Annual conference of the German Association for the Study of English (Deutscher Anglistenverband)

22–25 SEPTEMBER 2019
AT LEIPZIG UNIVERSITY

#ANGLISTENTAG2019
CONTENTS

Page

1 WELCOME

2 CONFERENCE SCHEDULE

3 OPENING

12 ACADEMIC PROGRAMME

13 KEYNOTES

19 SECTIONS

Section 1: Interdisciplinarity

Section 2: Matter

Section 3: Masculinities

Section 4: Canonization

Section 5: Digital Orality

29 WORKSHOPS

83 SOCIAL PROGRAMME

88 EVENINGS

87 EXCURSION

88 CITY TOURS

89 SERVICE & MAPS

91 CONFERENCE VENUE

91 GETTING AROUND LEIPZIG

93 ORGANISING TEAM

AT A GLANCE

PHONE NUMBERS

WIFI

ACCESSIBILITY
All conference events except the excursion to Colditz are wheelchair-accessible. Campus bathrooms use a euro key.

REGISTRATION DESK
On Monday and Tuesday the desk is located outside room HS 2 at the Hörsaalgebäude. Feel free to leave your luggage there or in the lockers on the same floor. Organising and student staff carry coloured badges and are happy to help.

LEGAL NOTICE
Published by the Department of British Studies at Leipzig University. Mail address: 04081 Leipzig. Visitor address: Beethovenstraße 15, 04107 Leipzig. Edited by Prof Dr Oliver v. Knebel Doeberitz, Isabell Große, Jonatan Steller (layout, typesetting, photos), Alexandra v. Thuemmler (advertising) and Kati Voigt. Printed by Flyeralarm GmbH, Alfred-Nobel-Straße 18, 97080 Würzburg.
Welcome to Leipzig

Dear Colleagues and Friends,

it is our great pleasure to welcome you to the 2019 Anglistentag in Saxony, hosted by the Department of British Studies at Leipzig University. The University of Leipzig was founded in 1409, making it one of the oldest universities in Germany. We are very proud of contributing to the university’s long tradition as a space for national and international academic discussion and exchange by bringing the Anglistentag to Leipzig for the very first time.

The annual Anglistentag provides an opportunity to present cutting-edge research in the field of literary and cultural studies, linguistics, and in teaching English as a foreign language, and it is also a superb venue for meeting colleagues and friends. This year we are looking forward to inspiring talks across a wide variety of topics, ranging from new ideas on interdisciplinarity, to masculinities and ridicule in anglophone cultures, all the way to the role of the literary canon and to questions of orality and literacy in language research. We are also very pleased that James English, John Welsh Centennial Professor of English at the University of Pennsylvania, Jonathan Culpeper, chair of Linguistics and English Language at Lancaster University, and Tom McCarthy, author of best-selling novels, have accepted our invitation to come to Leipzig and contribute keynote lectures to the academic programme.

We trust that you will experience an abundance of lively academic discussion, gain fresh insights into the study of English, and that you will enjoy our beautiful city of Leipzig with its many attractions.

Oliver v. Knebel Doeberitz and the organising team
Leipzig University
Department of British Studies

PHOTO: PAULINUM
### Conference Schedule Overview

#### Sunday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 pm</td>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>GWZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 pm</td>
<td>Conference Warming</td>
<td>THÜRINGER HOF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Monday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 am</td>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>FOYER HS 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 am</td>
<td>Opening and Award Ceremony</td>
<td>PAULINUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 am</td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
<td>FOYER HS 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 am</td>
<td>Keynote by James English</td>
<td>HS 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 noon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pm</td>
<td>Section Panel A</td>
<td>S 120–127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 pm</td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
<td>S 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 pm</td>
<td>Junior Scholars Meet-Up</td>
<td>S 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 pm</td>
<td>Section Panel B</td>
<td>S 120–127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 pm</td>
<td>Keynote by Jonathan Culpeper</td>
<td>HS 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 pm</td>
<td>Reception</td>
<td>NEW TOWN HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 pm</td>
<td>City Tour B in German with a Night Guard</td>
<td>NEW TOWN HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 am</td>
<td>Keynote by Tom McCarthy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 am</td>
<td>Poster Session and Coffee Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 am</td>
<td>Members’ Assembly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 am</td>
<td>City Tour C in English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 noon</td>
<td>Conference Dinner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pm</td>
<td>Editors’ Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 pm</td>
<td>Section Panel C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 pm</td>
<td>Workshops A &amp; B on University Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 pm</td>
<td>City Tour D in German</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 pm</td>
<td>Conference Dinner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 pm</td>
<td>Members’ Assembly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 pm</td>
<td>Workshops A &amp; B on University Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 pm</td>
<td>City Tour D in German</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 pm</td>
<td>Conference Dinner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 pm</td>
<td>Members’ Assembly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tuesday**

- **8 am**: Keynote by Tom McCarthy (HS 2)
- **9 am**: Poster Session and Coffee Break (Foyer HS 2)
- **10 am**: Members’ Assembly (HS 2)
- **11 am**: City Tour C in English (Campus Courtyard)
- **12 noon**: Conference Dinner (Auerbachs Keller)
- **1 pm**: Editors’ Meeting
- **2 pm**: Section Panel C (S 120–127)
- **3 pm**: Workshops A & B on University Teaching (S 126–127)
- **4 pm**: City Tour D in German (Campus Courtyard)
- **5 pm**: Conference Dinner
- **6 pm**: Members’ Assembly
- **7 pm**: Workshops A & B on University Teaching
- **8 pm**: City Tour D in German
- **9 pm**: Conference Dinner
- **10 pm**: Members’ Assembly

**Wednesday**

- **8 am**: Workshop C on Post-Doc Opportunities (GWZ)
- **9 am**: Excursion to Colditz Castle (Bus Stop Goethestrasse)
- **10 am**: Workshop C on Post-Doc Opportunities
- **11 am**: Excursion to Colditz Castle
- **12 noon**: Workshop C on Post-Doc Opportunities
- **1 pm**: Excursion to Colditz Castle
## Conference Schedule: Sunday and Monday

### Sunday 22 September

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1–7 PM</td>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>Geisteswissenschaftliches Zentrum, Beethovenstraße 15, Foyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2–6 PM</td>
<td>Board Meeting</td>
<td>Geisteswissenschaftliches Zentrum, Beethovenstraße 15, Room H5 3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 7 PM</td>
<td>Conference Warming</td>
<td>Thüringer Hof, Burgstraße 19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Monday 23 September

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8–9 AM</td>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>Main Campus, Hörsaalgebäude, Foyer HS 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9–10 AM</td>
<td>Opening and Award Ceremony</td>
<td>Main Campus, Paulinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15–10:45 AM</td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
<td>Main Campus, Hörsaalgebäude, Foyer HS 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45–11:45 AM</td>
<td>Keynote by James English</td>
<td>Main Campus, Hörsaalgebäude, Room HS 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15–3 PM</td>
<td>Section Panel A</td>
<td>Main Campus, Seminargebäude, Rooms S 120–127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 1 Literature and ...? Perspectives on Interdisciplinarity**

**Introduction**
Prof Dr Jens Martin Gurr, PD Dr Ursula Kluwick

**How Interdisciplinary is Interdisciplinary Research?**
Prof Dr Dirk Vanderbeke, Timea Mészáros
POSTCOLONIAL URBAN AESTHETICS: THE POETICS OF LOCATION AND DISLOCATION IN A SELECTION OF ‘BOMBAY’ POEMS
Prof Dr Cecile Sandten

BETTER STORIES ABOUT SCIENCE? THE CONTEMPORARY SCIENCE NOVEL AND THE FIELD OF ‘LITERATURE AND SCIENCE’
Prof Dr Anton Kirchhofer

SECTION 2 MAKING MATTER
MATTER: PAGE, STAGE, SCREEN

INTRODUCTION
Prof Dr Ingrid Hotz-Davies, Prof Dr Martin Middeke, Prof Dr Christoph Reinfandt

MORAL MATTERS: POWER, COLONIALITY, AND NARRATIVE IN HANYA YANAGIHARA’S THE PEOPLE IN THE TREES
Dr Gero Bauer

CONCRETE MATTERS: MATERIALS, METHODOLOGIES, AND OTHER MAKINGS
Dr Kylie Crane

THE PERFORMATIVITY OF MEDBH MCGUCKIAN’S INTERTEXTUAL ECPOETICS IN BLARIS MOOR
Dr Jessica Bundschuh

SECTION 3 ‘FUNNY MEN’: MASCULINITIES AND RIDICULE IN ANGLOPHONE CULTURES

INTRODUCTION
PD Dr Stefanie Schäfer, PD Dr Wieland Schwanebeck

DICKENS AND THE CAMP AESTHETIC
PD Dr Franziska Quabeck

MENTION THE WAR: BRITISH SITCOMS AND MILITARY MASCULINITY
Prof Dr Anette Pankratz

SECTION 4 CANONIZATION IN TIMES OF GLOBALIZATION AND DIGITIZATION

INTRODUCTION
PD Dr Kai Wiegandt, Jun-Prof Dr Jens Elze

WORLD LITERATURE AND THE NATIONAL FRAME: REROUTING MULTICULTURAL CANONS
PD Dr Jan Rupp

CONSTRUCTING THE LITERARY CANON: THE CASE OF CONTEMPORARY IRISH FICTION
PD Dr Ralf Haekel

MONDAY CONTINUED
SECTION 5 ORALITY, LITERACY – AND THE DIGITAL?
NEW PERSPECTIVES ON LANGUAGE OF IMMEDIACY
AND LANGUAGE OF DISTANCE

INTRODUCTION
Prof Dr Sarah Buschfeld, Dr Sven Leuckert

EXPLORING THE ‘DEGREE OF IMMEDIACY’ IN LATE MODERN ENGLISH SYNTAX
Dr Lucia Siebers

LANGUAGE OF IMMEDIACY, LANGUAGE OF DISTANCE AND
LANGUAGE AWARENESS – FROM MANUSCRIPT TO INTERNET
PD Dr Göran Wolf

“THIS WORD NO GET CONCRETE MEANING OO”: PRAGMATIC MARKERS
IN NIGERIAN MULTILINGUAL ONLINE COMMUNICATION
Dr Mirka Honkanen

3–3:30 PM
COFFEE BREAK
Main Campus, Seminargebäude, Room S 126

3–3:30 PM
JUNIOR SCHOLARS MEET-UP
Main Campus, Seminargebäude, Room S 121

3:30–5 PM
SECTION PANEL B
Main Campus, Seminargebäude, Rooms S 120–127

SECTION 1 LITERATURE AND ...?
PERSPECTIVES ON INTERDISCIPLINARITY

LITERATURE AND INTERDISCIPLINARY (HEALTH) RISK RESEARCH –
THOUGHT STYLES, PROBABILITIES, AND NARRATIVES OF UNCERTAINTY
PD Dr Julia Hoydis

INTERDISCIPLINARITY ACROSS THE “TWO-CULTURES”
PD Dr Marcus Hartner

SECTION 2 MAKING MATTER
MATTER: PAGE, STAGE, SCREEN

“NO WIRES – ALL ALIVE”: THEATRICAL BODIES AND THEATRICAL THINGS
Dr Kerstin Fest

AGAINST THE “MYTH OF NON-MEDIATION”: THE
MATERIALITY OF LIVE THEATRE BROADCASTING
Dr Heidi Liedke
IN THE BLINK OF AN EYE – PAGE, EYE-MOVEMENT, SONNET FORM
Prof Dr Felix Sprang

SECTION 3 ‘FUNNY MEN’: MASCULINITIES AND RIDICULE IN ANGLOPHONE CULTURES
RICKY GERVAIS’ DISTORTED MENS
Dr Nele Sawallisch
TOXIC MASCULINITY AND ACID HUMOUR: NEGOTIATING MASCULINITIES AND LATE NIGHT COMEDY
Dr Ulla Ratheiser

SECTION 4 CANONIZATION IN TIMES OF GLOBALIZATION AND DIGITIZATION
CANON, CORPUS, ARCHIVE: SELECTION AND VALUATION FROM ROMANTIC CRITICISM TO THE DIGITAL HUMANITIES
Tim Sommer
COMP TITLES AND PRODUCT SUGGESTIONS: THE ALGORITHMS OF CANON FORMATION
Prof Dr Sebastian Domsch

SECTION 5 ORALITY, LITERACY – AND THE DIGITAL?
NEW PERSPECTIVES ON LANGUAGE OF IMMEDIACY AND LANGUAGE OF DISTANCE
CONSTRUCTING IMMEDIACY AT A DISTANCE: THE COMMENTS SECTION OF ONLINE BLOGS
Dr Cornelia Gerhardt
“We ARE ALL IN THIS TOGETHER” – BALANCING VIRTUAL PROXIMITY AND DISTANCE IN ONLINE CAREGIVER DISCUSSIONS
Prof Dr Birte Bös, Carolin Schneider
DIGITAL FOOD TALK: BLURRING IMMEDIACY AND DISTANCE IN YOUTUBE EATING SHOWS
Dr Sofia Rüdiger

3:30–5 PM
CITY TOUR A IN GERMAN
Main Campus, Campus Courtyard

5:15–6:15 PM
KEYNOTE BY JONATHAN CULPEPER
Main Campus, Hörsaalgebäude, Room HS 2

MONDAY CONTINUED
### Conference Schedule: Monday and Tuesday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7–9 PM</td>
<td>Reception</td>
<td>New Town Hall, Martin-Luther-Ring 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9–10:30 PM</td>
<td>City Tour B in German with a Night Guard</td>
<td>New Town Hall, Martin-Luther-Ring 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9–10 AM</td>
<td>Keynote by Tom McCarthy</td>
<td>Main Campus, Hörsaalgebäude, Room HS 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–10:30 AM</td>
<td>Poster Session and Coffee Break</td>
<td>Main Campus, Hörsaalgebäude, Foyer HS 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 AM–1:30 PM</td>
<td>Members’ Assembly</td>
<td>Main Campus, Hörsaalgebäude, Room HS 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 AM–12 NOON</td>
<td>City Tour C in English</td>
<td>Main Campus, Campus Courtyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30–2:45 PM</td>
<td>Editors’ Meeting</td>
<td>Main Campus, Seminargebäude, Room S 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3–4:30 PM</td>
<td>Section Panel C</td>
<td>Main Campus, Seminargebäude, Rooms S 120–127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td><strong>Section 1 Literature and ...?</strong></td>
<td>Room S 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Perspectives on Interdisciplinarity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>From Law and Literature to Law and the Humanities, Law and Culture... and Beyond?</td>
<td>Dr Susanne Gruß</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Literature and... Business Studies: Conflicts and Crossovers</td>
<td>Dr Caroline Kögler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Prof Dr Jens Martin Gurr, PD Dr Ursula Kluwick</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION 2 MAKING MATTER

**MATTER: PAGE, STAGE, SCREEN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Speaker(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tentacular Narrative Webs: Unthinking Humans, Exploring Non-Human Matter in Fiction</td>
<td>Dr Dunja M. Mohr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Places, Animals, Things: The Importance of the Non-Human for John Berger’s Spiritual Materialism</td>
<td>Prof Dr Christian Schmitt-Kilb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of Broomsticks and Doughnuts: British Thing-Essays from 1700 Until Today</td>
<td>Daniel Schneider</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

