FIORETTI Evelyne	PRAG	Grenoble 3
FRAY-MEIGS Divina	PRAG	Paris 3
GETTLIFFE Patrick	MCF	Le Mans
GILDEFER Deirdre	ATER	Paris 6
GOARZIN Anne	ATER	Rennes 2
GONZALEZ Madalena	ATER	Aix-Marseille 1
GREENSTEIN Rosalind	MCF	Paris I
HERVOUET-FARRAR Isabelle	MCF	Clermont-Ferrand 2
HOFFMANN Catherine		Tours
HURWORTH Angela	ATER	Paris 7
JOBERT Manuel	ATER	Lyon 3
JOUET-PASTRE Gabrielle	MCF	Paris 3
KAENEL André	PR	Nancy 2
KATZ Daniel	MCF	Amiens
KILGORE Jennifer	ATER	Littoral
LA CASSAGNERE Mathilde	ATER	Montpellier 3
LACABANNE Sonia	MCF	Grenoble 2
LAUZANNE Alain	MCF	Rouen
LEBAILLY Hugues	PRAG	Reims
MACLAREN Alister	PRAG	Besançon
MAGUIN François	PRAG	Toulouse
MASSU Claude-Charles	PR	Aix-Marseille I
MESPLEDE Sophie	PRAG	Rennes 2
MIKOWSKI Sylvie	ATER	Paris 6
MOISAN Jean-François	MCF	Paris XIII
MORCELLET Françoise	CE	Paris 3
MORSE Ruth	PR	Paris 7
MORTIER Janie	MA	Paris XIII
NI RIORDAIN Cliona	ATER	Paris IX
O'KELLY Dairine	MCF	Toulouse 2
OMHOVERE Claire	Ass.Agr.	Nancy 2
PEDOT Richard	PRAG	Metz
PEGON Claire	MCF	Aix
PERNOT-DESCHAMPS Marguerite	MCF	Dijon
PERRIN Isabelle	MCF	Paris 3
PIQUET François	PR	Lyon 3
PLUVINAGE Delphine	ATER	Angers
QUOST Christine	CE agr	Grenoble 3
RAYNAUD Michel		Toulouse (CPGE)
REMY Michel	PR	Nice
RICCIOLI Michael	MCF	Amiens

RITCH Janet	Lect	Paris IV
RODIER Carole	ATER	Montpellier 3
ROMANSKI Philippe	MCF	Rouen
SALATI Marie-Odile	MCF	Chambéry
SOHIER Jacques	MCF	Angers
SOULAS Christine	PRAG	Rennes 2
STENTON Tony	MCF	Grenoble 3
SUKIC Christine	ATER	Artois
TERRIEN Nicole	MCF	Marne-la-Vallée
TERRIER Françoise	PRAG	Paris
TOUPIN Fabienne	MCF	Tours
TUDEAU-CLAYTON Margaret		
VENUAT Monique	ATER	Clermont
VIDAUD Richard	PRAG	La Rochelle
VIENNE-GUÉRIN Nathalie	PRAG	Rouen
VILLEZ Barbara	Lect	Paris II
WALTERS James	PRAG	Besançon

Le secrétaire général et le trésorier seront reconnaissants aux intéressés ou à tout autre membre de la Société des corrections et additions qui leur seront suggérées.

English in the Age of Cultural Studies

What will become of English? This is the question I propose to address. What will become of the study of English in the age of cultural studies? Since accepting Michel Morel's invitation, this question has taken on a new poignancy, a new pertinency for me, for I have been drafted to serve as chair of the department of English at Cornell — my colleagues' revenge for the sabbatical year I have spent enjoying myself in Montpellier. Now I must confront the question of what English departments should be doing, or at least, whether I will be able to bully my colleagues into undertaking serious discussion of the question of what we should be doing, for it is all too easy these days, when there are not the resources for new initiatives, to avoid posing difficult questions about the departmental enterprise as a whole. Do we have a common enterprise in a Department of English these days or are we a collection of particular interest groups, linked together only by a common mail room and a xerox machine?

Some twenty-five years ago, Clark Kerr, president of the University of California, defined the modern American university as a set of independent departments and research institutes united by a common parking problem. This cynical definition, for which Clark Kerr is chiefly remembered today, nevertheless took for granted that academic departments themselves, at least, were unified by a discipline or academic mission. Nowadays it is not clear whether departments are the elementary units of the university. In the United States they are certainly its données, but do they have enough unity to function as units — to play the role of the basic functional units of the university? Is there enough common ground for an English department to function as a group with a common project?

I know, of course, that the situation of English in France is different from that of English faculties in England and English departments in the United States. For one thing, our English departments have a historic mission which weighs as a heavy burden on the shoulders of the living. In the nineteenth century, educational thinkers such as Cardinal Newman and Matthew Arnold gave the study of English literature a crucial cultural role, claiming for it the special power to serve both as an antidote to materialistic interests stimulated by capitalism and as a means to promote the unity of a society increasingly divided by economic and class differences. Newman declared, "by great authors, the many are drawn up into a unity, national character is fixed, a people speaks, the past and the future, the East and the West, are brought into

communication with one another." Literature was a special kind of writing which could help civilize the lower classes (Terry Eagleton speaks of throwing the workers a few novels to keep them from throwing up a few barricades), but also the aristocrats, whom Arnold called "the Barbarians," and the middle classes (the Philistines), by engaging the mind in complex ethical issues, inducing readers to examine their own conduct as an outsider (a reader of novels) would and thus promoting disinterestedness, teaching sensitivity and fine discriminations, producing identifications with men and women of other conditions and thus promoting fellow feeling, giving readers a stake in cultural memory (the tradition of English) and cultivating a commitment to Englishness. Religion had been discredited and could no longer function as social cement; philosophy too had been shaken, wrote Arnold — there is not "an accredited dogma which is not shown to be questionable" — but poetry could not be discredited by fact or reasoning, since it is based on imagination, and to it fell the most important social functions. For great English critics of the twentieth century, such as I. A. Richards and F. R. Leavis, the terms of celebration changed but the conviction, nay, the imperative that "English must save us," remained stronger than ever.

