

MODERN GREEK STUDIES

(AUSTRALIA & NEW ZEALAND)

Volume 13, 2005

A Journal for Greek Letters

Pages on Australian Society

Published by Brandl & Schlesinger Pty Ltd
PO Box 127 Blackheath NSW 2785
Tel (02) 4787 5848 Fax (02) 4787 5672
www.brandl.com.au

for the Modern Greek Studies Association
of Australia and New Zealand (MGSAANZ)
Department of Modern Greek
University of Sydney NSW 2006 Australia
Tel (02) 9351 7252 Fax (02) 9351 3543
E-mail: Vrasidas.Karalis@modern.greek.usyd.edu.au

ISSN 1039-2831

Copyright in each contribution to this journal belongs to its author.

© 2006, Modern Greek Studies Association of Australia

All rights reserved. No parts of this publication may be reproduced, stored
in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means
electronic, mechanical or otherwise without
the prior permission of the publisher.

Typeset and design by Andras Berkes

Printed by Griffin Press

MODERN GREEK STUDIES ASSOCIATION OF AUSTRALIA & NEW ZEALAND (MGSAANZ)

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΝΕΟΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΑΥΣΤΡΑΛΙΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΝΕΑΣ ΖΗΛΑΝΔΙΑΣ

President: Michalis Tsianikas, Flinders University
Vice-President: Anthony Dracoupoulos, University of Sydney
Secretary: Thanassis Spiliadis, La Trobe University, Melbourne
Treasurer: Panayota Nazou, University of Sydney, Sydney

MGSAANZ was founded in 1990 as a professional association by those in Australia and New Zealand engaged in Modern Greek Studies. Membership is open to all interested in any area of Greek studies (history, literature, culture, tradition, economy, gender studies, sexualities, linguistics, cinema, Diaspora, etc). The Association issues a Newsletter (Ενημέρωση), holds conferences and publishes two journals annually.

MODERN GREEK STUDIES
(AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND)

Editors

VRASIDAS KARALIS & MICHAEL TSIANIKAS

Book Review Editor

HELEN NICKAS

Text editing: **Katherine Cassis**

MEMBERSHIP TO MODERN GREEK STUDIES ASSOCIATION

plus ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION for two issues

Individual: AUS \$45 US \$35 UK £25 €35 Institutions: AUS \$70 US \$65 UK £35 €45 (plus postage)

full-time student/pensioners: AUS \$20 US \$30 UK £20

(includes GST)

Address for all correspondence and payments

MGSAANZ

Department of Modern Greek, University of Sydney, NSW 2006 Australia

Tel (+61-2) 9351 7252 Fax (+61-2) 9351 3543

E-mail: Vras@arts.usyd.edu.au

The periodical welcomes papers in both English and Greek on all aspects of Modern Greek Studies (broadly defined). Prospective contributors should preferably submit their papers on disk and hard copy. All published contributions by academics are refereed (standard process of blind peer assessment). This is a DEST recognised publication.

Το περιοδικό φιλοξενεί άρθρα στα Αγγλικά και τα Ελληνικά αναφερόμενα σε όλες τις απόψεις των Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών (στη γενικότητά τους). Υποψήφιοι συνεργάτες θα πρέπει να υποβάλλουν κατά προτίμηση τις μελέτες των σε δισκέτα και σε έντυπη μορφή. Όλες οι συνεργασίες από πανεπιστημιακούς έχουν υποβληθεί στην κριτική των εκδοτών και επιλέκτων πανεπιστημιακών συναδέλφων.

CONTENTS

SECTION ONE

Stuart Roseworne	The Shifting Power Relations in Australia's Economic Success Story: From Neo-Liberalism to Neo-Conservatism	7
Carole M. Cusack	Religion in Australian Society: A Place for Everything and Everything and Its Place	28
Evan Kanarakis	Where Be the Rock? Sex, Drugs and Rock & Roll: Influence, Empowerment and rebellion, or Commercial Constructs, Cheap Imitation and War Over?	46
Steve Georgakis–		
Richard Light	The Athens of the South: Sport in Australian Society	58
Andrea Bandhauer–		
Maria Veber	German Studies Today: Gender and Intercultural Studies	75
Panayiotis Diamadis	Aegean Eucalypts	86