Prof Dr Ingrid Hotz-Davies, Prof Dr Martin Middeke, Prof Dr Christoph Reinfandt

### SECTION 3 ‘FUNNY MEN’: MASCULINITIES AND RIDICULE IN ANGLOPHONE CULTURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Speaker(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Imitation Competition: Comic Masculinity in Midlife Crisis in Michael Winterbottom’s The Trip Series</td>
<td>Prof Dr Lucia Krämer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laughable Old Men: Conceptions of Aging Masculinities in the Britcom</td>
<td>Franziska Röber</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

PD Dr Stefanie Schäfer, PD Dr Wieland Schwanebeck

### SECTION 4 CANONIZATION IN TIMES OF GLOBALIZATION AND DIGITIZATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Speaker(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“A Truth Universally Acknowledged”? Jane Austen, Fan Fiction and the Canon</td>
<td>Prof Dr Angelika Zirker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Value of Hashtags and Goodreads: Theorizing the Canon in Digital Culture</td>
<td>PD Dr Julia Straub</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

PD Dr Kai Wiegandt, Jun-Prof Dr Jens Elze
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY 25 SEPTEMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>9:15 AM–2 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EXCURSION TO Colditz Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bus Stop Goethestraße</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>10 AM–2 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WORKSHOP C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geisteswissenschaftliches Zentrum, Beethovenstraße 15, Room R 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>SECTION 5 ORALITY, LITERACY – AND THE DIGITAL?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEW PERSPECTIVES ON LANGUAGE OF IMMEDIACY AND LANGUAGE OF DISTANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Room S 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>TWEETING WITH TRUMP: AN ANALYSIS OF TRUMP’S TWITTER LANGUAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof Dr Patricia Ronan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>TERTIARY ORALITY? REREADING WALTER ONG IN THE POSTHUMANIST ERA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof Dr Theresa Heyd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45–6:15 PM</td>
<td>WORKSHOPS A &amp; B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>DAS ANGLISTIKSTUDIUM IM SPANNUNGSFELD VON SCHULE UND UNIVERSITÄT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof Dr Christoph Heyl, Dr Jürgen Ronthaler and Prof Dr Felix Sprang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Room S 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>THE DIGITAL IN RESEARCH-ORIENTED TEACHING: INTERDISCIPLINARY EXCHANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Sabine Bartsch and Prof Dr Angelika Zirker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–6:30 PM</td>
<td>CITY TOUR D IN GERMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–6:30 PM</td>
<td>Auerbachs Keller, Grimmaische Straße 2–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>CONFERENCE DINNER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>CITY TOUR D IN GERMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Main Campus, Seminargebäude, Rooms S 126–127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Room S 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>EXCURSION TO Colditz Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Main Campus, Campus Courtyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>SCHRITTE NACH DER PROMOTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof Dr Ilka Mindt, Dr Sandra Dinter, Dr Philip Jacobi, Dr Sven Leuckert and Prof Dr Felix Sprang</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OPENING AND AWARD CEREMONY

**TIME**  Monday 9–10 am

**VENUE**  Main Campus, Paulinum

**SPEAKERS**

*President of the German Association for the Study of English*

Prof Dr Klaus P. Schneider

*Rector of Leipzig University*

Prof Dr Beate A. Schücking

*Dean of the Faculty of Philology*

Prof Dr Beat Siebenhaar

Organising Team

Prof Dr Oliver v. Knebel Doeberitz

*President of the European Society for the Study of English*

Prof Dr Andreas H. Jucker

Award Ceremony for the Postdoctoral Dissertation Prize

Prof Dr Rainer Emig

**HOUSEKEEPING**

**COMMITTEE OF THE POSTDOCTORAL DISSERTATION PRIZE**

Prof Dr Stefani Brusberg-Kiermeier,

Prof Dr Rainer Emig,

Prof Dr Angela Hahn and

Prof Dr Claudia Lange

**PHOTO**: PAULINUM, **CREDIT**: KATI VOIGT
We are accustomed to thinking of hierarchies of literary value in terms of *canonicity* (value in the academic system, gauged by metrics of citational and curricular frequency); *consecration* (value in the system of mainstream prestige, gauged by distribution of prizes, awards, and honors), *popularity* (value in the system of literary commerce, gauged by sales figures and bestseller lists); or *personal preference* (value in our own system of favorites and aversions, gauged by affective response and attachment). But these days the most ubiquitous and arguably the most influential form of literary valuation is the online rating, typically calculated on a five-star scale via an aggregation of reader scores. A high rating on this scale does not directly correlate with popularity, prestige, or canonicity, nor is it even a perfect reflection of the personal preferences of the individuals doing the rating. So what exactly is a five star rating, and what kind of value does it represent? How have we become so dependent on a metric whose meaning we do not really understand? In this talk, Jim English will trace the history of the five-star system, its transformations in the digital age, and its contemporary functions and affordances.
PROF JAMES ENGLISH

James F. English is John Welsh Centennial Professor of English at the University of Pennsylvania, where he is also the founding director of the Price Lab for Digital Humanities. He received his MA from the University of Chicago and his PhD from Stanford. His main fields of research are the sociology and economics of culture; the history of literary studies as a discipline; and contemporary British fiction, film, and television. His first book *Comic Transactions* (Cornell UP) explored the joke-work of the political unconscious in the British novel from Conrad and Woolf to Lessing and Rushdie. Perhaps his most influential work to date, *The Economy of Prestige* (Harvard UP) is a study of the history, functions, and effects of prizes in literature and the arts. *Economy of Prestige* was named Best Academic Book of 2005 by *New York Magazine*. *The Concise Companion to Contemporary British*, a collection of essays about the scene and system of literary production in the UK, was published the following year by Blackwell. *The Global Future of English* was published in 2012 in the Blackwell Manifesto series. It rethinks the prevailing narratives of contraction and decline that dominate histories of the discipline, stressing instead the discipline’s expansion within a rapidly massifying global academic apparatus, and the new challenges and opportunities such sudden and dispersive growth presents.

For a few years now, James English has been studying the effects of digitalization on literature and on reading and has also been using methods of the digital humanities for his own studies in literary sociology. His current book project is *Beauty by the Numbers*, a brief history of attempts to quantitatively analyze aesthetic quality. An ongoing digital project proposes to periodize the field of contemporary Anglophone fiction by means of quantitative analysis of hand-built meta-data. Some results of this research were published in a special issue of *Modern Language Quarterly* on “Scale and Value: New & Digital Approaches to Literary History” that English co-edited with Ted Underwood. A related digital project is *Mining Goodreads: Literary Reception Studies at Scale*, which involves computational analysis of nearly 4 million book reviews from the Goodreads social reading site. Findings from this project will be published in a volume English is co-editing with Heather Love for Oxford UP.
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This lecture encompasses a series of reflections on ‘writtenness’ and ‘spokenness’ in and across the English language especially in Britain. It begins with the present-day and one of the most prevalent myths in British culture: when posh people speak, they do not ‘drop’ (i.e., fail to pronounce) the letters of the written form. I examine this myth, and also the myth that American English is corrupting British. Both myths, I argue, relate to what sociolinguists have referred to as the “standard language ideology” (e.g., Milroy & Milroy 1985/1992). This is, essentially, a belief system revolving around the idea that there is only one correct spoken variety of language which is modelled on a single correct written form. This ideology, I propose, also encompasses writers, who, accordingly, are imbued with superhuman abilities. With this in mind I consider one further myth, the myth that Shakespeare created many thousands of new words for the English language. Of course, the standard language ideology assumes one written variety with high value. Historically, however, such a variety has more often than not been lacking. At this point, I introduce a more descriptive approach to ‘writtenness’ and ‘spokenness,’ one revolving around three categories, namely, the degree to which a text is speech-like, speech-based or speech-purposed. This descriptive approach is part of the work on spoken interaction in historical English writing that I conducted over 20 years with Merja Kytö (e.g., Culpeper & Kytö 2010). I discuss some of our findings, in particular what we termed ‘pragmatic noise’ (essentially, primary interjections, the noises – ooh’s and aah’s – that facilitate conversation). I also discuss the genre of play-texts, a complex hybrid genre, and how it has changed over the centuries. As a coda to this lecture, I bring the focus back to the present day. I offer some observations on online sarcasm, especially in comparison with spoken sarcasm, and thereby note some of the resources a digital medium deploys.

Jonathan Culpeper is chair of Linguistics and English Language at Lancaster University. In his research, he focuses, amongst other things, on orality and literacy, most noticeably in his work on the exploitation of historical written material for the analysis of spoken language. A central publication on this topic is the monograph *Early Modern English Dialogues: Spoken Interaction as Writing* (2010, Cambridge University Press, co-authored with Merja Kytö). In this book, Culpeper and Kytö classify certain text types as “speech-based,” “speech-purposed,” and “speech-like,” partially solving the ‘bad data problem,’ which lamented the issue of having to rely on written texts for the analysis of spoken language of the past. Another of Culpeper’s main research interests is pragmatics, the exploration of language in its situational, context-sensitive dimensions. An important publication is the *Palgrave Handbook of Linguistic (Im)politeness* (2017, Palgrave Macmillan, co-edited with Michael Haugh and Dániel Z. Kádár); various papers on politeness theory as well as on connections between pragmatics and other disciplines such as corpus linguistics have been published by Culpeper in numerous prestigious journals (e.g. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, *Journal of Pragmatics*, *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, *Journal of Politeness Research*).

In addition to his linguistically-inclined research, Culpeper has published widely on interdisciplinary topics. His work on Shakespeare is a case in point, with a major publication being the book *Stylistics and Shakespeare: Transdisciplinary Approaches* (2011, Continuum, co-edited with Mireille Ravassat). In his plenary talk, Jonathan Culpeper will also bridge several gaps: between orality and literacy, between British and American English, and between literary and cultural studies and linguistics.
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FROM PAPER TO PULP: A REPORT FROM NO MAN’S LAND

TOM MCCARTHY LONDON

TIME Tuesday 9–10 am  ROOM HS 2, Hörsaalgebäude, 1st Floor

Translated into over 20 languages, adapted for cinema and theatre and honoured with several awards, the novels of Tom McCarthy could be seen as bringing several of the themes of this conference into perfect alignment. Not only do they move across a wide interdisciplinary range, drawing on (inter alia) anthropology, psychoanalysis, philosophy, political theory and cinema; they also display a recurrent preoccupation with materiality, with the untranslatability – or ‘baseness’ – of plain, simple matter. In this keynote, he discusses both his own practice and his understanding of literature tout court in terms of in-betweens, impurity and mess.
TOM MCCARTHY

Best known for his best-selling and prize-winning novels, Tom McCarthy is also a critic, installation artist and cultural theorist. He was born in 1969 and grew up in London. His debut novel, *Remainder*, was originally published in 2005 by a niche publisher. Alongside *Men In Space* (2007), however, it established his reputation as a standard-bearer of the avant-garde. *C* (2010) won the Windham-Campbell award and *Satin Island* (2015) won the Goldsmiths Prize. Both novels were shortlisted for the Man Booker Prize.

*Tintin and the Secret of Literature* (2006) explored Hergé’s work through the prism of structuralist and post-structuralist literary theory. Tom McCarthy’s two other books, popular with students for whom his novels are required reading, contain some of the essays he has written for a wide variety of print publications including *Guardian*, *Independent*, *London Review of Books*, *TLS* and *Another Magazine*. McCarthy is also known for the art exhibited in the name of the ‘semi-fictitious avant-garde network’ International Necronautical Society.
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Over the past few decades, interdisciplinarity has been gaining in popularity. In some contexts, it even seems to have become a “must” for innovative and successful research, the sine qua non for certain funding contexts. Indeed, interdisciplinarity can be extremely beneficial, and to enter a dialogue with other disciplines enables entirely unforeseen approaches, questions, and outcomes. It fosters, to borrow formulations from Dame Gillian Beer, the transformation of ideas and the destabilisation of knowledge, and thus helps “uncover problems disguised by the scope of established disciplines” (Beer 115). Interdisciplinarity is fundamentally, and productively, transgressive, and this already signals its appeal to literary and cultural scholars.

Yet interdisciplinarity also comes with its problems, both on a purely pragmatic as well as on a conceptual level. Knowledge from other fields can be difficult to acquire, and sufficient “interiority” (Shattock 54) to other disciplines almost impossible to gain. Indeed, how much we need to learn of other skills and about other processes of enquiry in order to enter a dialogue with representatives of other fields, what, in other words, is deemed “enough” knowledge, remains a complex question. What some see as interdisciplinarity, others dismiss as a mere retooling of concepts from other disciplines (see Huggan), and the boundaries and transitions between multidisciplinarity and interdisciplinarity are sometimes hard to gauge. It also makes a difference whether interdisciplinarity is pursued on an individual level, or within larger networks. Moreover, while some fields and research contexts allow us to make productive use of our core competencies as scholars in literary and cultural studies, we can be little more than either amateurs or marginal contributors in other fields. Thus, interdisciplinary research contexts frequently also challenge us to defend our own discipline and to reflect on the legitimacy and “relevance” of the questions and forms of analysis that typically concern us.
This section aims to explore the challenges and difficulties of interdisciplinary research as much as its benefits. Fields of enquiry may include collaboration between literary/cultural studies and the natural and life sciences (biology, chemistry, climate research, physics, medicine, etc.), and the social sciences (anthropology, psychology, sociology, political science, etc.). Basically, the section asks how we “do” interdisciplinarity both in research and in teaching. Papers might address, but are not limited to, the following aspects:

- What literary studies has to offer to other disciplines, both through its subject matter and material, as well as through its specific methodologies, forms of enquiry, and types of analysis.
- The communication between different fields and their representatives.
- The role of literature and literary studies for the grand societal challenges, and the “relevance” of our discipline.
- Historical perspectives on interdisciplinarity and its changing meanings and practices.
- Specific fields of interdisciplinarity, such as cognitive literary studies, ecocriticism and the environmental humanities, literature and science research, literary and cultural urban studies, literature and political science, literature and economics, literature and material culture.
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13 years ago, when the Anglistentag still had a plenary panel session, the topic of this panel discussion was “Interdisciplinarity”, and I (Dirk Vanderbeke) contributed a paper “Wie interdisziplinär is interdisziplinär?” For this paper, I chose 50 articles from 2003, the titles of which indicated an interdisciplinary approach, and I checked the bibliographies to find out what kind of secondary literature from which academic fields had actually been used in the research. The result varied strongly, depending on the chosen “other” discipline. In interdisciplinary research on literature and art, film and music, for example, almost half of the secondary texts originated in these disciplines. The situation was quite different in research on literature and science or economics, where far fewer texts from scientists and economists were taken into consideration. In general, it was noticeable that proximity of the academic fields increased the willingness to engage with literature from the respective field.

In our joint paper for this year, we will update these findings, i.e. we will use the same method to see whether the approaches to interdisciplinary research have changed. We will check the bibliographies of books and articles from 2017 to gauge whether the tenet that interdisciplinarity requires familiarity with the respective fields of enquiry is reflected in the secondary literature employed in the research.
Postcolonial studies have initiated shifts towards transcultural, translocal, and transdisciplinary perspectives, raising new questions about received ideas and familiar fields such as travel writing, autobiography, or the many perspectives on the English literary canon. One area that has not yet been so extensively studied is the poetic representation of contemporary South Asian and Asian metropolises (e.g. Rao; Ho and Stierstorfer; Herbert; Sandten).

