

About the Social Relevance of the Study of Culture and Literature¹**Steven Totosy de Zepetnek²****Abstract**

In his article, “About the Social Relevance of the Study of Culture and Literature”, Steven Totosy de Zepetnek discusses the situation of humanities with regard to the discipline of comparative literature and the fields of world literature and comparative cultural studies. Totosy de Zepetnek’s postulate is that in order to make the study of literature and culture a socially, politically, and economically relevant activity of scholarship today, humanities scholars ought to turn to contextual work. Further, he argues that the field of comparative cultural studies — practiced in interdisciplinarity and employing new media technology — would achieve global presence and social relevance of the humanities while at same time producing in-depth scholarship.

Introduction

The perspective and use of comparison in scholarship have been and are widely employed in various disciplines and among several compelling lines of argumentation of with regard to comparative and contextual study in the humanities and social sciences is put forward by Marcel Detienne in his *Comparing the Incomparable* (36-39) (see also George M. Fredrickson’s *The Comparative Imagination*). At the same time, in and about the discipline of comparative literature it remains a recurrent view that it is lacking definition, has no or only a partial framework of theory and/or methodology and that for these reasons the discipline remains with a history and presence of insecurity

(see, e.g., Grabovszki). These lacunae — acknowledged repeatedly in the discipline since its inception in the nineteenth century — are among others a result of the discipline's borrowing from other disciplines for the analysis of literature (and culture). In terms of institutional presence, the discipline gained both intellectual interest and institutional presence mostly in the U.S. and in Europe (albeit in the latter to a lesser extent than in the U.S.) and in both regions it is undergoing a diminishing presence since the interest in and adoption of literary and culture theory in departments of English and because of comparative literature's entrenched Eurocentrism (see, e.g., Pireddu; Totosy de Zepetnek, *Comparative Literature*, "The New Humanities"; Witt). A further shortcoming of comparative literature remains its construction (theoretical and applied) based on national literatures at a time when the paradigm of the global has gained currency in many disciplines and approaches. Significantly, since the 1980s the discipline has been under pressure to justify its institutional, as well as intellectual validity owing to the arrival of cultural studies. Despite these developments, Haun Saussy makes the claim — with regard to the U.S. — that "Comparative Literature has, in a sense, won its battles. It has never been better received in the American university. ... Our conclusions have become other people's assumptions" ("Exquisite Cadavers" 3; see also Finney; Saussy refers to the U.S. and writes "America": this is hegemonial and imperial appropriation of a continent and at least in scholarship and against established public discourse this ought not be [on the problem and practice of this appropriation, see, e.g., McClennen]). While Saussy's analysis that comparative literature's aims and scope have gained currency in literary study is well argued and a welcome positive view, what is missing in his assessment is attention to the discipline's institutional constriction in the U.S. (as well as in Europe). His positive view of the new status quo

represents an adjustment to such opinions as Susan Bassnett's in her *Comparative Literature: A Critical Introduction* that the discipline is dead (3), Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's similar suggestion with the title of her book *Death of a Discipline* (i.e., comparative literature), or the negative prognosis in the entry "Comparative Literature" in the *Routledge Dictionary of Literary Terms* (GMH), etc. The two opposing views — that the idea of comparative literature "conquered" literary study and that the discipline is dead— refer to the U.S. and Europe and while both may be correct assessments depending on whether one considers the discipline's intellectual content or its institutional status, they continue with a Euro-US-American-centric view. What is remarkable is that both the concept of the discipline, as well as its institutional presence are advancing in so-called "peripheral" regions including in European countries such as Spain, Portugal, Greece, etc., and this is the case also in Latin America, Mainland China, and India or in Arabic (with regard to large number of books published in the last decade and even earlier in Chinese, Arabic, and Indian languages, see Totossy de Zepetnek, "Bibliography of (Text)books"; on world literature, see also

Damrosch, *What Is*; D'haen; Damrosch, Melas, Buthelezi; D'haen, Damrosch, Kadir; Jullien). In the West, comparative literature as a discipline remains — while embattled with regard to its institutional presence — an established field particularly in Anglophone regions such as the U.S., and to a lesser extent in Canada and Australia.

In England, where the discipline has not had a strong presence, the discipline has gained in interest recently.

I argue that the advances of comparative literature in the "periphery" should not be viewed as "catching up" — i.e., the "period" view in literary history — similar to how, for example, modernity has first appeared in West Europe

and then developed later in various parts of the world: the current advances of comparative literature in “peripheral” regions are a result of the impact of globalization and thus a sophisticated construct with both traditional and new ideas and approaches, as well as practice of immanent relevance (more on this, see, e.g., Krishnaswamy; see also Caruth and Culler; Wang, “Confronting Globalization”).

Comparative literature and the concept of world literature

I begin with the following definition of comparative literature:

The discipline of Comparative Literature is *in toto* a method in the study of literature in at least two ways. First, Comparative Literatures means the knowledge of more than one national language and literature, and/or it means the knowledge and application of other disciplines in and for the study of literature and second, Comparative Literature has an ideology of inclusion of the Other, be that a marginal literature in its several meanings of marginality, a genre, various text types, etc. ...

