

# Open Research Online

---

The Open University's repository of research publications and other research outputs

## Introduction: on English studies and philology, and on collaboration and contributions

### Book Section

How to cite:

Gupta, Suman and Katsarska, Milena (2010). Introduction: on English studies and philology, and on collaboration and contributions. In: Gupta, Suman and Katsarska, Milena eds. English Studies on This Side: Post-2007 Reckonings. Plovdiv, Bulgaria: University of Plovdiv Press, pp. 17–44.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© 2010 University of Plovdiv Press

Version: Accepted Manuscript

---

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's data [policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

---

[oro.open.ac.uk](http://oro.open.ac.uk)

# **Introduction: On English Studies and Philology, and on Collaboration and Contributions**

Suman Gupta and Milena Katsarska

## **A Conflict of Faculties?**

Suman Gupta

This volume arises from a collaborative project on English Studies in Bulgaria and Romania which began in 2007, the year when both countries formally joined the European Union. It seemed an opportune moment for stock taking of the condition of the discipline in these countries for several reasons. Some concerned the disciplinary formation of English Studies in general, and some had to do with the specific social and cultural milieus of Bulgaria and Romania. In a general way, the global spread and dominance that the English language, and consequently English language cultural products, currently enjoys has naturally been accompanied by a growing interest in English Studies. English departments and subject centres have burgeoned and flourished of late in higher education around the world. However, the discipline itself – if it can indeed be regarded as anything so unitary – is currently both deeply divided and uneven. To begin with, English Studies is conceived along several disparate models in different contexts which seem to exist in discrete zones and do not really speak to each other. Moreover, the discipline continues to be troubled by the geopolitical dominance of Anglophone centres (primarily Britain and the United States), despite the global reach of the English language. Interrogating the presumptions that appear in and from these geopolitical centres *within* the broadly Anglophone sphere (from a variety of postcolonial and marginal positions) has occupied much of the last three decades and has made some headway in terms of general institutional visibility, but remains an incomplete project. The pursuit of English Studies in ordinarily non-Anglophone contexts has barely been scratched as an area of interest in general institutional terms, despite venerable academic traditions and considerable scholarly production. Thus the particularities of English Studies in German or Russian or Chinese or Egyptian academies may be registered to some extent in those countries respectively, but very rarely appear in ostensibly panoptic or generalised accounts of the discipline. And English Studies in such contexts continues to be almost entirely neglected in academies of the Anglophone centres. However, some of the most interesting developments in the discipline are arguably taking place there, amidst the crossings and interfaces of languages, histories and cultural forms. This is evident in the English Studies scholarship that is prolifically produced in ordinarily non-Anglophone contexts; it is also apparent in English Studies curricula and teaching practices in higher education there, which necessarily accommodate the discipline amidst local realities and exigencies. In a general way then, the project in question approached English Studies in Bulgaria and Romania as case studies which could inform a larger project on English Studies in non-Anglophone contexts – one that is germane to the discipline at large, wherever it may be pursued. Bulgaria and Romania both have considerable traditions of English Studies, dynamic academic communities and departments of English Studies in higher education institutions, with institutions which are open enough and scholars who are committed enough to enable such a collaborative project to be fruitfully undertaken.

That briefly outlined general sense of the discipline which underpinned the collaborative project would hardly have made sense if it wasn't articulated in terms of the specifics of the Bulgarian and Romanian contexts. The general and the particular are in this instance mutually defined. English Studies in both contexts throws the general features of the

discipline into relief, so to speak, because of specific common denominators and because of marked differences. The combination of common denominators and differences in Bulgaria and Romania enable us to characterise their distinctive relation to and difference from dominant and general accounts of the discipline – their distinctive presence in English Studies. The common denominators are well known. Both countries were of the former Eastern Bloc, in both single-party communist governments collapsed in late 1989, and both went through a period of sweeping social and political transitions thereafter. To a great extent the latter were in the direction of seeking integration with the transnational formation of the European Union, which was achieved for both in 2007. The experiences of communism, post-communism, transition toward liberal capitalism and EU accession are broadly common denominators which impinged upon all areas of study – on academic institutional arrangements as on disciplinary pursuits. These experiences are also marked by the differences between the two contexts, and indeed by variegations within each of the two contexts, in ways which are expressed succinctly in the following chapters and which I therefore do not need to try and summarise here. As in any area of study, so in English Studies the particularities of the experiences of Bulgaria and Romania before and after 1989 and before and after 2007 were registered in a variety of ways. On the ground, in working out its methods and objects of analysis, the collaborative project in question was designed to take account of these. The idea was ultimately to engage the specificities and commonalities of English Studies in Bulgaria and Romania with a view to discerning what sort of vantage point is thereby obtained for reconsidering dominant and general accounts of the discipline.

That is a very cursory and somewhat abstract account of the thinking behind the collaborative project this volume arises from. More flesh and life are added to this account in the chapters that follow. In practice, the project involved collaborations between colleagues from universities in Bulgaria (St Kliment Ohridski University in Sofia, St Cyril and St Methodius University in Veliko Turnovo, Paisii Hilendarski University in Plovdiv) and Romania (University of Bucharest, Ovidius University in Constanta, Babes-Bolyai University in Cluj, Lucian Blaga University in Sibiu) and the UK (The Open University, Roehampton University in London). Some material was collected in Bulgaria particularly (determined by the practicalities of funding) to inform wide-ranging discussions along the lines sketched above: student surveys were conducted, interviews were undertaken, curricular content was charted, teaching practices were observed, and bibliographies were put together. Some of the results of these investigations are available on the project website at <http://www.open.ac.uk/arts/he-englishes>. These investigations and the material accordingly collected were used as a spring board for discussions on English Studies in Bulgaria and Romania, and in an Anglophone centre like Britain, and with a general global perspective. The discussions took the form of a series of workshops in the course of 2008 and 2009: in Veliko Turnovo and Plovdiv, in Cluj and Sibiu, in London. A core group of collaborators attended all the workshops, and other colleagues were invited to attend each according to proximity to the location of the workshop. Thus the workshops in Romania naturally had a strong input from colleagues in Romania, but maintained coherence with the project's overall objectives through contributions by some colleagues from Bulgaria and the UK. Similarly, workshops in Bulgaria had a strong Bulgarian contribution, but also significant input from Romanian and British collaborators. This volume is particularly a result of one of the latter, of discussions that took place in and around the workshop in the premises of the Bulgarian Union of Scholars, and with the support of the Paisii Hilendarski University, in Plovdiv in October 2008.