Generally, metropolises are characterised by intensified, augmented diversity and contrasting architectural manifestations as well as by vertical and horizontal urban density and complexity. In addition, an energetic bustling atmosphere often pervades the city. These images are associated with Western metropolises such as London, Paris, or New York, which have become the cultural and architectural epitomes of the modern city. The notion of the postcolonial metropolis, however, alludes to the multi-layered and stratified ways of life inside, as well as outside, city centres, and, often, to the ‘downside’ of cityscapes in postcolonial societies. This holds true for the Indian metropolis ‘Bombay,’ a city that, due to its colonial past and amplified contemporary present, can be identified as a postcolonial metropolis. This metropolis often discloses its own subversive urban aesthetic of underworlds morphing into overworlds (Mehta 2008), where tradition, modernity, postcoloniality and postmodernity collide in the most unrelenting and dynamic fashion, revealing the limits of Western concepts and models of urbanity and modernity. Addressing the question of how cityscapes have been aesthetically depicted in all of their urban complexity in literature, my paper, through a close reading of selected poems, aims to show that the postcolonial city of ‘Bombay’ is a metropolis that does not lend itself to easy poetic description and condensation. Instead, ‘Bombay’ poems bear features of dynamism and multiple layering that are rendered via a vivid poetics of location and dislocation, or upside and downside. By way of an interdisciplinary approach, here urban studies (e.g. “cityness,” Simone) and postcolonial textuality (e.g. “postcolonial flânerie,” Hartwiger; “poetic geography”), I will provide verification of how I address interdisciplinarity as it relates to urban studies and postcolonial poetry in research and teaching.
My contribution will address issues of ‘literature and science studies’ as interdisciplinary practice. In looking at its potentials as well as the challenges and obstacles it faces, I will build on my perspective of a member of the research group “Fiction Meets Science” (fictionmeetsscience.org). This group has been funded by the Volkswagen Foundation since 2013, in a funding format designed, among other things, to highlight the role of literature and literary studies in grand societal challenges. And it has, at least to my knowledge, a unique composition, since it involves novelists who have written or are writing ‘science novels’ – as we have come to designate fiction in which scientific practice and scientific concepts play a central role both thematically and in relation to textual structures –, it involves scientists whose disciplines and practices are becoming the object of fictional representation, as well as literary scholars and social scientists who are seeking to work together on a larger range of such novels and other fictional narratives.

I will briefly outline the formats of interdisciplinary practice devised and practiced within this group, and equally briefly discuss the rationale for devising these formats against the background of a rough historical sketch of successive phases and (inter)disciplinary status of the field of literature and science studies, as well as a side-glance at the goals and structures of other current interdisciplinary research groups in the field. Against this background I will review methodological aspects of interdisciplinarity from the perspective of literary studies, discussing ways of making analytical work relate both to the disciplinary interests of literary studies as well as to the questions and issues which engage other agents and participants in the public and internal arenas of discourses on science.

Specifically this will bear on the connections which may be forged between practices of close reading and textual analysis, between practices of discourse analysis, and between analyses of readerly engagement and ‘recognition,’ which takes these terms and develops them beyond the already useful forms which they have taken on in the thinking of Rita Felski (cf. *The Uses of Literature*, 2009).

Of course, such an endeavour is beset by multiple risks of mutual misconceptions and misunderstandings. But it also has the potential to shed light on the significant and persistent demand for – more and better – stories about science, both on the part of the wider public and on the part of scientists themselves, on the ways in which literary fiction has begun to join the negotiation of this demand, and not least on the role which literary studies can play in enabling the various potentials of recognition this affords.
This paper draws on the experience of a literary studies scholar working on risk perception and management. Focussing on collaborative research on health risk with scholars in medicine and the health sciences, risk is a concept which epitomizes typical challenges and benefits of ‘doing’ interdisciplinarity. The former include that literary studies’ view on risk might be denied by the hard sciences what Latour called “the pleasure of producing one fact” (in Kofman). While, this paper argues, literature offers valuable insight into the genealogy of risk in different socio-cultural contexts and the constructedness of medical ‘facts’ in the sense of Fleck’s ‘thought styles,’ as well as into human reasoning and patterns of risk behaviour in non-/fictional narratives, a pitfall in interdisciplinary communication is that of being assigned the role of historian or pseudo-pyschologist. Literary studies’ competence in interpreting narratives, however, might also require negotiation, for example with regard to the understanding of narrative (interviews) geared towards producing statistical evidence in a clinical context.

Though a majority of risk theory comes from sociology, the term has diverging and even opposing meanings and applications in different fields. The health sciences employ a concept of risk as measurable uncertainty, driven by an action-oriented paradigm of prevention and “evidence-based” medicine. Preventing or minimizing risk being the predominant discursive goal, a problem is trying to manage the growing amount of complex information for health-related decision-making and people’s ‘irrational’ responses to ‘factual’ health risks. However, referring originally neutrally to the objective estimation of possible events, the mainly negative association of risk with danger of loss and the avoidance paradigm dominant in the health sciences today is only shaped in the course of the 19th century as a result of the reduction of complexity by standardizations invented in that period. Exploring the evolution and currency of risk from the joint perspectives of philosophy of science, cultural sociological theory and literary studies opens a wider background for understanding health risk narratives; it also accounts for risk’s focus on agency and the emotional component it comprises besides probabilities. Risk is tied to storytelling as a means of constructing meaning, causal coherence and dealing with uncertainty. It forms an integral part of (self-)narration as well as dialogic interactions, and it sublimes accidents, hopes and fears into ‘storied’ lives. Consequently, interdisciplinary risk
The idea of interdisciplinarity has retained a generally positive image over the past decades. Many institutes for advanced studies enjoy an excellent academic reputation and research foundations such as the DFG actively promote interdisciplinary exchange by funding collaborative research centres (SFBs) and interdisciplinary research networks. Promoting dialogue between disciplines is widely acknowledged as a productive research strategy that can lead to new questions and the development of unforeseen approaches. Yet, despite this general praise, interdisciplinarity remains a double-edged sword. Not only does it come with a variety of pragmatic and conceptual problems, but the pursuit of research situated between different disciplines can both benefit and harm academic careers. This particularly pertains to attempts at bridging what Charles P. Snow has famously called the “two cultures.”

My paper addresses the conceptual and pragmatic challenges faced by interdisciplinary work situated at the intersection of literary studies and science. Drawing on the example of cognitive approaches to literature, I will discuss scholarly concerns about the ‘nature’ and ‘purpose’ of the humanities as well as some of the epistemological and methodological tensions characterising the endeavour of integrating empirical (cognitive) science into (non-empirical) literary and cultural studies. Problems such as the “explanatory gap” between mind and brain (Levin), or the (allegedly) different aims of scientific and literary research (Adler and Gross) have given rise to an extensive critical debate on the potential, the scope, and the problems of this particular field of study (e.g. Jackson; Adler and Gross; Zymner; Hartner). Taking this debate as a starting point, I will outline some of the major challenges and pitfalls faced by scientific approaches in the humanities and attempt to reflect on potential ways of conceptualising and engaging with such research in a methodologically sound way.

‘Law and literature’ first emerged as an element of legal education at American law schools during the 1970s, and has since become a regular part of the legal curriculum in the U.S. The establishment of courses in the field was initially an attempt to replenish law students’ ‘dry’ legal studies with the spark of ‘real life’ and emotion which, proponents of the movement argued, legal education did not provide. In the early days of law and literature, then, literature was habitually constructed as a means to restore a humane element to legal studies, employed to ‘repair’ a perceived lack in legal education and legal practice. Not surprisingly, this aspect of law and literature has elicited criticism from literary scholars, who have highlighted the tendency of law and literature to treat literature as an emotional supplement to law rather than accepting it as an equal partner in an interdisciplinary venture that comes with its own disciplinary traditions and terminology. Law and literature has since evolved into a complex interdisciplinary field which entails its own springs and snares. The problem of interdisciplinarity in this field, first depicted comprehensively by US-American legal scholar Jane B. Baron in 1999, is partly due to a distinct lack of academic mindfulness and self-consciousness, and has led to a fracturing of the movement into a “multiplicity of approaches and concerns” that “may lead skeptics to dismiss law and literature as an empty vessel, a phrase devoid of content” (1062). Apart from the various criticisms directed against the field as a whole, scholars rightly bemoan literary academics’ lack of legal knowledge and legal academics’ lack of literary knowledge, respectively, and demand serious reflection of the socio-cultural contexts of specific laws and literatures. Nevertheless, academic interest in the interrelations of the legal and the literary is still in full swing. Law and literature (and ‘law and the humanities’ or ‘law and culture’) seems to be in the middle of developing into a diverse interdisciplinary field influenced not only by literary studies and literary theory but also by cultural studies. In this paper, I would like to explore the history of law and literature as well as the more recent incarnations of the field, discuss a project which took interdisciplinarity seriously by bringing together early modern literature and contemporary law – the Shakespeare Moot Court Project (Manderson & Yachnin, 2002–2007) – and shed some light on the possible interconnections of law and literature with the (generic) laws of literature in my own take on the field.

The relationship between literary and cultural studies and business studies has long been a difficult one. Whilst a number of subfields of business studies, such as critical management studies and organisation studies, have drawn diversely on the humanities including literary and cultural studies as a source for inspiration, traffic in the opposite direction remains scarce. Steeped in (post-)Marxist doubts as to the moral integrity of anything ‘business,’ and aggravated by recent structural changes in Britain’s university landscape, literary and cultural studies scholars tend to consider the research that comes out of business schools in generically negative terms; particularly where a destructive ‘managerialism’ is perceived to be entering higher education, (potential) crossovers between business studies and the humanities are viewed with suspicion, or cynicism (e.g. Westall; Eagleton; Brouillette). This complicates interdisciplinary work. As Mrinalini Greedharry and Pasi Ahonen observe in a rare instance of cooperation between literary studies and critical management, they have had to defend themselves repeatedly against disbelief and hostility from literary scholars, needing to reassure them that “a turn to management and organization perspectives is not a turn to managerialism or a backhanded way of slipping the objectives of neo-liberal management of higher education into humanities research” (49–66). What is frequently overlooked is that business schools are no disciplinary monoliths, let alone ideological ones, and that they can harbour not only mainstream U.S. American management approaches but also a range of heterodox fields from critical management studies to feminist and islamic economics (see also Zein-Elabdin; Zein-Elabdin and Charusheela). Where debates about economy and business do become relevant in literary and cultural studies, they are typically informed not by a diverse spectrum of business or economics research but, as Lawrence Grossberg has suggested, by a set of (over-)familiar economic theories that “we already know we are likely to agree with” (Grossberg 106). At the same time, negative notions of ‘business’ are embraced for identitarian politics where ‘business’ and related notions such as ‘capitalism’ are constructed by literary and cultural studies scholars as morally inferior ‘Others’ and a constitutive outside.

Building on my interdisciplinary background in both literary and cultural studies and business administration, and my transdisciplinary conceptualisations of the market as a performative dimension of practice (see my Critical Branding), I discuss in this talk the frequently politicised, mutual positionings; existing interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary crossovers and projects; as well as my own work as a conceptual background for exploring – not the differences – but overlaps and crossovers between the work and practices of those doing literature and those doing business.
If there is one discernible trend after the dissolution of the Age of Theory as it flourished under the impact of the linguistic turn, it seems to be a renewed focus on matter. While Theory (with a capital T) marked the climax of a longstanding development that refined the representational paradigm of Western culture after the linguistic turn of the early twentieth century, recent developments reformulate the modern triad of objectivity, subjectivity and reflexivity in terms of materiality, affect and mediality in order to acknowledge the ‘force of things’ and the ‘vibrancy of matter’ (Jane Bennett) in the ‘entanglement of matter and meaning’ (Karen Barad). The emergent new epistemological and ontological framework has often been subsumed under the bracket term ‘new materialisms’, which also covers parallel developments like ‘speculative realism’ (Quentin Meillassoux), ‘object-oriented philosophy’ (Graham Harman, Timothy Morton) or ‘actor-network theory’ (Bruno Latour). Of late, works by Donna Haraway (Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Cthulucene, 2016) and Bruno Latour (Facing Gaia: Eight Lectures on the New Climatic Regime, 2015/2017) in particular have claimed the practical and political urgency of the new mode of thinking against the backdrop of climate change and social upheaval as ultimate outcomes of the old paradigm. The interrelated analysis of matter and affect challenges traditional mind/body- and nature/nurture oppositions and, instead, highlights the complexity of oppressing linguistic signifying practices and forms in literature, theatre, and film. In this, literature, performance, art, and popular culture are seen as subverting such representations. Interrelating affect and matter, thus, accentuates sensations, intensities, valences, and interior movements that are generated and shaped by energies which are themselves embedded in diverse forms of embodied human life (i.e. Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick and Brian Massumi, and, more recently, Sarah Ahmed, Lauren Berlant, Eugenie Brinkema, Brian Massumi, Gregory J. Seigworth/Melissa Gregg, Diana Cool/ Samantha Frost, Patricia Clough, Nigel Thrift). Literary texts and textures can thus
be viewed as a nexus of such matter/affect interrelation as they externalise mental activity (no matter whether in stone or papyrus or on paper or electronically).

The section ‘Making Matter Matter: Page, Stage, Screen’ invites contributions which clarify the concepts and assumptions at work in this paradigm. At the same time, however, it suggests that this be undertaken with recourse to aesthetic practices. (Literary) texts, performance(s), and their complex aesthetics can be regarded as complex explorations of mind/body activities which readers and spectators participate in beyond their respective cultural and historical differences. This suggestion is based on the observation that literature with its performative overcoding or repurposing of representational language use at least since Romanticism as well as modern theatre, film, music and arts have developed independently and have at times anticipated recent theoretical concerns by making matter matter beyond representation on levels of affect, process, involvement etc. Contributions to the section could thus address:

- Matter into words – words into matter
- Bodies-as-matter
- Circulation of affects
- The affectivity of bodies
- Flows and intensities that produce power, resistance, and desire
- Material practices of reading, writing, performing and seeing
- Process and meaning
- Natureculture and literature/art
- Eco-criticism and material practices
- Abstraction and matter
- Material spiritualisms
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**SUMMARY**
Prof Dr Ingrid Hotz-Davies, Prof Dr Martin Middeke, Prof Dr Christoph Reinfandt
The People in the Trees, Hanya Yanagihara’s 2013 debut novel, offers the fictional memoirs of Nobel Prize-winning biologist Dr Norton Perina, edited and annotated by his friend Ronald Kubodera. The novel is a rich and complex neo-gothic exploration of scientific megalomania – intricately captured in Perina’s voice –, colonial exploitation, the human/nonhuman divide, and the physical and epistemological abuse of power. In the context of this section, I want to discuss how, in The People in the Trees, matter comes to matter in three different, but interrelated dimensions.