Comparative Literature has intrinsically a content and form, which facilitate the cross-cultural and interdisciplinary study of literature and it has a history that substantiated this content and form. Predicated on the borrowing of methods from other disciplines and on the application of the appropriated method to areas of study that single-language literary study more often than not tends to neglect, the discipline is difficult to define because thus it is fragmented and pluralistic. (Totosy de Zepetnek, *Comparative Literature* 13)

There are of course many works on comparative literature, both for and against it, and about the problem of a clearly outlined methodology and theoretical framework. Among recent thought on the principle of comparison, Susan Stanford Friedman argues in “Why Not Compare?” that “comparison is an ever-expanding necessity in many fields, including literary studies, where the intensification of globalization has encouraged comparative analysis of literature

and culture on as transnational, indeed, planetary scale” (753; see also, e.g., Dimock; Goldberg; Radhakrishnan).

Relevant is that while the principle of comparison is, mostly, an accepted tenet, the discipline of comparative literature itself is, on the institutional level, constricting. In the U.S. there are attempts to retool the discipline as “world literature” based on Johann Wolfgang von Goethe’s early nineteenth-century concept.

Goethe’s concept of *Weltliteratur* is, among others, about the relevance and importance of translation and he argued against the national conception of literature (for examples of the current understanding of the relevance of Goethe’s concept, see, e.g., Birus; Pizer; Sturm-Trigonakis). While Goethe’s proposal did not gain presence as a

structure in

institutional settings (i.e., university departments of world literature), the concept itself has been — at least *in nomine* — a standard in the discipline of comparative literature as an intellectual and pedagogical approach. However, in practice Goethe’s notion resulted in Eurocentrism and the national approach. In recent years perhaps against the said shortfalls of comparative literature — i.e., Eurocentrism, the loss of its locus of literary and culture theory, and its insistence on the national approach — the earlier concept of world literature has gained renewed interest — mostly in US-American scholarship, but also elsewhere — since the late 1980s and a good number of books and collected volumes have been published with the approach (see, e.g., Aldridge; Carroll; Damrosch, *What Is*; D’haen; D’haen, Damrosch, Kadir; Gallagher; Hynes-Berry and Miller; Ivanov; Jullien; Klitgard; Lamping; Lawall; Moriarty; Pizer; Prendergast, Christopher; Simonsen and Stougard-Nielsen; Sturm- Trigonakis; Wang, *Comparative Literature*).

While courses in world literature exist widely in the English-speaking world, in Europe, and Asia, the difference is that while such courses are taught, there are few departments of such and while in the U.S. and Canada there is a limited development towards the establishing of departments and professorships specifically designated as “world literature”, it remains to be seen whether the concept would develop as degree granting departments, thus according it an institutional base, an important issue with regard to funding, as well as professorships. A definition of world literature, as distinct from comparative literature, is as follows: “World literature is not an infinite, ungraspable canon of works but rather a mode of circulation and of reading, a mode that is as applicable to

individual works

as to bodies of material, available for reading established classics and new discoveries alike” (Damrosch, *What Is* 5).

Interestingly, Damrosch’s concept of world literature with regard to literary production, publication, and circulation is similar to the micro-system approach to the study of literature as proposed by the initiators of the approach, Siegfried J. Schmidt’s and Itamar Even-Zohar, and as practiced by their disciples. These approaches are related to and with parallel thought in, for example Pierre Bourdieu’s, Norman K. Denzin’s, and Robert Estivals’s work (see also Gupta; Totosy de Zepetnek, *Comparative Literature*; “The New”).

An alternative view is expressed by Saussy:

.the concept of world literature that consists chiefly of a canon, a body of works and their presence as models of literary quality in the minds of scholars and writers. But the phrase “world literature” is not used exclusively in so normative a sense. Another sense, increasingly prominent in recent years, makes “world literature” be an equivalent of global literary history, a history of relations and influences that far exceeds the national canons into which academic departments routinely squeeze and package literature. (It is not surprising that academic departments nationalize literature: departments are an invention of the nineteenth-century university, a supranational medieval institution re-chartered by the monoglot nations of the industrial era.) An obvious improvement on the anachronism and petty chauvinism of national canons, this global literary history remains under-valued so long as it leaves untouched by analysis the rival accounts of global history that occupy economists, historians and geographers. So, for example, the world-literature proposals of Pascale Casanova and Franco Moretti, despite their differences, assume a framework of international exchange deriving from Immanuel Wallerstein’s world-systems theory: a sudden spreading of European influence across the globe starting around 1500 and carrying with it, not just colonialism, disease and firearms, but also the novel. Extra-European populations have, in their accounts, the opportunity to respond to the European form, but it is left vague how much of a difference their

own narrative traditions make outside their home areas or whether they were not perhaps in advance of the European form in various ways. By subjecting this research program, currently being carried out in dozens of university world-literature programs, to a blunt and slightly unfair description, I mean to evoke the perspective of other global literary histories taking as their center different languages, different genres, different literary practices and their diffusion from different centers . A model of world literature that made room for the countless literary worlds would be relativistic, not deterministic. (“The Dimensionality” 291-93)

Similarly, Martin Puchner suggests that

. world literature, or world creation literature, as I understand it, thrives on the relation between the two words of which this term is composed: world; and literature. It invites us to reconsider the dimension of reference, asking what world or worlds this literature refers to; the dimension of scale through which some type of totality is aimed at; and, by contrast, the decision to use the model as a way of making that totality manageable. (347)

and Marshall Brown also suggests a relational concept: “world literature . is writing that conveys the power and the conflicted nature of encounters with natural, or social, or metaphysical realms beyond our power to contain them”

(362). These approaches appear to be related to the so-called “thematic” reading and study of literature (see, e.g.,

Bremond, Landy, Pavel), an approach in comparative literature but one that has not taken hold in a widespread manner. Further, while these and similar definitions of and discussions about the concept and/or its practice do not conflict with definitions of comparative literature (or with that of comparative cultural studies), the difference is that while in comparative literature focus remains on the study and teaching of literature in a global perspective (that is, in the discipline’s foundations but practiced in a Eurocentricism; see above), in world literature focus is on how to read and to a lesser extent as to how to teach world literature. Thus, the two approaches — comparative literature and world literature — complement each other.