Having gone briefly through the broad conceptual underpinnings of the collaborative project and this volume, I would now like to turn to a more individual perspective on one aspect of these. This perspective has a bearing on discussions in many of the chapters here

and yet is not squarely addressed in them, and it explains to some degree the interest of British collaborators and authors here (including mine). This has to do with the different models of English Studies in different contexts mentioned above.

In my view, it is most appropriate that this volume is published by the Plovdiv University Press because the collaborative project has its roots in Plovdiv. My first visit to Bulgaria in 2005 was to the Paisii Hilendarski University of Plovdiv, when I first met colleagues in English Studies from there and other Bulgarian universities, in the context of a quite different project (on Globalization, Identity Politics, and Social Conflict, see [www.open.ac.uk/arts/gipsc](http://www.open.ac.uk/arts/gipsc)). I became vaguely aware then that these colleagues were affiliated to Philology Faculties dealing mainly with Modern Languages, among which English Studies figured. More precisely, I was aware of and had even passed through other philology faculties and institutes in continental Europe before that without giving the matter much thought, but in Plovdiv it was borne on me that my understanding of English Studies as a philological discipline was distinctly shaky. My education and professional affiliations in Britain, India and elsewhere prior to that had been in English Literature departments or sub-departments in Faculties of Arts or Humanities. I also gradually became aware of, or rather put my mind to, the fact that the manner in which pedagogic arrangements are made for English Studies in Philology Faculties is somewhat different from those I have been accustomed to. These are necessarily programmes which combine courses in language/linguistics and literature/culture studies, and serve to develop practical and applied language skills among students (inevitably, given that it is an ordinarily non-Anglophone context that most students come from) as well as to cultivate an understanding of Anglophone linguistics, literatures and cultures. In other words, all students majoring in English or taking English in a combined programme have a more holistic exposure to all those strands of English Studies, which could be expected – consistently with the philological tradition – to inform and enhance each other. As Ann Hewings’s chapter below observes, English Studies in Britain is a divided house, and in general these strands are held apart more emphatically in pedagogic practice, usually in an institutionally demarcated way. Various combinations and overlaps are available in programme pathways on offer in Britain, but on the presumption of separateness. In fact the juxtapositions of and expectations of mutual interpenetration between these strands that pertain to English Studies under Philology Faculties is a markedly unfamiliar notion in Britain and even in the United States (I explain the “even” below) now. One may go through shelves of critical theory textbooks and disciplinary overviews for English literature or linguistics or cultural studies produced since the 1970s for the academy in Anglophone centres and rarely encounter the term “philology” (I have looked). I also gathered that the institutional disposition of English Studies in Philology Faculties is generally consistent with that of other subject areas under their aegis. In fact philological structures and expectations sit more comfortably there, through well-established practice and ensconced conceptual precepts, in the study of Slavic languages, Romance languages, and obviously German and Classical languages, than perhaps in English Studies now.

The perception that there is a sort of slip between the institutional arrangements and expectations of Philology Faculties and the specific place of English Studies therein also grew on me gradually between 2005 and 2007, when the collaborative project was initiated. It was evident to me that, in terms of their sense of disciplinary affiliation and belonging, Bulgarian or Romanian English Studies colleagues spoke the same language as colleagues in Britain or the United States. Very few of the former appeared to think of themselves as English philologists in a broad sense, and preferred to identify their scholarly and pedagogic commitments distinctly in terms of English Literature and Cultural Studies, English Language and Linguistics, American Studies, at times Irish Studies, and (more unfamiliarly from a British point of view) British Studies. The last is rare in Britain as a clearly

demarcated subject area, but easily anticipated as a natural correlative to approaching English Studies as consisting in a foreign language and literature (with traditional counterparts in the form of courses on British civilization or English-speaking civilizations). Besides, I was aware of the drive by the British Council to institute British Studies in Central and Eastern Europe in the 1990s, and had regarded it (and still do) as an ideologically invidious move on the Council's part on grounds which are outside the remit of this paper. That English Studies colleagues in Philology Faculties seem to habitually present themselves in this fashion is, it seems to me, not merely a matter of being specific about their teaching and research interests. It is because within the Philology Faculty, the English Studies area is really disposed in a rather un-philological fashion – as distinct sub-departments of language and linguistics, literature, culture studies, American studies etc. which do not greatly inform each other in pedagogic or scholarly matters. Indeed, I was given to understand that at some Bulgarian and Romanian institutions English Language and Linguistics and English Literature are seeking distinct and separate institutional status. The sub-departmental divisions within English Studies under Philology Faculties match largely institutional arrangements for English Studies under Faculties of Arts or Humanities. In practical terms, English Linguistics speaks as little or as much to English Literature in Bulgaria as in Britain as far as teachers and researchers go, even though the student experience and institutional arrangements of English Studies in Bulgaria have a more cohesive appearance than in Britain.

In other words, it seemed to me that in Bulgaria and in Romania English Studies is actively and perhaps somewhat uneasily straddling a kind of conflict of Faculties: trying to reconcile a philological model of the discipline with a humanities/arts model of the discipline – in other words, trying to reconcile a cohesive language-literature-culture model with one which tends to hold linguistics/language, literature and culture studies apart (or starts by presuming a separation). The situation is further complicated by the status of English Studies as a foreign language and literature area, and therefore of an overlapping “area studies” sort of model at play alongside (for the purposes of this project, particularly associated with post-Second World War American Studies). From my individual perspective, this negotiation of multiple and apparently contradictory models was of particular interest in engaging the collaborative project. Admittedly, it is an interest that had derived to some extent from my own restricted Anglocentric view of English Studies.