The novel’s metafictional structure, with its introduction, comments, scholarly footnotes, and climactic revelation of a left-out piece of the story, refers back to a long tradition of ‘fictional editions’ – most prominently Vladimir Nabokov’s Pale Fire. It draws our attention to the ambiguous nature of both the confessional narrative in general, and the inequalities of power and material processes of imperial knowledge production inherent in the logic of Western science more specifically. The processes of selecting, ordering, and referencing foregrounded here prompt important questions about the power hierarchies produced and cemented in curating an archive of material and immaterial artefacts.

On the level of story, Yanagihara’s novel produces an abundance of detail in the fictional construction of the island of U’ivu. The text’s narrative evocation of material richness, the density of ‘natural’ fabric and human and non-human agency the protagonist observes and remembers, creates a fictional space that, within the logic of the novels imperialist narrative, reproduces an exotising dichotomy of ‘Western’ rationality and foreign/tropical’ materiality historically tied to a logic of moral hierarchy associated with a lack of reason and sexual immorality in the colonies. This dichotomy – a manifestation of the Cartesian dualism, the foundation of modern Western thinking – is problematised in Perina’s encounter with the mysterious life-extending turtle – the opa’ivu’eke –, and his fascination with the ‘dreamers.’ These zombie-like humans, having eaten the turtle’s flesh, grow unusually old physically, while their mind and brain decay. Both the opa’ivu’eke and the ‘dreamers’ point towards the fragility of the material and epistemological boundaries between the human and non-human, and of western dualistic thinking in general, and ques-
tion the divide between human/animal, human/‘dreamer,’ nature/culture, body/mind.

Finally, by choosing two narrative voices completely caught up in their scientific/imperial/masculinist perspective, the novel, in the manner of nineteenth-century genre-fiction, sensationalises the reading experience in a way that provokes both immediate affective reactions – disgust, outrage, irritation –, and begs the question as to the moral positioning of the reader towards the narrative. Perina, the novel’s protagonist and main point of identification for the reader, clearly lacks a moral compass compatible with humanist ideals. His unabashed physical/material and colonial/abusive penetration of the island and the ultimate sexual abuse of the many children he adopts and brings to Europe to serve as substitutes for his unfulfilled dream of immortality pose intriguing questions about both the material damage inflicted through colonial and sexual violence, and about the relationship between the materiality of literature, its subject matter, and the material realities of knowledge production, inequality, and violence.
J.G. Ballard’s *Concrete Island* imagines a postmodern Crusoe, ‘marooned’ upon a traffic island in the metropolis of London. Themes of domination and subordination, of language (in particular: literacy), and of shipwreck, survival and contact permeate Ballard’s 1974 novel, like its obvious interlocutor, Daniel Defoe’s 300-year-old novel, *Robinson Crusoe*.

This contribution addresses the various meanings of concrete in Ballard’s novel, pushing back on the ostensible separation between metaphor (as ‘conceptual’) and matter (as, what, then? ‘real’?). In doing so, it draws on Karen Barad’s methodology of diffraction to articulate a mode of interpretation that concerns itself with differences and relationalities rather than representations, or sameness and mimesis. Shifting from a perspective that only ‘sees’ objects to one that grapples with the relations forged by *materials* gives rise to a mode of interpretation that can more readily reckon with the agential capacities of matter. It also allows for shift outside of dualistic frameworks which might otherwise seek to contain interpretations of the novel (as a ‘re-write’, or as a ‘representation of’ something or another), or of matters of interpretation, more generally. Concrete emerges not ‘only’ as noun, or object—as a material comprised of water, sand, aggregate and cement—but also, by insisting (‘standing upon’) on its *concrete* (adjectival) forms, as agential.

On Ballard’s setting of a traffic island, with Maitland’s (the protagonist’s) architectural sensibility for materials and forms, concrete emerges as co-constitutive for the fictional world of *Concrete Island*. In this interpretation, relations are shown to be forged textually (to *Robinson Crusoe*) and materially (sand!) through concrete, which is mobilised as both noun and adjective: The matters of the text are, as the play on words from the section title suggests, matters of matter, matters that matter.
THE PERFORMATIVITY OF MEBDH MCGUCKIAN’S INTERTEXTUAL ECOPOETICS IN BLARIS MOOR
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Northern Irish poet Medbh McGuckian’s work, devoted to decenteredness, fluidity, multiplicity, and a transgression of boundaries, is famously slippery and elusive; thus, one would rightly assume that her eco-feminist poems, which explore the shared exploitation of a subject and the natural settings she inhabits, would enact any dislocation(s) obliquely. Indeed, instead of simply externalizing a speaker’s mental distress onto an ecology, McGuckian inverts the material relationship to embed her pastorals, like a pregnant seed, within the individualized female subject. Thus, Arcadia shifts from outside to inside, making the boundary between inner and outer material spaces murky.

The contemporary Irish pastoral – in the context of landscape long appropriated and co-opted by the British – often serves a radical function, since it upholds a threatened cultural identity. McGuckian’s latest volume, Blaris Moor (2017), is named after the ballad that memorializes the 1797 execution of four men branded members of the United Irishmen, called so because of their failed Rebellion intended to unite Protestants and Catholics. More forcefully in this volume than those prior, McGuckian strains to reveal scars buried in a volatile landscape through her doggedly tireless practice of intertextuality (in which one stanza alone stitches together quotations from Gottfried Benn, Walter Benjamin, Paul Celan, and Rose Ausländer). The references without explicit acknowledgement of provenance simulate the frenzied experience of contemporary readers, caught, as Marjorie Perloff contends, by the “Internet [that] has made copyists, recyclers, transcribers, collators and reframers of us all” (49). As a result, McGuckian’s aesthetic practice of building eco-poems ‘recycled’ from an elaborate network of references necessitates her work be read collaboratively, collectively, and, above all, performatively.

Approaching the poetic text as material performance, McGuckian’s Blaris Moor suggests that physical trauma need not replicate a state of immobilized victimhood,

[...] I had anticipated the entire echo, would there ever be one to help us to fullness again?

MEDBH MCGUCKIAN, “ATTEMPT AT A ROOM” (2017)
if it evolves within the reader’s presence as an on-going dialogue of creation and transmission. For instance, in “The Reading Fever,” while “The heart experiences systole, / small controlled doses of forgetfulness,” “The intellect performs a full resolution,” since it “is hidden / in an offering—the sensible, the coastal / grasses still in winter head, the apple” (McGuckian 2). That is, even if, as Ulrich Baer asserts, “an aberration of memory […] leaves a body without a context” (18), unassimilated and unresolved, recourse to the material practice of intertextuality both grounds and splinters the speaking subject and the witnessing reader. The resulting poem of trauma, shared across a tangible site of “sensible” “coastal grasses,” transforms matter into words – and words into matter.

Objects always play a part on stage: the effect costumes, props, stage sets, or lack thereof have on the audience cannot be underestimated and the notion that props take on a significance that goes beyond being just objects on stage is not uncommon. In his monograph *The Life of Stage Objects* (1989), for instance, Andrew Sofer discusses the question of meaning and agency of things on stage. Citing Hamlet’s skull and Othello’s handkerchief as examples, Sofer argues that props “are more than just three-dimensional symbols” and that “they take on a life of their own as they weave in and out of the stage action” (vi).

The notion of a relation between subject and object that transcends a simple binary is also at the heart of Bruno Latour’s argument in *We Have Never Been Modern* (1991), in which he develops the concept of the non-modern (as opposed to the modern, postmodern, and anti-modern) in which the strict separation of subject and object resolves. Objects losing their distance from and otherness to the (human) subject, for example, can become ‘quasi-objects,’ which are “much more social, much more fabricated, much more collective than the ‘hard’ parts of nature, but they are in no way the arbitrary receptacles of a full-fledged society” (55), they “do not belong to Nature, or to Society, or to the subject; they do not belong to language either” (65).

The non-modern is also a field of opportunities: “It is the Middle Kingdom, as vast as China and as little known” (48).

What I want to suggest in this paper is that the theatre and, perhaps even more spatially specific, the stage can be seen as a “Middle Kingdom” and that both actors and things turn into Latour’s quasi-objects when engaged in activities on stage. The quasi-objects with which I am most concerned here are puppets as they represent perfectly the often uneasy relation of object and subject in the context of performance: they blur the boundaries of acting subject and acted upon object; and they also gesture towards a potential instability in the concept of the unified acting human subject in general.

The relationship between puppets and human actors will be further investigated with the help of theoretical texts by Heinrich von Kleist, *Über das Marionettentheater* (1810), and Denis Diderot *Paradoxe sur le comédien* (1773) and a discussion of Henry Fielding’s and Samuel Foote’s dramatically different opinions on and usage of puppets on stage.
AGAINST THE “MYTH OF NON-MEDIATION”: THE MATERIALITY OF LIVE THEATRE.Broadcasting
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As Jane Bennett points out in her thought-provoking Vibrant Matter (2010), “[f]or some time political theory has acknowledged that materiality matters. But this materiality most often refers to human social structures or to the human meanings ‘embodied’ in them and other objects” (xvi). Her idea to establish a link between Thoreau’s notion of the wild, Deleuze’s idea of the virtual and Foucault’s notion of the unthought and point to how all three “are trying to acknowledge a force that, though quite real and powerful, is intrinsically resistant to representation” (xvi) is an intriguing one and serves as the starting point for the framework presented in this paper.

By taking recent developments in theatrical performance as the focal point of analysis, I want to question this purported resistance to representation that adheres to ‘materiality.’ Is it possible to approach this force and make it more palpable, rather than merely talking about it as ‘thing-power’? In what areas does it become more manifest? Building on my ongoing postdoctoral project, which investigates the aesthetics of live theatre broadcasting and its potential for an experience of liveness in manifold ways, this paper argues that livecasting is a specific aesthetic form that puts the made-ness of performance to the fore. This stands in contrast to the rhetoric surrounding live theatre broadcasts which occludes the idea that in the filming a selection and heightening process of a given performance takes place; John Wyver also speaks of the “myth of non-mediation” around livecasts that evokes an “outside broadcast fairy” (109) that captures the performances.

By looking at two recent livecasts in detail – the NT’s Julie (2018) and Antony and Cleopatra (2018) – and thinking about them as emerging out of the friction between the live, the adapted and the archive(d) (cf. Sant; Giannachi et al.), this paper suggests that, in fact, livecasting lays bare the theatrical skeleton. I would argue that it, perhaps inadvertently, precisely puts the materiality of British performance and thus its rootedness in ‘European culture’ (cf. Harvie) to the fore, at a time when the UK – as a state – are about to break away from mainland Europe; materiality, indeed, becomes the defining feature and the primary marker of quality. The made-ness of theatre, its use of human bodies, stage design, scenography, sound, becomes the de-
fining feature of the British theatre experience, also as transmitted to venues outside
the UK. Through the elaborate use of technologies and broadcasting equipment such
as additional microphones and cameras, each filmed performance is material and
actually increases the made-ness of theatrical performance rather than making it dis-
appear behind an apparatus; when recorded – some livecasts are later available to
be bought on DVD or for download, some of them accessible only in the National
Theatre’s archive – it is a material.

Thus, I understand ‘material’ as an umbrella term that encompasses several char-
acteristics: first of all it stands for the material conditions of production that are al-
most grotesquely emphasized in this context and that I will call the material-theat-
rical. Second, taking the cue from performance studies’ theorization, the livecasting
phenomenon invites us to reflect on the materiality of (textual) form and the hybrid-
ity that ‘the livecast’ represents, namely a generic hybrid between performance, dra-
matic text and film. In contrast to other ‘regular’ theatrical performances, a livecast
of a production is one step further removed from the dramatic text. It challenges us
to tie together conceptual nodes from the fields of adaptation studies and interme-
diality. This is the material-textual aspect. Most importantly, however, as central as
this material dimension is, it is equally fragile when it gets into contact with those
consuming it. The material when in touch with audiences – who themselves might
enact their amateur-theatricality – and scrutinized as providing an experience of
liveness becomes a material that lives. The responses on social media and the infor-
mation surrounding the livecasts constitute a paradocumentational brim that is es-
sential to the phenomenon. When liveness, the filming of a performance and the (re-
corded) human response to it collide, the aspect of the material-ephemeral comes to
the fore.
IN THE BLINK OF AN EYE – PAGE, EYE-MOVEMENT, SONNET FORM
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With my paper I wish to contribute to conceptualising possible ways of probing into “sensations, intensities, valences, and interior movements that are generated and shaped by energies which are themselves embedded in diverse forms of embodied human life” (CfP). With new formal approaches and digital methods in the humanities as a backdrop, my aim is to combine quantitative and qualitative studies of how the sonnet as a material text interacts with the reader’s eye. I will thus probe into what recorded eye-movement may tell us about the sonnet and its form. There are only a few eye-tracking studies, so far, that have addressed the peculiarities of reading poetry, and the focus is hardly ever on the materiality of the poem but rather on phonological aspects related to rhyme schemes (cf. Carminati et al.). Equally, semantic units are still the main concern, and some studies have ventured into the organisation of the poem on the page to discuss those semantic units ([enjambment] (cf. van ’t Jagt et al.), [the alignment of the lines of a haiku (cf. Müller et al.)]). I will present the results of an explorative study that probes into the materiality of the sonnet by analysing fixations, saccades and blinks of individual readers while reading sonnets. These eye-tracking protocols of readers scanning Shakespeare’s sonnets reveal, for example, that the “matter/affect interrelation“ (CfP) is indeed far more complex than the partitions of the sonnet along semantic units suggest. One fascinating result of our ongoing study is that the reader’s attention is directed at the beginning of lines rather than at their end. Most importantly, the eye-tracking data do not easily support the claim that readers identify a “particular mode of organizing and amplifying patterns of image and thought,” and that “[t]he sonnet inscribes in its form an instruction manual for its own creation and interpretation” (Levin, xxxvii). I will argue that the eye-tracking data calls for a re-appraisal of the poem as matter. Reading sonnets, the eye-tracking data suggests, requires a “particular mode of organizing and amplifying” but that mode does not simply map onto traditional conceptions of the sonnet form.
This paper takes its cue from critical theories and the hard sciences both renegotiating relationalities between humanity and the world: current ontological debates break away from the category of Anthropos as a central organizing position and 21st century sciences disrupt the artificial boundaries between human/nature, nature/culture, human/animal/plant. For instance, microbiology’s research on metaorganisms and microbiomes evidences the human as a symbiotic cooperative interactive system of (multi-)organisms, challenging the established division between the human self and nonself (Rees, Bosch, and Douglas), while the geologically established fact of the Anthropocene collapses the human/nature distinction on a macrolevel. The hard science’s pointing towards a shared materiality and dynamic relationalities on a macro- and microlevel intersects with a number of recent critical theories that interrogate human exceptionalism and trouble the ingrained opposition between human and nature/animal/machine. Where new materialism (Barad, Bennett) positions the human as no longer different from matter(s) and argues for a dynamic relational ontology grounded in intra-active becoming, Katherine N. Hayles’s key concept of ‘cognitive nonconscious framework,’ her book’s titular ‘unthought,’ seeks to reintroduce an expanded notion of cognition and consciousness, emphasizing the shared cognitive capacities of humans, animals, plants, and machines, and “locat[ing] the human on a continuum with nonhuman life and material processes” (65). Similarly, Donna Haraway’s notion of an interwoven, symbiotic “living across species”, a “tentacular thinking,” and of “sympoetic systems” captures the intrinsic and messy entanglement of humans and “oddkin,” while seeking to replace the nihilistic Anthropocene/Capitolocene story with the counternarrative of the “Chthulucene” as a wider, messier term.

