A few weeks ago I received a review copy of a recent textbook for survey courses titled *Voces de España: Antología literaria* (Paredes-Méndez, Harpring and Ballesteros 2004). It is the Peninsular companion volume to the popular *Voces de Hispanoamérica* (Chang-Rodríguez), and as always when I come upon a new anthology intended for the undergraduate classroom, I was hopeful. Could this book be a useful tool for teaching the survey course, one that represents at least half of my hours in the classroom, the "Survey of Peninsular Literature through 1700"?

The survey course is many things, but for me it has always posed an ideological and intellectual problem, one that forces some very important questions for scholars of literature. First, it forces the question of its own razón de ser. What are we trying to accomplish with the survey? Familiarize our students with some version of a canonical group of texts? A sort of canon-lite for yanquis? A selection of texts that are somehow representative of the pre-modern literary production of the lands that are now Spain? Which authors might you include in such a list, and why? The further you interrogate the idea of canonicity, the less clear our pedagogical mission becomes.

Do we define it geographically and teach the literature of the kingdoms that later became Spain? If so, what do we do with authors from Aragon, Catalonia, Galicia, or Granada? Is it to teach the literature of the Kingdom of Castile and Leon? Then what to do with the Castilians who wrote in Galician-Portuguese, Provencal, Latin, Hebrew, or Arabic? Is it to teach only the vernacular Castilian literature of Castile-Leon?

If our criteria are aesthetic, do the aesthetic values we use in making our selections bear scrutiny? Can we question the value of regular versification? Of one or another rhyme scheme? Of one or another set of poetic or prosaic habits of practice?

All these questions point up the ambiguity of our pedagogical mission as university instructors of medieval Hispanic or Iberian literature. Today I would like to address the question of canonicity in teaching medieval literature, and in particular the problem of the persistent monolingualism in academic Hispanism, and in our own pedagogy and research, with an eye toward the noticable disconnect between literary historiographical theory on one side, and textbook publishing on the other.

The so-called 'culture wars' of the last thirty years or so gave rise to a lively discussion of canonicity and a critical reevaluation of literary historiography. Our own George Greenia gives an elegant overview of this debate in the introduction to his article on the *Celestina* as a canonical text. He notes that "the contemporary Spanish educational establishment has for the most part not engaged itself with the Canon Wars except as to modulate traditional categories" (4). In the US, this discussion has been dominated by specialists in English literature, and only in recent years have Hispanists begun to make substantial interventions. In 1997 Barbara Mujica defended the value of a canonical pedagogical anthology in an article in *Hispania* that included a very useful (if not particularly critical) history of anthologies of Spanish literature published in Spain and the US. In the same journal and in the following year, Joan Brown and Christa...
Johnson published a quantitative analysis of MA reading lists and survey course syllabi and concluded that there was no fixed, "substantial canon" (1998, 5) of Hispanic literature, and belies the misconception that instructors of early modern literature were even less canonical in their offerings than their modernist and postmodernist colleagues (1998, 6). Two years later in Spain, José María Pozuelo Yvancos and Rosa María Aradra Sánchez published a monograph, *Teoría del canon y literatura española* (2000), in which they summarize and historicize the canon wars in North America and then turn their critical lens onto Spain [Not a complete list].

More recently, specialists in medieval and early modern Hispanic literatures have begun to address the problem of canonicity and literary historiography in fairly high-profile venues. These critics, however, have not focused more on literary historiography than on pedagogy per se. In the 2004 *Cambridge History of Spanish Literature*, María Rosa Menocal and John Dagenais both call for a reevaluation of the literary historiography of the Iberian Middle Ages. Both critics question the value of a literary historiography based on the idea of a modern national literature, an approach that, in Dagenais' words, belongs to a rapidly changing, if not already outmoded idea of the ways in which peoples, languages, and literatures exist. The stories such volumes tell about the Middle Ages no longer ring true. It is time to begin to think about the shape of the new stories we will tell about the medieval past of that place we now call 'Spain.' (2004, 400)

Menocal explains that the ideologies of modern Hispanism have led academics (both in Spain and in North America) to produce a vision of the Iberian Middle Ages that is "little more than the primitive stages of what will eventually become the real thing" (2004, 61); that is, the culture of Spain, a modern nation state, with a national language, Castilian, or "Spanish." According to her, this is an impoverished view. If you have a look at quotation number one on your handout, you will see that she believes that the untidy truth is that medieval Spain was home to a greater variety of interrelated religions and cultures, as well as more languages and literatures, than seem plausible or convenient to attribute, as origins, to the literature of a single modern national literature. If unified nations and single national languages are the benchmarks for the divisions of literatures established in the modern period, then the medieval universe which precedes it cannot be fit into those same parameters and divisions, without distorting the past to make it seem as if its only lasting value was in laying the groundwork for a distant and ultimately unimaginable future. (2004, 61)

