

ziemlich fremd vorkommen mag, jedoch im optimalen Fall die Zukunft dominieren wird. Trotzdem erscheinen mir seine durchaus optimistischen, ironischen Worte geeignet, sie uns allen, die wir am Netzwerken sind, um Auslandsgermanistiken in einem globaler angelegten German–Studies–Projekt miteinander zu verbinden und zukünftige Zusammenarbeit weltweit sichern zu können, mit auf den Weg zu geben. Er meint:

Stößt man bei irgendeiner dieser Tätigkeiten auf Schwierigkeit, so lässt man die Sache einfach stehen; denn man findet eine andre Sache oder gelegentlich einen besseren Weg, oder ein anderer findet den Weg, den man verfehlt hat; das schadet gar nichts, während durch nichts so viel von der gemeinsamen Kraft verschleudert wird wie durch die Anmaßung, dass man berufen sei, ein bestimmtes persönliches Ziel nicht locker zu lassen. In einem von Kräften durchflossenen Gemeinwesen führt jeder Weg an ein gutes Ziel, wenn man nicht zu lange zaudert und überlegt. (Musil I, 31)

### **Europe: A Challenge for German and Culture Studies**

**Peter Hanenberg**

**Universidade Católica Portuguesa, Research Center for Communication and Culture, Lisbon**

The history of German Studies is intimately related to the national movement in the nineteenth century. German Studies arose in history as a means of founding and securing the notion of the nation – and thus to overcome a certain political and cultural stagnation felt by the intellectuals after the Vienna Congress and – please allow me this strange parallelism – after Goethe's death in 1832. Immermann's *Epigonen* and Ernst Willkomm's *Die Europamiiden* are two examples of a culture searching for its path. When Georg Friedrich Benecke, Karl Lachmann, and the Brothers Grimm started their devotion to and research on German culture, they did not just start from a German perspective, but instead situated their work in the context of the classical heritage and, in the case of Benecke, for example, in the context of other European literatures. But the famous "Germanistentage" in 1846 in Frankfurt and in 1847 in Lübeck brought together researchers from literary and language studies as well as from history and law, who concentrated their work on German subjects. When Wilhelm Grimm presented the dictionary project that would take more than a century to complete, it turned out to be simultaneously a work of fundamental research and the fruit of contemporary challenges. The entry "Germanist" in the dictionary is especially interesting, as it refers to the "experts and teachers of German law," a term that developed only in the nineteenth century, as the dictionary explains, referring especially and as a kind of self-fulfilling definition to Jacob Grimm's edition of the *Rechtsaltertümer*. Only later, still following

the dictionary (in a volume edited only in 1897), the term had been transferred to the experts and teachers of German language, history, and heritage.

"Even scholarly enterprises, seeking deep roots and reaching out widely, depend on external reasons," as we can read in Wilhelm Grimm's introduction to the German dictionary. Those external reasons have always gone along with the history of German Studies. Affirmation of national interest and cohesion was the main goal for a long time, as well as dignifying German's history and literature as the way to prove and guarantee its value. The study of the German Middle Ages as the Romantic ideal of a harmonious society and the painstaking task of editing what could be considered the classical German heritage were, even in terms of methodology, the main challenges of the young discipline.

Philology and history turned out to be outstanding disciplines in the late nineteenth century, corresponding to the main political and social challenges and providing the new German Empire and an emerging society with a coherent and appropriate cultural project. Considering those beginning, we might ask now in which sense Europe might be a challenge for German and Culture Studies today. First we might briefly reflect on disciplinarity and interdisciplinarity; second, we might consider the role of literature; third, one word must be said about the language question; and finally we should wonder what might today be considered "a coherent and appropriate cultural project".