Well, it's hard to imagine saying "English will save us" in a French university. That should give you a certain freedom; you are not charged with the historic responsibility of producing the properly educated citizen, of whom the discriminating professor was the model. Are you the better off for that? I'm not sure. I suspect that in France that cultural responsibility is thought to belong to the *lycée*, and that neither *lettres classiques*, or *lettres modernes*, or *philosophie* bears, in theory, the burden of maintaining the culture. Of course *départements d'anglais* in France do bear the burden of language teaching, which is more concretely burdensome, if less intellectually burdensome. But lest you start feeling sorry for yourselves, remember that, in America, English departments are responsible for teaching a generation brought up on MTV (Music television) to write English sentences, and not just English sentences but whole English paragraphs. And — *le comble* — when colleagues in other departments are annoyed to discover that their students don't write very well, they can blame the English department.

But the question I propose to address concerns the role of the study of English literature in what I am calling the age of cultural studies. This is a salient question in both Britain and America, where various books, such as Anthony Easthope's *English into Cultural Studies* have declared that cultural studies is the new dispensation and will take over English departments.

The situation is somewhat different, of course, for departments of *foreign* literature. Foreign language and literature departments in France, as well as in America, have long been concerned to teach culture or civilization broadly conceived, not just literature. In the United States, in recent years, foreign literature departments have explicitly transformed themselves into departments of French studies or German studies, in the hope of attracting more students through courses on German fascism, Italian cinema and so on. (Our German department at Cornell has for some time been affectionately known as the "anything but German literature department." It offers courses on Freud, Nietzsche, Lou-Andreas Salome, Nazis, German film, Walter Benjamin, the Frankfurt school, but seldom a course on Goethe, Rilke or Mann.)

Of course, even English departments in England and America have long taught non-literary texts. Perhaps the most famous paper in the Cambridge English tripos was the paper on British moralists (when I taught at Cambridge I enjoyed teaching for this paper, which covered, as we said, "British moralists from Plato to Sartre." Locke and Hume were practically the only Brits included). But this was high culture. To speak of the age of cultural studies means something else.

It's hard to say, though, what Cultural studies is. It seems less an intellectual movement (from which you would expect a certain coherence) than a "field," as we say. But what is a "field"? It needn't have an institutional reality — there are few departments of cultural studies or degrees in cultural studies. What we call "fields" have above all an imaginary existence, as fantasmatic objects with which people identify. Bookstores, journals, and publishers play a role here. By publishing and displaying interesting books under the rubric of cultural studies, they create the desire and the identifications that produce a field and make it a force to be reckoned with. These cultural agents helped to make what goes by the nickname of "theory" a significant field, especially in the United States, even though there remain to this day very few programs in theory or degrees in theory.

It is understandable that publishers would be attracted to the idea of cultural studies since this category enables them to avoid deciding whether a work should be placed under the heading of sociology or film theory or women's studies, or literary criticism, or all of the above. But despite the cultural studies shelves in bookstores and the recent proliferation of introductions and anthologies, it is surprisingly difficult to work out what "Cultural Studies" means. The first big anthology, brought out by the main publisher of cultural studies, Routledge, is called — surprise! — simply *Cultural Studies*, edited by Larry Grossberg, Cary Nelson, and Paula

Treichler. This book begins by declaring that cultural studies is neither a field nor a method, for culture includes everything and can be studied by a vast range of methods. "Cultural Studies", the introduction continues, "is thus committed to the study of the entire range of a society's arts, beliefs, institutions, and communicative practices." Often the point of cultural studies seems to be to resist any exclusion that definition might involve. Its defining principle is to resist exclusion on principle, as a matter of principle. As a result, it often seems as if the only positive claim is that, whatever is studied and by whatever method, cultural studies should aim to make a political difference. The editors write that most of those who identify with cultural studies, whatever their approach, "see themselves not simply as scholars providing an account but as politically-engaged participants." "Cultural studies thus believes", the editors continue, "that its own intellectual work is supposed to — can — make a difference." This is an odd statement but, I think, a revealing one: cultural studies does not believe that its intellectual work *will* make a difference. That would be overweening, not to say naive. It believes that its work "is supposed to" make a difference. But is this a credo to energize a field — "I believe that my work is *supposed to* make a difference"? Perhaps sensing a problem, the editors insert a parenthetical "can", but I suspect that, indeed, the distinguishing feature of cultural studies may well be the conviction that its work "*is supposed*" to make a political difference. It is as though the redemptive goals that have often animated work in the humanities have been retained by cultural studies, but that it has abandoned the idea that this goal is linked either to a particular content (such as, literature will make us whole again) or to a particular method (ideology-critique will demystify social arrangements and the discourses that sustain them, and thus ideology, and make change possible). But a redemptive scenario that lacks either a distinctive content or a particular method for which claims could be made is scarcely plausible. A strange result indeed!

Since culture is on the one hand the system of categories and assumptions that makes possible the activities and productions of a society and on the other hand, the products themselves, the reach of cultural studies is vast. But since meaning is based on difference, cultural studies in practice has gained its distinctiveness and its meaning from the interest in popular or mass culture, as opposed to high cultural forms already being studied in universities. In the United States, identifying with cultural studies seems to mean resisting literary studies. To do cultural studies means above all *not* to study canonical writers — or to study them only, by way of provocation, as part of some mass phenomenon.

Now in Britain, where cultural studies began, the idea of studying popular culture — the habits and pastimes of the working and lower-middle classes, for example — had a political charge. Cultural studies was the relay of proletarian experience. In Britain, where the national cultural identity was linked to monuments of high culture — Shakespeare and the tradition of English literature, for example — the very fact of studying popular culture was an act of resistance, in a way that it isn't in the United States, where national identity has often been defined *against* high culture. Jackson Pollock could be hailed as the great American painter because he departed in so many ways from the image of high culture. If we take Mark Twain's *Huckleberry Finn* as the icon of American literature — the work which does as much as any other to define Americanness — then we need only recall the ending, where Huck Finn lights out for the territories because Aunt Sally wants to "civilize" him. He seeks to escape civilized culture. High culture has not been part of the definition of national identity in the United States. *Au contraire*, traditionally, the American is the man on the run from culture. In the United States it is scarcely self-evident that shunning high culture to study popular culture is a politically radical or resistant gesture. On the contrary, it may involve the rendering academic of mass culture more than the radicalizing of academic studies.