We would do well to understand these comments in light of the current, broader reevaluation of the concept of modern nationalism, language, and literature across related disciplines. Linda Hutcheon, a specialist in 19th-century English literature, wrote that her 2002 volume entitled *Rethinking Literary History: A Dialogue on Theory*, which she co-edited with Mario Valdés, was motivated by a need to "rethink the dominance of
the national model of literary history, a model that has been premised on ethnic and
often linguistic singularity, if not to say purity (2002, 3). According to Hutcheon, the
nineteenth-century nationalist models of literary historiography no longer reflect the
values of our times – the text is number two in your handout:

in our twenty-first century globalized, multinational, and diasporic world,
how can we explain the continuing appeal, not only, of the single-
nation/single-ethnicity focus of literary histories, but also, of its familiar
teleological model, deployed even by those writing the new literary
histories based on race, gender, sexual choice, or any number of other
identitarian choices? (2002, 3)

In the particular case of Hispanism, this nationalist approach has meant an
unquestioning focus on literature written in Castilian, a national and imperial language
that has enjoyed five centuries of hegemony in representations of both Peninsular,
Colonial, and Post-Colonial cultures. Joan Ramon Resina, in a 2005 contribution to a
volume entitled Ideologies of Hispanism and edited by Mabel Moraña, argues that the
privilege enjoyed by Castilian due to its status as an imperial language has resulted in a
kind of "symbolic dominance" whereby Hispanism’s monolingualism is justified by the
self-evident superiority of the Castilian dialect itself. According to Resina, orthodox
Hispanism maintains that one can account for the success of Castilian, and its
consequent dominance of the cultural sphere with its intrinsic linguistic and artistic
superiority – the text is number three in your handout:

Hispanism operates as if it were the natural outcome of a civilization
process coalescing around a language deemed superior to the ones it
came into contact with and thus foreordained to replace them on its
ascension to Peninsular, continental, and some day cosmic preeminence
(2005, 161)

In the forge of Spanish nationhood, this monolingualism went hand-in-hand with a
"missionary zeal" that ordained Castilian not just as a marker of Spanish-ness, but as
marker of Christianity. It thus became the vehicle of conversion not just of the
Peninsula’s Jews and Muslims, but of the evangelization of the indigenous peoples of
the New World. Walter Mignolo, in the same volume as Linda Hutcheon's essay,
explains that Castilian as a religiously charged national language was seen as the
extension of Christian Greco-Roman antiquity into the modern era, and that the
identification of Castilian with Greek and Latin alphabetic writing reinforced the
exclusion of non-Romance languages from a national cultural narrative. To paraphrase
Nebrija (3), Castilian became the companion of an empire of lands and bodies, and also
of souls. And so one might yet hear a speaker of Catalan or Gallego rebuked in Madrid
with the words Usted me habla en cristiano!1

1 See also the comments of Ríos-Font on the Historia literaria of Rodríguez Mohedano and Rodríguez
Mohedano, "the sap that joins Spain and Spanish America (but not necessarily Portugal or other one-
time Spanish dominions) is both religious (Catholic) and linguistic. Just as Castilian united the
Joan Ramon Resina, in the above essay, underscores the need for Hispanists to process the significance of Castilian's lasting hegemony in academic Hispanism. The quotation is number two on your handout:

The discipline's monolingualism needs to be recognized not as an effect of Hispanism's ideology but as its main vehicle. The voiding of entire tracks of historical memory is one of its consequences. This can be seen in the thinness of the approaches to the cultures and experiences of Spain's non-Castilian peripheries, which are often subjected to formulaic patterns of understanding, if they come into purview at all. What would be scandalous in any other area of knowledge is here the norm: incidental comments or sweeping judgments with little or no substantiation, ignorance of the scholarship in the relevant languages, and a complete lack of interest in the cultural agents themselves. The result is the construction and circulation of a new doxa that differs from the old in paying lip service to cultural pluralism. New meets old, however, in presuming a cultural awareness that the critical practices belie. (2005, 174)

In line with Hutcheon, Dagenais, Menocal, and a host of other critics of obsolete yet stubbornly persistent habits of national literary historiography, Resina argues that the production of knowledge in today's democracies, on either side of the Atlantic, should operationalize the political values of our society, namely what he calls the "democratic extension of the means of access to cultural universality" (2005, 174) to all constituent groups. This attitude is very much in keeping with current pedagogies of inclusion in the US academy that have given rise to new areas of humanistic and interdisciplinary studies such as US Latino and Chicano Studies, African American Studies, among others. And yet, as Resina rightly points out, we have been slow to operationalize this shift in our critical work, and even slower in our pedagogy.