The travels of philology in relation to English Studies in Anglophone centres, and its current troubled status and indeed near invisibility therein, is an interesting issue and could explain a great deal about the ambiguous place of English Studies in Philology Faculties in Bulgaria and Romania and elsewhere. This introduction is not the place to explore that issue in an extended way, but a few gestures towards the background and debates at stake could be useful for approaching the following chapters. In line with my focus on English Studies here I confine my half-baked gestures to sources available in the English language, though any kind of adequate engagement with the matter would call for competence in a large number of other European languages.

The transformation of the classical Roman *philologus* – “which lies halfway between scholar and critic and denotes a man with sufficient learning in language and literature to evaluate and give permanent form to the poetic text” (Fantham 1989:222) – into the methodical philologist, with a particular scientific and interpretive interest in both classical and modern nationally-defined texts, in 19<sup>th</sup> century Germany is extensively charted ground. The ideas of Johann Gottfried Herder, Wilhelm von Humboldt, and Friedrich Schlegel are central to this area, as are those, with a hermeneutic turn, of Friedrich Schleiermacher. Mueller-Vollmer usefully describes the transformation they wrought in bringing modern philology and correlatively a new hermeneutics into existence as involving two components:

The first concerns the transformation of classical philology into a cultural science, whose task was defined as the critical authentication of the extant bodies of texts from Greek and Roman civilization through a process of reconstitution, classification and interpretation, with the aim of reconstructing in their entirety the cultures that had produced them. This transformation led to the encyclopaedic systems of the philologists and historians of the nineteenth century and has shaped the history of the human sciences until today. The second component is 'general hermeneutics', or hermeneutic theory proper as an independent field of inquiry. It is centred around the notion of understanding. (Mueller-Vollmer 2000: 177)

Formulations by French Enlightenment *philosophes* and German idealist philosophers coalesced with a desire to reconstruct national consciousness, and inspired von Humboldt's conception of a philological educational programme – "a unified project in language, literature and culture [which] achieved its most powerful form" in 19<sup>th</sup> century Europe and which should be reconsidered seriously in the 21<sup>st</sup>, according to Hardcastle (1999: 32). Hardcastle's is, incidentally, a lucid account of this complex process and of von Humboldt's contribution to it. From the literary critic's perspective, Schleiermacher's work on the hermeneutic dimension of philology, which seeks to excavate the linguistic underpinnings of texts as parts of linguistic systems and as individual context-specific constructs is equally noteworthy (for useful summaries see Mueller-Vollmer 179-82; and Hamilton 1996: 56-67). The philological project ruled supreme in human studies in Europe through the 19<sup>th</sup> century and much of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, and indeed still has a powerful existence. The first serious challenge to the philological endeavour to grasp culture by paying close attention to the forms and meanings of language in literature, came after Ferdinand de Saussure's *Course in General Linguistics* appeared posthumously in 1916. The possibilities of synchronic linguistic analysis were introduced in the *Course* not so much by dismissing philology as by putting it aside: "philological criticism is still deficient on one point: it follows the written language too slavishly and neglects the living language" (Saussure 1959: 1-2). In the latter half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, as literary theory sought to integrate developments from Saussurean linguistics with a more philosophical approach to textual interpretation, and gradually took the institutional form of Theory (with the capital T marking some sort of institutional autonomy as a subject-area), the hold of the philological model was seriously interrogated.

For English Studies in Anglophone centres the situation apropos the philology model was more complex even in the early stages of the discipline. As the various accounts of the history of English Studies in different continental European countries in Engler and Haas's edited volume *The European History of English Studies* (2000) show, the development of a philological structure for *Anglistik* from Germany had a particularly strong and lasting influence. In Britain it was relatively modestly felt. Though philological ideas "entered English educational thinking through the works of Coleridge, Carlisle, Arnold, Huxley, Mill amongst many other writers and thinkers" (Hardcastle 1999: 42), their impact on the development of the academic discipline of English was modest. Nineteenth century scholarship in Britain on English language, history and literature do show a powerful subscription to the philological method, but *institutionally* there were stronger Evangelical and Utilitarian and particularly imperial ideologies at work which gave the academic discipline a different character – especially in making English Literature (which became predominantly the discipline of *English* in Britain and the colonies) the conduit of "social missions". Institutional developments along these lines have been extensively examined for England (e.g. Palmer 1965, Baldick 1983, Doyle 1989, Dixon 1991), Scotland (e.g. Crawford 1992), colonies like India and South Africa (e.g. Vishwanathan 1989, Johnson 1996). Perhaps a narrower focus on class divisions and broader view of imperial domains intersected on English Studies in Britain to contain its nationalist spirit – to some degree at odds with the

practice of philology, and despite philology's universalising philosophical underpinnings. In the early half of the 20th century the distinctive British model of English as an academic discipline was institutionally firmed up. By the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century an anti-philological drive from the United States simply confirmed that aspect of the discipline in Britain, and elsewhere where the British model was accommodated, despite sea changes at the instance of influences from the United States in other aspects of English Studies (especially in incorporating Theory and then identity politics).