The origins of Cultural Studies in Britain are associated particularly with the names of Raymond Williams and Richard Hoggart, the latter the founder of the Birmingham Center for Cultural Studies. In 1980 Stuart Hall, successor to Hoggart at Birmingham, published an article, "Cultural Studies: Two Paradigms," contrasting the early model, associated with Williams and Hoggart, which undertook to study popular culture as a vital expression of the working class, with a later model — of Marxist structuralism — which studies mass culture as meanings imposed on society, an oppressive ideological formation. The tension between these two options continues to animate cultural studies today: on the one hand, the point of studying popular culture is to get in touch which what is important for the lives of ordinary people — their culture — as opposed to aesthetes and professors; on the other, there is a strong impetus to show how people are being constructed and manipulated by cultural forms. There is considerable tension here — so much so that I find it tempting to define the field of cultural studies by this tension. Cultural studies, then, dwells in the tension between, on the one hand, the analyst's desire to analyze culture as a hegemonic imposition that alienates people from their interests and creates the desires that they come to have and, on the other hand, the analyst's wish to find in popular culture an authentic expression of value.

If one takes this tension to define cultural studies, then the central strand of cultural studies would be that which finds a way of negotiating this tension, most often these days by showing that people are able to use the cultural materials foisted upon them by capitalism and its media and entertainment industries in ways that constitute a kind of culture of their own. Popular culture is made from mass culture. Popular culture is made from cultural resources that are opposed to it and thus is a culture of struggle, a culture whose creativity consists in *bricolage,* in using the products of mass culture. If one defines cultural studies as the negotiation of this tension — the tension between the critique of mass culture as ideology and the celebration of popular culture as the resistance to the hegemony of capitalism — then it has a clear logic but becomes much a narrower and graspable project, so much so that it has the air of a project or particular line of argument rather than a field.

Indeed, this distinctive project is not what people have in mind when they speak of "the age of cultural studies," so we come back to our larger uncertainties, such as whether cultural studies is supposed to study all culture, of the past as well as present, high as well as bw, or whether it focuses on the present and the popular, in contradistinction to traditional forms of study. There is also the key question of whether cultural studies is opposed to contemporary theory or, on the contrary, the concrete expression of contemporary theory. Some students who embrace cultural studies — particularly the study of historically marginalized cultures — see themselves as opposed to theory and as the champions of historical and cultural particularity. But even if the proponents of cultural studies identify against "theory," the majority of work that presents itself as cultural studies is highly self-conscious about, and involved with, theoretical and methodological questions.

Thinking about the relation between cultural studies and what we call "theory," I am struck by the similarity between the difficulty of defining cultural studies and the difficulty of defining "theory." What is theory? Well, what goes by the nickname "theory" in the United States is sometimes called "literary theory" because of its links with departments of literature, but it is certainly not theory of literature in the traditional sense — accounts of the nature of literature, the distinctiveness of literary language, and so on. Much of what is central to theory — the historical and genealogical studies of Michel Foucault, the psychoanalytic theory of Jacques Lacan, the deconstructive readings of philosophical texts by Jacques Derrida and so on — is only marginally concerned with literature. Like cultural studies, theory is broad, amorphous, interdisciplinary. You can imagine almost anything

fitting in if it is done in a provocative way. What makes something theory, it seems, is that it is picked up as interesting and suggestive for people working outside the discipline within which it arises. So discussions of madness or of perspective, of sexuality or narrative or prostitution, can all enter "theory" if they seem to have implications, for people's thinking about signification and the constitution of subjects. If we ask what so-called "theory" is the theory *of*, the answer can only be something like signifying practices in general, the constitution of human subjects, etc. — in short, something like culture, in the sense that it is given in cultural studies. One might thus conclude, it seems to me, that cultural studies is — or should be conceived as — the general name for the activities of which what we call "theory" for short is the theory: cultural studies is the practice of which what we call "theory" is the theory.

I have offered two hypotheses about cultural studies. The first, the narrow, is that cultural studies investigates how people make popular culture from mass culture. This offers little place to literature but it is no threat to the study of literature. The second is that cultural studies is that practice of which what we call "theory", for short, is the theory. Here the role of the study of literature is by no means assured, but since a good deal of so-called "theory" results from turning skills of literary analysis to the study of other sorts of texts, literature might still claim a certain centrality.

Why should cultural studies be the new growth area in the humanities? In a sense, its emergence, at least in the United States, seems a logical result of the extension of literary methods of analysis to a wide range of non-literary objects and texts. But in a forthcoming book called *The University Beyond Culture*, Bill Readings, a brilliant young English critic who had taught at Geneva and in the US and Canada, who was killed in a plane crash in 1994, argues that cultural studies is made possible by a recent shift in the governing idea of the university. To put it most simply, Kant based the university on a single regulative principle, the principle of Reason. Humboldt and the German Idealists gave us the modern university by replacing the University of Reason with the University of Culture, an institution whose purpose was jointly teaching and research, given its *raison d'être* by the production and inculcation of national self-knowledge, the formation of educated citizens, imbued with a national culture. Here culture is the goal of the university: for instance, the reproduction of the man of culture instantiated in the professor — whence the possibility of such anecdotes as that of a dowager accosting an Oxford don during the first World War: "Young man, why aren't you in France fighting to defend civilization." "Madam," came the reply, "I *am* the civilization they are fighting to defend."

It was this notion of the university, the University of Culture, that gave literary studies the centrality that philosophy had enjoyed in the University of Reason. With the globalization of capital, the importance of forming national subjects has diminished, the production of the cultured citizen, hitherto the goal, in theory, of a liberal arts education, has become less central, and the University of Culture has given way, at least in the US and the UK, to what I would agree with Bill Readings in calling most simply the University of Excellence. (In the United States our administrators love to speak of the university's commitment to excellence, to create "centers of excellence," and to urge all employees to strive for excellence. The university has no particular goal, except to have its various parts functioning excellently — where excellence becomes a *contentless* measure permitting homogenization and bureaucratic control. All divisions of the university can be asked to demonstrate their excellence and since this takes the form or ratings or rankings they are all rendered comparable, even if they engage in radically different sorts of activities — advising students, maintaining buildings, raising funds, teaching history. The University of Excellence need have no specific goals but is free to strive for excellence without defining it. In practice, excellence is connected with professionalization: you are judged by your peers, which means that excellence is determined by how you are rated by others. In Britain under Thatcher, this became even more explicit than in the US: ratings of excellence in teaching and research determine the level of funding for subsequent years.

It is when culture is no longer the goal or purpose of the university that it can become an object of study among others. As Readings writes, "the Human sciences can do anything they like with culture, can do cultural studies, because culture no longer matters for the university."