Comparative cultural studies

Cultural studies, while innovative and an essential field in the humanities and social sciences, retains one

drawback and this is its monolingual construction as it is a field developed and practiced primarily in the Anglophone world by scholars who in general at best work with two languages. Hence the notion that what has been a trademark of comparative literature, namely working in multiple languages, ought, ideally, be carried over into “comparative cultural studies”. Developed since the late 1980s by Steven Totosy de Zepetnek, the conceptualization of comparative cultural studies is based on a “merger” of tenets of the discipline of comparative literature — minus the discipline’s Eurocentrism and nation-orientation — with those of cultural studies including the latter’s explicit and practiced ideological perspective. Additional tenets of comparative cultural studies include that attention is paid the “how” of cultural processes, following radical constructivism (see, e.g., Riegler; Schmidt, *Kognitive Autonomie*, “Literary Studies”, “From Objects”; see also the humanities and social sciences quarterly [peer reviewed and Thomson Reuters ISI-AHCI indexed] *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* <<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb>> and the print monograph series of Books in Comparative Cultural Studies, both published by Purdue University Press and the Shaker Press print monograph series of Books in Culture, Media, and Communication Studies). Hence, the objective of study is often not a cultural product as such, but its processes within the micro- and macro-system(s) which are interesting for the study of culture (on the macro-system see, e.g., Apter; Damrosch, *What Is*; Wallerstein; on the micro-system see, e.g., Schmidt; Even-Zohar; Totosy de Zepetnek, “Systemic”; Villanueva). To “compare” does not — and must not — imply hierarchy, that is, in the comparative and contextual perspective and analysis it is the method in use rather than the studied matter that is of importance. Attention to other cultures is a basic and founding element and factor of the framework of comparative cultural

studies. This principle encourages an intercultural and interdisciplinary dialogue, expressly ideological, and thus in this aspect identical with cultural studies, which, among others includes the perspective of the intercultural that is inclusionary (and its corollaries of multiculturalism, transculturalism, crossculturalism, etc.). Dialogue is understood as inclusion, which extends to all Other, marginal, minority, and all that has been and often still is considered peripheral. It is optimal for scholars working in the field of comparative cultural studies to have the working knowledge of several languages, disciplines, and cultures before moving on to the study of theory and methodology. Of note is that while up to the 2000s “comparative cultural studies” — while of course an obvious constellation and theoretical framework — has been a rare designation either in scholarship or institutional structures as in programs or departments, since the mid-2000s it has been increasingly appearing both in scholarship and as in professorships and programmes/departments. In addition, it should be noted that while comparative cultural studies appears as a field of study mostly in the humanities, parallel developments can be seen in sociology and cultural anthropology albeit — similar to the field’s designation in literary studies — with few if any explicit theoretical and/or methodological description and/or aims and scope.

Comparative cultural studies focuses on the study of culture both in parts (e.g., literature, film, popular culture, the visual and other arts [inter-art studies], television, media and communication studies and new media and also including aspects of such cultural production as architecture, etc.) and as a whole in relation to other forms of human expression and activity, as well as in relation to other disciplines in the humanities and social sciences. Work in comparative cultural studies does not mean that the traditional study of literature including close-text study would

be relegated to lesser value; rather, both can and should occur in a parallel fashion. Thus, such an approach enables a thorough contextual cultural analysis. Ideally, comparative cultural studies utilizes English as the contemporary *lingua franca* of scholarship; however, the use of English in published scholarship, itself a subject of much theoretical discussion, does not mean US-American centrality (see, e.g., Ramanathan; Rubdy; Prendergast, Catherine; Young). On the contrary, the broad use of English as the international language of scholarship allows scholars from outside the Anglophone world and continental Europe to present their works on an international forum and be understood by their colleagues in other countries. Importantly, comparative cultural studies focuses on evidence-based research and analysis, for which “contextual” (i.e., the systemic and empirical) approach presents the most advantageous methodologies and framework (on this, see, e.g., Ferguson’s and Golding’s argument for the empirical; and see above). Comparative cultural studies insists on a methodology involving interdisciplinary study with three main types of methodological precision: intra-disciplinarity (analysis and research within the disciplines in the humanities), multi-disciplinarity (analysis and research by one scholar employing any other discipline), and pluri-disciplinarity (analysis and research by team-work with participants from several disciplines) (see Totosy de Zepetnek, *Comparative Literature* 79-120). Comparative cultural studies is an inclusive discipline of global humanities and, as such, acts against the paradox of and tension between the global versus the local. And last but not least, comparative cultural studies attempts to reverse the intellectual and institutional decline of the humanities and their marginalization, thus arguing for the relevance of humanities and social sciences scholarship. A summary definition of

comparative cultural studies is as follows:

Comparative cultural studies is the theoretical, as well as methodological postulate to move and dialogue between cultures, languages, literatures, and disciplines. This is a crucial aspect of the framework, the approach as a whole, and its methodology. In other words, attention to other cultures — that is, the comparative perspective — is a basic and founding element and factor of the framework. The claim of emotional and intellectual primacy and subsequent institutional power of national cultures is untenable in this perspective. In sum, the built-in notions of exclusion and self-referentiality of singleculture study, and their result of rigidly-defined disciplinary boundaries, are notions against which comparative cultural studies offers an alternative as well as a parallel field of study.