SECTION TWO

S. M. Hawke	Dancing with the Ghost of Charmian Clift: A Ficto-Critical Requiem	106
Alexander Norman	Where the Church Bell Can Be Heard, There the Parish Lies: Issues of Schism and Continuity in the Greek Orthodox Church in Australia	122
Yiorgos Anagnostou	Through the Lenses of Rage: Refracting Success in Greek America	132
Angie Voela	The Construction of the Woman in Karkavitsas' <i>Η Ανγερή</i>	145
Vassilios Letsios	Back to Bable in the Time of Modern Greek. Language Varieties in the Novel <i>Αντιποίησης Αρχής</i>	167
Elena Koutrianou	Poetry as Recomposition: Odysseas Elytis Translating Sappho	192

Petro Alexiou	Diaspora and Colonialism in Australia in the 1920s: The Case of Alekos Doukas's Migrant 'Voyage South'	206
Anthony Stephens	Interrogating Myth: <i>Ariadne</i>	230

SECTION THREE

Joanne Finkelstein	The Demotic City – The Chattering Classes and Civility	263
Robert van Krieken	Occidental Self-Understanding and the Elias–Duerr Dispute: 'Thick' versus 'Thin' Conceptions of Human Subjectivity and Civilization	273
Craig Browne	Castoriadis on the Capitalist Imaginary	282

SECTION FOUR

	BOOK REVIEWS (Edited by Helen Nickas)	300
	LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS	327

Andrea Bandhauer and Maria Veber

The University of Sydney

GERMAN STUDIES TODAY:
GENDER AND INTERCULTURAL STUDIES

The reflections we present in this article were inspired by discussions that ensued around a panel conceptualised as one of four cornerstone panels of the conference 'Diverse Directions in German Studies', the inaugural conference of the German Studies Association of Australia (GSAA) in 2003. The conference intended to promote the discussion of issues concerning the cultural determination and socio-political context of the discipline of German Studies in Australia. The second intention was to foster discussion about Australian German Studies and its interaction with German Studies in other countries, its self-definition, and new directions in its continuing evolution with respect to both teaching and research. Within this brief, the panel 'Gender and German Studies' was convened with twofold intention. On the one hand, it resulted from a perceived need to reflect on the relationship between gender and German Studies and to assert the continuing relevance of gender within the changing discipline. On the other hand and in consonance with the conference as a whole, it sought to present an interplay of multi-lateral perspectives and thus to overcome the usual bi-lateral Australia/Germany and US/Germany axes.¹ The conference discussion following the panel moved into broader ranging questions of how German Studies views itself and its further development in Australia, Germany and the United States. Aside from the key points of contemporary feminist debates such as the sex/gender distinction and the significance of Judith Butler, it addressed links between Gender and Cultural Studies and the place of literary studies within German Studies. The engaged and passionate presentations of the speakers (Ortrud Gutjahr (Universität Hamburg), Sara Lennox (University of Massachusetts) and Alison Lewis (University of Melbourne)) demonstrated emphatically that in Australia as elsewhere, engagement with perspectives and methods inspired by a feminist inflected

gender analysis runs in tandem with an intellectual activist interest in the shaping of German Studies.²

The following paper traces some more recent developments in German Studies within the German speaking countries (Inlandsgermanistik/in-country Germanistics) and discusses some of the implications these developments concerning the self-definition and future development of 'In-' and 'Auslandsgermanistik' might have for the discipline. We sketch the relatively recent paradigm shift within the German Humanities to a specifically German form of German Culture Studies and consider some implications of this shift for research directions within the fields of Gender and Intercultural Literary Studies. We make reference to the written contributions of the panel speakers in this context.

As is the case with 'Inlandsgermanistik', the discipline of German Studies in Australia has been occupied with the process of change. In Australia the appearance of the Dawkins Green Paper on Education in 1987 forced academics to respond to federally and institutionally driven changes in the definition of education and learning, and to redefine the societal function of both. The status and relevance of Modern European Languages have been subject to continuous questioning, and German Studies has increasingly had to demonstrate its viability. A number of conferences convened by Australian Germanists have responded to this challenge,³ and Germanists continue to work together with the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD), the Goethe-Institut and cultural attachés of the German speaking countries, as well as forging contacts and establishing international research projects with other universities to reshape the discipline. As the organised body constituted by and representing Australian Germanists, the GSAA provides a focus for this work.