Contemporary literary texts increasingly disseminate such conceptual shifts and evolving paradigms by sensitizing us to different ways of worlding and developing narratives that describe varied material and affective relations to the world. Along these lines and working across fields, taking some cues from schema criticism’s cognitive approach (Moya, Bracher), this paper reads Jeff VanderMeer’s richly metaphorical (weird) speculative fiction trilogy *Southern Reach* (2014) as an attempt to
‘unthink’ humans in Hayles’s sense and as an ecological allegory that narrates of the Chthulucene’s infusion of materialities, of anthropocentric interference and bioengineering transformed into a reverse process of herbaforming, and celebrates the (involuntary) human fusion with the ‘oddkin’ and the remixing of all life forms’ materialities. Haraway’s ‘tentacular thinking’ resonates with VanderMeer’s dense and surreal tentacular narrative web of an environment’s eco-colonizing of humans that textually immerses readers into nebulous experimental passages of a dreamlike uncertainty, of poetic and messy material and discursive entanglements where words are living material. VanderMeer’s Area X becomes an un/natural transformative metaorganism with diluted self/non-self boundaries, both real and abstract in the sense of Timothy Morton’s ‘hyperobject,’ with a diffuse consciousness and a ‘cognitive nonconscious,’ literally and figuratively embodying the vibrant entanglement of plant-animal-human origins that instill a new way of ‘unthinking’ through the reading process.
Francis Ponge (1899-1988), French ‘poet of things’ (*Le parti pris des choses*), has asked for “a sort of writing … which, situating itself more or less between definition and description, would take from the first its infallibility, its indubitability, its brevity also, from the second its respect for the sensory aspect of things…” Many of John Berger’s generically undefinable texts approach Ponge’s demand. Berger’s ways of seeing and writing are characterised, throughout his multifaceted oeuvre, by an open-minded attentiveness to the world in its totality, human and non-human, animate and inanimate, art(ificial) and nature/natural. This attentiveness results in a spiritual materialism based on a respectful curiosity towards the world, a relentless willingness to be impressed by it, precise descriptions and a constant interaction of sensual and critical awareness. Highlighting his preference of Spinoza over Descartes, Berger always insists on the importance of the non-human in his reflections about what it means to be human.

In recent years, a mind-set such as the one described above has gained currency as a critical concept in the social sciences and the humanities under the label ‘new materialism.’ New materialism now serves as an umbrella term for critical approaches across the disciplines whose common ground is a shared uneasiness with the excessive focus on language and discourse in the aftermath of post-structuralism and deconstruction. New materialists of every shade aim at countering this perceived obliviousness towards bodies, things, places, animals; they re-evaluate and emphasise, from different angles and with different agendas, the importance of the material world and our inescapable entanglement with it.

John Berger has implicitly written his own poetics of materiality and of the non-human world long before new materialism gained momentum in academic debates. It is extractable from his topics, his perspective, and from an attitude which is borne by a unique style of writing, or rather of textual organisation. What this means, how Berger’s implicit poetics may be described and how this relates to his spiritual materialism: these issues shall be addressed by looking at passages from Berger’s *Pig Earth* (1979) and *and our faces, my heart, brief as photos* (1984) through the prism of terms and concepts provided by new materialist theory. This will reveal the extent to which these concepts are thrown into sharp relief if they are approached with and through Berger.
While the it-narrative, the thing-poem and thing theatre have been around for some time, the essay – which is often considered literature’s fourth genre – is still lacking its thing-subgenre. Yet, particularly in British literature, we find a wide range of texts which could be subsumed under this label – starting with Jonathan Swift’s “Meditation upon a Broomstick” and continuing with, among others, Robert Louis Stevenson’s “Philosophy of Umbrellas,” Rose Macaulay’s “Arm-Chair” and Geoff Dyer’s “Otherwise Known as the Human Condition (with Particular Reference to Doughnut Plant Doughnuts).”

This study provides a theoretical conceptualization of thing-essays, explaining why the essay as literary genre lends itself particularly well to literarizations of the personal relationships that people have fostered to everyday objects throughout the centuries. The essay’s subjective and anti-systematic approach enables it to capture even the most idiosyncratic and fragmentary experiences in the contemplations of things as they have been conceptualized in the writings of Martin Heidegger, Jean Baudrillard, Bruno Latour, Graham Harman and Bill Brown.

In order to account for synchronic and diachronic differences in thing-essays, this paper suggests a typology of three modes via which things can be approached essayistically. In the transformative mode, one thing is, in a series of comparisons, turned into another thing. This mode prevails in the earliest thing-essays, when the emergence of consumer society had created a new abundance of things that writers sought to make sense of by connecting them to older and more familiar concepts. The transformative mode has returned in today’s late capitalist society, where people, fatigued with the overflow of things, search for deeper meanings in them. The associative mode explores the associations that things trigger and is predominant in thing-essays in Romanticism, as by then, things had been around long enough for associations to gather around them. Finally, the meta-reflective mode ponders in general terms how we view things and are shaped by them. This mode proliferates in the times marked by a more detached world-view, such as the Enlightenment period. Most thing-essays, however, are hybrids where at least two of these modes are at work simultaneously.
While “men in trouble” are always good for a laugh in comedy and beyond, scholarly perspectives on the relation between masculinity and humour are lagging behind. Humour studies have only recently engaged with the category of masculinity (Attardo; Wirth). By the same token, the field of masculinity studies has only seldom investigated humour, laughter, and comedy: amongst the various encyclopaedias in the field of masculinity studies that have appeared in the last 15 years, very few (Flood et al.; Horlacher et al.) include reflections on humour or address topics like the uses of masculine humour in patriarchal cultures and the sociology of laughter as part of male bonding scenarios (Kuipers).

Recent debates address women comedians and their ‘funny bones,’ thus revealing once more that men’s presence in comedy remains an invisible (and all the more powerful) norm. Likewise, renewed interest in the importance of a ‘sense of humour’ for British and American national identities revisits transatlantic genealogies, but sidetracks the normalisation of masculinity at the heart of the connection between self and laughter (Wickberg), while narratology offers a broadening of semantic humour theories with regard to longer and shorter narrative texts but neglects the question of who tells (Attardo). Last but not least, as ‘monolithic’ masculinities are on the rise in the political arena all over the world, laughter once again provides a powerful tool: it subjects (political) bodies to denigration, but also serves as a social glue that creates temporary communities of laughter, united in their shared acknowledgement of unspoken norms —see for instance the comedic gesturing used by Donald Trump during his bid for the Republican candidacy in the 2016 elections (Hall et al.), or UKIP leader Nigel Farage’s constant grinning, which earned him comparisons to the Cheshire Cat or the Grinch.
By its very nature, laughter is an ambivalent force, forever torn between transgressive critique and restorative tendencies. This is as true of politics as it is of cultural production, from Shakespearean comedy to cringeworthy ‘comedies of discomfort,’ the work of controversial stand-up comedians like Ricky Gervais, Doc Brown, or Eddie Izzard (whose queer persona makes the challenging of established gender norms part of the stage experience), or the mocking of crisis-ridden middle-aged masculinity in contemporary film and television.

This section seeks to examine the uses of masculine/ist humour in anglophone cultures past and present. We would like to ask, for instance, how funny men (re)configure the performance of masculinities, how the allegedly rigid male body is loosened up and carnivalised as a comic effect, and how laughter and ridicule (re)write masculinist myths and narratives.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>SECTION OUTLINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SECTION PANEL A: ICONIC ECCENTRICS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>INTRODUCTION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PD Dr Stefanie Schäfer, PD Dr Wieland Schwanebeck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td><strong>DICKENS AND THE CAMP AESTHETIC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PD Dr Franziska Quabeck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td><strong>MENTION THE WAR: BRITISH SITCOMS AND MILITARY MASCULINITY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof Dr Anette Pankratz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SECTION PANEL B: COMIC PERSONAS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td><strong>RICKY GERVAIS’ DISTORTED MEN</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Nele Sawallisch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td><strong>TOXIC MASCULINITY AND ACID HUMOUR: NEGOTIATING MASCULINITIES AND LATE NIGHT COMEDY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Ulla Ratheiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SECTION PANEL C: AGING MEN</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td><strong>THE IMITATION COMPETITION: COMIC MASCULINITY IN MIDLIFE CRISIS IN MICHAEL WINTERBOTTOM’S THE TRIP SERIES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof Dr Lucia Krämer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td><strong>LAUGHABLE OLD MEN: CONCEPTIONS OF AGING MASCULINITIES IN THE BRITCOM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Franziska Röber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SUMMARY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PD Dr Stefanie Schäfer, PD Dr Wieland Schwanebeck</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the history of comedy, many different, but often contingent principles have been identified as sources for laughter. Superiority, incongruity, inelasticity and subversion are only some of the most common candidates. Thomas Hobbes coined superiority as a possible explanation of laughter in the *Leviathan* in 1651 as a feeling of ‘sudden glory’ over another, while James Beattie claimed in 1764: “Laughter arises from the view of two or more inconsistent, unsuitable, or incongruous parts or circumstances, considered as united in one complex object.” (581) The principle of ‘camp’ is not typically included in this list. While contemporary usage suggests allegedly hyperbolically effeminate behaviour in (homosexual) men, Susan Sontag first defined camp as a ‘sensibility’ in art in 1964. According to Sontag, camp is “decorative art, emphasizing texture, sensuous surface, and style at the expense of content” (278). Camp is the deliberately artificial, the deliberately hyperbolical in art. As Sontag states, “camp sees everything in quotation marks” (280).

I will argue that Dickens makes use of this aesthetic in the creation of his comic men. Dickens scholarship of the last decades has prioritised the so-called ‘dark’ Dickens, side-lining his comedy in favour of his more serious themes. However, the 19th century perceived Dickens first and foremost as a comic writer. This paper argues that it is time to resurrect the comic Dickens with a special focus on his conception of masculinity. His funny men stylise themselves as living art and create dramatic roles for themselves that allow them to escape the demands of Victorian concepts of masculinity. I would like to show in my paper that Dickens makes use of a number of comic principles, including ‘camp’ and incongruity, and thereby subverts Victorian gender ideologies. He creates funny men who unmask the false notion of a ‘true’ gender identity through the camp aesthetic.

British sitcoms get great mileage out of mentioning or showing the war. Probably the most famous example is Basil Fawlty in *Fawlty Towers* (1975–1979). He undermines his own imperative, “Don’t Mention the War”, offers his German guests “Colditz salad” and a parade in Prussian goose-step. Other sitcoms like *Dad’s Army* (1968–1977), *It Ain’t Half Hot, Mum* (1974–1981) or *‘Allo ‘Allo!* (1984–1992) go even further and are set during the time of the Second World War. As soldiers or resistance fighters, the main characters contribute to the British war effort, either by keeping the home fires burning or bearing the White Man’s Burden abroad. The sitcoms operate with a double structure: they “mobilize [...] popular memory” (Bowes 133), often with a nostalgic touch; at the same time, they debunk official historiography with its notion of great men making history (Korte/Lechner 14; cf. Sommer 201–202).

Within this framework, the traditional hegemonic imperial British masculinity, characterised by military discipline, patriotism and heroism serves as an implicit ideal type. The TV comedies deconstruct this ideal and show a group of men muddling through (Lenz 46). The types of masculinity run the gamut from Captain Mainwaring’s middle-aged middle-class mediocrity in *Dad’s Army* to the flamboyant entertainer ‘Gloria’ in *It Ain’t Half Hot, Mum*. National identity and Englishness/Britishness intersect with matters of class and ethnicity. Apart from contributing to the “popular memory” of the war, the sitcoms thereby also negotiate questions of contemporary masculinity projected into the past, looking for the Officers and Gentlemen as well as representing often subversive alternatives.

RICKY GERVAIS’ DISTORTED MEN
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Ricky Gervais has earned a reputation as comedy’s enfant terrible and Golden Globe specter, but equally as comedic genius and all-rounder. His best-known global success is the uproarious mockumentary The Office (2001–2003), which he co-created with Stephen Merchant, but he has also gained critical acclaim for more melodramatic productions such as Derek (2012–2014). Since he frequently figures as the producer, director, and main actor of his projects, he blurs the line between such dyads as ‘author’/’protagonist,’ ‘author’/’narrator,’ or autobiography/fiction. Such doubling also complicates our understanding of different versions of masculinity that Gervais and his characters have toyed with throughout his career. Among the different “funny” versions of men highlighted in his various projects figures the stark contrast, for example, between The Office’s general manager-turned-rock star David Brent, who oscillates between the grotesquely funny and rude, and Derek Noakes, whose good-naturedness and naiveté endear him to his colleagues. Gervais’ own performance of masculinity in his stand-up programs and talk show appearances include his impersonations of the good-hearted loser, the grumpy middle-aged man, and both the victim and the perpetrator of fat-shaming. In short, he experiments with masculinity/ies very much “in relation to cringe humour, [and] the comedy of embarrassment” (CfP). This contribution wants to highlight the different ‘funny men’ and versions of masculinity we encounter in Gervais’ work – toxic, distorted, and otherwise. It pursues the question whether he uses such portrayals productively, as a version of what Rebecca Krefting calls “charged humor” (2014), or, rather, whether they serve as a strategy to promote his comedic mantra of “you can joke about anything you want” (see Facebook entry, Dec. 31, 2018).

Humour can be a powerful tool in challenging existing power relations. As humour deliberately violates norms and contests normativity, it “creates new, unusual perspectives on the object and thereby communicates sovereignty, creative power, and the freedom to intervene in the world” (Kothoff 5). Those who (deliberately) create laughter gain temporary control of a situation and thus manage to assert their dominance in the given social hierarchy (ibid. 8). This potential to intervene and to tip power structures in favour of the comedian can be considered a prerequisite for political comedy in general and late night comedy talk shows in particular (Niven et al. 118). Their hosts often use their sovereignty and creative power to hold those to account who exercise their influence and authority in spheres outside the respective show, mostly in political offices or other institutions of prestige.

The seismic shift in public discourse triggered by the #MeToo movement in late 2017 added a new dimension to what could, and should, publicly be said about those in power. In its wake, the concept of toxic masculinity and its far-reaching implications seemed to take shape in social as well as traditional media, laying open a well-known, albeit suddenly highly topical imbalance in gender relations. In that comments on current events belong to the standard repertoire of late night shows, the question was not so much if, but rather when and how the issue of toxic masculinity would have to become the target of their comedies.

This paper will examine how late night shows have broached this highly sensitive topic through the use of comedy. It will look at the humorous strategies employed and whether they succeed in navigating between ridicule and derision for displays of toxic masculinity, and empathy and respect for those confronted with it. Necessarily, the discussion will also take into account that the majority of late night hosts are male and will consequently have to negotiate their own concepts of masculinity in this context. After all, the success of their comic intervention will largely rely on how believable the comedian manages to distance himself, explicitly or implicitly, from any possible association with toxic masculinity.