This inclusion extends to all Other, all marginal, minority, border, and peripheral entities, and encompasses both form and substance. However, attention must be paid to the “how” of any inclusionary approach, attestation, methodology, and ideology so as not to repeat the mistakes of Eurocentrism and “universalization” from a “superior” Eurocentric point of view.

Dialogue is the only solution. (Totosy de Zepetnek, “From Comparative Literature” 259; see also Totosy de Zepetnek, “The New Humanities”)

While the humanities have a difficult stand with regard to funding and social relevance everywhere and historically so, since the arrival of new media and the internet and thus the development of the frequency and expansion of communication new possibilities have emerged for scholarship. And while the humanities in general are slow in the incorporation of new media in their use in scholarship and pedagogy, comparative literature, as well as comparative cultural studies — because of their intrinsic character of interdisciplinarity — would be a natural locus of contravening the trend of constriction and the diminishing

presence of the humanities. In cultural studies digital humanities is considered an important development in both theory and application and thus also comparative cultural studies includes attention to digital humanities as one of its principal tenets (see, e.g., Lisiak; Lisiak and Totosy de Zepetnek; Schreibman, Siemens, Unsworth; Totosy de Zepetnek, *Comparative Literature*, “The ‘Impact Factor’”, “The New Humanities”, “Aspects of Scholarship”;

Totosy de Zepetnek and Lopez-Varela Azcarate; Totosy de Zepetnek, Lopez-Varela Azcarate, Saussy, Mieszkovicz; Ursa; Van Peer, Asimakopoulou, Bessis). With regard to the use of new media whether in research, publishing, or pedagogy the negative attitude towards new media technology by scholars in the humanities is surprising, as Geert Lovink writes:

By and large, the humanities have been preoccupied with the impact of technology from a quasi-outsider's perspective, as if society and technology can still be separated ... This resistance by humanities scholars appears in two characteristic reactions to the proposition that information technology constitutes a crucial cultural force. First, one encounters a tendency among many humanists contemplating the possibility that information technology influences culture to assume that before now, before computing, our intellectual culture existed in some pastoral non-technological realm. *Technology*, in the lexicon of many humanists, generally means "only that technology of which I am frightened." I have frequently heard humanists use the word *technology* to mean "some intrusive, alien force like computing," as if pencils, paper, typewriters, and printing presses were in some way *natural*. (Lovink qtd. in Landow 46)

While the economic and industrial situation of the rest of the world outside of the West represents a problem with regard to the access and use of the internet, one would hope that it is only a matter of time when the world altogether would have access to and would use the internet and thus new media technology in scholarship, publishing, and pedagogy in the humanities (for a bibliography of intermediality and digital humanities, see, e.g., Vandermeersche, Vlieghe, Totosy de Zepetnek).

Similar to comparative literature and world literature, a further area in comparative cultural studies of importance include translation studies, a still neglected field on the landscape of scholarship in general (see, e.g. Apter; Bassnett; Totosy de Zepetnek, "Taxonomy"): while in the study of literature the field of translation studies has gained interest in the last several decades, what is lacking is theoretical work and its application. In particular, translation studies is in need of development with regard to issues of gender (see, e.g., Flotow; Simon), as well as in

relation to issues of transnationality and globalization.

Conclusion

Along with overlapping and complementing aspects and perspectives, there are differences between the discipline of comparative literature and the fields of world literature and comparative cultural studies: comparative literature is a discipline with a global history, intellectual relevance, as well as institutional presence while world literature and (comparative) cultural studies are fields of study and thus with intellectual relevance but with limited institutional presence. The difference between comparative literature and world literature on the one hand and (comparative) cultural studies on the other is that in the former focus remains explicitly on literature while in the latter literature is one of several subject matters studied and where literature is studied within the context of culture, although this is not necessarily so and not a given: the “relegation” of literature to a lesser focus in (comparative) cultural studies has been criticized (see, e.g., Error; Hillis Miller; Virk; Wang); however, in my view this is misguided and simply not the case because in (comparative) cultural studies there is a significant corpus of scholarship where literature is studied as the principal subject matter. As argued, the objective is the wider cultural context in which analysis is performed.