Australian academics in the Humanities have had in the first instance to respond to politically driven changes, and only in the second instance to the institutional consequences for scholarship. While cutbacks to education in Germany mean that the in-country discipline of 'Germanistik' can now afford as little complacency⁴ as its external off-shoot in Australia, in Germany it was, until recently, the other way round.

The establishment of Intercultural Literary Studies (Interkulturelle Germanistik) on an intellectual as well as on an institutional level in Germany was mainly a product of what has since become known as 'The Cultural Turn' (kulturelle Wende). In the volume *Germanistik als Kulturwissenschaft (German Studies as Culture Studies)* Ortrud Gutjahr, among others, identifies this 'Cultural Turn' in Germany as the point of departure for the establishment of new directions in research, with gender as well as interculturality becoming paradigms of scholarship in all established disciplines within the Humanities.⁵

She locates this paradigm shift firmly at the intellectual and the institutional level, showing how this change was called for and supported by the German Research

Foundation (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft/DFG) in the early 90s.⁶ The call for a reconceptualisation of the Humanities was an acknowledgment of the increasing trend towards inter- and transdisciplinary research in response to changes within Europe resulting from debates about national identity within a united Europe, pluralisation, and growing transnational networks.⁷ It thus required that the traditional practice of 'Germanistik' take cognisance of historical and cultural phenomena and also take into account the increasing culture of interdisciplinarity within the academy.

The process has meant that the term 'Geisteswissenschaften', which has defined the Humanities since its detailed definition by Wilhelm Dilthey⁸, has itself become subject to interrogation. The appropriateness of 'Geist' in the Hegelian sense as a universal notion and common denominator for the Humanities has been questioned, and the more pluralistic and discursive term of 'Kultur'⁹ has been proposed as a valid departure point for the reforms. Debates, sometimes heated, have accompanied the renaming of the 'Geisteswissenschaften' as 'Kulturwissenschaften' in train with the 'Cultural Turn', and these continue in the still on-going process of examination and reconceptualisation of the discipline.¹⁰ The new paradigm of 'Kulturwissenschaften' is known as 'Culture Studies' in order to distinguish it from British and American forms of Cultural Studies. Breger et al point out that while American Cultural Studies is heavily influenced by the Birmingham School it also integrates heterogeneous elements such as discourse theory, cultural anthropology, New Historicism, postcolonial criticism as well as Gender Studies.

In contrast, German Culture Studies is also informed by historical anthropology, media and systems theory, cultural memory research, and the history of myth and religion, thus differing from both.¹¹

Like Breger et al, Benthien and Velten, in their introduction to *Germanistik als Kulturwissenschaft*, stress that German Culture Studies should not be mistaken for Cultural Studies as it developed in Great Britain, even though it adopts some of the latter's methods. They also view literature as a principal focus in German Culture Studies. In introducing the area of study, Benthien and Velten acknowledge that literature is but one form of cultural expression, while stressing that German Literary Culture Studies emphatically engages with literary forms of textuality.¹² The emphasis on literature is also to be found in the introduction to the first volume of a key journal of Literary Culture Studies, the journal *KulturPoetik* (cultural poetics). Here, Dieterle et al. state:

Literary Culture Studies is to remain Literary Studies. It has neither to give up the viewpoint specific to its discipline, nor lose sight of the specific contribution and momentum of literature within culture. (transl. AB and MV)¹³

Literature is thus to be seen as a subsystem of cultural systems: literary texts as the focal point of discourses, myths and rituals, of power and politics, of cultural constructions such as race, gender, national and social identity. In this sense, literature becomes a place where difference is constructed, a cultural text and medium of historical anthropology where performances of self and other are staged.