If in Britain the institutional inculcation of philology in English Studies has had a low-key presence, in the United States the case was the opposite. Historians of the discipline there (e.g. Graff 1987, Scholes 1998) chart a trajectory that embraced the philological model at an *institutional* level while making concessions to both home-grown and British departures. Scholars revered as institutional icons in the United States were thought of as philologists, such as Albert Cook, Edwin Greenshaw, Leo Spitzer, Erich Auerbach. As it happened, the drama of rejecting the philological model and actively forgetting (almost an oxymoron) it with the broad realm of English Studies in view – and also with Comparative Literature within focus -- was overtly played out in the United States. A key moment in the drama was highlighted by René Wellek's 1963 article "American Literary Scholarship." This noted that, "In 1900 a type of philological scholarship imported from Germany had triumphed in American graduate schools and in the production of American literary scholars" (Wellek 1963: 296); gave reasons for that triumph; went on to observe that:

By the mid-century, philological scholarship, though still entrenched in most graduate schools, was definitely on the defensive; its exclusive rule of the American universities was broken; and everywhere, especially among the younger men of the staff and the students, dissatisfaction with the system became so widespread that it seemed merely a matter of time when it could be seen as a historical phenomenon of American cultural history (298);

and then delivered a burst of invective against such scholarship on Wellek's own account:

The useless antiquarianism, the dreary factualism, the pseudo-science combined with anarchical scepticism and a lack of critical taste characteristic of this scholarship must be apparent to all today. The system has become almost too easy a target for ridicule. (299)

He concluded by marking other distinctive approaches to literary studies that have emerged in the United States (New Humanist, Marxist, New Critical), and charting some of the reasons for American disaffection with philology (its affiliation with nationalism and ethnic particularities, America's distance from Europe, and the remoteness from antiquity there). Wellek captured a political mood which was in fact felt widely in Europe too, and certainly taken to heart in the United States. A scathing radical critique of the place of Oratory and Rhetoric in English Studies, aligned with the philological model, in a politically conservative American academy by Richard Ohmann (1976) followed a decade later. The rise of theory mentioned above, and its institutional entrenchment as Theory, soon moved from linguistic and philosophical abstraction towards embracing a range of New Left political agendas (which Edward Said [1983] thought of as the "worldly" concerns of theory), especially along the lines of difference and postcoloniality and marginal identities (in terms of gender, race, sexuality, immigration). These ideological turns seemed antithetical to the nationalist and yet universalist, backward-looking associations of philology. By 1988, addressing a conference on "What is Philology?" at Harvard University, Wendell Clausen prefaced his call for a reconsideration of philological ideals with the words: "Anyone who speaks of philology today must be aware that it has become, for many, a pejorative term, even a term of abuse" (Clausen 1990: 13).

And yet, those associations made with philology and so desecrated did not register the grand ambition of a unified project of language, literature and culture and nor did they do justice to the humanistic idealism that its proponents often and explicitly espoused. In a curious way, the drive of Theory and politics in English Studies in Anglophone centres – indeed in linguistic, literary and cultural studies more broadly – actually itself led to interdisciplinary interfaces between languages, literatures and cultures, with political and philosophical idealism implicit, which became institutionally respectable in the course of the 1980s and 1990s. That these moves resonated in various ways with the project of philology should have been self-evident -- and probably were, but weren't announced in so many words. Possibly a kind of shrill political correctness which makes mantras of normatively loaded words made it prudent not to call this a reiteration or reinvention of the philological project with expanded boundaries. Only very few distinctly muted attempts in that direction were made in the United States, usually by resorting to a sort of dumbing down of philology, by seeing it as less than what it was, or conceiving it more modestly than seems plausible. Most influential in this direction was Paul de Man's 1982 essay "The Return to Philology," which looked back nostalgically to philological approaches taken in university courses in the 1950s at Harvard to observe:

Mere reading, it turns out, prior to any theory, is able to transform critical discourses in a manner that would appear deeply subversive to those who think of the teaching of literature as a substitute for the teaching of ethics, psychology, or intellectual history. Close reading accomplishes this often in spite of itself because it cannot fail to respond to structures of language which it is the more or less secret aim of teaching to keep hidden.

Attention to the philological or rhetorical devices of language is not the same as aesthetic appreciation, although the latter can be a way of access to the former. (Man 1986: 24)

Perhaps it was de Man's continental European background which was making a return here, but as iconised a Theorist in the United States, as institutionally and academically valorised, could scarcely be disregarded. It is noteworthy though that de Man's sense of philology here seems a distinctly modest one: a matter of close reading for the purposes of teaching. It was so modest that it could be noted without considering its implications too deeply. But still it was de Man speaking, which was a big deal in the United States at the time. The Harvard conference on philology in 1988 referred above, where Clausen spoke, was organised by Jan Ziolkowski, who went on to edit the proceedings. In an engagingly forthright introduction there (Ziolkowski 1990), he recalled the difficulty he had in getting prominent scholars to participate in a conference on philology, and how useful it was to draw their attention to de Man's essay to secure their agreement. Perhaps it was out of regard for de Man that on the whole the proceedings had an upbeat tone about philology. But it made little difference, and philology stayed out of the vocabulary of Theory and of English Studies in Anglophone centres. It makes timid and unobtrusive appearances once in a while, such as in Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht's work on textual scholarship, where philology is cautiously removed from any contentious ambit into a narrowly applied one as "a configuration of scholarly skills that are geared toward historical text curatorship" (Gumbrecht 2003: 2).

In continental Europe the philological model remained firmly entrenched for the study of modern languages, including by and large for English Studies. But particularly in English Studies this was a difficult negotiation. The postures against philology that had been struck in Anglophone centres of the discipline, particularly in the dominant United States, could hardly be disregarded: neither as a matter of academic interest nor as a matter of institutional prerogatives was that possible. What came to obtain was and is precisely the kind of in-between state of affairs, the straddling between two disparate models, with which I began



these reflections. The adjustments that followed in the peculiar space of English Studies in Western Europe in the 1980s, so that the British/American models of the discipline could sidle in with the prevailing philological model, were naturally received with unease. Indicative here is a tirade against such adjustments, published in the form of an essay entitled “English as a Foreign Literature and the Decline of Philology” by T.A. Birrell in 1989. Drawing upon his experience of teaching English literature in Nijmegen University, Birrell here “protests” against the gradual demise of an assumption, an ethos, and an ideal, that can be expressed in the term ‘Philology’, or rather ‘*Philologie*’ ... what ‘humanism’ had originally meant for Latin and Greek, ‘philology’ now meant for the whole family of languages – a scholarly reverence for language, and for its expression in literature (Birrell 1989: 581-82).