To flesh out this claim we might say that literature (and to a lesser extent history and art history) was previously the site where culture could be observed, assimilated, debated, and studied. The rise of cultural studies is assisted by arguments that the notion of culture involved in taking literary study as the instrument of culture is elitist, and by recent analyses of the nationalist projects of literary studies. These have helped fuel the move to cultural studies, but cultural studies will *not* replace literary studies at the center of the university's idea of itself, first, because cultural studies is not based on a project of forming cultured citizens. Occasionally in the United States cultural studies is linked to the idea of forming a non-racist, non-sexist, non-homophobic, multicultural citizenry, but generally this is not the impetus, both because the idea of forming a citizenry seems nationalist and totalizing, and because practitioners of cultural studies think that their

political intervention will occur in some other way (they believe that their work is supposed to make a difference but don't say how).

Now that the goal of the production of national subjects is no longer central, it is perfectly all right for academics in universities to analyze and to teach all sorts of cultural materials and practices. This is not subversive but feeds right into the culture industry and constitutes something like its exotic and pedantic arms. The American press is amused by cultural studies and likes to run stories about academics writing about Madonna or cereal boxes. Cultural studies is a continuation of journalism on the one hand and, on the other, a contribution to the general disdain for academics, who are thought to make a complicated fuss about things that really should simply be consumed.

But what happens to English in the age of cultural studies? Well, English *departments* seem fairly well placed, for different reasons, in both France and the United States — I'm less sure about the UK. In the US, because they have been extremely imperialistic, taking on all sorts of studies and becoming central interdisciplinary departments in the humanities. In France, on the other hand, the importance of English as a world language will keep students enrolling in courses in English —lack of students doesn't seem to be your problem. So the question is, what will happen to the study of English literature, which has until now been the central activity of English? Though there are inexorable cultural and economic forces at work—such as the cultural dominance of television, the rise of visual culture, and the globalization of the economy — I do not think that they ensure the eclipse of literature. First of all, because, as I have mentioned, culture in the broad sense adduced by cultural studies cannot replace literary studies as a point of cultural investment. Quite specifically, there won't be a powerful movement rallying to the claim that "culture will save us." However popular or widespread it becomes, the study of non-literary discourses will not replace the study of literature by virtue of claims for cultural centrality, will not become *an activity for which central cultural claims are made*.

Readings' remark that cultural studies is possible because culture no longer matters for the university, means that the modern university is structurally indifferent to what is studied, so that there is *not* some compelling rationale for the study of TV sitcoms and advertisements. Thus the age of cultural studies leaves plenty of space and plenty of scope for *decisions* by teachers and by English departments about the contents of their teaching and the place of literature in that teaching. If cultural studies is the name for the practice of which what we call "theory" is the theory, then it allows plenty of room for literary study, but teachers will have to choose to teach and engage with literature. Its place will not be guaranteed. And the

reasons for choosing literature will not be the old ones: that it gives access to a luminous realm of eternal truths, that it will create national identity and unite the classes; nor, that it will serve as cultural capital — students fitting themselves for higher social status by acquiring a capital of knowledge of literature. It will be rather that literature illustrates in particularly efficient, dramatic, complex, and engaging ways mechanisms for the production of meaning; that literary works provide the best, most complex and engaging occasions for interpretation, and perhaps also that literary works illustrate the oppositional force of imagination. It is, above all, writing that calls for a reading and engages readers in problems of meaning.

Finally, I think, the reason for teaching literature is its performative complexity, whereby works end up engaging readers in processes that do or illustrate something other than what the works are commonly supposed to say. Since I do want to talk about an actual literary work this evening, let me illustrate this with one of the most commonly studied works in English, *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. I want to talk about what has long been held to be the major flaw or failing of the book, the ending.

Ernest Hemingway, who said he would give a million dollars to read *Huckleberry Finn* for the first time, also remarked that "you must stop where Nigger Jim is stolen from the boys. That is the real end. The rest is just cheating." And most readers find unsatisfying the final chapters of the book, where Huck reverts to being Tom Sawyer's naive subordinate. Jim, the runaway slave who has been Huck's companion on the raft, is captured and is being held at the Phelps' farm. Huck, going to investigate, is mistaken for Tom Sawyer, but plays along in that role. When the real Tom Saywer arrives to visit his relatives, he pretends to be Tom's brother Sid, and he agrees to help Huck free Jim, but insists on an elaborate, interminable rescue conducted according to what he takes to be the canons of romance adventures — by smuggling in spoons for Jim to dig a tunnel with, for instance, rather than opening the door for him.

As readers we have been seduced by the idyll of floating down the Mississippi and persuaded that questions of freedom and identity are at stake. If Huck simply fits back into his niche as Tom's sidekick in the juvenile world of the naughty boy's adventures, this suggests that our assumption that we have moved into a different sort of moral and idyllic world might be a delusion. Readers, therefore, have a stake in finding the ending a mistake. The fact that all the elaborate business at the end is mounted to steal into freedom a slave who has in fact (though we don't yet know it) already been set free by the will of his owner, Miss Watson, only increases the sense of

pointlessness. We want Huck and Jim to float on, on the raft, in nature, into a fuller state of freedom.

Now American culture has a great investment in the notion of freedom from civilization — the idea of getting away from it all in an asexual paradise of comradeship, hunting or fishing or just sitting on a boat, or floating on a raft incarnates (for Americans) an ideal association of innocence, nature, and freedom. This image is powerfully with us still, as witness the American beer commercials in which men sit around in the woods drinking beer, saying to each other, "Guys, it doesn't get any better than this." Twain feels the pull of this image, none knows it better, but when he puts Jim on the raft with Huck, this both makes floating down the river a more profound quest for freedom—more than adolescent hookey-playing—and gives freedom a different status, as no longer something that can be gained simply by lolling on a raft, especially as the raft carries a runaway slave deeper into slave territory. Twain's problem with the ending is that since the Mississippi flows from north to south, floating down the river on a raft carries Jim deeper into slave territory and does nothing to advance his freedom.

Jim will only be free when he is in *society* — a society where he won't be arrested as a runaway slave. This is something that the ending shows in ways readers find annoying. Tom knows Miss Watson's will has freed Jim but conceals this knowledge in order to have the adventure of freeing him (in juvenile adventures which are said to make a mockery of the quest for freedom). The novel's very emphasis on this elaborate, unnecessary freeing of Jim puts into relief the fact that the crucial action, the act which makes Jim free, is Miss Watson's will. Not any of Huck's moral decisions or acts of generosity or daring, nothing but this legal act—an act which, in the context of the novel, has three distinctive characteristics. It is an act possible only in civilization, it is the act of a woman, and it is not a *narrative* event but an act locatable only in the curious performativity of a legal document.