By 2000 the popularity of the 'Literary Studies as Culture Studies' section (Sektion: 'Literaturwissenschaft als Kulturwissenschaft') at the International Germanist Congress (Internationaler Germanistenkongress/IVG) – held every four years, it is the largest international forum for Germanists – attests to the successful incorporation of Culture Studies into mainstream literary studies.¹⁴ As Ortrud Gutjahr notes in her introduction to the published papers of this section, it attracted by far the most abstracts.¹⁵ The published papers demonstrate that the new approach has resulted in a shift in perspective within traditional areas of German Literary Studies,¹⁶ as well as in the introduction of the concepts of alterity and interculturality as key categories of analysis.¹⁷

As Gutjahr outlines, the notion of 'Interkulturelle Germanistik' emerged from the realisation that 'Inlandsgermanistik' was out of touch with the problems facing German Studies in other cultures. The discipline needed to take into account different approaches to the study of 'things German', it needed to question its essentialisms and allow for and incorporate the gaze of the other on German society and its cultural products. 'Inlandsgermanistik' thus had to unsettle its assumption of leadership and direction-setting in order to counter its increasing global marginalisation.¹⁸

However, there was also pressure from within Germany. The rise of migrant literatures and the acknowledgement of their voice by the literary establishment¹⁹ led to the realisation that 'Germanistik' had to acknowledge these changes and develop an 'intercultural hermeneutics' in order to analyse texts which negotiate the margin, the in-between and the 'third space'.²⁰

Significantly, in this context Gutjahr stresses the impact of German unification on the rethinking of German cultural identity and its 'other'. In the intellectual debates that followed this sudden political turn (*die Wende*) questions of similarities and differences between the citizens of the two German states became virulent. The cultural other now appeared behind the veneer of sameness and the seemingly well-known. In order to understand the intellectual debates following the merging of two distinct political entities whose citizens had developed entirely different political and cultural identities, literary scholarship had to find a position of distance from where it could question its assumptions about what constituted 'German' literature and being 'German'. This resulted in the need to negotiate – in Gutjahr's words – 'a process of becoming foreign or one of allowing one's self-perception to become foreign' (*ein Fremd-Werden oder Fremd-werden-Lassen des*

eigenen Selbstverständnisses).²¹ From this need resulted the development of a form of intracultural German literary studies concerned with the evaluation of difference within the newly unified Germany.

A particularly clear example of the need for an appropriate analytical apparatus to assess the complex issues at play in the context of German unification and thus the kind of analysis Gutjahr outlines is provided by the so-called 'Literaturstreit' (literary debate) that ensued upon the publication of Christa Wolf's short novel *Was bleibt* (1990). Wolf, who had been stylised in West Germany as the iconic dissident writer of the German Democratic Republic (GDR), had at the same time been a leading, if controversial figure in the East German literary establishment. Initial reactions published in leading (ex-West) German newspapers (notably the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, *Die Zeit*, *Die Welt*, the *Frankfurter Rundschau*, the *Süddeutsche Zeitung* and *Der Spiegel*) took Wolf to task for first publishing this account of her victimisation by the Stasi immediately following German unification in 1990, when in fact she had given the years 1979 and also 1989 as original dates of writing.²² It seemed to many critics that Wolf chose to point out her dissidence when it seemed convenient.²³ Of significance for the present context is that the debate²⁴ went far beyond Wolf. The author merely served as a scapegoat for the critical reassessment of the representatives of GDR literature who had not opted to leave the GDR during the communist regime and had chosen instead to voice their criticism from inside the state. In spite of their critical stance towards GDR socialism, their envisaged utopia was a 'third way' socialist system developed from within the GDR, which in their view provided a better foundation for the realisation of an 'other' Germany after WWII than did the Federal Republic of Germany.²⁵ Initial newspaper criticism condemned the author by accusing her of having been the 'state poet' of the former regime. The criticisms also targeted those West German leftist intellectuals who, like Wolf, would have preferred that the GDR develop a 'third way' socialist system after the fall of the wall. Critics also denounced those who had defended the values of GDR literature by arguing that its authors were representatives of a 'Gesinnungsästhetik' (an aesthetics informed by the author's political opinion).²⁶ The shock of this conflict made it clear that the analysis of GDR as well as post-unification literature could best be achieved with the aid of a critical apparatus that could enable German scholars to acknowledge the otherness of GDR literature and the specific differences brought into play within post-unification literature.

The analysis of post-unification literature by the Australian Germanist Alison Lewis can be viewed as an example of intracultural analysis within an Intercultural Literary Studies as outlined by Gutjahr. Lewis' particular focus is on gender. In the context of discussing the largely negative impact of unification on many (ex-East) German women

and the resultant sense of crisis, Lewis asserts that ‘unification has produced new forms of gender difference that have led to the repositioning of gender, of gender roles, gender identity and norms.’²⁷ Focussing on ‘the texts as literature that we can evaluate with the help of literary codes’,²⁸ Lewis asserts that post-unification fiction and its ‘cultural images and emblems of the feminine and masculine inscribe this sense of crisis in literary texts.’²⁹ Her work thus demonstrates how the analysis of post-unification literature can enrich the understanding of intercultural as well as gender studies.

