

ING 4

EXAME DE PROFICIÊNCIA EM INGLÊS PARA PROCESSOS SELETIVOS DE PROGRAMAS DE PÓS-GRADUAÇÃO DA UFMG

ÁREA Nº 04: LINGUÍSTICA, LETRAS E ARTES

IDENTIFICAÇÃO > (escreva somente o nº do CPF. Candidato estrangeiro sem CPF: informe o número do passaporte)

CPF:

PASSAPORTE:

DATA: / /

NOTA:

INSTRUÇÕES:

1. Esta prova é constituída de 1 (um) texto em língua inglesa, seguido de 5 (cinco) questões abertas, totalizando, com esta folha de rosto, 5 (cinco) páginas. Caso identifique algum problema, solicite a substituição da prova.
2. Leia atentamente o texto e responda às questões propostas. As questões deverão ser respondidas em **português, a tinta** (cor azul ou preta; provas respondidas a lápis **não serão corrigidas**) e com letra **legível**.
3. A duração da prova é de **3 (três) horas**.
4. **É** permitido o uso de dicionário impresso. O candidato deverá utilizar seu próprio exemplar.
5. Os rascunhos deverão ser entregues ao examinador, junto com a prova: texto e questões.
6. Responda às questões **de acordo com o texto**.

Texto:

Copyright© 1979 by New Literary History,
The University of Virginia
NEW LITERARY HISTORY

Genre and the Literary Canon

Alastair Fowler

I. Canons of Literature

THE LITERATURE we criticize and theorize about is never the whole. At most we talk about sizable subsets of the writers and works of the past. This limited field is the current literary canon. Some have argued that much the same is true of individual works: that an "elasticity" in the literary artifact permits us to attend now to small samples, now to larger traditions and groupings of which the work in its unitary sense forms a mere constituent. This may be true in part, although much has still to be said on the side of the artifact's integrity. But however that may be, few will dispute the elasticity of *literature*. The literary canon varies obviously-as well as unobviously-from age to age and reader to reader. The Dame Mutability who produces these marvelous changes has often been identified with fashion. Isaac D'Israeli, an early proponent of this view, argued that "prose and verse have been regulated by the same caprice that cuts our coats and cocks our hats," and concluded his essay on literary fashion with the claim that "different times, then, are regulated by different tastes. What makes a strong impression on the public at one time, ceases to interest it at another ... and every age of modern literature might, perhaps, admit of a new classification, by dividing it into its periods of fashionable literature." Now fashion's claim to rule is not easily denied. A desire for novelty, which we should not undervalue, has much to do with pleasure in literary form. Nevertheless, "taste" is more than fashion and should not be subordinated to trivial laws of circumstance. But to recognize taste for what it is, we need at least to glimpse its involvement in multifarious processes, many of them apparently quite unconnected with literature. Their variety, which is the subject of Kellett's challenging essay *The Whirligig of Taste*, calls for extended study. In the present paper I shall look at only one determinant, genre. As soon as one thinks of genre in relation to taste, one is struck by how many of D'Israeli's instances of displaced fashions are described in generic or modal terms: "the brilliant era of epigrammatic points," "another age was deluged by a million of sonnets," "an age of epics," "dream" (i.e., dream vision), "satires," "romance," "tragedies," "comedies." In fact, changes in the literary canon may often be referred to revaluation or devaluation of the genres that the canonical works represent.

The official canon, however, is sometimes spoken of as pretty stable, if not "totally coherent." And the idea of canon certainly implies a collection of works enjoying an exclusive completeness (at least for a time). Yet the biblical canon was arrived at only after many vicissitudes and over a period of many centuries. At each stage it was categorically fixed (although subject to varying emphases, conciliary, denominational, sectarian, individual); but when it enlarged or contracted, the new canon, too, was definitive. Moreover, canonical books of Scripture are not merely authentic but also authoritative. This normative sense has prompted a useful extension of the term to secular literature. Thus Curtius writes of "canon formation in literature [that] must always proceed to a selection of classics" and that embodies itself in lists of authors, curricula, histories of literature, and canons of taste.