With the situation of comparative literature constricted on the institutional level in Europe and in Anglophone North America and the said lack of institutional presence of world literature, cultural studies, and

comparative cultural studies (because they are “fields” and not established “disciplines”) the status quo of comparative humanities remains precarious against the national approach, as well as owing to the hegemony of US-American scholarship. At the same time, there are indications that comparative literature as a discipline experiences a revival in some parts of the world outside of Europe and Anglophone scholarship (i.e., in Chinese, Arabic, Indian languages, Latin American languages, etc.) and this is a significant and promising development not the least because of the obvious appeal of the discipline in the “periphery”, thus a corrective measure with regard to the historical Euro- US-American hegemony of the discipline. That the related concept of world literature is experiencing a revival at this point, while interesting and in many ways a welcome development, because it is occurring mostly in Anglophone US-American scholarship, it remains limited by definition. Further, despite comparative literature’s often proclaimed differentiation and in many instances objection to cultural studies, the latter is gaining interest globally although at this point with US-American — and to a lesser measure with British — cultural studies. While this interest is in principle a welcome situation, its drawback remains the monolingual state of affairs with regard to theoretical precepts and here is where comparative cultural studies would/could enhance scholarship and globally so.

I believe that to make the study of literature and culture a socially relevant activity of scholarship today we must turn to contextual work parallel with regard to professional concerns such as the job market, the matter of academic publishing, and digital humanities and, put more broadly, with regard to the role of social, political, and economic aspects of humanities scholarship. In this context, the role of the university and academics the idea of the “corporate university” is not necessarily a bad notion (on various aspects of the corporization of the university, a US-

American phenomenon [but that is gaining traction globally and in a parallel fashion], see, e.g., Donoghue; Garber; Ginsberg; Hacker and Dreifus; Menand; Nussbaum; Readings; Taylor). That is, if humanities scholars think, research, publish, and teach with and within the paradigm of the social relevance of humanities scholarship and pedagogy as I propose and dialogue with administrators of the "corporate university," a more equitable outcome would result than the habitual sidelining of the humanities with scholars complaining and feeling unappreciated. Further, in the West a continuous debate persists about tenure and its value and process and it is no secret that in the feudal system of tenure the majority of professors — once they have obtained tenure (I am referring to research universities where research and teaching are evaluated together and not to universities where only teaching is required for work and tenure) — cease or drastically reduce their work with regard to research and publications either because with tenure they are safe in their position and/or because of their administrative work load. There is no easy solution to this problem but it remains an issue that the vast majority of tenured faculty publish little (see, e.g., Rubenstein and Clifton; while the survey has been conducted in the U.S. and Canada only, I submit that the situation is no different anywhere) and such a state of affairs would not be tolerated in the "real world". Among other reasons, it is because of this that university administrators urge to implement the "corporate university" with its business oriented modalities and practices. Based on tenets of the comparative and contextual approach, practiced in interdisciplinarity, and employing new media technology, comparative cultural studies could/would achieve in-depth scholarship, social relevance, and a global

presence including recognition in the “real world”.

Notes

1. The above article is a revised version of “The Social Relevance of the Study of Culture and Literature, Intercultural Communication, and Sustainable Humanities”, a key note speech delivered at the biennial conference of CLAI: Comparative Literature of India Association, University of Hyderabad, January 2009. I thank the Association for the invitation to the conference, the opportunity to share my thoughts with colleagues in India, and the superb hospitality I experienced. A substantially longer version of the above article — Steven Totosy de Zepetnek and Louise O. Vasvari, “The Comparative and Contextual Study of Literature and Culture and Globalization” — is forthcoming in *The Cambridge Companion to Comparative Literature and Comparative Cultural Studies*. Ed. Steven Totosy de Zepetnek and Tutun Mukherjee. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2012.

2. Steven Totosy de Zepetnek <<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweblibrary/totosycv>> — born 1950 in Hungary, raised in Austria, Germany, and Switzerland, and university education and career in Canada followed by relocation to the U.S. in 2000 — taught comparative literature at the University of Alberta, comparative media and communication studies at the University of Halle-Wittenberg and at Northeastern University, as well as at various universities in Asia. In addition to numerous articles he has published three dozen singleauthored books and collected volumes in various fields of the humanities and social sciences, most recently the collected volumes *Comparative Hungarian Cultural Studies* (with Louise O. Vasvari, 2011), *Mapping the World, Culture, and Border-crossing* (with I-Chun Wang, 2010); *Perspectives on Identity, Migration, and Displacement* (with I-Chun Wang and Hsiao- Yu Sun, 2009), and *Comparative Central European Holocaust Studies* (with Louise O. Vasvari, 2009). Totosy de Zepetnek’s work has also been published in Chinese, French, German, Greek, Hungarian, Italian, Macedonian, Mahrati, Polish, Portuguese, and Spanish translation. He is founding and current editor of the Purdue University Press humanities and social sciences journal *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* (ISSN 1481-4374) <<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb>> and series editor of the Purdue University Press print monograph series of Books in Comparative Cultural Studies and the Shaker Press print monograph series of Books in Comparative Culture, Media, and Communication Studies. He resides in Boston.

Works Cited

Aldridge, Owen A., ed. *The Reemergence of World Literature: A Study of Asia and the West*. Newark: U of Delaware P, 1986. Print.

Apter, Emily. *The Translation Zone: A New Comparative Literature*. Princeton: Princeton UP,

2006. Print.

Bassnett, Susan. *Comparative Literature: A Critical Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993. Print.

Birus, Hendrik. "Main Features of Goethe's Concept of World Literature." *Comparative Literature Now: Theories and Practice /La Littérature comparée à l'heure actuelle. Theories et réalisations*. Ed. Steven Totosy de Zepetnek, Milan V. Dimic, and Irene Sywenky. Paris: Honore Champion, 1999. 31-41. Print.