In her emphasis on the use of ‘literary codes’ to evaluate post-unification literary texts, Lewis remains emphatically within the framework of German Literary Culture Studies – and interestingly that seems to be the approach favoured by most Australian German Studies scholars. However, she also insists on retaining a critical stance that is informed by feminist analyses of power in gendered relationships, stressing that:

By having faith in the plurality of approaches and in the power of persuasion of feminist critiques of gender as a power relationship, and by making an engagement with gender a key issue, the marginalization of gender concerns can be avoided.³⁰

Lewis’ work on gender and interculturality can be situated firmly in the context of ‘Interkulturelle Germanistik’ as it has developed following the Cultural Turn. The concern in ‘Interkulturelle Germanistik’ with constructions of difference identifies it as belonging to the area of ‘Differenzwissenschaften’ (difference studies). As a discourse of othering, interculturality is related to discourses such as postcolonial studies and gender as well as those following from it such as queer studies and studies of masculinity.³¹ Gender and Intercultural Studies are thus aligned in their interest in constructs of own and other and in the notions of the sexually and culturally foreign. Difference as it was originally conceptualised within Gender Studies is the product of a plurality of transient and unstable relationships rather than being an effect of the stable dichotomies envisaged in the early stages of the debate around the sex/gender distinction.

Institutionally and intellectually, Gender Studies represents a significant shift from the activist beginnings of the women’s movement and its academic manifestation. In the same way that American feminism and the American women’s movement were direction-setting in Germany through translations of American feminist writings,³² the notion of gender entered the German debate mostly via America. As well, the English term gender has entered academic discourse in Germany as an addition to the German term ‘Geschlecht.’ Whereas the term ‘Geschlecht’ refers to both sex and gender, usage of the term gender in German allows a clear distinction to be made between socially constructed gender and biologically determined sex.

In Germany, while the field of Gender Studies has achieved the institutional success denied to Feminist Studies,³³ scholars working within the field are emphatic about the need to retain feminist modes of inquiry. Von Braun and Stephan, in their introduction to Gender Studies in Germany, counter ‘the fear’ that Gender Studies would render feminist perspectives and thus the gains of feminist/women’s studies obsolete by insisting, as does Lewis,³⁴ that these “can and must” remain focal points within Gender Studies. Von Braun and Stephan emphasise that the interdisciplinarity that forms the basis of Gender Studies readily allows insights into the interconnectedness of discourses regarding women and gender in the various disciplines. Furthermore, they state that only the co-existence of both gender and feminist perspectives ensures that the foundational research and critique provided by feminist research from its very beginnings can continue to inform Gender Studies.³⁵ Von Braun’s and Stephan’s assertion of the positive implications of Gender Studies for feminist inquiry shows that developments in Germany were again closely linked to those in America. For example, Sara Lennox states that in the US ‘gender studies was not understood in opposition to feminist or women’s studies but rather as a signal that the categories “woman” or “femininity” were now to be conceived differently’,³⁶ i.e. according to non-essentialist criteria.

The category of gender gained currency in Germany principally through the reception of Judith Butler’s first book, *Gender Trouble*.³⁷ The significance of this work for the German debate,³⁸ which until then had been focussed on the sex/gender distinction, cannot be overstated. However, as Gutjahr points out, the stage had been set for Butler’s constructionist theories by feminist deconstruction, which asserted that gender was merely a phenomenon resulting from processes of signification.³⁹ Butler’s initial impact and resonance in Germany has been described as the result of an accident: it was the first major text by a prominent American gender theorist to be translated into German. As a result, Butler by default became the acknowledged expert, as German feminists with no knowledge of English did not have access to the ideas of theorists such as Teresa de Lauretis, Sandra Harding, Nancy Fraser or Donna Haraway, and thus to the context of the American debates.⁴⁰