If we go back to the studies I have discussed so far, Resina's comments appear to be spot on. Mujica's 1997 article does not include language in its assessment of canonicity. Brown and Johnson's 1998 discussion of MA reading lists and syllabi likewise omits language choice as a category of analysis. Pozuelo Yvancos and Aradra Rodríguez's 2000 study of the canon and Spanish literature completely avoids the question of Castilian hegemony ---a remarkable fact when you consider their solid grasp of the impact of identity politics in the US academy. Even those medievalists who

multicultural reign of Alfonso X, it is also the constituent element expected to give symbolic cohesion to the territories of the empire" (2004, 20).

2 This omission is proof positive of Resina's claims that "language is not a neutral conveyor of information but a space for investments of memory, of intellectual dispositions, of affective inclinations, and pragmatic choices" (2005, 175). It is interesting to note that Hutcheon points out that 'identity politics' is hardly a new factor in literary historiography: "The versions of the story of the past told by the present have always been associated with questions of cultural authority and, thus, with politics, especially with some kind of 'identity' politics. Since the nineteenth century, the identity has most often been national, and so the accounts of the history of the nation's literary have played a significant role in the formation of certain national self-imaginings" (2002, 4). That is, it's only called 'identity politics' if it
champion multiculturality omit or give very limited consideration to non-Romance literatures of the Peninsula. For example, when Dagenais tackles the problem of monolingualism in medieval Hispanic studies, he mentions Catalan and Galician-Portuguese, and even advocates for the inclusion of Sephardic literature in Judeo-Spanish and Ladino (2004, 54-55) dedicates a full two paragraphs to the Latin literature of medieval Iberia, but is silent on the question of Hebrew and Arabic.

There is a clear logic to this entrenched monolingualism in the context of the Spanish academy, where the discipline evolved as a kind of government agency charged with producing and diffusing a national cultural paradigm (Ninyoles 1997, 89-90, cited in Resina 2005, 179). But how to account for this practice in North America, where most Hispanists (with the exception of those working in US Latino studies) are not seen as agents of an indigenous national culture? Why is it that in an academic environment that purports to stress cultural diversity, transcultural communication, and domestic multiculturality, we perpetuate the linguistic policies of Franco's Spain, whether passively or otherwise?

Resina (2005, 180) offers that our need to deliver Castilian language instruction to our clients explains this trend to a certain extent. This institutionally imposed monolingualism further bears out his ideas of the entrenchment and reproduction of imperialist institutional practices of non-governmental Hispanism. Our departments of national European languages are based on their continental counterparts, even down to the official languages of instruction. This was not always the case, as Mujica reminds us, in the US throughout the 1950s and 1960s many university instructors of Spanish literature lectured in English. This turn toward instruction in the target language combines a denationalized linguistic policy inherited from Spain with a service-economy model of university instruction all our own (see, for example, Bosquet 2008).

Given the extent to which our institutional and pedagogical habits are under the influence of the modern National literature paradigm, how do we go about operationalizing the inclusionary critical and pedagogical practices imagined by Dagenais, Menocal, and like-minded critics? In his 2002 essay "Rethinking the Colonial Model," Walter Mignolo writes of the decolonization of literary history, of rewriting literary history from a perspective that does not privilege an imperial subjectivity or subsume a diversity of literatures under a single, national or imperial rubric. How do we do this in an institutional context that is shaped by imperial habits? He proposes that "translation . . . could be a methodological tool to decolonize both the concepts of literature and of literary history" (2002, 176). Menocal has elsewhere argued for the value of teaching non-Castilian texts in translation as a way of broadening the linguistic and cultural representation of medieval Iberia in our pedagogy. This practice flies in the face of the doctrine of authenticity, another inheritance from Spanish national philology, which

---

3 "How does civil service behavior reproduce itself, if at all, in an academic structure characterized by market-driven mobility rather than by the protocols of ascent on the bureaucratic rung-ladder?" (Resina 2005, 179)

4 "The most basic trait that US Hispanism shares with state Hispanism is the discipline's narrow linguistic foundation, which is exacerbated in the United States by the scholar's dependence on language instruction for her clientele" (Resina 2005, 180)
dictates that the object of textual study must be read in its original form (a doctrine that does not obtain in many other cases, such as in scriptural study, where the canonical Vulgate Bible is itself a translation of a translation). Nonetheless, as Mignolo suggests, there is a leveling effect to legitimating non-canonical, colonized literatures by allowing them into the scholarly discussion, notwithstanding the post-imperial status of the language in which this discussion takes place.