Of course, whenever one speaks about the origin of German Studies, its conception as an interdisciplinary project is striking. For the German Studies Association in North America, this is more than clear, at least in the sense of a programmatic commitment. But *Germanistik* in the German-speaking countries or even in other European countries like Portugal is much more limited to language and literature studies than to history and sociology. This limitation has its reasons in the founding of the so-called human sciences or *Geisteswissenschaften*, which had to prove their viability through a constant differentiation of their subjects and methods. Literature and history as distinguished disciplines in the sense of a defined scholarly project had to be established as such in order to confront the increasing importance of the so-called natural sciences. It is still worth reading what Jacob Grimm presented at the first *Germanistentag* in defense of what he calls the inexact sciences, even before Dilthey defined the scope of *Geisteswissenschaften*. Interestingly, it is not the study of literature that Grimm joins to history (including law as deriving from it) and research on language as the core business in the inexact sciences. It is poetry itself that is a part of these sciences, a fact that only recently has been recognized again through several projects on the "knowledge of arts" or "knowledge cultures." Interdisciplinarity in the case of Jacob Grimm does not only include language, law, and history, it goes even beyond the established academic limits to include artistic forms of knowledge production. This broad concept has not been maintained as a result of the process of systematic scholarly differentiation, so that today we find distinguished institutions, chairs, and careers for each of them.

For about twenty or thirty years now, this situation has strongly been criticized, for instance in the famous book on *Geisteswissenschaften heute* by Wolfgang Frühwald, Hans Robert Jauß, Reinhart Koselleck, and others that brought a discussion

in the early 1990s to the German-speaking countries that had already been going on internationally for some time. Several turns in literary studies and history have constantly been linked to a broader concept of their disciplines, challenging established methods and even institutions. It is true that, somewhat late in the German context, culture studies today seem to be widely accepted as the current umbrella that best protects and promotes both history and literary studies. Recent changes in the European higher education system seem to confirm this position, even on the level of institutions. For our Portuguese German Studies Association I can state that reflection on Culture and Media Studies began in the late nineties, and did not find broad recognition at that time. But now, some ten years later, we are very proud of our congress held in 2008 that will give rise to two books with the titles *Rahmenwechsel Kulturwissenschaften* and *Kulturbau. Aufräumen, Ausräumen, Einräumen*; these will place our discussion on the international scene again as a demonstration of our commitment to Culture Studies – in the sense of an approximation between Cultural and Media Studies as developed from the Birmingham School and the German tradition of *Kulturwissenschaft*.

But despite all the critics, it seems to me that interdisciplinarity has always and widely been a common practice in German Studies (sometimes hidden behind institutional curtains), when I think of such methods as the sociology of literature or the social history of literature that dominated German *Germanistik* since the seventies in practice, somehow silently, and without producing a huge amount of theory. For German Studies in Portugal one might say the same: In the teacher-training programs that imprinted the field until the year 2000 or 2001, literature was widely present as a means of unfolding a certain cultural Germanness. It is from this practice of analysis and interpretation that the assumption derives of a literature and its study that could be meaningful in terms of society and culture. This is where we have to start reflection on our second issue, the role of literature today, because it is here that many changes occur that challenge our discipline and call for new tasks.

It has always been difficult to establish the limits of what "Germanistik" should deal with. In spite of all efforts to broaden the field as widely as possible, a certain conservative concept of high literature managed to stand firm across the decades, even through the times when authors declared the death of literature, through the boom of popular and trivial literature as well as through the attacks of media society, the age of reproductivity, and cultural industries. You surely will agree with me that our virtual society represents a new challenge to the importance of literature — and I would even dare to say an ultimate challenge to it. In spite of all these threats and changes, the study of literature continued to exert a strong influence over degree programs in many universities in Europe and also in Portugal. In the case of the university where I worked before, the weight of literature was nearly the same as for language and much more than for culture and history studies or — in the case of teaching training — even didactics. The new degree programs in the Bologna Process strongly reduced the significance of literature, so that we now have to reconsider what kind of literature study we want to offer and what for! I would suggest for now that we should use literature syllabi to reflect on the power of narration and the productive richness of language, two main areas that allow a

new focus in our discipline, as I will try to argue.

By that we reach the language question. Colleagues working in the German-speaking countries of course have a different point of view on this question than those who have to deal mainly with students who are not native speakers of German. Let me point out three things regarding this issue: the decline of German, multilingualism, and translation. We all may agree – and unfortunately surveys produced by the DAAD and the Goethe Institut confirm it – that German language learning is decreasing all over the world, and mainly in the Western European countries. Until relatively recently we could expect a certain language competency for all those who wanted to enroll in German Studies. Now we cannot do this, because there would not be any students (except for pupils from the German School or remigrants from the German-speaking countries). Besides unfavorable school curricula, there are several reasons for the decline of German, but the most important ones seem to me the power of English (or Glenglish, as we call this global English) and the emergence of new global languages like Spanish and Chinese. You can well imagine that I am not an enemy of the power of Glenglish. On the contrary, I am very happy that the world found a language that facilitates communication and guarantees a minimum of comprehension to a steadily increasing number of people. And more: English in the context of German studies is a good means to distinguish between the subject of study and the meta-language of analysis and description, allowing simultaneously an interdisciplinary approach (namely to our colleagues in other so-called national philologies) that we have been missing for such a long time. If we do German Studies in English and in the language of the students and people we are working with, we have done half the job of disseminating knowledge, an aspect that I would consider quite worthwhile.