Butler’s theses were at the same time extremely divisive and extremely productive. While the initial German reception of *Gender Trouble* was overwhelmingly negative, it has since provided the springboard for further research avenues within German scholarship,⁴¹ and continues to do so, as we show below. In Stephan’s view, the polarisation in initial responses was symptomatic of the generational conflict within German feminism,⁴² which is reflected in contributions by established German theorists published in a special issue of the journal *Feministische Studien* (1993).⁴³ Critics targeted the implications of the radical reconceptualisation of difference following Butler’s proposal that

both (biological) sex and (socialised) gender were to be understood as being discursively constructed. Thus Duden and others problematised the disappearance of the body, or more specifically, in Duden's words, the appearance of the 'Frau ohne Unterleib' (woman without a lower body).⁴⁴ Hilge Landweer later took this aspect of the debate a step further in her specific focus on the need to acknowledge the body's discursively represented reproductive capacity. With reference to Cassirer's theory of symbols, she suggests that in each culture the discursive representation of generativity involves the categorisation of sexed gender.⁴⁵

Dörte Bischoff in her overview of gender within Intercultural Literary Studies asserts that Butler's semiotic critique of ideology which presented culture as a stage for performances of identities and differences has resulted in many studies that transcend disciplinary boundaries. Bischoff argues that Butler's theories provided a bridge for the increasing divide between literary and sociological forms of inquiry, and have thus proved productive for the literary analysis of biographical and socio-historical texts by women.⁴⁶

In addition, Butler's concept of masquerade has proved especially productive for gender research within Literary Culture Studies.⁴⁷ Scholarship in this area has focused on reconstructing the relationship between masquerade and sexual difference in different historical epochs as well as their functioning in literary texts. Processes of cultural inscription in the masquerade thus reveal themselves to both constitute and unsettle order.⁴⁸

In a forward-looking contribution to debate, the literary scholar Ina Schabert proposes that Butler's definition of performance as defined in *Gender Trouble* could become a productive category for literary analysis. Within the context of arguing that the specific literariness of literary texts unsettles textual order in the same way as the feminine unsettles the masculine cultural order, Schabert suggests literature offers unique possibilities of parody and critique. She draws a parallel between Butler's view of gender performances and the capacity of literature to produce multiply ambiguous fictional discursive representations of gender. Thus while it is normal analytical practice to apply theories of gender to the reading of literary texts, Schabert proposes that literary texts can in fact inform gender theory. In this view, literature as gender performance in Butler's subversive sense becomes a site for the expression of alterity and difference. We suggest that this notion of the productivity of both gender and literature would also be applicable within the field of Intercultural Literary Studies and its interest in the processual and dialogic constitution of gender and cultural differences.

An overview of a paradigm shift in Australia similar to the Cultural Turn would entail consideration of the influence of British and American Cultural Studies approaches in other disciplines in the Humanities, and consideration of how this has flowed on to German Studies departments in Australia. By the same token, an account of the influ-

ence of Feminist/Women's Studies and then Gender Studies and other studies of difference in Australian German Studies has yet to be written, and we regard this paper as an initial presentation and suggestion for further areas of consideration.

Research in the related fields of Gender and Intercultural Literary Studies in Germany suggests that theoretical approaches informing studies in these areas provide rich possibilities for further productive research in Australia. We would argue that Australian German Studies retain engagement with literary texts as one of its focal points, and in agreement with Lewis and others, we strongly stress that literary analysis should continue to be informed by feminist critiques of power structures within gender relations.