This is a snapshot ---with all the subjectivity and selectivity that the metaphor implies--- of the current discussion on how post-colonial theory and the reevaluation of literary history might be applied to our field. But let us return to the crisp new copy of Voces de España that made its way to my desk this fall, and to the question of the theories and practices of medieval Hispanic literatures. Let us return to the survey anthology. Since its first and only edition in 1972, the Antología de autores clásicos españoles by Sánchez Romeralo, Ibarra, and Da Rosa, has been a popular choice for instructors of medieval and early modern Spanish literature (raise your hands if you've used it -- now raise your hand if you still use it). As might be expected, it has been criticized as being out of date and overly canonical. This is probably to be expected of a text that has not been reedited for twenty-five years, and does not merit discussion. Editors of other, newer anthologies have made efforts to update or otherwise modify their selection and contextualization of texts. Mujica, for example, states that in her two-volume 1991 Antología de la literatura española, she "expands the canon," including works by "several previously neglected women writers" (1997, 206), as well as other works, such as Delicado's La lozana andaluza, "for years considered too risqué to include in teaching anthologies" (1997, 206). The more recent effort of Rodney Rodríguez, Momentos cumbres de las literaturas hispánicas (2004) is even more inclusive, and the first such anthology to address Hispanism's monolingualism. He includes, with facing Castilian translations, selections of the Galician-Portuguese Cantigas de Santa María by Alfonso X, and a poem by Ausias March in Catalan. He does not, however, include selections in Arabic or Hebrew, and his non-Castilian texts in Hispano-Romance languages do not make it past the 1492 cut. So while he boldly carries out the Dagenaisian and Menocalese directives, he falls short of the Resinian exhortation, demonstrating just how persistent the colonization of literary history can be, despite our best efforts to resist.

This was my mindset as I opened up my new copy of Voces de España, pausing, as many of us do, to get a good snoutful of that tangy new-book bouquet. I looked over the table of contents, visions of multicultural sugarplums dancing in my head. What I saw was a nearly exact duplication of the canon reproduced in volume 1 of Sánchez Romeralo and Ibarra's Antología de autores españoles with some very slight modifications. Thirty years of culture wars had made no noticeable impact on one of the most widely available textbooks in our field.

Before I wrap this up, I would like to add that this is not a manifesto or a call to arms. I am aware that the priorities and proclivities of textbook authors and literary historiographers do not necessarily coincide all of the time. I just want to call upon my colleagues to consider that each one of us is participating in writing literary history every time we teach a survey course, and to take stock of this participation vis-a-vis our convictions about what we should teach and why.
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1) belongs to a rapidly changing, if not already outmoded idea of the ways in which peoples, languages, and literatures exist. The stories such volumes tell about the Middle Ages no longer ring true. It is time to begin to think about the shape of the new stories we will tell about the medieval past of that place we now call 'Spain.' (Dagenais 2004, 400)

2) the untidy truth is that medieval Spain was home to a greater variety of interrelated religions and cultures, as well as more languages and literatures, than seem plausible or convenient to attribute, as origins, to the literature of a single modern national literature. If unified nations and single national languages are the benchmarks for the divisions of literatures established in the modern period, then the medieval universe which precedes it cannot be fit into those same parameters and divisions, without distorting the past to make it seem as if its only lasting value was in laying the groundwork for a distant and ultimately unimaginable future. (Menocal 2004, 61)

3) in our twenty-first century globalized, multinational, and diasporic world, how can we explain the continuing appeal, not only, of the single-nation/single-ethnicity focus of literary histories, but also, of its familiar teleological model, deployed even by those writing the new literary histories based on race, gender, sexual choice, or any number of other identitarian choices? (Hutcheon 2002, 3)

4) Hispanism operates as if it were the natural outcome of a civilization process coalescing around a language deemed superior to the ones it came into contact with and thus foreordained to replace them on its ascension to Peninsular, continental, and some day cosmic preeminence. (Resina 2005, 161)

5) The discipline's monolingualism needs to be recognized not as an effect of Hispanism's ideology but as its main vehicle. The voiding of entire tracks of historical memory is one of its consequences. This can been seen in the thinness of the approaches to the cultures and experiences of Spain's non-Castilian peripheries, which are often subjected to formulaic patterns of understanding, if they come into purview at all. What would be scandalous in any other area of knowledge is here the norm: incidental comments or sweeping judgements with little or no substantiation, ignorance of the scholarship in the relevant languages, and a complete lack of interest in the cultural agents themselves. The result is the construction and circulation of a new doxa that differs from the old in paying lip service to cultural pluralism. New meets old, however, in presuming a cultural awareness that the critical practices belie. (Resina 2005, 174)
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