He effectively protests against the consequent separation of English language and literature through curricular reform, so that language teaching acquires a more independent and applied edge. It seems to me that in continental European English Studies particularly the uneasy negotiation between two models, which Birrell touched the pulse of, still continues. It appears as a backdrop of particular interest when we turn to the condition of English Studies in East and Central European countries such as Bulgaria and Romania.

Negotiations between the two models of English Studies is of particular interest in contexts like Bulgaria and Romania because of some of the shared and differentiated experiences noted earlier amidst which the discipline has been constructed and pursued. In some of the following chapters much is said, for instance, about the importance of the history of communism, post-communism, transition toward European integration for developments in English Studies. Behind those observations there remain some interesting questions which are yet to be reckoned with, which indeed some of these chapters begin to reckon with. Questions such as: How did the philological model for the study of modern languages negotiate with an ideologically led agenda in the communist period? Why did it persist or how did it accommodate itself with the exigencies of communist academic policy? What freedoms and restrictions did its persistence enable? How particularly did that work for English Studies? To what extent were the ideological proclivities of dominant Anglophone centres accommodated in the discipline in post-communist and transitional dispensations? How forcefully and to what effect has that worked?

It seems to me that the answers to such questions begin to surface in the chapters that follow, and no doubt will be productively engaged through further projects and discussions. These questions undoubtedly simmer near the surface of most of the following chapters. And they are of the greatest interest wherever English Studies is engaged, perhaps particularly from the somewhat blinkered Anglocentric disciplinary perspective that prevails in Britain and the United States. The issue of the two models is but one area in which fruitful further discussions can be expected. Certainly the following chapters give evidence of numerous other issues to do with English Studies that have already been more extensively and illuminatingly pondered in Bulgaria and Romania, with far-reaching potential effects on the academic discipline in general.

### **On This Side**

Milena Katsarska

Between December 2007 and May 2008, within the initial phase of the collaborative project which the present volume arises from, a comprehensive student survey was conducted in Bulgaria. This survey aimed at tapping into English Studies students’ perceptions about the tertiary level programmes that they are involved in, and prompted students to indicate what

subject area they felt they were currently studying. Faced with a blank box on the survey form, some of them wrote “English”, others “English Studies”, others still “English and American Studies”. Some of those involved in joint subjects stated “English and (another language)”. Quite a few responses both in single and joint subjects did use the ‘Ph’-word. In fact, a closer look at the 202 respondents from Plovdiv University reveals that 130 of them, coming from a range of programme backgrounds, have variously spelled out ‘Philology’ -- more so the first and second year students than students in the later years of their study. Interestingly, a group of fourth year students who chanced upon what their juniors had written could not refrain from remarking on this “oddity” as, in their words, they were aware that such a concept “did not exist” in English-speaking worlds or, at the very least, would scarcely mean anything without a footnote. We could of course attribute the change from early to later years of study as a matter of changing perceptions of translation. In other words, possibly students in the early years tended to translate the Bulgarian *филология* literally and faithfully into *philology*, while those in later years went for *English Studies* as an idiomatic and free translation -- and then, in Peter Newmark’s (1981) terms, reduced it to *language ‘simply’*. Alternatively, in all awareness that hardly anything in translation is *language ‘simply’*, we could try to imagine the “footnote” that those students considered necessary as one that clarifies the complex and slippery relation between *English Philology* and *English Studies* as programme labels, informed by the dynamics of disciplinary constructions and institutional spaces.

The first task of this section of the introduction is that: to give an imaginary “footnote” on what the previous section suggestively identifies as a “kind of conflict of Faculties” from an Anglophone perspective. In fact the previous section could be regarded as such a “footnote”, and here I begin by extending that “footnote” with a few further observations drawn from the perspective of my professional experiences – which, unlike my co-editor’s, have not been confined to academies of Anglophone contexts. The second task of this section is to unpack the rationale behind this volume entitled *English Studies on This Side: Post-2007 Reckonings*, and highlight the dialogic links between its constitutive parts and the diverse voices which speak in it. In the following my position is informed by my involvement in the collaborative project this volume arises from, first as a research team member and then as coordinator for Bulgaria in it. More importantly, what I have to say draws on my personal professional experience as a graduate from the Sofia University English Studies programme in 1994 and subsequently as a lecturer and scholar in American Studies at the Plovdiv University English Department since 1995. It is especially with the latter in view that I would like to offer some, often speculative, observations on what it means to be positioned within a philological space while doing English Studies in Bulgaria at present.

Indeed, the Bulgarian model for English Studies in higher education has been shaped since its inception along the lines of the German model of philology. In pragmatic terms this means that English Studies programmes are traditionally programmes which combine courses in language/linguistics and literature/culture studies. Additionally, they serve to develop practical and applied language skills among students (by curricular provisions which allocate about 1/3 of classroom contact hours to language practice) while cultivating an understanding of Anglophone linguistics, literatures and cultures that rely on and extend each other. In other words, in tune with the philological tradition, students majoring in English or taking English in a joint subject have a more holistic exposure to all those strands of English Studies than in Anglophone contexts, where language/linguistics and literature tend to be pursued (in pedagogic and scholarly terms) separately. To attempt to comprehensively conceptualise the implications of a currently functioning philological model in relation to English Studies as *a* (provisionally singular) discipline with a global spread and practice is rather utopian. But it is

certainly an enterprise worthy of extensive exploration, bearing in mind that traditional models maintain a strong hold in a number of contexts.