Of course. I am sensitive to the argument that by sacrificing German as the hard core of our business, we might be losing – in a certain sense – the unique selling point of our discipline. That is why we should argue always on the basis of multilingualism – as the European Union does. Multilingualism is the bridge to diversity and diversity means cultural richness. If we accept English for communication and multilingualism for cultural richness, we never fail the goal. We just have to distinguish what we expect from whom and when.

Multilingualism is not a steady-state, but a process. Multilingualism is nothing more than a museum if it is not complemented by a constant effort at translation – because only through translation does cultural richness become visible, viable, and veritable. That is why Umberto Eco claimed that translation is the real language of Europe. Before being a technique, translation is a process, and before process, it is an attitude. That is why reflecting on translation should never be left out of German Studies. On the contrary, doing German Studies globally is widely based on the labor of translation. In the context of multilingualism, German Studies should guarantee quality and continuity in translation and, hence, contribute to one concrete form of translating Europe to itself.

Cultural richness and the labor of translation lead us to the crucial point of our argument: *a coherent and appropriate cultural project in German Studies*. Like Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm, I am strongly convinced that we never can do

our “arts and sciences” out of time, that “even scholarly enterprises, seeking deep roots and reaching out widely, depend on external reasons.” The reasons of the Grimms' age can of course not be ours. The notion of the nation has gone through the ups and downs of history and if it is still a powerful tool and entity in politics and culture, it is also strongly confronted by three other movements: globalization, continentalization (as Paul Michael Lützeler has suggested), and regionalization. Our section offers good proof for that, as it invites us to reflect on the new situation of our discipline in an age of globalization. As a political and mainly as an economic reality, globalization requires a cultural reorientation. “Europe” seems to me to represent a challenge that is fairly open and concrete enough to offer an external reason for our discipline, as the nation did formerly. Let me present some evidence for this assertion.

First, Europe is an intercultural project that needs to be acknowledged by interdisciplinary research and teaching. We cannot imagine any social and cultural area where a limited view on German issues could nowadays reveal any significant understanding. German politics, society, and culture no longer (if they ever did) work on their own. If we take the European dimension seriously, German Studies will gain a lot by exchanging methods, knowledge, and findings with other national study areas – and thus discover common issues as well as diversity. Once again, Bologna degree programs somehow anticipate this new disciplinary constellation by integrating it into curricula like “European Literatures and Cultures” or “Modern Languages and Cultures.” The number of autonomous German Studies programs in Portugal decreased from about twelve in 2001 to three or four today: and the number of students enrolled in those programs shrank even more drastically.

A classical concern with German literature thus rarely manifests itself in my country now. But that does not mean that, in this context, literature is no longer a subject of interest. First of all, literature has played a leading role in the development of a modern European consciousness, even if the raising of that consciousness mainly took the form of national literatures. If one thinks of any age in the history of literature, one can easily demonstrate that it is a European phenomenon: from the Middle Ages through the Baroque, classicism, the Enlightenment, Romanticism, and realism up to the avant-gardes in the twentieth century. All these periods are represented in each national literature, sometimes at the same time, sometimes earlier or later, and always in different national expressions. The teaching of literature should now attempt to rediscover the Europeanness of literature in this sense. And more: instead of reading classical texts — like Goethe's *Faust* for German or Camões' *Lusiads* for Portuguese literature — in the sense of their national importance, they can be interpreted as specific contributions to a certain idea and consciousness of Europe. I tried this out with several texts and in several academic contexts, and the results are more than surprising.

Of course, I am not naive enough to simply discover the European side of national literatures. When we learned that national ideas and concepts were the results of constructive efforts in imagination, we certainly admit that their European dimension is a construction as well – so that it must be experienced in this constructive sense. The process of reading as a construction of meaning guided by what we find

written and what we conceive by it is one of the most complex and deep human experiences. Literary studies should simultaneously allow this experience and enable – in the sense of a second-order observation – its identification as such.