What is the significance, in the novel, of the fact that the crucial act is Miss Watson's will? First, the novel has encouraged us to oppose nature to culture, to see Huck and Jim as fleeing a constricting and oppressive civilization, associated with slavery, tight clothes, washing, prayers, Sunday school, and rigid rules of behavior — fleeing it for nature, in which freedom is to be found. The fact that the idyll on the raft in the midst of nature coincides with Huck's moral struggles and his decisions to help Jim gain freedom encourages us to establish a link between civilization and constriction, on the one hand, and nature and freedom on the other, and in this economy of the novel, women are on the side of civilization and

constriction, always wet blankets limiting boy's activities, punishing them for harmless acts, and generally, as Huck says, out to civilize them. The unsatisfactory ending, however, in revealing that the freedom for Jim comes not from nature but from civilization, from the highly rule-bound civil procedures of the law, and that the act which produces freedom is the act of a woman, undoes this hierarchical opposition and these alignments. Specifically, it undermines the possibility of maintaining an opposition between civilization and freedom, with women on the side of civilization against freedom.

We readers feel that the ending is unsatisfying because it brings us down from the idyll in nature, and from the ethical drama's of Huck's struggles with his conscience, to the literary games played by Tom Sawyer in staging an unnecessary rescue that deploys all the motifs from the adventure stories he knows; but the reason this seems so truly unsatisfactory to us may be precisely that it exposes the idyll of floating down the river, the adventures of protecting Jim, and Huck's moral struggles, as events which *also* play no part in securing Jim's freedom. This freedom derives solely from the legal event of the will. We readers tend to distinguish the good narrative of nature and moral drama from the pointless narrative of Phelps' farm, but our dismayed rejection of the latter may be a defense against the suspicion that, *in relation to the problem of Jim's freedom*, the first narrative is equally irrelevant, a seductive literary construction with motifs more elegant and durable than those that seduce Tom Sawyer but motifs that are not fundamentally different in their status from his romantic fancies. Just as Tom Sawyer wishes to preserve his adolescent romance drama of freeing Jim, readers of *Huckleberry Finn* wish to preserve the more sophisticated pastoral literary drama of seeking Jim's freedom in river adventures and moral struggles.

The greatness of the book, I suggest, lies in the success with which it induces us to participate in this process while offering resources to critique the mythic constructions that seduce us or that we deploy. It elaborates this myth of nature and freedom with such power that we may tend to forget or to dismiss as imperfections the ways in which it suggests that these are secondary to the non-narrative operations that secure freedom in civil society. In such ways, literature works through a performative complexity, a resistant relation to what it is generally *thought* to say — as Twain is generally thought to have given us a celebration of freedom in nature, the beginnings of a truly American literature. How ironic that the freedom of the slave, which it uses to deepen its moral engagement, turns out to depend on that most civilized European device, the will!

My point, you may recall, is that among the good reasons for encouraging the study of literature is the tendency of the best literary works to show us things *other* than what they are canonically thought to say. I was emphasizing that the study of literature needs to be encouraged, for while the age of cultural studies does not militate against literary study, it certainly does not guarantee that literary study will take place, and teachers in English departments will have to make decisions, collectively and individually, to teach works of literature, if they wish to give literary study pride of place in their programs.

Such decisions should not be excessively difficult in France where the American notion of students as customers who should be given what they believe that they want does not yet hold sway. Consider, for instance, the fate of the study of poetry. The greatest danger to literary studies in the United States is the decline of the teaching of poetry, both in secondary schools and in universities. In schools this is linked to the belief that students want to study things that seem to them immediately connected to their own lives and that this means modern narratives, or at least texts without special literary devices such as meter or strange language. And in American universities, where students are generally able to choose their courses from a broad set of offerings, they tend to avoid poetry, as something unfamiliar and unfriendly, which leads literature departments, in their quest to gain more students, to make poetry less central to their programs. If the study of poetry is no longer at the heart of literary study, that has dire consequences, for close attention to language and to artifice are no longer so central, and thematic and ideological concerns encounter no resistance as they take over. And once themes are all that count, why not study movies and tv programs rather than literature, which requires reading?

Now in France, where you are not so subject to the tyranny of students' uninformed sense of what they might or might not enjoy, where you have a tradition of programs established by departments or by state institutions, and where students do not expect to be able to choose what they like, you are in a good position to foster the study of poetry. I have been somewhat dismayed to note, during the past academic year that I have spent in France, here and there signs of a decline in the place occupied by poetry in the teaching of English departments, but I hope this is just an accident and not a salient trend. Let me put it to you bluntly: you are in a good position to see to it that students work on poetry at all stages of their studies, and it would be a great shame to waste this opportunity.

For students working in a foreign language poems are crucial: Why do I say this? Well, educational and philosophical tradition, since Plato at least,

distinguishes good memory from so-called bad memory, *Erinnerung* from *Gedächtnis*, the memory of understanding and assimilation from the memory of merely mechanical or rote repetition. On the one hand there is what you have made your own and can reformulate; on the other what you repeat, parrot-like, as something foreign that has become lodged in your mind, a piece of otherness. Now novels belong on the side of *Erinnerung* — as writing you assimilate. If you remember a novel you recall, in your own words, as we say, what happens (it is mostly teachers who, perversely, can quote actual sentences from novels); but poems go with *Gedächtnis*: to remember them at all is to remember some of their words, isolated phrases, perhaps, which stick in your memory, you don't know why. The power to lodge bits of their language in your mind, to invade and occupy it, is a salient feature of poems, a major aspect of their being. Poems seek to inscribe themselves in mechanical memory, ask to be learned by heart, taken in, introjected or housed as bits of alterity which can be repeated, considered, treasured or ironically cited.

Now students of foreign languages *need* to have bits of language stick in their heads: to learn a foreign language involves the mechanical storage of formulations that incarnate foreignness, and it is better, I would argue, for this to be memorable formulations of poems than scraps of dialogue about how to get to Buckingham Palace or Piccadilly Circus. Willy-nilly, English popsongs will lodge in your students' minds; there ought to be some poems there as competition for song lyrics.

Second, in purely practical terms, poems are good to teach because they are short, can be xeroxed, held in front of you, referred to in discussion — the evidence is right there for all the class to see — they can easily be recalled and quoted in examinations.