THE IMITATION COMPETITION: COMIC MASCULINITY IN MIDLIFE CRISIS IN MICHAEL WINTERBOTTOM’S THE TRIP SERIES

PROF DR LUCIA KRÄMER PASSAU

SLOT  Tuesday 3–4:30 pm  ROOM  S 124, Seminargebäude, 1st Floor

The proposed paper reads Michael Winterbottom’s three mini-series The Trip (2010), The Trip to Italy (2014) and The Trip to Spain (2017) as a comical reflection on masculinity in midlife crisis that combines ridicule with pathos. The two male protagonists at the centre of the series, played by the two British star comedians Steve Coogan and Rob Brydon as fictionalised versions of themselves, are both in their mid- to late-forties and grapple with their careers, as well as their roles as fathers, their sexuality and, above all, their mortality. In my analysis, I want to concentrate on two interrelated aspects of the series, namely its evocation of existentialism, which is coupled with a theme of fragmented personalities conveyed by a web of intertextual references.

Going beyond a mere ridiculing of middle-aged masculinity, The Trip evokes an existentialist theme, which is contained in some key motifs (e.g. the trip/journey, food, lonely man in nature) as well as the narrative structure of the series. Moreover, the presentation of the protagonists bears traits of the theatre of the absurd: reminiscent of Beckett’s Vladimir and Estragon, yet much more self-aware of the absurdities of their own existence, they keep waiting for meaningful things to happen in their private and professional lives. Yet wholeness eludes them: The Trip shows Steve and Rob as ultimately fragmented personalities. The key device used in the series to convey this is the representation of the protagonists’ conversations and lives as an echo chamber where intertextual references to Romantic poetry, various TV genres and films, and to Rob’s and Steve’s comic programmes combine with the pair’s seemingly compulsive (and competitive) imitations of famous people to deconstruct the notion of the (comic) artist as original genius along with the notion of stable personalities. The series thus champions the notion of ‘man’ and ‘comedian’ as performative categories, which are the result of imitation and repetition (with variation).
A popular adage states that men age like fine wine, while, when it comes to women, ageing is more likened to cheese: “aged was only good to a degree [before] the mold and the inevitable casting aside” becomes a reality (Webb 33); a statement that Susan Sontag famously echoed when she stated that “men are ‘allowed’ to age without penalty, in several ways, that women are not” (31). Looking at advertisements for anti-ageing medicines such as Viagra and testosterone supplements which promise a continuously fit, attractive, tough and virile ageing male body, ageing seems to be a non-threatening re-affirmation of masculinity – as long as men are able to remain sexually active in later life. At the same time, the ageing man who shows continued sexual interest runs the risk of being labelled and marginalised as a “dirty old man”; a man whose virility and sexual desire defies expectations of a more serene sexuality and who, by adhering to hegemonic constructions of masculinity, often centred around youthful bodies, virility and sexual prowess, transgresses the image of an asexual grandfather-figure.

TV, especially the sitcom format, plays a significant role in this field of contradictions. It perpetuates, legitimises, transforms, and deconstructs stereotypical notions of age, gender and sexuality through its unique use of laughter and humour, both of which play a “disciplinary, corrective role in society [by] ridiculing the deviant behaviour of others” and also function as a site for “criticising social norms, unsettling hierarchies and depicting ‘the unsayable’” (Neumann/Kamm 5). While the BBC show Hold the Sunset (2018) seeks to ridicule the expectation of a continuously independent, tough, virile, assertive, emotionally restrictive and competitive man by focusing on humorous narrations of ageing bodies, emotional intimacy, widowerhood and care as central ways of understanding masculinity and sexuality in later life, From May to December (1989–1994) uses laughter in a more ambivalent way, by deriding forays into dating and relationships by older men and, simultaneously, ridiculing expectations of physical frailty, asexuality, senility, and hegemonic conceptions of masculinity in order to promote a heterogeneous and diverse representation of older men and ageing bodies.

My talk will focus on these two programmes to investigate how the hybrid serial format of the Britcom represents and constructs ageing male bodies and masculin-
ities in older age, and how it moves this discourse outside the binary (and stereotypical) ‘asexual’ vs. ‘highly sexual’ divide, thereby transcending and challenging the status quo.

The section addresses canonization as a historical practice changing in the wake of globalization and digitization. Central issues are the following:

1. National canons have been giving way to transnational canons for quite some time. At the same time, in the globalized book market the dominance of English is becoming increasingly evident. Literary prizes such as the Nobel Prize and Man Booker Prize follow the trend towards globalization of the book market and reinforce it, but also express specific political agendas (Engdahl). For example, from the 1980s to the 2000s the Booker Prize arguably had a revisionist effect on canon formation. Which canons have emerged in the academy and beyond it? How do we interpret convergences and divergences between academic and non-academic canons? Can we identify tendencies of homogenization or pluralisation of canons in a global perspective?

2. The current debate about world literature can be interpreted as an attempt to rethink canonization (Damrosch; Casanova; Thomsen, *Mapping World Literature*; Emmerich; Mufti). Approaches informed by the sociology of literature define world literature via dissemination and translation of texts, text-immanent approaches define it via textual properties. With a view to canonization, it remains an open question whether both aspects can be dealt with in isolation. How can the interplay of immanent and social factors in the constitution of recent canons be conceptualized? Are there literary strategies and subjects that make texts canonical at certain times? Which historical discourses on literature refer to these characteristics?

3. The internet has helped to break the monopoly of professional book reviewing in the established media. In addition to a particularization of critical value judgments, this has led to a valorization of the quantitative side of critical value judgments. The online book trade already uses quantifications to make purchase proposals. On the consumer side, quantitative criteria arguably tend to become qualita-
tive criteria of their own right. The question arises as to whether automated preselection counteracts or contributes to canonization. How much scope remains for canon criticism when quantity becomes a central criterion for canonicity?

4. Quantification also characterizes the methods of the digital humanities. On the one hand, distant reading enables a critique of the academic canon by tracing tendencies in literary production beyond the established corpora (Moretti; Jockers; Thomsen, World Famous). At the same time, the method has so far rather confirmed the special status of “great texts.” Further, the digital humanities’ markup techniques are particularly well-suited to the analysis of style, a category closely linked to the traditional values of literary criticism. How can the digital humanities contribute to academic canon formation?

We call for papers that engage with these and related questions.
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WORLD LITERATURE AND THE NATIONAL FRAME: REROUTING MULTICULTURAL CANONS

PD DR JAN RUPP HEIDELBERG

SLOT  Monday 1:15–3 pm  ROOM  S 125, Seminargebäude, 1st Floor

The canon has taken an unlikely career turn in critical debates over Anglophone writing. While it tended to be synonymous with the Western canon or English classics, talk about a “black British canon” (Low and Wynne-Davies) or “multicultural canon” (Marx 85) has appropriated the concept to credit the transformation English-language writing has seen on a global scale. Concomitantly, this development is construed as ushering in a new transcultural world literature, requiring transnational and diasporic paradigms to attend to the production and circulation of English literatures across the globe. Yet the canons of Anglophone world writing are far from inclusive, assigning world-literary capital to a few hypercanonized authors while relegating much other work to shadow canons. Moreover, domestic concerns and traditions are often glossed over in the global celebration of particularly mobile and cosmopolitan bodies of writing.

Against this backdrop, the proposed paper will discuss recent trends in refugee writing, an area memorably counted among the novel themes and “terrains of world literature” (Bhabha 12) today. In Europe’s current refugee situation, asylum narratives (cf. Woolley) and collaborative projects like Refugee Tales (Herd and Pincus) have highlighted the significance of dwelling and domestic territory, trying to carve out a multicultural canon within while documenting traumatic experiences. Modelled on Chaucer’s The Canterbury Tales, the present-day stories reinterpret the canonical text and lay claim to English lands. As a combination of oral history and fiction, Refugee Tales has involved retracing the old pilgrim’s way, inhabiting a public space otherwise denied to many refugees. Simultaneously, some of the stories recall itineraries that already link some of Chaucer’s pilgrims to places elsewhere in the world.

As I shall argue, new writing like Refugee Tales constitutes an alternative form of canonmaking from below, set apart from transnational circuits of world literature and the global book market. Ostensibly conceived to counter resurgent nationalisms and xenophobia, it possibly reveals a dialectics of canonization in times of globalization, inviting us to reread the canon within and against the national frame.

Bhabha, Homi K. The Location of Culture. Routledge, 1994.
Within the field of contemporary literature written in English, Irish literature occupies a special place. On the one hand, Irish literature, and particularly Irish fiction, is discussed in terms that also apply to the wider field of literatures in English in general – world literature, literature after modernism, new realism, etc. On the other hand, there are aspects that are particularly ‘Irish,’ such as the fact that authors like Éilís Ní Dhuibhne write both in Irish and in English. In my proposed talk I want to disentangle the interplay of international and local aspects that lead to the formation of the contemporary canon of Irish fiction.

On the one hand, Irish fiction is particularly successful on the international book market, and many Irish authors from John Banville and Anne Enright to Anna Burns have won international awards such as the Booker Prize – which in turn plays a key role in contemporary canon formation. Furthermore, many Irish authors living and writing abroad – such as Emma Donoghue in Canada or Colm McCann in the US – are discussed in the context of Irish literature as well – which has a long tradition linked to emigration setting in in the 19th century. On the other hand, typically Irish traits distinguish this as a form either obsessed with, or struggling with the burden of, a national literature. It is particularly this last aspect I want to focus on. In 1999 Colm Tóibín wrote: “The purpose of much Irish fiction, it seems, is to become involved in the Irish argument, and the purpose of much Irish criticism has been to relate the fiction to the argument.” Much has changed since the turn of the Millennium, however, but the focus on the national, social, and particularly economic context still fundamentally influences Irish canon formation. For instance, periodization is not primarily following the international tags of ‘postmodern’ or ‘metamodern’ but rather key local economic events: the novels are described as Celtic Tiger or, after 2008, Post Celtic Tiger works of fiction. In a case study I want to read three contemporary works and discuss the way they treat Irish matters – and how this influences their inclusion in, and indeed the cultural construction of, the canon of contemporary Irish fiction: Anne Enright’s *The Green Road*, Sally Rooney’s *Normal People*, and Anna Burns’s *Milkman*.
The late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries witnessed the establishment of national canons as well as the emergence of a language of valuation that tended to distinguish between mass popularity and rarefied literary excellence. If this normative selectivity is openly on display in the literary criticism of Coleridge, Wordsworth, or Hazlitt, its premises survive largely intact in Victorian sage writing (Carlyle’s critical essays, or Arnold’s notion of culture as “the best that has been thought and said”) and beyond (as in Leavisite “great tradition” criticism). Twentieth-century critical professionalization entailed a shift to the consecrating dynamics of the academic “culture of the school” that John Guillory has described as the key factor in the debating and credentialing of contemporary literary canons (41). Where Romantic and post-Romantic criticism had tended to read canonicity as quasi-transcendental, ahistorical textual property, academic discourse moved the social constructedness of canons centre stage. More recently, it has seemed that new digital methodologies would do away with canonization altogether and instead allow us, in Franco Moretti’s words, to “look at all of literary history: canonical and non-canonical: together” (208).

Proceeding from a *longue durée* approach to discourses and practices of selection from the early nineteenth century to the present, my paper will probe such epistemological optimism through tracing the afterlife of the logic of canonization in digitally informed scholarship. As a case study for the latter, I will use several of the “pamphlets” launched by the Stanford Literary Lab since 2011. My reading of these will suggest that the digital humanities champion a new rhetoric of selection that does not, however, entirely dispense with the necessity of selecting. For some historical contexts, only a fraction of “everything” has been digitized (Algee-Hewitt et al.), and that which is available for digital analysis often privileges the Anglophone archive at the expense of non-Anglophone writers and writing (Porter). For other contexts, “all of literary history” is simply too large a corpus to allow for meaningful analysis (McGurl and Algee-Hewitt). If in literary criticism digitization has resulted in shifting discourses of canonization, there are also striking continuities in terms of practices of selection (between ‘good’ and ‘bad’ texts or ‘good’ and ‘bad’ data). Seen against this background, the development from qualitative to quantita-
tive methods—the difference between the ‘subjective’ canons of the Romantics and the ‘objective’ corpora of the digital humanists—appears far less straightforward than is commonly assumed.


Porter, J. D. “Popularity/Prestige.” *Pamphlets of the Stanford Literary Lab* 17, 2018, pp. 1–22.

**COMP TITLES AND PRODUCT SUGGESTIONS: THE ALGORITHMS OF CANON FORMATION**

**PROF DR SEBASTIAN DOMSCH GREIFSWALD**

**SLOT** Monday 3:30–5 pm  
**ROOM** S 125, Seminargebäude, 1st Floor

One of the mechanisms of canon formation that has so far received not enough critical attention, even though it has always been strongly influential at one end of the chain of cultural production, and, through digitalization, is gearing up to become of the most important and influential factors, is comparison. We tend to often think of the canon in terms of exceptionality (the great masterpieces that tower above the rest), but in a broader sense, understanding texts through comparisons with others establishes the canon as a whole much more firmly. This is reflected, on the one side, in the publishing industry’s strong reliance on the use of “comp titles” for acquisition and marketing decisions, an aspect that is starting to come under scrutiny (McGrath) But digitalization has turned this mechanism into a central factor for a book’s success by turning it into an algorithm that suggests comparable titles to customers. This paper wants to start investigating the types of effect that (particularly algorithmic) comparison has on canon formation, for example considering generic evaluation, the sociology of authors, or notions of innovation versus convention/expectation.

“A TRUTH UNIVERSALLY ACKNOWLEDGED”? JANE AUSTEN, FAN FICTION AND THE CANON

PROF DR ANGELIKA ZIRKER TÜBINGEN

SLOT Tuesday 3–4:30 pm
ROOM S 125, Seminargebäude, 1st Floor

The Jane Austen fanfiction corpus has its beginning with Sybil Brinton’s 1913 novel Old Friends and New Fancies; since then, almost every year a number of fanfiction novels has been appearing, and the advent of the Internet, with its much lower threshold, has sparked an increasing number of fanfiction published online. While Jane Austen’s works are undoubtedly part of the (Western) canon of literature, her fanfiction is not; and yet, there is something like a Jane Austen “fanon” (cf. Thomas) that is fluid and flexible but still expressive of some sort of agreement within the community. It is also something that begins to spread in that Jane Austen fandom has become a global community (see Yaffe). What is more, academics have recently become more and more interested in this fanon and begun to reflect on its status within the field of literary studies. Hence, apparently, not only the fanon is fluid and flexible but so is academia in its increasing recognition of fanfiction (e.g. van Steenhuyse). At the same time, however, it becomes, because of the internet and online publications, increasingly difficult to keep track of the Jane Austen fanon. Moreover, the quality of the texts is often not very high, which makes it, so it may seem, hardly worthwhile to consider fanfiction more deeply from an academic point of view.

In my paper, I would like to address these difficulties when it comes to canonization of fanfiction in a global and a digital context and will offer a different perspective on fanfiction and its uses in literary studies. The digital corpus of online fanfiction gives us new opportunities to make sensible use of the digital humanities, for instance, by using distant reading techniques. Thus we may learn something of the different approaches chosen by writers of fanfiction, which allows us to draw inferences about style and plot, character portrayal etc. These findings, in turn, may lead to close readings, and they may tell us something about processes of understanding as readers of Jane Austen’s works become writers themselves. To conclude, I will present a few first results as to literary style based on distant reading methods and what they may tell us about fanfiction writers.