One immediate observation along such lines comes to mind with regard to the interrelatedness of the “philological project” (from its roots in German idealist philosophy to its methodological heights in the 19<sup>th</sup> century and influence in the better part of the 20<sup>th</sup>) with national consciousness, which has been interrogated not only by the advent of Theory but also by present day fluidities of identities, communications and movements. From a contemporary point of view, it seems implausibly reductive and critically problematic to anchor English Studies to “territorialities” demarcated within, for example, nation-states and to thereby focus on “national language/literature/cultures”. However, English Studies BA degrees in a philological vein by and large structure disciplinary knowledge in courses from such a rationale. Further, to the extent that English Studies in Anglophone centres have been informed by a philological model (more so for the USA, see Graff 1987) there have been significant departures from that model: institutional developments there have inserted divides between linguistics, literature and area studies, and have been complicated by the specificities of Anglophone contexts. The influence of these Anglophone centres, however, can hardly be disregarded in Bulgaria or elsewhere when it comes to English Studies. Thus, the philologically organised department and degree subject in English Studies (necessarily English and American studies these days) in Bulgaria operates in the tension zones of centrifugal and centripetal forces of disciplinary developments and disciplinary knowledge organisation. Taken to the “basic” level of practical considerations: contemplating what, for instance, a four-year BA curriculum in English Studies should contain as a “disciplinary core” in a foreign language (a shrinking space for containing disciplinary knowledge) versus an ever expanding academic field (or shall we say fields?) does indeed evoke a sense of crisis. Negotiations on the BA level through a model of the discipline that seems resistant to a number of developments (both related to understandings of disciplinarity and realities of today) and current practices pushes in a variety of directions: from departmental debates about an imminent split between literature and linguistics, to relegation of responsibility to students (who on an elective basis can choose to take courses in a variety of areas and combinations within the same programme), to setting up BA degree programmes within the paradigm of Applied Linguistics (usually combined as English and another language). In other words, both the “contemporary pull” and “the expanding curriculum” that the “discipline” of English Studies experiences today primarily occupy the elective margins, rather than the core, of a BA degree in the subject in Bulgaria. Also, the latter development I mentioned – that of setting up English Studies programmes along an Applied Linguistics paradigm – is fairly recent and is seemingly not given the weight accorded to a model of long standing or the nostalgic aspiration to be a “rounded-philologist”. Instead such programmes, which are structured either with a translation or education orientation, capitalise on such selling-points as: (a) drawing on explicitly contextually-specific and practice-oriented developments in linguistics; (b) being conceived of as a foundational degree in explicitly professional and job-market terms; (c) being in tune with EU-wide processes and policies (the Bologna Process, multilingualism and plurilingualism, etc). This in turn begs the question of where and how philology degrees, and perhaps the entailing philological model, could be positioned on the map of disciplines and subject areas -- especially in view of our case in point, English Studies. Deeper questions lurk behind that: how could a holistic language, literature and culture approach function given a “deterritorialized” (from national anchors) subject matter in English Studies? What is the philological model’s relation to the prevailing political economy, since it requires a considerable long term investment? What is the implicit and potential politics of philology?

The answers to these are yet to be mooted and debated but the collaborative project on English Studies in Bulgaria and Romania, from which this volume arises, has provided the environment to begin identifying relevant issues and discussing them across institutional spaces. The above-mentioned institutional and curricular considerations are indicative of tensions at a number of levels that are pertinent generally to European, ordinarily non-Anglophone, philologically-structured contexts of English Studies, as they are specifically to the two contexts in question here – Romanian and Bulgarian higher education. I would like to think of these as productive tensions for they have stimulated scholars from a range of professional contexts to contribute to *English Studies on This Side: Post-2007 Reckonings*.

As the previous section of this book's introduction indicates, the subsequent chapters are informed by discussions that took place during and around a workshop held in Plovdiv in October 2008. In many ways the discursive workshop structure has been carried into the present volume, and the workshop exchanges are reflected in the dialogic links between the chapters and parts. These chapters are arranged under four broad parts. Each part brings together chapters which have a coherent emphasis, and it therefore makes sense to present them together. And yet all the parts – and therefore the chapters within them -- are also related to the others. They are all concerned with disciplinary constructions and practices in relation to English Studies.

The opening part, "Canon, Curriculum and Change," initiates a complex mapping of the territory that this volume covers. Positioned within different professional contexts, the contributors here variously elucidate the links between processes of canon formation and their relationship to the pedagogical spaces of English Studies. The chapters examine the relationship between canon formation and the production of academic curricula in English Studies against a broad socio-cultural background. The background comprises factors such as Bulgarian, Romanian and UK constructions of Anglophone cultures and identities, interpretive and evaluative responses to Anglophone texts and discourses, as well as language politics given the global spread of English. The thread that runs explicitly or tacitly throughout this part has to do with "change": change in terms of institutional and disciplinary developments in English Studies and in relation to shifting ideological dispensations. In this regard W. R. Owens's question, "What, then, should the relationship between the 'canon' and the 'curriculum' be?" -- posed towards the end of his detailed account of the relation between canon and curriculum – is worth recalling. And his subsequent answer is suggestive of where the critical potential to seek change in this respect might be located: "It seems to me that it would be helpful to keep the two concepts separate as much as possible, and to recognise that a curriculum is – and should be – much more open to change than a canon."

Mihaela Irimia's chapter surveys the historical development of English Studies in Romania not so much in terms of institutionalization (e.g. following a chronology of subject, degree and department foundations) as through mapping a complex web of influences. This web of influences accounts for Romanian cultural identity construction and the role played therein by conceptions of "Anglophoneness" and Englishness -- in the cultural sphere generally and in the institutional spaces of English Studies particularly. In an imagological vein, Irimia places the idea of Anglophoneness in Romania as deriving from a range of extrinsic influences which gradually become interiorized. The chapter charts paths of continuities as well as ruptures in the process of the institutionalization and consolidation of English Studies in Romania. Keeping Irimia's observations alongside Gavrilu, Hulban and Popa's "The History of English Studies in Romania" (in Engler and Haas eds. 2000), and comparing these Romanian accounts with similar Bulgarian accounts such as Shurbanov and Stamenov's "English Studies in Bulgaria" (also in Engler and Haas eds. 2000) and indeed some contributions in this volume, calls into question some of the preconceptions that ostensibly underpin this volume itself and the project it arises from. Such a comparison, in