Third, there is a succinct body of technical knowledge about poetic forms, metrics, which students can learn and which will prove to them that they have in fact acquired a particular body of knowledge rather than simply experiencing a random corpus of narratives — which is what literary education can all too easily become.

Fourth, and more significantly, poems exemplify in brief compass the mechanisms of language in all their intricacy, the broadest range of devices for the production of meaning. They are, in short, good to think with.

Finally, poems initiate students into a different relation to language, where it is not something supposedly transparent but manifestly opaque and haunting. Lyrics are not heard but overheard. Their puzzling mode of address to the reader encapsulates, for me, the literary relationship. They introduce

the possibility of possession by language, fascination with it, as something to explore, to live with and live in.

For instance, I would like students to experience the eerie fascination of the resonant but perplexing juxtapositions of poems like W.H. Auden's "The Fall of Rome." I quote the whole poem to reach the amazing final stanza.

The Fall of Rome

The piers are pummelled by the waves;
In a lonely field the rain
Lashes an abandoned train;
Outlaws fill the mountain caves.

Fantastic grow the evening gowns;
Agents of the Fisc pursue
Absconding tax-defaulters through
The sewers of provincial towns.

Private rites of magic send
The temple prostitutes to sleep;
All the literati keep
An imaginary friend.

Cerebrotonic Cato may
Extol the Ancient Disciplines,
But the muscle-bound Marines
Mutiny for food and pay.

Caesar's double bed is warm
As an unimportant clerk
Writes I DO NOT LIKE MY WORK
On a pink official form.

Unendowed with wealth or pity,
Little birds with scarlet legs,
Sitting on their speckled eggs,
Eye each flu-infested city.

Altogether elsewhere, vast
Herds of reindeer move across

Miles and miles of golden moss,
Silently and very fast.

"Altogether elsewhere" is marvelous, and I would like students of English to recall those reindeer, but I confess that this is not a pedagogically useful example — it's hard to explain the appeal of these lines. There is a hint of the mathematical sublime, with the unmasterable natural image — vast herds, miles and miles of golden moss — where you might expect a reference to barbarian hordes, so that the indifference of those reindeer moving silently and very fast gives them a kind of innocence as an inescapable reality, — the antithesis of decadence — the larger picture which makes civilization in its decline seem somewhat mesquin and not just sinister. In cases like this I recall Wallace Stevens' dictum: “A poem must resist the intelligence,/ Almost successfully.” That resistance helps produce the power and fascination of poetry.

More practically, I would like to emphasize the pedagogic efficiency of brief lyrics, which can pose minor puzzles that students can work out, as they explore the resources of English and the complexities of familiar themes. For instance, Gerard Manley Hopkins' "Spring and Fall," to a young child.

Margaret, are you grieving
Over goldengrove unleaving
Leaves, like the things of man, you
With your fresh thoughts, care for, can you?
Ah, as the heart grows older
It will come to such sights colder,
By and by, nor spare a sigh,
Though worlds of wanwood leafmeal lie;
And yet you *will* weep, and know why.
Now no matter child, the name,
Sorrow’s springs are the same.
Nor mouth had no, nor mind expressed,
What heart heard of, ghost guessed:
It is the blight that man was born for,
It is Margaret you mourn for.

"And yet You will weep": you persist in weeping in the present, or: you will weep in the future, or both. "And yet you will weep, and know why": you know why now, obscurely (heart heard of it and ghost or spirit guessed).

Or perhaps: you will know why, in the future, in the wisdom of maturity. Possibly both: you sense obscurely now what you will later explicitly know. Or possibly: you *persist* in weeping and want to know why right away — which prompts the poem to tell you why, to posit a single source for sorrow so that weeping for falling leaves is weeping for oneself.

But the hour grows late. Let me leave you with an example of a very short lyric which does not contain linguistic difficulties to daunt students but which boldly wagers that poetry will work, will perform, that it can speak to us, that it can force us to grant it power to speak from beyond the grave, compelling a relationship. This is a fascinating poem to discuss, by John Keats: "This Living Hand."

> This living hand, now warm and capable
> Of earnest grasping, would, if it were cold,
> And in the icy silence of the tomb,
> So haunt thy days and chill thy dreaming nights
> That thou wouldst wish thy own heart dry of blood,
> So in my veins red life might stream again,
> And thou be conscience calmed — See, here it is —
> I hold it towards you.

Boldly asserting what is false, that there is here a living hand, the poem makes the astounding claims that if this hand were in the grave, we would wish ourselves dead in order to give it life again. When the poem then claims to hold out its hand to us, what do we do? Can we resist the power of the impossible gesture of this language? — "See here it is, I hold it towards you"?

With no more ado, I release you and urge you thereafter to return to your universities and to teach poetry, for the good of your students and for the good of English in the age of cultural studies.

Jonathan Culler
Cornell University

Assemblée générale d'octobre 1996

Ordre du jour :

- Approbation du procès-verbal de l'assemblée générale de Nancy
- Rapport du trésorier
- Rapport du secrétaire général : "SAES et communication électronique"
- Intervention des présidents des jurys de concours
- Le statut des PRAG
- Les procédures de recrutement
- Le point sur ESSE
- Questions diverses
- Annonces de colloques

Réunions d'octobre 1996

Vendredi 4 octobre 1996

Bureau de la SAES: 10h30- 13h - Salle 12.

Etudes anglaises: 17 h - 18 h 30 - Salle 5.

Association des mediévistes anglicistes de l'enseignement supérieur: 14h30-16 h - Salle 5.

Societé d'études anglo-américaines des XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles: Réunion du bureau de 15 h 30 à 17 h - Salle 12.

Société d`études anglaises contemporaines: 14 h - 16 h - Salle 16.

Société française d'études victoriennes et édouardiennes: 16h-17h30 Salle 16.

Société d'études conradiennes: 17h30 - 18h30 - Salle 16.

Société Française d'études irlandaises: 16 h - 18 h - Salle 33.

Centre de recherche et d'études de civilisation britannique: Réunion du bureau: 14 h - 16 h - Petit amphi. Assemblée générale: 16 h - 18 h - Petit amphi .

Association des linguistes anglicistes de l'enseignement supérieur: 15h30-17h30- Grand Amphi.

Association des anglicistes pour les études de langue orale dans l'enseignement secondaire et supérieur: 17h30-19 h- Grand Amphi.

Samedi 5 octobre 1996

Groupe d'études et de recherches de l'anglais de spécialité: 10h30-12h Salle 5.

Société de stylistique: 9 h 30-11h - Salle 15.