NOTES

- 1 The conference was inspired by discussions with Pat Herminhouse [President, German Studies Association of America (GSA)] and Sara Lennox (Vice President 2005-2006 and future President of the GSA) at a Women in German (WiG) conference in America. Both were keen to establish links with Australian Germanists. We hope that links with other strands of 'Out of Country' German Studies will be forged at future conferences.
- 2 The conference convenors are currently working on the publication of the proceedings. The working titles of the panel contributions, to which we refer in this paper, are: Gutjahr, Ortrud, 'Differenzanalysen. Genderforschung und Interkulturelle Literaturwissenschaft in Deutschland.' (Analyses of Difference. Gender and Intercultural Literary Studies in Germany. Trans. AB and MV); Lennox, Sara, 'Feminism and German Studies in the United States.'; Lewis, Alison, "'A Happy Marriage of Convenience": Gender and German Studies in Australia'.
- 3 See for example the conference 'Deutsch unter Druck' (German under Pressure) in Sydney in 1996.
- 4 See Engel, Manfred, 'Einleitung zur Teilsektion "Interdisziplinarität und Medialität."' In: *Akten des X. Internationalen Germanistenkongresses Wien 2000. 'Zeitenwende – Die Germanistik auf dem Weg vom 20. ins 21. Jahrhundert.'* Bern: Lang, 2003, p. 143.
- 5 Gutjahr, Ortrud, 'Interkulturalität: zur Konjunktur und Bedeutungsvielfalt eines Begriffs.' In: Benthien, Claudia and Hans Rudolf Velten (eds.), *Germanistik als Kulturwissenschaft. Eine Einführung in neue Theoriekonzepte.* Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 2002, p. 349.
- 6 The 'Denkschrift' (memorandum) in which prominent scholars called for a rethinking of the humanities provided the impetus for these changes. (Frühwald, Wolfgang; Jauss, Hans R.; Koselleck, Reinhart; Mittelstrass, Jürgen; Steinwachs, Burkhardt: *Geisteswissenschaften heute. Eine Denkschrift.* Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1991.
- 7 See Benthien and Velten (eds.), 'Einleitung' in: *Germanistik als Kulturwissenschaft. Eine Einführung in neue Theoriekonzepte*, op. cit., p. 17.
- 8 See Dilthey, Wilhelm, *Einleitung in die Geisteswissenschaft. Versuch einer Grundlegung für das Studium der Gesellschaft und der Geschichte*, 1883.

- 9 Graevenitz, Gerhard v., 'Literaturwissenschaft und Kulturwissenschaften. Eine Erwiderung': *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte* 73 (1999): 98.
- 10 See for example *Jahrbuch der deutschen Schiller-Gesellschaft* 16, 17 and 18 (1997, 1998 and 1999); *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte* 73 (1999); newsletter of the German German Studies Association (*Mitteilungen des deutschen Germanistenverbandes*) 46.4 (1999).
- 11 See Breger, Claudia; Dornhof, Dorothea and Dagmar von Hoff, "Gender Studies/Gender Trouble. Tendenzen und Perspektiven der deutschsprachigen Forschung." In: *Zeitschrift für Germanistik*. Neue Folge 1 (1999): 77.
- 12 Benthien and Velten (eds.), 'Einleitung', op. cit., pp. 14, 15.
- 13 Dieterle, Bernard; Engel, Manfred; Lamping, Dieter and Monika Ritzer: 'KulturPoetik – eine Zeitschrift stellt sich vor.' In: *KulturPoetik* 1.1 (2001), www.uni-saarland.de/fak4/fr4/Engel/kulturpoetik/0101.htm (accessed 13/10/04).
- 14 See Engel, op. cit., p. 143.
- 15 See Gutjahr, Ortrud, 'Vorwort zur Sektion "Literaturwissenschaft als Kulturwissenschaft".' In: *Akten des X. Internationalen Germanistenkongresses Wien 2000*, op. cit., p. 11.
- 16 Engel, op. cit., p.144.
- 17 Gutjahr, 'Vorwort', op. cit., p. 15.
- 18 See Gutjahr, forthcoming, op. cit., p. 20.
Interkulturelle Germanistik was formally established at a German as a Foreign Language conference (Deutsch als Fremdsprache/DaF) at the University of Karlsruhe in 1984 (see Gutjahr, Ortrud, 'Interkulturalität: zur Konjunktur und Bedeutungsvielfalt eines Begriffs.' In: Benthien and Velten (eds.), op. cit., p. 348.
- 19 For example the Turkish German writer Emine Sevgi Özdamar was awarded the prestigious Bachmann prize in 1991.
- 20 See Gutjahr, forthcoming, op. cit., p. 20.
- 21 Gutjahr, forthcoming, op. cit., p. 23.
- 22 Harder, Jürgen, 'Tertium non datur: "Literaturstreit" in Deutschland: Menetekel einer Kulturwende.' In: *Berliner LeseZeichen* 4 (1997) www.berliner-lesezeichen.de/lesezei/Blz97_04/text0.1.htm accessed 26/10/04, p. 4.
- 23 For example, Firsching maintained that at stake here was the connection between morality and literature, or more precisely, between ideology and politics on the one hand and aesthetics on the other. See Firsching, Annette, *Kontinuität und Wandel im Werk von Christa Wolf*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 1996, p. 275.
- 24 This debate has been extensively documented. See for example Anz, Thomas (ed.), 'Es geht nicht um Christa Wolf. Der Literaturstreit im vereinten Deutschland.' München: edition spangenberg, 1991; Deiritz, Karl und Hannes Krauss (eds.), *Der deutsch-deutsche Literaturstreit oder 'Freunde, es spricht sich schlecht mit gebundener Zunge'*. *Analysen und Materialien*. Hamburg and Zürich: Luchterhand, 1991; Huyssen, Andreas, 'After the Wall, the failure of German Intellectuals', *New German Critique* 18 (1991) pp. 109-43;
Parkes, Stuart, 'The Politics of Literature: Writers, Intellectuals and German Unity', *German Politics* 2 (1993) pp. 450-66; Brockmann, Stephen, 'German Literary Debates after the Collapse', *German Life and Letters* April (1994); Wallace, Ian, (ed.) *German Monitor* 1994:

