
Farah Ghaderi a, *

a Urmia University, Iran

In the world of globalized English, the focus is more on learning practical skills of language than on language as a tool for expression. This concentration has marginalized English literary studies. The very little scholarship on teaching English literature either does not come from within the discipline or is not generally targeted at an EFL context. English Studies Beyond the ‘Center’ offers a long-awaited take on the why and how of teaching English literature in an EFL context from the perspective of a literature specialist. The volume is an attempt to address three interdependent issues: the place of English literature education in the world of globalized English studies, the main goal behind teaching literature as part of English studies and the way literature is taught. Indeed it seeks to “make a case for literary study in this expanded, essential, globalized English studies” (p. 1). As a Canadian educated in North America and a professor teaching in Japanese universities, Myles Chilton brings in his educational backgrounds from the ‘center’ of English studies and his experiences of teaching literature from universities ‘beyond the center’ to this book, making it very useful for people who are involved in teaching English literature especially in an EFL context. Chilton also takes the reader on a pedagogical journey which is both pleasure and profit. The book is made of five chapters, preceded by an acknowledgments section and a 14-page introduction providing an overview of the chapters. The volume also includes a comprehensive works cited section and an index of authors and subjects.

Chapter one, “Japanese lessons: Global English, English literature, and the Japanese academy” reflects on the factors behind a decline in teaching English literature in Japan and chronicles development of pedagogies of English language and literature in its five sections. The first section, Japanese higher education, explains the position of literary studies in Japan through contextualizing its higher education. It also highlights how Japan’s higher education goals are different from those of the West. This is followed by Japanese English education, which is devoted to identifying the divergent objectives of English literary education and English language
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education in Japan and offering an overview of Japanese first encounter with English language in colonial days. Next section, Grammar-translation, identifies grammar-translation as the main approach used to English education in Japan, with translation as the goal and grammar as the means. It further elaborates on the tendency towards communicative English in Japanese English departments. The West’s lingering orientalization of Japan and Japan’s self-orientalization are taken up in The Galapagoes effect, where Japanese’s tendency towards an essentialized self/other dichotomy is discussed. The Global turn maintains that globalization of English has led to an emphasis on communicative English and the ensuing marginalization of literary studies. The section closes with the author’s providing some good hints for improving the status quo of English studies in Japan.

In its four sections, chapter two, “Finding new homes” analyzes the relationship between learning language and literature. In Never less clear, the author argues that English literary pedagogy suffers from a bifurcation of theory and reading, ‘fetishistic’ borrowing of theoretical frameworks from other disciplines, and institutional considerations influencing the intellectual content. Then, in EFL to the rescue, Chilton briefly looks at the ways English literature is taught by EFL teachers and applied linguists. The discussions mostly come from scholars who are not literature specialists indicating “a lack of cross-disciplinary knowledge” (p. 54). The focus in Stylistics is on why stylistics is popular with linguists and applied linguists for teaching literature in an EFL context. Drawing on critics in the fields of literature and language, Chilton presents an interesting analysis of how these scholars criticize one another’s discipline, the concentration mostly being on literary critics finding faults with the ways literature is taught by EFL teachers. A discussion of how language and literature might meet is taken up in the last subheading, Kumbaya. Chilton borrows David Damrosch’s concept of ‘ellipsis’ which allows a more flexible and productive space for a combined pedagogy than “an idealized linear progression” (p. 68) as ellipses can direct pedagogy to where disciplinary boundaries of language and literature are erected or broken. The cross-disciplinary ellipsis is found mostly fruitful for the Expanded Circle students (like Japanese students) for whom teaching language and literature must start from zero.

Chapter three, “The provincialized future of English literary studies”, comprises seven sections of varying length. It opens with English centripetally which maintains that while language studies are increasingly becoming concerned about the embedded ethnocentric attitudes of English, English literature in an EFL context (such as Japan) follows and reproduces what is taught at the center. The following short section, The monolingual center, looks at why pedagogy has not been developed for teaching English literature in an EFL context. The center can and does bold outlines the factors which make English literary studies stuck in Anglo-American universities. Orientalism continued very briefly addresses the interesting subject of self-exoticism through providing an example from English studies in the Philippines. Drawing on the concept of ‘native-speakerism’ and ‘implied reader’, Who we are? unveils that the purported global and transnational literary studies are heavily informed by Anglo-centric and especially American assumptions. English centrifugally maintains that the varieties of English in the Outer Circle as well as the values reflected in their literature are different from those of the Anglo-American center. This pattern does not hold for the English studies in the Expanding Circle such as Japan. Generic English and world literature examines English literature textbooks and world literature as two Anglo-centric products which could contribute to “English literary pedagogy beyond the center” (p. 91). The chapter also discusses a renewed interest in pedagogy as an effect of world literature, a turn to localization and reception in literary studies as well as provincializing Anglo-American literature.

In chapter four, “Class time”, Chilton takes the theoretical discussions of the previous chapters into the real world of class in order to try them for practicality and validity. Beginnings, the first of seven sections, sets forth the pedagogical journey and provides information about the varied and extensive teaching experience of the author in Japan and in Chicago. The section also provides
an example of a short story teaching in a conversation class and the lessons learnt from that experience. *Middles* shares the pedagogical strategies (good humor, flexibility, task-based techniques) deployed by Chilton for a more engaging class. *Textual power* highlights the failure of some literature teaching methods beyond the center as a consequence of language barrier. Robert Scholes’ three-step framework of reading, interpretation, and criticism (providing a combined pedagogy for language and literature) is then followed and a sample is provided. A discussion of the similarity between the teaching of English and that of rhetoric is taken up in *Writing*. It also examines the benefits of combining reading and writing in a “unitary pedagogical approach” especially for the context of Japan where students do not get much training in writing (p. 119). *Culture* explores the relationship between culture and literature and places a Canadian novel in a dialogue with a Japanese novel. The chapter moves on to consider how a world literature pedagogy can help to highlight “the gaps in cultural knowledge” and negotiate cultural differences (p. 125).

Chapter five, “Epilogue” succinctly reiterates the goals of the book and maintains that a turn towards more practical ways of teaching and more immediate forms of entertaining industry have put English literature in a precarious situation. It accentuates that students’ real needs and interests should be taken seriously and pedagogies should be geared towards addressing them. The chapter also maintains that the recommended combined pedagogy for language and literature should not reduce literature to the means of teaching language only, and explains how literature produces two types of pleasure: ‘plaisir’ and ‘jouissance’. Chilton closes the chapter by arguing that non-native students’ response to a text can also be regarded as literature, which means that students and the teacher work together to create knowledge, making the classroom “part of the text itself” (p.137).

There are a number of unfortunate typos (pages 33, 45, 68, 72, 76, 78, 94, 121, 125) and repeated sentences (p. 127), which need to be taken care of in subsequent editions. Moreover, the interesting subject of self-exoticism, addressed by Graham Huggan (Huggan, 2001) has been very briefly touched upon, leaving the reader wanting more of such analysis. Apart from these, Chilton has to be commended for addressing the existing gap on how and why to teach English literature in an EFL context. *English Studies* is all the more valuable given the first-hand experience Chilton shares with the reader of many years of joyful teaching as a native literature professor in Japanese English departments. The book does indeed have useful and practical hints for teachers of English literature both to native and non-native students. Indeed, *English Studies* stands as a remarkable achievement bridging research and practice.
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