my view, gestures toward a need to interrogate any easy “lumping together” of Romania and Bulgaria as being similarly placed in relation to English Studies by virtue of being non-Anglophone, European, post-communist, recently acceded, etc. On a related note, Ludmilla Kostova’s chapter usefully takes a distinctive approach to the history of English Studies in Bulgaria. Here the concept of the literary canon is approached from the perspective of literary historiography, which necessarily partakes in pedagogical and larger cultural processes. Literary historiography is conceived as a driving force in the canon formation of a foreign literature and as implicated in identity construction and identity politics. Kostova focuses on a specific case study: the two-volume *History of English Literature* by the Bulgarian scholar Marco Mincoff, which has played a key role in the development of English Studies in Bulgaria. In Kostova’s words the critical analysis positions the “histories of foreign literatures within the broad context of cross-cultural literary reception,” with a view to “examining the ways in which literary canons are formed in “non-native” cultural communities and singling out a major line of development in the reception of English-language literatures in the Bulgarian context.” This chapter not only poses questions about the manner in which scholarly influence works within English Studies in Bulgaria, but also raises questions about the politics of identity construction in Bulgaria -- of essentialist “Bulgarianness” vis-à-vis the essentialised English “Other” – during and since the period of state national communism. Yordan Kosturkov and Lubomir Terziev then respond in briefer chapters to some of the issues raised in this part already. They ponder the intersections between canon and curriculum with their personal professional experience in view.

The chapters which conclude the first part take the discussion of curriculum and change to the area of language and linguistics. On the one hand, Ann Hewings addresses the question “English Studies – One Discipline or Many?” and unpacks the plurality of understandings, constructions and academic practices that define disciplinarity. On the other, Joan Swann’s “Global Englishes” brings to the fore the political implications of changing linguistic “cartography” in documenting and understanding the position of English as a global language. Here three approaches for coming to grips with the global spread of the language are discussed: linguistic imperialism, World Englishes, and English as a lingua franca. It is evident that these have a bearing on both English as a language of education and English as a subject of study, insofar as these are pursued in Bulgaria and Romania and as indeed in other ordinarily non-Anglophone contexts.

The second part, “Pedagogy, Practice and Policy,” focuses on practices in teaching and learning and their relationship to the broader social and cultural environment. This begins by continuing with the focus on language and linguistics on which the previous part ended. Alexandra Bagasheva’s and Boryana Bratanova’s chapters steer the discussion of English Studies towards specific cases of courses and classroom arrangements for teaching linguistics, against background shifts in dominant theoretical and pedagogic models and practices. While Bratanova addresses the critical implications of changing a core textbook in English grammar, Bagasheva details changes in the curriculum design and presentation of a foundational course in General Linguistics for undergraduates. The latter chapter draws a complex picture which moves between macro and the micro level concerns, and effectively conveys the negotiations that occur at the interface of current developments in linguistic theory and the pragmatics of linguistics pedagogy. The underlying ideological implications for the learning environment are also teased out, especially in charting the “classroom” as an intellectual space which both transmits and spatially constructs the discipline. Petya Tsoneva’s and Pavel Petkov’s chapters thereafter move the emphasis to pedagogy in literature and culture studies by analysing an MA programme in British Studies set up at the University of Veliko Turnovo in the transitioning 1990s with the support of the British Council. These offer a critical account of the programme, examine the methodology that was adopted and the outputs that resulted, and

express unease about the manner in which the balance of literature and cultural studies was negotiated. The role of the British Council is raised in these, albeit in an indirect fashion: to my mind, that is a matter of particular scholarly interest which is yet to be adequately addressed. The manner in which Anglocentric bodies, such as the British Council, have attempted to mould English Studies in Bulgaria and Romania and indeed internationally deserves closer critical attention.

Further, this part of the volume touches upon some political factors and policy-making initiatives that impinge upon the pedagogical spaces of English Studies prior to and after EU accession in 2007. With regard to the specific pedagogic practice of note making, Ana-Karina Schneider argues that shifts in ability and attitudes in the Romanian university context are bringing about “a new definition of English studies that hinges on the EU-regulated imperative that all language departments produce active, marketable language skills.” She goes on to illustrate how the shifts in question and their effects are leading toward a redefinition of literacy. The pressures put on pedagogic practice by transnational and national policy initiatives, and the contradictions which consequently arise, are the themes of both Madeleine Danova’s and Silvia Florea’s chapters. Both focus in different ways on the effects of policies which seek to widen the reach of education at national levels in response to EU initiatives. Both pay particular attention to the effects of these on the broad area of English Studies. Danova examines closely the background to the setting up of retraining programmes in Sofia University, which are designed to turn school teachers from various backgrounds into English teachers within brief and intensively-structured periods. Florea details policy initiatives in Romania to increase access to higher education, examines their modes of implementation, and assesses the results with English Studies as the arena in view. Various kinds of miscalculations and inadequacies are found in both the conceptualisation of the policies and in their implementation. One of her significant findings is that access may have “widened” numerically but has not “broadened” in the sense of extending evenly to different constituencies. Danova’s and Florea’s chapters highlight not only the contextual nuances of both countries as recently acceded EU members but also position English Studies in direct relation to employment, society and government policies.

The third part, “Collaborations and Circulations,” turns to institutional collaborations and the circulations of ideas – in other words, the scholarly and academic exchanges which have impacted on the development English Studies. This part brings together personal recollections and retrospective reflections on such exchanges in Bulgaria. Irinia’s and Kostova’s chapters in part one, I have noted, illuminate how a complex network of influences in and after the period of national state communism defined English Studies. The contributions in this part by Alexander Shurbanov, Michael Holman, and Simon Edwards discussing international institutional collaborations and exchanges throw light on the same area, but from a quite different direction. The collaborations and exchanges in question were between Sofia University and the Universities of Leeds and Roehampton in the UK and SUNY Albany in the USA. These chapters not only complicate widely held notions of rigid ideological (and consequently academic) isolation between the “two camps” on either side of the “iron curtain”, they also clarify the personal investments that went into institutional links in terms of agents, benefactors and beneficiaries. These reminiscences present academic links that were formalized to varying degrees as enabling a mutually informative and rewarding environment for English Studies. Mutuality, of course, lies behind institutions which formalise academic and educational collaborations at the government level too, such as the Bulgarian American Commission for Educational Exchange Fulbright. The investment of the latter in the development of English and American Studies in Bulgaria is outlined by its executive director Julia Stefanova in the last chapter of the third part.