I argued before that literature studies should concentrate on the power of narration and the productive richness of language. Reading literature as a construction of Europeanness can be an interesting way to experience the power of narration both for European and non-European readers. I have done so with my students in the Master Course on Culture Studies and I verified that a subject that seemed quite obsolete to the students turned out to occupy a certain place in their lives.

To make this possible, we had to rely on translation whenever the original language was not available for the students (which is generally the case, except for Portuguese and English). But we carefully tried to consider the original language as far as possible – pointing out the difficulties in translation and hence the productive richness of each language. We thus rediscovered literature, even within a certain classical canon, and we discovered Europe where before there was only a national interest. I remember as a special experience the reading of Jacques Derrida's essay on the question "Qu'est-ce qu'une traduction ›relevante‹?" that we discussed in its English version. The nonexistence of a Portuguese translation, Derrida's reflection on the meaning of the French *relevance* and the English *relevance*, and finally the triple sense of German *Aufhebung* exemplified the richness of linguistic diversity and translation as a crucial European experience.

And by that route we also contributed to a notion of multilingualism, because no translation can ever satisfy all the dimensions of a text. Thus translation should never be considered as a simple *ersatz* for the original but as a means to maintain the longing for its uniqueness. Although we cannot count on a broad linguistic knowledge among our students when they start their courses, we certainly increase their language awareness and the desire to take it further during the first years of their curriculum.

Over the years, we tried out hundreds of arguments to engage more students for our language – and you know that there are really good ones to follow: employability, utility, cultural depth, modernity, technology, the number of German-speaking people, the market, the quality, exclusiveness, its complexity (as a cognitive challenge), and its easiness (as being similar to English...): all these things between Goethe, *Tokio Hotel*, and BMW. But students do not just follow good arguments, neither in the sense of scholarly relevance nor in the sense of professional applicability. They need to discover their personal connection to it, like a "Sitz im Leben" that brings the topic into the concrete setting and projection of their lives.

Richness through diversity is a good part of a coherent and appropriate cultural project. This seems even clearer to me when I think of Alain Touraine's proposal of "a new paradigm for understanding today's world," first published in 2005. Touraine's book describes the progression from a social and political paradigm to a cultural one, in which the subject and cultural rights stand in the center of argumentation. The most important task today, following Touraine, is "to recognize the diversity of the combinations between modernity and cultural heritage or political system that exist throughout the world" (p. 157). Europe seems to be something like a



laboratory of such diversity, turning into a commitment what formerly caused disgust. Europe – as we should imagine it – means the opening to the world and to cosmopolitanism and a respect for regional and national plurality. Whether one considers Europe in the terms of Zygmunt Bauman as "an unfinished adventure," or of Jeremy Rifkin as a "dream," or of George Steiner as an "idea," or of Eduardo Lourenço as the encounter of two different ways of reasoning, or of Anthony Giddens and Ulrich Beck in its global and cosmopolitan dimension, or finally in the terms of Peter Sloterdijk as a seminary where people think beyond empire, diversity and cultural rights are crucial to all of us. Sloterdijk remembers the Portuguese navigator Vasco da Gama who answered his frightened crew in a storm: Look, how the ocean is trembling with fear for you. Such is our endeavor, creating words that – based on experience – pinpoint the way to an unknown horizon.

Of course, such a project needs dedication. But now it may seem clearer why and how German Studies can positively answer this challenge by turning itself into a true European discipline. German Studies will recover its interdisciplinary broadness as Culture Studies beyond false disciplinary limitations as part of a new paradigm for understanding today's world. Within this paradigm it will take care of one concrete form of cultural diversity, the one that is normally expressed in the German language, of its history and cultural experience as a sometimes threatening, sometimes promising heritage. As in the fairy tales of the Brothers Grimm: *Und wenn sie nicht gestorben sind, so leben sie noch heute*.