Bourdieu, Pierre. "Questions of Method." *Empirical Studies of Literature*. Ed. Elrud Ibsch, Dick Schram, and Gerard Steen. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1991. 19-36. Print.

Bremond, Claude, Joshua Landy, and Thomas Pavel, eds. *Thematics: New Approaches*. Albany: State U of New York P, 1995. Print.

Brown, Marshall. "Encountering the World." *Comparative Literature: Toward a (Re)construction of World Literature*. Ed. Ning Wang. Spec. Issue of *Neohelicon: acta comparationis litterarum universum* 38.2 (2011): 349-65. Print.

Carroll, Michael Thomas, ed. *No Small World: Visions and Revisions of World Literature*. Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English, 1996. Print.

Caruth, Cathy, and Jonathan Culler, eds. *Literary Criticism for the Twenty-first Century*. Spec. issue of *PMLA : Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 125.4 (2010): 899-1152. Print.

Cheng, Chin-Chuan, I-Chun Wang, and Steven Totosy de Zepetnek, eds. *Cultural Discourse in Taiwan*. Kaohsiung: National Sun Yat-sen UP, 2009. Print.

Damrosch, David. "Hugo Meltzl and 'The Principle of Polyglottism'." *The Routledge Companion to World Literature*. Ed. Theo D'haen, David Damrosch, and Djelal Kadir. London: Routledge, 2011. 12-20. Print.

---. *What Is World Literature?* Princeton: Princeton UP, 2003. Print.

Damrosch, David, Natalie Melas, and Mbongiseni Buthelezi, eds. *The Princeton Sourcebook in Comparative Literature: From the European Enlightenment to the Global Present*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2009. Print.

- Denzin, Norman K. *Symbolic Interactionism and Cultural Studies*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1992. Print.
- Detienne, Marcel. *Comparing the Incomparable*. Trans. Janet Lloyd. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2008. Print.
- D'haen, Theo. *The Routledge Concise History of World Literature*. London: Routledge, 2012. Print.
- D'haen, Theo, David Damrosch, and Djelal Kadir, eds. *The Routledge Companion to World Literature*. London: Routledge, 2011. Print.
- Dimock, Wai Chee. "World Literature on Facebook." *PMLA: Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 126.3 (2011): 730-36. Print.
- Donoghue, Frank. *The Last Professors: The Corporate University and the Fate of the Humanities*. New York: Fordham UP, 2008. Print.
- Error, Gvozden. "Qu'est-ce qu'on compare en littérature comparée. L'Innovation en tant que désintégration (résumé)." *Filoloski pregled* 40.2 (2003): 86-92. Print.
- Estivals, Robert, Jean Meyriat, and François Richaudeau. *Les Sciences de l'écrit. Encyclopédie internationale de bibliologie*. Paris: Retz, 1993. Print.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar. *Polysystem Studies*. Spec. Issue of *Poetics Today* 11.1 (1990): 1-268. Print.
- Finney, Gail. "Elitism or Eclecticism?: Some Thoughts about the Future of Comparative Literature." *Symploke: a journal for the intermingling of literary, cultural, and theoretical scholarship* 16.1-2 (2008): 215-25. Print.
- Flotow, Luise von. *Translation and Gender: Translating in the "Era of Feminism."* Ottawa: U of Ottawa P, 1996. Print.
- Fredrickson, George M. *The Comparative Imagination: On the History of Racism, Nationalism, and Social Movements*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1997. Print.
- Gallagher, Mary, ed. *World Writing: Poetics, Ethics, Globalization*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2008. Print.
- Garber, Marjorie. *The Use and Abuse of Literature*. New York: Pantheon Books, 2011. Print.
- Ginsberg, Benjamin. *The Fall of the Faculty: The Rise of the All-Administrative University and Why It Matters*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2011. Print.

GMH [GM. Hyde]. "Comparative Literature." *The Routledge Dictionary of Literary Terms*. Ed. Peter Childs and Roger Fowler. London: Routledge, 2005. 29-31. Print.

Goldberg, David Theo. "Praise the Web." *PMLA: Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 126.3 (2011): 448-54. Print.

Grabovszki, Ernst. "The Impact of Globalization and the New Media on the Notion of World Literature." *Comparative Literature and Comparative Cultural Studies*. Ed. Steven Totosy de Zepetnek. West Lafayette: Purdue UP, 2003. 45-57. Print.

Gupta, Suman. *Globalization and Literature*. Cambridge: Polity, 2009. Print.

Hacker, Andrew, and Claudia Dreifus. *Higher Education? How Colleges are Wasting our Money and Failing Our Kids and What We Can Do About It*. New York: Times Books, 2010. Print.

Hillis Miller, J. "Globalization and World Literature." *Comparative Literature: Toward a (Re)construction of World Literature*. Ed. Ning Wang. Spec. Issue of *Neohelicon: acta comparationis litterarum universum* 38.2 (2011): 251-65. Print.

Hynes-Berry, Mary, and Basia C. Miller. *Responding to Literature: World Literature*. Evanston: McDougal, Littell, and Company, 1992. Print.

Ivanov, V. (HBaHOB, V.). *CpaeHumenbHoe numepamypoeedeHue BceMupHan numepamypa CmuxeedeHue* (Comparative Literature, World Literature, Prosody). Moscow: Languages of Russian Culture P, 2004. Print.