The current canon sets fixed limits to our understanding of literature, in several ways. The OFFICIAL CANON is institutionalized through education, patronage, and journalism. But each individual has also his PERSONAL CANON, works he happens to know and value. These two sets have no simple inclusive relation. Most of us fail to respond to some official classics; on the other hand, through superior judgment or benefit of learning, we may be able to extend the socially determined canon usefully. We may depart from it, that is, in ways that are not merely eccentric: as by seeing merit in an experimental work or by revaluing a neglected one. Here, translations from foreign and early indigenous literature have obviously a considerable function (Wyatt's Petrarch, Dryden's Chaucer, Cary's Dante). Infusion of elements from popular art have also a vital influence. So the narrative ballad, after centuries of belonging firmly to the popular canon and of being excluded from the literary canon, attracted the interest of the impartial Gray and was given art treatment by Wordsworth and Coleridge.

The literary canon in the broadest sense comprises the entire written corpus, together with all surviving oral literature. But much of this POTENTIAL CANON remains inaccessible, for example, because of the rarity of its records, which may be sequestered in large libraries. There is thus a more limited ACCESSIBLE CANON. This is much narrower than *the New Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature* might suggest. Practical limitations work in various ways, which may be mutually confirming. Most direct are the limits to publication: Traherne (1637-74) could hardly be canonical until his principal works were "discovered" (1896-97) and printed (1903, 1908). And even for a novelist with a readership as wide as Trollope's, the canonical works (in the present sense) cannot extend beyond those recently reprinted. Similarly, contingencies of manuscript transmission have shaped the medieval canon: paperback publication and anthologizing still limit the accessible canon for some social groups: and the bibliophilic canon in unexpected ways influences the literature available even to scholars. With the performing arts, accessibility is particularly restricted. Who can tell how many Jacobean plays may not be better than the very few that happen to have been put on? Reviving neglected plays is so difficult and costly that even attempts at "reverse censorship" by state patronage have failed to counteract the competitive narrowing of theatrical tradition to a repertoire of half-a-dozen genres. As for restrictive censorship, that has at times drastically narrowed the literary canon-to the extent of prohibiting at least the contemporary exemplars of entire genres, such as satire.

From this accessible canon further systematic preferences have often been exercised, leading to SELECTIVE CANONS. The selective canons with most institutional force are formal curricula, whose influence has long been recognized, and treated in such studies as R. R. Bolgar's *The Classical Heritage and Its Beneficiaries*. But reaction to an official curriculum may issue in an "alternative" curriculum, equally strict, but until recently less examined by literary historians. And always there is a briefer, more rapidly changing, unseen curriculum of passages that are familiar and interesting and available in the fullest sense. Such selections are all responsive in one way or another to the CRITICAL CANON. This is surprisingly narrow. For most critics, indeed, the literature their work relates to is not that listed in bibliographies, but the far more limited areas of interest marked by repeated discussion in journals-particularly those that, like *Scrutiny*, acquire influence. From this canon, countless considerable authors are excluded. For example, the first fifteen annual volumes of *Essays in Criticism* (1950-65) contain no article on Vaughan or Traherne or Cotton or Diaper or Smart or Clare or de la Mare. In fact, NCBEL records no criticism on Cotton after 1938. And even within the canonical writers, critics tacitly agree to operate, in the main, on beaten tracks-Piers Plowman 18, Spenser's Bower of Bliss, Dryden's Achitophel, and the like-the best passages, of course.

Inevitably, the individual choices that follow all these selections include very few writers, although they may extend, by quirks of personal taste, to unfashionable outsiders such as de la Mare. It must be judged fortunate that literature's generic nature is such as to enable samples to stand for much larger groupings, by incorporating their types. For the significance of the literary canon would be hard to exaggerate. Apart from its obvious exclusions and limitations, it has a vital positive influence by virtue of its variety and proportions. Arrived at through the interaction of many generations of readers, it constitutes an important image of wholeness.

Of many factors determining our literary canon, genre is surely among the most decisive. Not only are certain genres regarded *prima facie* as more canonical than others, but individual works or passages may be valued more or less highly according to their generic height.

Fonte: <http://www.unife.it/lettere/lingue/lingue/insegnamenti/letteratura-inglese-ii-lingue/programma-bibliografia-calendario-lezioni-modalita-desame-e-materiale-didattico-anno-accademico-2012-2013/Alastair%20Fowler-%20Genre%20and%20the%20Literary%20Canon-%201979.pdf> (Adaptado)
Acesso: Setembro de 2015.

Questões:

1. O que D'Israeli afirma em relação à elasticidade da *literatura*?

2. Como é apresentado o fato de não haver uma relação inclusiva simples entre o cânone oficial e o cânone pessoal?

3. Que exemplos são dados em relação aos limites da publicação?

4. O que são currículos formal e alternativo?

5. Como gênero é relacionado a cânone literário?