- Christa Wolf in Perspective*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1994; Sallis, Judith, 'The search for permanence in a disintegrating world: Christa Wolf's "Was bleibt",' in *German Monitor. Kulturstreit – Streitkultur. German Literature since the Wall* 38 (1996), pp. 109-23; Wittek, Bernd, *Der Literaturstreit im sich vereinigenden Deutschland. Eine Analyse des Streits um Christa Wolf und die deutsch-deutsche Gegenwartsliteratur in Zeitungen und Zeitschriften*. Marburg: Tectum, 1997.
- 25 Firsching, op. cit., p. 274.
- 26 Harder, op. cit., p. 6.
- 27 Lewis, op. cit., p. 15.
- 28 Lewis, op. cit., p.19.
- 29 Lewis, op. cit., p.19.
- 30 Lewis, op. cit., p. 29.
- 31 Gutjahr, forthcoming, op. cit., p. 17.
- 32 This is acknowledged by all commentators in this field. For recent examples see Gutjahr, forthcoming, op. cit.; Braun, Christina v. and Inge Stephan, 'Einleitung.' In: *Gender-Studien. Eine Einführung*. Stuttgart, Weimar: Metzler, 2000, p. 11; Bischoff, Doerte, 'Gender als Kategorie der Kulturwissenschaft.' In: Benthien/Velten, op. cit., p. 298-322; Stephan, Inge, 'Gender, Geschlecht und Theorie.' In: *Gender-Studien*, op. cit., pp. 58-96.
- 33 See Weigel, Sigrid, 'Geschlechterdifferenz und Literaturwissenschaft.' In: Brackert, Helmut and Jörn Stückrath (eds.), *Literaturwissenschaft. Ein Grundkurs*. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1999, pp. 686-699.
- 34 See discussion above.
- 35 Both quotations, Braun v. and Stephan, op. cit., p. 11.
- 36 Lennox, Sara, forthcoming, p. 4.
- 37 Butler, Judith, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: 1990. (Translated as *Das Unbehagen der Geschlechter*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1991.)
- 38 Gutjahr, forthcoming, p. 16.
- 39 Gutjahr, op. cit., p. 12
- 40 Stephan, Inge, op.cit., p. 64.
- 41 See Stephan, op. cit. pp. 64-69.
- 42 Stephan, Inge, op. cit. p. 65.
- 43 *Feministische Studien: Kritik der Kategorie Geschlecht*. 11: 2 (1993)
- 44 Duden, Barbara, 'Die Frau ohne Unterleib: Zu Judith Butlers Entkörperung. Ein Zeitdokument.' Lindemann, Gesa, 'Wider die Verdrängung des Leibes aus der Geschlechtskonstruktion.' Both in: *Feministische Studien*. op. cit.
- 45 Landweer, Hilge, 'Generativität und Geschlecht.' In: Wobbe, Theresa and Gesa Lindemann (eds.), *Denkachsen: Zur theoretischen und institutionellen Rede vom Geschlecht*. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp, 1994.
- 46 Bischoff, Dörte, op. cit., in: Benthien and Velten, op. cit., pp. 302-303.
- 47 Breger et al, op. cit., pp. 82-85.
- 48 See Bettinger, Elfi and Julika Funk (eds.), *Maskeraden. Geschlechterdifferenz in der literarischen Inszenierung*.