Préparateurs à l'agrégation externe et membres du jury:

Littérature: 9h- 10h, Salle 16

Civilisation: 10h- 11h, Salle 16

Linguistique: 9h- 10h, Salle 33.

Compte rendu du XVIII^{e} congrès de l'APLIUT

"Stratégies d'apprentissage" était le thème du XVIII^{e} congrès de l'APLIUT (Association des professeurs de langue vivante en IUT) qui s'est déroulé à l'IUT de Tarbes les 6, 7 et 8 juin 1996 ; il a réuni 120 participants venant de tous les coins de France et de Grande-Bretagne.

Les communications ont porté sur les définitions et typologies des stratégies d'apprentissage d'une langue étrangère ; les intervenants ont indiqué les méthodologies de recherche actuellement mises en œuvre (Janet Atlan, Françoise Raby et Christine Vaillant). Bob Burden et Marion Williams ont dressé un tableau quasi exhaustif de l'étude de la motivation, et en ont développé l'approche cognitive. À partir de réflexions théoriques, des exemples pratiques ont été fournis pour aider l'apprenant à élaborer ses propres stratégies d'apprentissage (Dick Allright, Bernadette Grancolas, Joan Allwright). Quelles sont les fonctions cognitives et métacognitives qui contribuent à l'élaboration de leurs stratégies d'apprentissage ? Qu'est-ce qui caractérise un "bon apprenant" en langues ? Comment prendre en compte la diversité des profils pédagogiques et des types cognitifs dans l'acte d'enseignement ? Telles sont quelques unes des nombreuses questions qui ont été abordées au cours de ces trois jours.

Ce congrès s'est déroulé dans d'excellentes conditions grâce à l'aide des institutions locales et régionales (IUT de Tarbes, Conseil Général des Hautes-Pyrénées et Conseil Régional) et du soutien du British Council. Le prochain congrès de l'APLIUT aura lieu à l'IUT de Nancy II du 5 au 7 juin 1997, avec la participation de CETaLL (Commission on Educational Technology and Language Learning) de l'AILA ; le thème sera "Enseignement des langues et nouvelles technologies".

Colloques

Les collégues à contacter dont le nom n'est suivi d'aucune adresse sont répertoriés dans l'annuaire de la S.A.E.S.

— *Du 7 au 11 septembre 1996:* Séminaire de linguistique diachronique organisé par l'ALAES à l'Université de Poitiers. Contacter Marc Fryd, Séminaire ALAES Poitiers 1996, Faculté des Lettres et des Langues, 86022 Poitiers Cedex; e-mail Marc.Fryd@univ-poitiers.fr - Tél. 49 43 79 66.

— *Les 20 et 21 septembre 1996:* European Conference on British Studies: Comparative and Intercultural Approaches. Université Paris XIII. Contacter François Poirier. Tél. 1 49 40 37 68 - Fax 1 49 40 39 22; e-mail Fpoirier@duniv-paris 13.fr

— *Les 23, 24 et 25 septembre 1996:* Colloque à Amiens de la SERCIA sur "Dispositifs narratifs policiers dans le cinéma anglophone". Contacter Dominique Sipière, Université de Picardie ou Reynold Humphries, Université de Lille III.

— *Les 15 et 16 novembre 1996:* Colloque de la SEAC à Paris IV sur "Lecteurs/Lectures". Contacter François Gallix.

— *Les 29 et 30 novembre 1996:* Journées Shakespeare sur Hamlet à l'Université d'Aix-Marseille I (Aix-en-Provence). Contacter Gilles Mathis.

— *Les 13 et 14 décembre 1996:* Colloque de l'Equipe Langues de l'Université d'Angers sur "L'idée coloniale." Contacter Jeanne Devoize ou Jacques Sohier.

— *Les 13 et 14 décembre 1996:* Colloque du CERAN à Lyon II sur "La poésie moderne: écriture de la limite, écriture à la limite." Contacter Jean-Marie Fournier ou Adolphe Haberer, 86 rue Pasteur, 69365 Lyon Cedex 07; e-mail : Adolphe.Haberer@univ-lyon2.fr

— *Les 14 et 15 décembre 1996:* L'université de la Réunion organise un colloque sur la place de la femme dans la nouvelle société multiculturelle d'Afrique du Sud.

— *Les 10 et 11 janvier 1997:* 20e Colloque de la SFEVE à Lille III sur "L'Enfance". Contacter Françoise Dupeyron-Lafay (communications) et Michel Krzak (organisation pratique).

— *Les 31 janvier et 1er février 1997:* Premier colloque de la Société d'Etudes Woolfiennes, fondée par Christine Reynier avec la collaboration de Catherine Bernard, Catherine Lanone et Carole Rodier. "Métamorphose et récit dans l'œuvre de Virginia Woolf." Propositions de communication à envoyer à Christine Reynier.

— *Les 31 janvier et 1er février 1997:* Colloque du Centre de recherche et d'études sur la nouvelle en langue anglaise de l'Université d'Angers sur "Other Places, Other Selves ?". Propositions de communication avant le ler septembre 1996. Contacter Emmanuel Vernadakis.

— *Les 7 et 8 février 1997:* Colloque du Centre des cultures anglo-saxonnes de l'Université de Toulouse-Le-Mirail sur "The Millenium and Utopia in Anglo-Saxon Countries." Contacter Jean-Louis Breteau. Tél. 61 50 43 09 ou Christiane Fioupou. Tél. 61 50 49 28 ou 61 50 35 50.

— *Les 7 et 8 février 1997:* Colloque du Centre de recherche sur l'imaginaire dans les littératures de langue anglaise, sur "La Métamorphose". Université de Reims. Contacter Mme Dorangeon.

— *Les 7 et 8 mars 1997:* Colloque international de l'équipe "Lieux de mémoire" du CREPLA à l'Université de Savoie (Chambéry) sur "Lieux et objets de mémoire." Propositions avant le 15 septembre 1996. Contacter: Jean Kempf, Dépt. d'anglais, Université de Savoie, BP 1104, F-73011 Chambéry. Tél. 79 96 93 38 - Fax 79 75 85 99. e-mail Jean.Kempf@univsavoie.fr

— *Les 21 et 22 mars 1997:* Colloque annuel de la SOFEIR (Société Française d'Etudes Irlandaises) à l'Université de Tours sur "Irlande, vision(s)/révision(s)". Responsable: Martine Pelletier, UFR Anglais-LEA, Université François Rabelais, rue des Tanneurs, 37041 Tours Cedex.