Comparative approaches inform a number of contributions to this volume, but it is in the fourth part, “The Comparative Perspective,” that this is considered in a sustained fashion. Here academic spaces that do not fall, strictly speaking, within the institutionally demarcated territories of English departments or degrees and which nevertheless are relevant to the discipline are taken up. The chapters in this section discuss a potentially rich and yet relatively neglected area of cross-fertilization at the interface of English Studies and Comparative Literature Studies. In Bulgaria the latter are institutionally located within degrees in Bulgarian and Slavic philology as well as in Screen and Stage Arts. Thus Cleo Protohristova discusses the inception and conceptualization of foundational university courses in Western European Literatures in Bulgaria, and places the origins of the study of English literature there in historical terms. Effectively, she sees the emergence of English Studies within the philological project with which I began this section, and which is so widely prevalent in continental Europe. Chapters by Ognyan Kovachev and Vitana Kostadinova engage with specific issues at the intersections of Comparative Literature and English Studies, namely, with receptive fields and the framing (or positioning) of genres and periods. They focus respectively on the Gothic and on Romanticism in the Bulgarian scholarly and academic milieu under different historical and ideological dispensations. Coming from the institutional context of Stage and Screen Arts, Iskra Nikolova’s chapter opens this volume to a revealing discussion of “reception in performance”, with particular attention to stage adaptations and performances inspired by English literary texts in Bulgaria.

The above summary of the contents of the present volume is indicative of the range of issues that are covered. Various senses of occupying a location and being located underpin all the efforts here: within institutional spaces; with regard to disciplinary areas; in regional and national and continental and international grids; in terms of geopolitical demarcations (such as East and West); along the lines of phases and periods (such as pre- and post-1989); with regard to perceived cultural territories (such as Anglophone and non-Anglophone). And yet, none of these diverse ways of conceiving location and speaking from a location close the deliberations in this volume into rigid cells. On the contrary, every space of location flows into other spaces and every notion of location overlaps with other notions in each of these chapters, and across the chapters, and across the parts. There *is* an underlying sense of location, it seems to me, which holds this volume together; and yet, to try to articulate that sense of location in a definite way would undermine the enormous sense of fluidity and openness with which it is expressed here. That’s why the editors of this volume have chosen the indicative and yet undefined phrase “on this side” to try to convey the location of this volume as a whole. Taken together, the located points of view extended from the specific theoretical, professional, institutional, historical, geopolitical, and other contexts *on this side* are suggestive of the critical potential entailed in reckoning with English Studies as a global discipline.

## Works Cited

Baldick, Chris. *The Social Mission of English Criticism, 1848-1932*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1983.

Birrell, T.A. “English as a Foreign Literature and the Decline of Philology.” *English Studies* 70:6, 1989. 581-86.

- Clausen, Wendell. "Philology." In Ziolkowski ed., 1990. 13-15.
- Crawford, Robert. *Devolving English Literature*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1992.
- Dixon, John. *A Schooling in 'English'*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 1991.
- Doyle, Brian. *English and Englishness*. London: Routledge, 1989.
- Engler, Balz and Renate Haas eds.. *European English Studies: Contributions Towards the History of a Discipline*. Leicester: The English Association for ESSE, 2000.
- Fantham, Elaine. "The Growth of Literature and Criticism at Rome." In George A. Kennedy ed. *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism, Vol.1: Classical Criticism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989. 220-44.
- Gavriliu, Eugenia, Horia Hulban and Ecaterina Popa. "The History of English Studies in Romania." In Engler and Haas eds. 2000. 231-265.
- Graff, Gerald. *Professing Literature: An Institutional History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Gumbrecht, Hans. *The Powers of Philology: Dynamics of Textual Scholarship*. Champaign IL: University of Illinois Press, 2003.
- Hamilton, Paul. *Historicism*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Hardcastle, John. "Von Humboldt's Children: English and the Formation of a European Educational Ideal." *Changing English* 6:1, 1999. 31-45.
- Johnson, David. *Shakespeare and South Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
- Man, Paul de. "The Return to Philology." *The Resistance to Theory*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1986. 21-26. [First published in *TLS* 10 December 1982.]
- Mueller-Vollmer, Kurt. "Language Theory and the Art of Understanding." In Marshall Brown ed. *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism, Vol.5: Romanticism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. 162-84.
- Ohmann, Richard. *English in America: A Radical View of the Profession*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1976.
- Palmer, D.J. *The Rise of English Studies*. London: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Said, Edward. *The World, the Text, and the Critic*. London: Vintage, 1983.
- Saussure, Ferdinand de. *Course in General Linguistics*. Trans. Wade Baskin. London: Peter Owen, 1959.
- Scholes, Robert. *The Rise and Fall of English: Reconstructing English as a Discipline*. New



Haven: Yale University Press, 1988.

Shurbanov Alexander and Christo Stamenov. "English Studies in Bulgaria." In Engler and Haas eds. 2000. 267-292.

Vishwanathan, Gauri. *Masks of Conquest: Literary Study and British Rule in India*. London: Faber and Faber, 1989.

Wellek, René. "American Literary Scholarship." *Concepts of Criticism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963. 296-315.

Ziolkowski, Jan. "What is Philology: Introduction." In Ziolkowski ed., 1990. 1-12.

Ziolkowski, Jan ed. *On Philology*. University Park PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1990.