Jullien, Dominique, ed. *Foundational Texts of World Literature*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2011. Print.

Klitgard, Ida, ed. *Literary Translation: World Literature of "Worlding" Literature?* Kobenhavn: Museum Tusculanum P, 2006. Print.

Krishnaswamy, Revathi. "Toward World Literary Knowledges: Theory in the Age of Globalization." *Comparative Literature* 62.4 (2010): 399-419. Print.

Landow, George P. *Hypertext 3.0: Critical Theory and New Media in an Era of Globalization*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins UP, 2006. Print.

- Lamping, Dieter. *Die Idee der Weltliteratur. Ein Konzept Goethes und seine Karriere*. Stuttgart: Kroner, 2010. Print.
- Lawall, Sarah, ed. *Reading World Literature: Theory, History, Practice*. Austin: U of Texas P, 1994. Print.
- Lisiak, Agata Anna. *Urban Cultures in (Post)Colonial Central Europe*. West Lafayette: Purdue UP, 2010. Print.
- Lisiak, Agata Anna, and Steven Totosty de Zepetnek. "Intermediality and Cyber Visualities of Central European Cities." *Real and Virtual Cities: Intertextual and Intermedial Mindscapes*. Ed. Asuncion Lopez-Varela Azcarate and Mariana Net. Bucharest: Univers Enciclopedic, 2009. 141-58. Print.
- McClennen, Sophia A. "Inter-American Studies or Imperial American studies?" *Comparative American Studies: An International Journal* 3.4 (2005): 393-414. Print.
- Menand, Louis. *The Marketplace of Ideas: Reform and Resistance in the American University*. New York: Norton, 2010. Print.
- Moriarty, Michael E. *The Semiotics of World Literature*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen P, 1996. Print.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. *Not for Profit: Why Democracy Needs the Humanities*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2010. Print.
- Pireddu, Nikoletta. "Between the Local and the Global: Comparative Literature in the Land of Dante." *Recherche Litteraire /Literary Research* 25 (2009): 26-33. Print.
- Pizer, John. "Johann Wolfgang von Goethe: Origins and Relevance of *Weltliteratur*." *The Routledge Companion to World Literature*. Ed. Theo D'haen, David Damrosch, and Djelal Kadir. London: Routledge, 2011. 3-11. Print.
- . *The Idea of World Literature: History and Pedagogical Practice*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 2006. Print.
- Prendergast, Catherine. *Buying into English: Language and Investment in the New Capitalist World*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh, 2008. Print.
- Prendergast, Christopher, ed. *Debating World Literature*. London: Verso, 2004. Print.
- Puchner, Martin. "World Literature and the Creation of Literary Models." *Comparative*

- Literature: Toward a (Re)construction of World Literature*. Ed. Ning Wang. Spec. Issue of *Neohelicon: acta comparationis litterarum universum* 38.2 (2011): 341-48. Print.
- Ramanathan, Vaidehi. *The English-Vernacular Divide: Postcolonial Language Politics and Practice*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2005. Print.
- Radhakrishnan, R. *Theory in an Uneven World*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2003. Print.
- Readings, Bill. *The University in Ruins*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1996. Print.
- Riegler, Alexander. *Radical Constructivism*. 1997-2010. Web.
<<http://www.radicalconstructivism.com>>.
- Rubdy, Rani, and Mario Saraceni. *English in the World*. New York: Continuum, 2006. Print.
Rubenstein, Hymie, and Rodney Clifton. "A New Approach to Tenure and Scholarship."
University Affairs /Affaires Universitaires 39.5 (1998): 23-24. Print.
- Saussy, Haun. "Exquisite Cadavers Stitched from Fresh Nightmares: Of Memes, Hives, and Selfish Genes."
Comparative Literature in an Age of Globalization. Ed. Haun Saussy. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins UP, 2006. 3-42. Print.
- . "The Dimensionality of World Literature." *Comparative Literature: Toward a (Re)construction of World Literature*. Spec. Issue of *Neohelicon: acta comparationis litterarum universum* 38.2 (2011): 289-94. Print.
- Schmidt, Siegfried J. *Foundations for the Empirical Study of Literature: The Components of a Basic Theory*. Trans. Robert de Beaugrande. Hamburg: Buske, 1982. Print.
- . "From Objects to Processes: A Proposal to Rewrite Radical Constructivism."
Constructivist Foundations: An Interdisciplinary Journal 7.1 (2011): 1-9. Print.
- . *Kognitive Autonomie und soziale Orientierung: Konstruktivistische Bemerkungen zum Zusammenhang von Kognition, Kommunikation, Medien und Kultur*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1994. Print.
- . "Literary Studies from Hermeneutics to Media Culture Studies." *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 12.1, 2010. Web. <[http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol12/iss1/!](http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol12/iss1/)>.
- . *Worlds of Communication: Interdisciplinary Transitions*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2011. Print.