— *Les 21, 22 et 23 mars 1997:* Colloque annuel du GRENA (Groupe de Recherche et d'Etudes Nord-Américaines: Serge Ricard) à l'Université de Provence sur "Voyageurs et voyages" ou "Travels and Travellers." Responsable: Gérard Hugues, IRMA, Université de Provence, 29 avenue

Robert-Schuman, 13621 Aix-en-Provence Cedex 1 (proposition avant le ler octobre 1996).

— *Du ler au 4 septembre 1997:* Université de Freiburg en Allemagne. Second IALS (International Association of Literary Semantics), Conférence 1997. Contacter Monika Fludernik, Professor of English Literature, Englisches Seminar, D-79085 Freiburg i.B.R., Allemagne. Tél. 49 761 203 3310 Fax 49 761 203 3359 ou 3340.

— Les 30 et 31 janvier 1997, Faculté des Lettres de l'Institut Catholique de Paris, "Rencontres poétiques du monde anglophone". Après une présentation académique, les poètes invités liront une sélection de leur œuvre: Denis Levertov, Debjani Chatterjee, Kenneth White, Derry O'Sullivan. Des ateliers de traduction de poèmes seront organisés le 31 janvier 1997. Contacter Isabelle Schwartz-Gastine, Faculté des Lettres de l'Institut Catholique de Paris, 21 rue d'Assas, 75006 Paris.

— Les 14 et 15 mars 1997, à l'Université Blaise-Pascal, Clermont-Ferrand, "Valeurs de contrôle". Contacter Alain Suberchicot, Programme champ culturel anglophone, 34 av. Carnot, 63037 Clermont-Ferrand Cedex.

— Les 5, 6 et 7 juin 1997, Université de Versailles Saint-Quentin, Colloque sur "Romantisme et modernité", en partenariat avec le centre de recherches poétiques de l'E.N.S. de Fontenay-Saint-Cloud. Renseignements auprès d'Isabelle Bour, Eric Dayre ou Patrick Née, Département des Humanités, 47, Bd Vauban, 78047 Guyancourt Cédex.

Appel à contribution

Alizés, la revue angliciste de La Réunion réunira des articles autour du programme du CAPES. Les propositions de contribution devront parvenir avant le 15 décembre 1996 à l'adresse suivante:

Alizés, Département d'Études Anglophones, Faculté des Lettres et des Sciences Humaines, Université de La Réunion, 15, av. René-Cassin,
B.P. 7151, 97715 SAINT-DENIS Messag Cedex 9.

Les articles ne dépasseront pas 30 000 signes, seront rédigés en français ou en anglais, devront suivre les normes de présentation du MLA Handbook, et être accompagnées d'une version sur disquette (IBM ou Apple).

Livres et documents reçus

— *Palimpsestes*, n°10, Presses de la Sorbonne Nouvelle, 1996, sous la direction de Paul Bensimon et Didier Coupaye, Niveaux de langues et registres de la traduction (2 vol.)

— Jean-Jacques Lecercle, *La violence du langage*, traduction de l'anglais par Michèle Garlati, Paris, PUF, 1996, viii + 285 pp.

— *Les Cahiers du Sahib*, éd. Michel Renouard, n°4, Rennes, P.U. de Rennes, 1996, 288 pp.

— *Le modèle économique anglo-saxon à l'épreuve de la globalisation*, éd. Martine Azuelos, Paris, Presses de la Sorbonne Nouvelle, 1995.

— *L'Espace urbain européen ou "Que faire du centre ville ?"*, éd. Yvette Marin, *Les Cahiers du CREHU* n°6, Besançon, Annales littéraires de l'U. de Franche-Comté, 1996, 298 pp.

— *Les Cahiers de l'APLIUT*, vol. XV, n°4, juin 1996.

— *TransLittérature*, éd. ATLF et ATLAS, n°11, été 1996.

— Catherine Maignant, *Histoire et civilisation de l'Irlande*, Paris, Nathan, 1996, 128 pp.

— Agnès Maillot, *IRA. Les républicains irlandais*, Caen, P.U. de Caen, 1996, 277 pp.

— Michael McLaverty, *Nouvelles*, trad. sous la direction de Jacqueline Genet et Élizabeth Hellegouarc'h, préface de Seamus Heaney, Caen, P.U. de Caen, 1996, 334 pp.

ADRESSES DES MEMBRES DU BUREAU

Alain CAZADE Trésorier	2ter rue Jean-Fallay 93250 VILLEMOMBLE Fax: 42 09 18 56. Tél.: 49 94 38 43
Ludmilla DELORME Vice-Présidente	2, place du 11 Novembre 1918 33700 MÉRIGNAC-LES-EYQUEM Fax : 56 31 86 17. Tél.: 56 97 84 72
Jeanne DEVOIZE Vice-présidente	15, rue de Brissac 49000 ANGERS Fax: 41 24 92 67. Tél.: 41 87 60 25
Jean-Louis DUCHET Secrétaire Général	4, rue Saint-Hilaire 86000 POITIERS Fax: 49 45 32 90. Tél.: 49 55 99 96
Adolphe HABERER **Président**	1, route de Saint-Antoine 69380 CHAZAY D'AZERGUES Fax: 78 69 72 26. Tél.: 78 43 65 24
Marie-Jeanne LAGADEC Secrétaire adjointe	130, boulevard Masséna 75013 PARIS Fax : 45 87 41 75. Tél.: 45 83 06 24
André MURAIRE Vice-président	L'Ombrienne, rue des Oliviers 06110 LE CANNET Fax: 93 37 55 36. Tél.: 93 31 44 47
Michel PETIT Secrétaire adjointe	Villa Coccinelle, 32 route Bleue 13620 CARRY-LE-ROUET Fax: 42 64 19 08. Tél.: 42 45 45 71
Albert POYET Vice-président	48, allée des Martyrs de la Libération 31400 TOULOUSE Fax: 61 50 48 35. Tél.: 61 52 68 62
Michel PRUM Trésorier-adjoint	24, rue de la Providence, 95800 CERGY Fax: 30 75 05 65. Tél.: 30 30 95 30

Le directeur de la Publication : Adolphe Haberer. *ISSN : 0982.3654*
Imprimé par Reboul Imprimerie s.a., 2-4 r Etienne-Mimard, 42000 Saint-Etienne
Dépôt légal: 3^{e} trimestre 1996 : 1300 exemplaires. 32 pages.