#### Works Cited

- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Rev. edition. London, New York, 2006.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. *Europe: An Unfinished Adventure*. Cambridge, 2004.
- Beck, Ulrich, and Edgar Grande. *Das kosmopolitische Europa. Gesellschaft und Politik in der zweiten Moderne*. Frankfurt/M., 2004.
- Brague, Remi. *Europe, la voie romaine*. Paris, 1992.
- Derrida, Jacques. "What is a 'relevant' translation?" Translated by Lawrence Venuti. In *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti, 423–46. 2nd ed. London, New York, 2004. (Original: "Qu'est-ce qu'une traduction ›relevante‹?" In *Quinzièmes Assises de la Traduction Littéraire*, 21–48. Arles, 1998.)
- Frühwald, Wolfgang, Hans Robert Jauf, Reinhart Koselleck, et al. *Geisteswissenschaften heute*. 2nd ed. Frankfurt a.M., 1996.
- Giddens, Anthony. *Europe in the Global Age*. Cambridge, 2007.
- Grimm, Jacob. "Über den Werth der ungenauen Wissenschaften". In *Kleinere Schriften*, 7: 563–66. Olms, 1966 (reprint).
- Grimm, Jacob, and Wilhelm Grimm. *Deutsches Wörterbuch*. Munich, 1991 (reprint).
- Hanenberg, Peter. *Europa. Gestalten. Studien und Essays*. Frankfurt/M., 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Europa eine Seele geben. Übersetzung als kulturelles Fundament Europas." In *Kritische Ausgabe. Zeitschrift für Germanistik & Literatur* 12 (2008–9): 16–19; online under <http://kritische-ausgabe.de/index.php/archiv/1425/>

- Lourenço, Eduardo. *Nós e a Europa ou as duas razões*. 4th ed. Lisbon, 1994.
- Lützel, Paul Michael. *Die Schriftsteller und Europa. Von der Romantik bis zur Gegenwart*. Munich, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Kontinentalisierung: Das Europa der Schriftsteller*. Bielefeld, 2007.
- Pagden, Anthony Pagden, ed. *The Idea of Europe: From Antiquity to the European Union*. Cambridge, 2002.
- Rietbergen, Peter. *Europe. A Cultural History*. New York, 2005.
- Rifkin, Jeremy. *The European Dream*. New York, 2004.
- Sloterdijk, Peter. *Falls Europa erwacht: Gedanken zum Programm einer Weltmacht am Ende des Zeitalters ihrer politischen Absence*. Frankfurt a.M., 1994.
- Steiner, George. *The Idea of Europe*. Tilburg, 2005.
- Touraine, Alain. *A New Paradigm for Understanding Today's World*. Cambridge, 2007.

## **Zur Geschichte und heutigen Lage der deutschen Sprache und Kultur in Norwegen**

**John Ole Askedal**  
**Universität Oslo**

### *1. Der Hintergrund: die geschichtlichen Beziehungen zwischen Deutschland und Norwegen*

Seit dem Mittelalter bestehen zwischen Deutschland und Norwegen auf vielen Gebieten sehr enge Beziehungen (Sigurdson & Thorsen 1998; Simensen *et al.* 1998; Stokke 1998; Thorsen in Askedal *et al.* 2008). Das Mittelalter hindurch war Norwegen durch das Kontor in Bergen und Niederlassungen in Tønsberg und Oslo in die Hanse eingebunden. In der frühen Neuzeit waren deutsche Fachleute an der Entwicklung des norwegischen Bergbaus maßgeblich beteiligt. Infolge der 1536 vom dänischen König durchgeführten lutherischen Reformation wurde das kulturelle Leben des Landes in den deutschen Kulturkreis tiefer einbezogen. Aus Dänemark nach Norwegen entsandte Beamte kamen häufig aus den zu Dänemark gehörenden norddeutschen Herzogtümern Schleswig–Holstein; davon zeugen heute noch Namen wie Stoltenberg (der Familienname des heutigen norwegischen Premierministers), Bull, Cappelen u. a. m. Von entscheidender Bedeutung waren die vielfältigen kulturellen Anregungen, die nach der Auflösung der Reichsunion mit Dänemark im Jahre 1814 im 19. Jahrhundert von Deutschland ausgingen; in Deutschland konnten norwegische Künstler das Wissen und die Fähigkeiten erwerben, die es ihnen möglich machten, einem neuen nationalen Selbstverständnis Ausdruck zu verleihen; hier wurden auch norwegische Wissenschaftler ausgebildet – ihre Arbeiten verfassten sie größtenteils auf Deutsch – und hier eroberten norwegische Schriftsteller ihren ersten und größten internationalen Markt; nicht wenige von