- Schreibman, Susan, Ray Siemens, and John Unsworth, eds. *A Companion to Digital Humanities*. Malden: Blackwell, 2004. Print.
- Simon, Sherry. *Gender in Translation: Cultural Identity and the Politics of Transmission*. London: Routledge, 1996. Print.
- Simonsen, Karen-Margarethe, and Jakob Stougaard-Nielsen, eds. *World Literature World Culture: History, Theory, Analysis*. Aarhus: Aarhus UP, 2008. Print.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. *Death of a Discipline*. New York: Columbia UP, 2003. Print.
- Stanford Friedman, Susan. "Why Not Compare?" *PMLA: Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 126.3 (2011): 753-62. Print.
- Sturm-Trigonakis, Elke. *Global playing in der Literatur. Ein Versuch über die Neue Weltliteratur*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2007. Print.
- Taylor, Mark C. *Crisis on Campus: A Bold Plan for Reforming Our Colleges and Universities*. New York: Knopf, 2010. Print.
- Totosy de Zepetnek, Steven. "Aspects of Scholarship and Publishing in the Age of New Media Technology." *Literatures in the Digital Era: Theory and Praxis*. Ed. Amelia Sanz and Dolores Romero. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2007. 171-84. Print.
- . "Bibliography of (Text)Books in Comparative Literature." *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture (Library)*, 1999-. Web.
<<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweblibrary/comparativeliteraturebooks>>.
- . *Comparative Literature: Theory, Method, Application*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1998. Print.
- . "From Comparative Literature Today toward Comparative Cultural Studies." *Comparative Literature and Comparative Cultural Studies*. Ed. Steven Totosy de Zepetnek. West Lafayette: Purdue UP, 2003. 235-67. Print.
- . "Systemic Approaches to Literature: An Introduction with Selected Bibliographies." *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature / Revue Canadienne de Litterature Comparee* 19.1-2 (1992): 21-93. Print.

---. "Taxonomy for the Study of Translation in Comparative Cultural Studies". *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture (Library)*, 1999. Web.
<<http://works.bepress.com/totosydezepetneksteven/43>>.

— . "The 'Impact Factor' and Selected Issues of Content and Technology in Humanities Scholarship Published Online." *Journal of Scholarly Publishing* 42.1 (2010): 70-78. Print.

---. "The New Humanities: The Intercultural, the Comparative, and the Interdisciplinary." *Globalization and the Futures of Comparative Literature*. Ed. Jan M. Ziolkowski and Alfred J. Lopez. Thematic Section: *The Global South* 1.2 (2007): 45-68. Print.

--- . "The Systemic and Empirical Approach to Literature, the Polysystem Theory, and Translation Theory: The Importance of Methodology." *Studies in the Humanities* 22.1-2 (1995): 12-20. Print.

Totosy de Zepetnek, Steven, and Asuncion Lopez-Varela Azcarate. "Education, Interculturalism, and Mapping a New Europe." *Mapping the World, Culture, and Border-crossing*. Ed. Steven Totosy de Zepetnek and I-Chun Wang. Kaohsiung: National Sun Yat-sen UP, 2010. 38-49. Print.

Totosy de Zepetnek, Steven, and Louise O. Vasvari. "The Comparative and Contextual Study of Literature and Culture and Globalization." *The Cambridge Companion to Comparative Literature and Comparative Cultural Studies*. Ed. Steven Totosy de Zepetnek and Tutun Mukherjee. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2012. Forthcoming. Print.

Totosy de Zepetnek, Steven, Asuncion Lopez-Varela Azcarate, Haun Saussy, and Jan Mieszkowski, eds. *New Perspectives on Material Culture and Intermedial Practice*. Thematic Issue *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 13.3, 2011. Web.
<<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol13/iss3/>>.

Ursa, Mihaela. "Comparative Literature in Romania at the Digital Hour." *Caietele Echinox* 20 (2011): 11-19. Print.

Vandermeersche, Geert, Joachim Vlieghe, and Steven Totosy de Zepetnek. "Bibliography of Publications in Media and (Inter)mediality Studies." *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 13.3, 2011. Web.
<<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol13/iss3/26>>.

Van Peer, Willie, Eleana Asimakopoulou, and Nik Bessis, eds. *Literary Education and Digital Learning*:

Methods and Technologies for Humanities Studies. Hershey: Information Science Reference, 2010. Print.

Villanueva, Dario. "Claudio Guillen: (World) Literature as System." *The Routledge*

Companion to World Literature. Ed. Theo D'haen, David Damrosch, and Djelal Kadir. London: Routledge, 2011. 108-16. Print.

Virk, Tomo. "Comparative Literature versus Comparative Cultural Studies." *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 5.4, 2003. Web. <<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol5/iss4/6/>>.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. "World-System Analysis: Theoretical and Interpretative Issues."

World-System Analysis: Theory and Methodology. Ed. Terence K. Hopkins. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1982. 91-103. Print.

Wang, Ning, ed. *Comparative Literature: Toward a (Re)construction of World Literature*. Spec. Issue of *Neohelicon: acta comparationis litterarum universum* 38.2 (2011): 243-498. Print.

---. "Confronting Globalization: Cultural Studies versus Comparative Literature Studies?" *Neohelicon: acta comparationis litterarum universarum* 28.1 (2011): 56-65. Print.

Witt Frese, Mary Ann. Rev. of Anne Tomiche and Karl Ziegler, eds. *La Recherche en*

litterature generale et comparee en France en 2007. Bilan et perspectives. Le Mont- Houy: PU de Valenciennes, 2007. *Recherche Litteraire /Literary Research* 24.47-48 (2008): 27-29. Print.

Young, Robert J.C. "English and the Language of Others." *European Review* 17.1 (2009): 203-12. Print.