The publication of Kristen Roupenian’s short story “Cat Person” in a 2017 issue of *The New Yorker* magazine drew wide circles, a global readership opening up to the hitherto little-known writer. “Cat Person,” a story of a date gone sour, resounded with on- and offline communities, particularly because it fed directly into the #MeToo debate.

In terms of canon theory, “Cat Person” is an interesting case. In a rather traditional vein, *The New Yorker* once more served as a stepping stone, or canonizing authority, for a short fiction writer, having promoted the genre of the short story and its practitioners since its early days. But there were further implications with regard to canon formation in today’s digital literary culture given the virulence with which Roupenian’s story sprawled, the velocity of critical responses it elicited, and the agents involved in all this. While in today’s academic discourse – prone to diversity, hyphenation and multiplicity – the fierce canon wars of preceding decades have subsided by and large, the canon debate might well reignite given the impact of digital culture on literary production and reception processes.

Thus, drawing upon contemporary examples, this paper aims to scrutinize selected aspects of canon theory which digitization has convoluted or rendered obsolete. Could “Cat Person”’s going viral be regarded as an “invisible hand” phenomenon (Simone Winko), i.e. a masked process of canon formation, and are there other such processes specific to digital media whose formative impact on the canon still needs to be acknowledged? Which relevance does e.g. Barbara Herrnstein Smith’s notion of the contingency of value, dating from the late 1980s, have if applied to online activities that blur the line between professional and lay criticism? Or put differently: are established terminologies from canon theory still adequate for a discussion of literature within the digital sphere?
‘Language of immediacy’ and ‘language of distance’ (Koch and Oesterreicher 2012) describe the properties of conceptually spoken and conceptually written language. While spoken language can be quite distant (e.g. in the courtroom or speeches), written language may also be quite immediate (e.g. in personal letters); boundaries are sometimes fuzzy. This has repeatedly been observed in earlier research (e.g. Schaefer 1992) and has become increasingly true in language use as to be found in digital media communication. Digital media provide us with new, unprecedented opportunities to communicate. Based on these new opportunities, research on language of immediacy and language of distance currently experiences a revival: Social media platforms and apps such as Facebook and WhatsApp allow us to communicate in a way that is closely linked to language of immediacy (despite being in the written mode) and offer new ways of expressing non-verbal and paraverbal signals as well. Analysing digital communication through the lens of orality and literacy is, essentially, “a philosophical move to investigate unstable and richly semiotic communicative and interactional events through the paradoxically traditional keyhole of verbal language” (Sindoni 2013: 2).

The section picks up on and expands the interest in the topic and provides an opportunity to reassess, rethink, and (re-)apply the notions of orality, literacy, language of immediacy, and language of distance by considering texts from various domains. While a strong focus of the section is on digital and computer-mediated communication (CMC) (see Krefeld 2016), we also invite contributions which analyse language of immediacy and language of distance from a diachronic and/or a World Englishes perspective. Central questions related to the section are the following:
– How are varieties and their features realised online? In which ways do speakers of a variety imitate the way they speak in online communication?
– Which intentions or aims do speakers pursue in digital communications (e.g. exploiting linguistic resources, code-switching and -mixing as a means of expressing multilingual identities, creating in-group identities etc.)
– Which role do emojis play in communicating para- and non-verbal features?
– Which insights can be gained by applying different conceptual models (e.g. Jucker 2018; Koch & Oesterreicher 2012) to the digital realm?
– How does that connect to earlier/traditional attempts to imitate spoken language in, for example, plays and other literary texts in the history of English?
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Ego-documents, such as letters and diaries, have become prime sources in the field of historical sociolinguistics. Despite the written medium, letters are at least to some extent what Koch and Oesterreicher (2012) have referred to as conceptually spoken (‘language of immediacy’). They emphasize that conceptually spoken and written is not to be seen as a dichotomy but rather as a “continuum of degrees of conceptual possibilities” (2012: 444), and they place the private letter approximately in the middle of the continuum. The aim of this paper is to apply Koch and Oesterreicher’s model and to test to what extent it helps to identify characteristic features of the ‘language of immediacy’ in vernacular letter writing.

While the presence of vernacular features in letter writing seems to suggest that the letters can be seen as instances of a ‘language of immediacy,’ there are also characteristics more typically connected with conceptually written language (‘language of distance’). A good case in point are letter writing formulae, which are quite formal in lexis as well as syntax. Further examples of highly distant and formal language combined with vernacular features are former standard uses of periphrastic do that became obsolete (Pietsch 2015: 227) and the use of the archaic pronouns thou and thy (Siebers 2019 fc.). Such results indicate that vernacular letters possibly constituted hybrid forms at several levels of language (Auer, Schreier & Watts 2015: 286).

One area that remains relatively unexplored in English vernacular letter writing is syntactic variation. According to Koch and Oesterreicher (2012: 454), the language of immediacy on the level of syntax is characterised by “economical use of hypotaxis.” In order to test this, nineteenth-century African American, Southern American and British vernacular letters are subjected to an analysis of hypotactic and paratactic structures.

The degree of immediacy is dependent on the complex interplay of certain conditions of communication. While letter writing is not a form of communication that is prototypically immediate, some conditions that facilitate immediacy, such as familiarity of the partners, free development of a theme and intense involvement, are nevertheless characteristic of the more private and informal letter. Due to differences in these communicative conditions in the three letter collections under study, it will be explored to what extent they have an impact on the degree of immediacy in letter writing syntax.

CONTINUED ABSTRACT ➔

**Academic Programme**

**Section 5**

**Language of Immediacy, Language of Distance and Language Awareness – From Manuscript to Internet**

**PD Dr Göran Wolf Göttingen**

**SLOT** Monday 1:15–3 pm  
**Room** S 127, Seminargebäude, 1st Floor

In contrast to (a) language history in general, (b) the history of the English language, and (c) the development of language studies and linguistics, the idea of the conceptual distinction of ‘language of immediacy’ and ‘language of distance’ (Koch & Oesterreicher 1986) is rather recent. Most utterances in a language, particularly those associated with ‘language of distance,’ presuppose some form of language awareness regardless of whether they belong to a more distant historical period or, for that matter, postdate the consideration of the concept by Koch and Oesterreicher.

Without disregarding the notion’s usage in FLT-contexts, language awareness is understood as ‘cautious, sensible, or even informed consideration of language usage(s).’ Against the background of this general meaning of language awareness, the paper is intended to address the following questions: How do instances of ‘language of immediacy’ and ‘language of distance’ relate to language awareness? Does language awareness include an awareness of the medial or conceptual distinction? If there is language awareness in the form of the above definition, how is that expressed terminologically?
Therefore, the paper aims at a comparison of medieval, (early) modern and present-day sources. With regard to the historical sources, metatexts, i.e. prefaces, dedications, etc., will be examined and related to the actual realisation in the corresponding text (e.g. Dan Michel’s *Ayenbite of Inwyt* or William Caxton’s *Eneydos*; cf. Gradon 1866/1965; Gradon 1866/1979; Crotch 1928; Culley & Furnivall 1890). The present-day material will be a randomised sample of social-media communication. For the time being, it is hypothesized that, in the latter, language awareness is neither commented upon or negotiated explicitly. It is assumed that language awareness can only be inferred from language use itself and the corresponding degree of appropriateness with regard to language of immediacy and language of distance.


This study deals with the usage of various pragmatic markers by Nigerians in their computer-mediated communication. The investigated items originate from different languages spoken in Nigeria but now seem to be used across ethnic boundaries as part of a Nigerian “digital ethnolinguistic repertoire” (Benor 2010; Heyd & Mair 2014) in online interactions that take place in Nigerian Pidgin and Nigerian English. The investigation relies on a large corpus from a popular non-thematic web forum for Nigerians. These highly interactive, informal, and multilingual data can be accessed through a Net Corpora Administration Tool developed specifically for archiving, searching through, and visualizing such web forum material.

The study focuses on a set of discourse markers and interjections common in Nigerian online writing, and the different discourse-pragmatic functions they may take up. The semantic flexibility of these items allows them to carry out very different functions depending on the context. Interjections are usually seen as a primarily spoken phenomenon, but they seem to be very frequent in asynchronous text-based online communication as well. I argue that they play a vital role in indicating emotional involvement and response, and hence contextualizing (Gumperz 1982) written utterances and making online ‘conversations’ feel more like conversations.

Furthermore, the particularities of employing, interpreting, and researching discourse markers and exclamations in online writing are addressed. Thus, this study contributes to a description of pragmatic borrowing (Andersen 2014) in Nigeria, as well as to the rising fields of pragmatics of computer-mediated communication and written multilingualism.

CONSTRUCTING IMMEDIACY AT A DISTANCE: THE COMMENTS SECTION OF ONLINE BLOGS

DR CORNELIA GERHARDT SAARBRÜCKEN

SLOT  Monday 3:30–5 pm ROOM  S 127, Seminargebäude, 1st Floor

This paper investigates the comments section of blogs with regard to their nature as a dialogical, involved, expressive and affective, but graphically coded, public and distal discourse type. This type of digital interaction between users and bloggers allows for immediacy at a distance. Hence, blogs and their comments sections represent a fine choice to discuss technologically mediated communication (TMC) from the perspective of orality and literacy.

This paper embraces the view that differences between ‘written’ and ‘spoken’ are non-binary and non-linear, but multi-dimensional. The non-binary nature of ‘spoken’ and ‘written’ has been noted since the late 1960s, also with the advent of genre descriptions. Biber’s seminal, emic Variation across Speech and Writing (1988) stresses the multidimensional nature of this textual variation. Biber proposes an analysis of 67 different features that group into six dimensions such as “informational versus involved” or “narrative vs non-narrative” (1988).

Blogs represent a mass phenomenon in TMC with a specific organization of its discourse (Frobenius & Gerhardt 2017). After having focused on the construction of veganism in food blogs (Gerhardt 2019a; 2019b fc.) and the use of ‘no-X’ (e.g. gluten-free) references in their comments section (Gerhardt 2019c fc.), I would like to analyse the comments section with regard to orality and literacy focusing on features such as tense or pronoun use (Biber 1988), but also TMC practices such as referencing across posts or the use of emojis.

Language use in social media has often been associated with conceptual orality. However, in-depth studies on specific social media formats (e.g. Hoffmann 2012; Sindoni 2013) have provided a more differentiated picture (cf. Bös & Kleinke 2017: 86). Indeed, even within one particular online community of practice (CoP, cf. Eckert 2016), variation in the degree of conceptual orality and literacy can be observed.

This study takes a closer look at a Facebook support group for caregivers of patients with Alzheimer’s disease (AD). Based on a specialized corpus of selected posts and their respective comments, we will show that members of this virtual CoP use different communicative means to position themselves (cf. Buchholtz & Hall 2005), e.g. as professional experts, lay experts (based on experiential expertise), or non-professional, loving relatives, and to present and discuss the challenges they have to cope with as caregivers of AD patients.

As the main aims of the group are to share experiences and provide moral support, it is hardly surprising that many of the contributions are characterized by a high degree of interpersonal and emotional involvement (cf. Landert 2014: 29; 2017: 32). This is displayed in the highly personal contents of the contributions, features of linguistic immediacy (e.g. direct address, frequent use of directive and expressive speech acts, non-standard language, etc.) and the copious use of emojis, all of which help to establish and reinforce solidarity and virtual proximity. However, some participants adopt a more distanced position, rationalizing the disease and its effects which are presented matter-of-factly in (pseudo-)scientific, analytical terms. The (non-)reactions of the participants show how the appropriateness of particular communicative practices is negotiated in the group.

By investigating both communicative elements creating varying degrees of immediacy or distance as well as their metapragmatic negotiation, this study provides insights into the coping strategies and group dynamics of this virtual CoP of caregivers, who share the burden of highly demanding, complex and often long-term caregiving tasks (cf. Byrne & Orange 2005: 170).
DIGITAL FOOD TALK: BLURRING IMMEDIACY AND DISTANCE IN YOUTUBE EATING SHOWS

DR SOFIA RÜDIGER BAYREUTH

SLOT Monday 3:30–5 pm

ROOM S 127, Seminargebäude, 1st Floor

This talk presents the discursive practices found in eating shows, so-called Mukbang, on YouTube. Traditionally a Korean phenomenon, Mukbang have become popular around the globe and are frequently performed in English. In typical Mukbang recordings, the YouTubers themselves eat copious amounts of food while talking about a range of topics. No audience is present during the recording, which makes the communicative event inherently different from ‘regular’ talking while eating. Nevertheless, Mukbang YouTubers construct their discourse as a conversation over food, drawing on the notion that “eating together creates a social bond” (Beeman 2014: 32). Focus in the Mukbang videos, therefore, lies not only on the celebration and
pleasure of food (cf. food porn; see McBride 2010) but also the interactional nature of mealtime discourse.

Using a corpus of 100 Anglophone Mukbang videos with a total length of approximately 44 hours, I describe the communicative and multimodal resources that eating show producers employ in order to overcome what Luff et al. (2003) called ‘fractured ecologies,’ i.e. the fact that different resources are available to conversational interactants in digitally mediated communication than in face-to-face interaction. In the case of eating shows, we find, for example, a spatiotemporal separation of the eating show producers and recipients, which leads, among other things, to the situation that one party of the conversation over food can neither smell, taste, or eat the food, nor participate in the conversation directly. This adds to the dimension of distance between the interactants, which the eating show producers address via several means: affective speech, often with the aim of creating in-group identities and familiarity (e.g., by using nicknames such as “my little sloths” or “honeybees,” involved pronouns, discourse markers), directives (e.g., “take the first sip of this, guys” while offering a drink to the camera, i.e. the viewers), and questions. While the YouTubers themselves communicate with their audience orally, the viewers can only react in writing via the comments (e.g. when being asked a question in a video), which adds yet another layer of complexity to the communicative situation. Moreover, what is otherwise a private event (sharing food with friends or family) becomes a public affair as the shows are potentially accessible by anyone on the internet. As such, the genre of online eating shows presents a fascinating mix (or blur) of characteristics traditionally associated with the language of distance and the language of immediacy (cf. Koch & Oesterreicher 1985/2012).

New media language has repeatedly been described as a category that comprises both features of oral and written language (e.g. Crystal 2009; Johnson 2017). One prominent medium in which the use of such features is found is the Twitter platform. Talking about Twitter currently tends to lead to the use of this medium by the current President of the United States, Donald Trump, as the Tweets from his account receive worldwide attention both for their content and for style.

The proposed paper examines the use of typical spoken versus oral features in Tweets sent from the Trump account. The study takes into account that the Tweets may in fact be multi-authored (Grieve 2017). Data are taken from the Twitter account @realDonaldTrump via the Trump Twitter Archive at trumptwitterarchive.com and analyzed for typical features of oral versus written language. These are in particular (Johnson 2015): average word and sentence length, type-token ratio, as well as the use of first and second person plurals, demonstrative and indefinite pronouns, predicative adjectives, contractions and prepositional phases.

Results show the use of typical orality features, suitable for transmitting populist messages, as well as more complex structures.

TERTIARY ORALITY? REREADING WALTER ONG IN THE POSTHUMANIST ERA

PROF DR THERESA HEYD GREIFSWALD

SLOT Tuesday 3–4:30 pm
ROOM S 127, Seminargebäude, 1st Floor

The 1980s brought forth a number of reconsiderations of spoken and written language (besides the Koch/Oesterreicher paradigm, see e.g. Biber 1988; Chafe & Tannen 1987). Despite different focal points, all these approaches advanced the debate in a similar direction: a) a critique of existing phonocentric tendencies in linguistics, and b) treating orality/literacy as a continuum predicated on language-internal and external factors. These ideas resonated with emerging CMC research: the description of digital genres as intermediate, hybrid or fluctuating between orality and scripturality can be found in the earliest studies of digital linguistic practice (e.g. Murray 1990) and has since become canonized in the theory of digital communication.

I argue that there is an additional aspect to the study of digital oralities which appears, by comparison, to have flown under the radar. Specifically, there is evidence that mobile linguistic practice is becoming increasingly spoken in a medium-based sense. Today, spokenness permeates digital genres – from video platforms such as YouTube, to gaming environments such as Twitch, to video calling applications such as Skype. And in recent years, such oral practices have moved beyond traditional communication settings and into the posthumanist (Pennycook 2018) realm of human-machine-interaction. Through technologies such as speech-to-text and text-to-speech recognition, and through the rise of digital assistants and artefacts, we are increasingly talking not just through, but with machines.

This paper will give an overview on some of the linguistic implications of these new oralities. I will reexamine Walter Ong’s notion of secondary orality as a form of technologized orality “which depends on writing and print for its existence” (Ong 1982: 3). Based on this theoretical concept, I will discuss whether current forms of spoken digital practice, in particular where they involve a posthuman element, can be understood as an emerging form of orality – a ‘tertiary orality,’ which goes beyond technically mediated forms of speaking, and may dissolve assumed distinctions between speaking and writing, between human- and machine-made discourse.

A: DAS ANGLISTIKSTUDIUM IM SPANNUNGSFELD VON SCHULE UND UNIVERSITÄT

PROF DR CHRISTOPH HEYL DUISBURG-ESSEN
DR JÜRGEN RONTHALER LEIPZIG
PROF DR FELIX SPRANG SIEGEN

TIME  Tuesday 4:45–6:15 pm  ROOM  S 126, Seminargebäude, 1st Floor

The ubiquity of the digital in research and society raises important questions concerning the competences and skills to be conveyed to future generations by the university. Currently, the first born-digital generation is entering the universities. Students of this generation are interacting with everyday technology in a very casual way, yet, they are just as new to the utility of digital technologies in their course of studies, as they are unfamiliar with their newly chosen subjects of study and their contents.

University teaching can nowadays build upon the openness and curiosity of this generation concerning digital technology. At the same time, it is facing the challenge of aligning the possibilities offered by digital technology with the requirements of philological and cultural studies aspects of the courses of study in order to enable students to critically engage with said technologies in an academic context. It is important that the teaching of digital technology is integrated into the study of language, literature and culture in order to convey to students its relevance in research, teaching and the workplace. University education must thus prepare aspiring academics and scientists as well as teachers for work, life and research in a digital society and make them aware of the methodological and theoretical implications.

Digital technology poses opportunities and challenges for the development of university teaching; these are frequently taken up in research-oriented teaching formats. Our workshop session invites participants to share their concepts and experiences from research-oriented teaching formats. We invite poster presentations optionally including demos of websites, teaching materials and software. The workshop will also include a panel discussion to spark further exchange about experiences and challenges and offer a forum for discussion on the role of the digital in teaching to a wider plenum.

The posters produced in advance of this workshop will be available to look at throughout the academic programme. In addition, the poster authors are available to answer your questions during the coffee break on Tuesday at 10 am.
C: SCHRITTE NACH DER PROMOTION

PROF DR ILKA MINDT PADERBORN
DR SANDRA DINTER ERLANGEN-NÜRNBERG
DR PHILIP JACOBI PASSAU
DR SVEN LEUCKERT DRESDEN
PROF DR FELIX SPRANG SIEGEN

TIME Wednesday 10 am–2 pm
ROOM R 2010, Geisteswissenschaftliches Zentrum, Beethovenstraße 15

Der Workshop richtet sich insbesondere an Post-Docs und Promovierende in der Endphase, die mehr über die akademischen Schritte nach der Promotion erfahren wollen. Inhaltlich skizzieren wir Wege und Schritte nach der Promotion, die mit Blick auf Berufbarkeit und Professur wichtig sind. Neben fachlichen Überlegungen werden wir uns auch den administrativen Schritten sowie dem Lehrportfolio widmen.
CONFERENCE WARMING

TIME  Sunday from 7 pm
PLACE  Thüringer Hof, Burgstraße 19

STARTERS
Consommé with vegetables and meatballs
*Kraftbrühe mit Gemüsestreifen und Fleischklößchen – 4,80 €
Small salad with dill yogurt dressing
*Kleiner bunter Salat mit Joghurt-Dill-Dressing – 5,50 €
Small salad with vinaigrette
*Kleiner bunter Salat mit Essig-Öl-Dressing – 5,50 €

MAIN COURSES
Pot roast with raisin sauce, red cabbage and potato dumplings
*Sauerbraten mit Rosinensoße, Apfelrotkohl und Thüringer Klößen – 14,90 €
Roasted chicken breast with herbal sauce, buttered peas and chips
*Gebratene Hähnchenbrust an Kräutersauce mit Buttererbsen und Pommes Frites – 13,50 €
Stewed beef rolls filled with onions, bacon and pickled cucumber,
  served with red cabbage and potato dumplings
*Geschmorte Rinderroulade, gefüllt mit Zwiebel-Speck-Gewürzgurke,
  serviert mit Apfelrotkohl und Thüringer Klößen – 16,50 €
Filled vegetable and potato patties served with courgettes,
  mushrooms and cream sauce with cress
*Gefüllte Gemüse-Kartoffelkissen mit frischen Zucchinis und
  gekräuterten Champignons auf Kresserahmsauce – 12,50 €
Gluten-free pasta, tomato sauce, vegetables and cheese (optional)
*Glutenfreier Nudelteller mit Tomatenragout, Gemüse und Balkankäse (optional) – 12,20 €

PUDDING
Wild berry compote with vanilla sauce and whipped cream
*Waldbeerengrütze mit Vanillesoße und Sahnekuß – 5,20 €

PHOTO: DETAIL OUTSIDE THÜRINGER HOF
The reception takes place at the New Town Hall, erected at the site of the former Pleissenburg from 1899 to 1905. Prof Dr Thomas Fabian, Leipzig’s Bürgermeister und Beigeordneter für Jugend, Soziales, Gesundheit und Schule, is expected to address attendees in the grand upper lobby.

**HORS D’OEUVRES**
- Canapés
- Pumpernickel snacks
- Vegetarian canapés

**SALADS**
- Mediterranean pasta salad
- Cherry tomato salad

**BROCHETTES**
- Courgette with scampi and fresh mint
- Canary melon with parma ham, cheese and grapes
- Mozzarella and cherry tomatoes

**PUDDINGS**
- Wild berry compote with vanilla sauce
- Tangerine curd crème

**ALCOHOLIC DRINKS**
- Rotkäppchen champagne
- Dornfelder wine, Heilbronn estate Drautz-Able, dry
- Riesling wine, Heilbronn estate Drautz-Able, dry
- Ur-Krostritzer beer
- Clausthaler Alkoholfrei beer

**NONALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES**
- Schorle (with gooseberry juice or rhubarb juice)
- Apple juice
- Mineral water (sparkling or non-carbonated)
CONFERENCE DINNER

TIME  Tuesday from 7:30 pm

PLACE  Auerbachs Keller,
        Grimmaische Straße 2–4

STARTER
Vegetarian potato soup with croutons and fresh herbs
Sächsische Kartoffelsuppe (vegetarisch) mit Croûtons und frischen Kräutern

MAIN COURSE
Pot roast with cabbage and potato dumplings
Heimischer Schmorbraten nach Angebot zu hausgemachtem Kraut und Kartoffelklößen

VEGETARIAN MAIN COURSE
Potatoes au gratin with fresh vegetables
Gratin von marktfrischem Gemüse auf Kartoffelscheiben

PUDDING
Small potato pancakes with applesauce
Leipziger Quarkkäulchen mit Apfelmus

PHOTO: MEPHISTO AND FAUST OUTSIDE AUERBACHS KELLER
EXCURSION TO COLDITZ CASTLE

TIME  Wednesday 9:15 am–2 pm  PLACE  Bus Stop Goethestraße

The castle is internationally renowned for its use as a high-security prison during World War II. It has one of the greatest records of successful escape attempts.

The fee for this excursion includes a lunch bag. You can safely deposit your luggage on the bus throughout the trip. The excursion ends near the main station, but we recommend booking your departure no earlier than 2:30 pm due to possible delays and traffic.

SCHEDULE

9:15 am: meeting at the bus stop Goethestraße near Leipzig main station

9:30 am: departure to Colditz Castle

10:20 am: arrival at Colditz Castle

10:30 am: guided tour of the castle in English with a focus on the history of British prisoners of war and their attempts to escape

12 noon: time to explore the castle by yourself

1 pm: return to Leipzig

2 pm: arrival in Leipzig

PHOTO: COLDITZ CASTLE, CREDIT: MARIA FLEISCHHACK
GUIDED CITY TOURS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>PLACE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: Monday 3:30–5 pm</td>
<td>Campus Courtyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Monday 9–10:30 pm</td>
<td>New Town Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Tuesday 10:30 am–12 noon</td>
<td>Campus Courtyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Tuesday 5–6:30 pm</td>
<td>Campus Courtyard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The city tours explore the most well-known sites in Leipzig’s city centre by foot. They are guided in German with the exception of tour C in English. The tours start at the Leibniz statue in the middle of the university’s main campus. Tour B, however, is guided by a costumed night guard and starts outside the New Town Hall.
MAIN CAMPUS

The main venue is located in the city centre not far from Leipzig central station. The opening and award ceremony takes place at the Paulinum while the remainder of the academic programme on Monday and Tuesday is located in the Hörsaal- and Seminargebäude on the main campus. The Hörsaalgebäude hosts auditoriums of various sizes. Keynotes and assemblies at the Anglistentag take place in lecture hall HS 2 on the first floor. On the ground floor you also find the Campus Library and a large canteen (Mensa am Park). The Seminargebäude provides rooms seating up to 80 people. The Anglistentag uses rooms S 120 to 127 for the panel sections and some of the workshops. They are located on the first floor on the far end of the corridor.

GEISTESWISSENSCHAFTLICHES ZENTRUM

Since the main campus is closed on Sunday, the initial registration as well as the final workshop on Wednesday will be held at the humanities campus opposite the beautiful Bibliotheca Albertina and right next to the impressive Federal Administrative Court. The Geisteswissenschaftliches Zentrum is located in Leipzig’s Musikviertel, just ten walking minutes from the main campus.
# CAFÉS AND RESTAURANTS

1. **Mensa am Park** (Canteen)  
   Universitätsstraße 5  
   140 m

2. **Bohemian Kids Café** (Small Café)  
   Universitätsstraße 18  
   140 m

3. **BackWerk** (Bakery)  
   Grimmaische Straße 14  
   160 m

4. **LUKAS Bäcker** (Bakery)  
   Grimmaische Straße 29  
   180 m

5. **Vapiano** (Italian Restaurant)  
   Augustusplatz 11  
   210 m

6. **Swiss Break** (Swiss Restaurant)  
   Neumarkt 26  
   220 m

7. **San Remo** (Italian Restaurant)  
   Nikolaistraße 1  
   230 m

8. **Hans im Glück** (Burger Restaurant)  
   Augustusplatz 14  
   260 m

9. **MAREDO Steakhouse** (Restaurant)  
   Nikolaistraße 3  
   290 m

10. **LUKAS Bäcker** (Bakery)  
    Grimmaische Straße 29  
    180 m

11. **Café Central** (Large Café)  
    Reichsstraße 2  
    300 m

12. **Indian Palace** (Indian Restaurant)  
    Nikolaistraße 12-14  
    400 m

13. **ALEX** (Restaurant/Café)  
    Salzgäßchen 3  
    500 m

14. **Milchbar Pinguin** (Restaurant/Café)  
    Katharinenstraße 4  
    600 m

# BARS AND TOURIST ATTRACTIONS

The above restaurants are marked on the map on page 92. More restaurants, cafés and bars are located along Barfußgässchen (650 m) and Katharinenstraße (650 m) in the city centre, in the mall at Leipzig Main Station (700 m), as well as along Gottschedstraße (1 km) and Karl-Liebknecht-Straße (1.5 km).

The St Nicholas Church was one of the centres of the Monday Demonstrations in 1989.

The City-Hochhaus features an observation deck 120 meters above ground level.

The Monument to the Battle of the Nations commemorates Napoleon’s defeat at Leipzig.

Leipzig Zoo was opened in 1878 and is known internationally for imitating wild habitats.

The Museum of Fine Arts shows works ranging from the Old Masters through to modern art.

The Forum of Contemporary History details the division and reunification of Germany.

Augustusplatz is Leipzig’s largest square, dominated by the Paulinum and the Gewandhaus.

The St Thomas Church holds the remains of Johann Sebastian Bach, its past music director.

Thüringer Hof (Warming)
Neues Rathaus (Reception)
Auerbachs Keller (Dinner)
Bus Stop Goethestraße (Excursion)

An interactive version of the map is available on Google Maps via the conference website. Just scan this code:
THANK YOU FOR JOINING US

ORGANISERS
Prof Dr Oliver v. Knebel Doeberitz  
Email: oliver.knebel@uni-leipzig.de
Dr Jürgen Ronthaler  
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COORDINATOR
Alexandra v. Thuemmler 
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Prof Dr Sabine Fiedler  
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Dr Maria Fleischhack  
Dr Frauke Hofmeister  
Dr Stefan Lampadius  
Isabell Große  
Max Jokschus  
Sophie Kriegel  
Jonatan Steller  
Kati Voigt

And the entire staff of the Department of British Studies at Leipzig University
Developed in partnership by Bloomsbury Publishing and Faber & Faber, Drama Online was created as a response to the need for a high-quality online research tool for drama and literature students, professors, and teachers. The award-winning digital library is a fast-growing resource which now features over 2,500 playtexts from 800 playwrights, 400 audio plays, 300 hours of video, and 370 scholarly books from leading theatre publishers and companies, offering a complete multimedia experience of theatre. Drama Online offers features to enhance teaching and study including an interactive transcript player, play finder, personalization features, monologue search, character grid, words and speeches graph, and exclusive content available only on Drama Online.

Available via Subscription or Perpetual Access www.dramaonlinelibrary.com

This invaluable digital library for global popular music brings together leading scholarship and interactive tools to hit the right note for research and learning. It is the ideal choice to enhance research and courses within music and related disciplines. Among an expanding selection of scholarly books and landmark reference works, Bloomsbury Popular Music is also home to the widely acclaimed 33 1/3 and 33 1/3 Global book series.

Available via Subscription or Perpetual Access www.bloomsburypopularmusic.com

Please contact Ben Fasham, at Ben.Fasham@Bloomsbury.com, for more information