

De-Centring Cultural Studies

De-Centring Cultural Studies:
Past, Present and Future of Popular Culture

Edited by

José Igor Prieto-Arranz, Patricia Bastida-Rodríguez,
Caterina Calafat-Ripoll, Marta Fernández-Morales
and Cristina Suárez-Gómez

**CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS**

P U B L I S H I N G

De-Centring Cultural Studies:
Past, Present and Future of Popular Culture,
Edited by José Igor Prieto-Arranz, Patricia Bastida-Rodríguez, Caterina Calafat-Ripoll,
Marta Fernández-Morales and Cristina Suárez-Gómez

This book first published 2013

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2013 by José Igor Prieto-Arranz, Patricia Bastida-Rodríguez, Caterina Calafat-Ripoll,
Marta Fernández-Morales and Cristina Suárez-Gómez and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system,
or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or
otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-4476-4, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-4476-5

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	ix
Introduction	1
De-Centring Cultural Studies. Past, Present and Future of Popular Culture José Igor Prieto-Arranz, Patricia Bastida-Rodríguez, Caterina Calafat-Ripoll, Marta Fernández-Morales and Cristina Suárez-Gómez	
Part I	
Theoretical Approaches to Popular Culture: Borderlands between Canonical and Popular Culture	
Chapter One	23
Intrusiveness or Interdisciplinarity? The Justification of Critical Categories on the Ethnoliterary Frontier Mercè Picornell-Belenguer	
Chapter Two	41
A New Kind of Popular Lyric Poetry? Collectivisation Processes in Recent Catalan Writing Margalida Pons	
Part II	
Popular Culture: From the Past to the Present	
Chapter Three	71
From the Middle Ages to the Future: The Arthurian Legend and its Transcultural Value Carlos Sanz-Mingo	
Chapter Four	89
A Tell-Tale Thriller: An Intertextual and Structural Insight into Poe's Pop Marta Miquel-Baldellou	

Chapter Five	119
Back to the Orient: Juan Valera's "El pájaro verde"	
Montserrat Amores	
Chapter Six	137
Popular and Experimental Anarchist Cinema: Anarcho-Syndicalist	
Film during the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939)	
Antonio Prado	
Part III	
Gender and Genres: New Perspectives in Popular Culture	
Chapter Seven	153
Hollywood's <i>Memoirs of a Geisha</i> and the Re-presentation	
of Culturally-Biased Stereotypes	
Iria María Bello-Viruega	
Chapter Eight	169
Imagining Difference in Maggie Gee's <i>My Cleaner</i> and <i>My Driver</i>	
Corneeltje Van Bleijswijk	
Chapter Nine	181
Between Tradition and Innovation: Approaching Feminism	
in the Construction and Characterisation of P. D. James's	
and Amanda Cross's Female Detectives	
María del Mar Ramón-Torrijos	
Chapter Ten	197
Theoretical Foundations for a Multimodal Analysis of Print-Media-	
Based Advertising in Critical Perspective	
Eduardo de Gregorio-Godeo	
Part IV	
Popular Culture and Age Subcultures	
Chapter Eleven	217
Firm and Hard: Popular Culture, Gendered Stardom	
and the Troubling Embodiment of "Successful Ageing"	
Josephine Dolan	

Chapter Twelve	247
<i>The Twilight Saga: Gender, Consumerism and Cultural Franchises</i>	
Meritxell Esquirol-Salom	
Chapter Thirteen	265
Youth Culture in Spain: Two Teen TV Fictions	
Paul Julian Smith	
Part V	
Popular Culture and National/Cultural Identities	
Chapter Fourteen	293
The (Re)Construction of Transylvania in Vampire Films	
Mihai Iacob	
Chapter Fifteen	305
From Folk to Children's Literature: An Ideological Analysis of the Grimms' Contribution to the Fairy Tale Genre	
Gloria Bosch-Roig	
Chapter Sixteen	321
The Changing Narrative Spaces of Slovak Television	
Slávka Tomaščíková	
Chapter Seventeen	339
From Elite Culture to Culture for the "New" People: The Reconstruction of Romanian Identity through the Cultural Press (1948-1964)	
Andrada Fătu-Tutoveanu	
Contributors	357

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Working on this volume has been a labour of love for all the editors. Throughout this long process, which started well before the 4th International SELICUP Conference was successfully held at the University of the Balearic Islands in October 2010, we have had ample opportunity to get to know each other even better. As a five-strong team, we have tried to diversify our endeavours so as to always maximise effort, and results seem to indicate that this effort has not been in vain. More importantly, however, these last two years have been rather eventful for all of us, and this editing experience has taught us that we do not stand alone in the world since we can always count on one another for help. As a result, we truly look forward to further collaborations as a team.

This volume would not exist without its contributors. Thanks are therefore due to the authors of the different chapters, who have been patient enough to accept our feedback and follow our guidelines. We truly hope they will find this experience as rewarding as it has been for us. Our especial thanks go to Dr Josephine Dolan, Dr Margalida Pons, Prof Paul Julian Smith, and Dr Slávka Tomaščíková, for the trust they have placed in us and for being generous enough to share their research with all of us.

Last but not least, we should like to thank everyone at Cambridge Scholars Publishing for believing in our project. They literally brought this book into being by expressing their interest in collaborating with us as early as they did. We are particularly grateful to Dr Andy Nercessian, for accepting our proposal, and to Carol Koulikourdi, Amanda Millar and Emily Surrey, for the lively, detailed correspondence and help provided at all stages.

THE EDITORS

INTRODUCTION

DE-CENTRING CULTURAL STUDIES: PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE OF POPULAR CULTURE

JOSÉ-IGOR PRIETO-ARRANZ,
PATRICIA BASTIDA-RODRÍGUEZ,
CATERINA CALAFAT-RIPOLL,
MARTA FERNÁNDEZ-MORALES
AND CRISTINA SUÁREZ-GÓMEZ

1. Why *De-Centring Cultural Studies*?

There is widespread agreement that the origin of cultural studies as we know it today can be found in post-World War II Britain, although the legacy of other figures from both within and outside the UK (such as Matthew Arnold, the Leavises or several members of the so-called Frankfurt School) has not always been given its due. Historical issues aside, cultural studies gradually came into shape in an attempt to find a way to overcome the limitations of traditional academic disciplines (Wallace 1995, 508; Surber 1998, 129-134) and to highlight the relevance of cultural manifestations hitherto ignored by academia. This twofold aim already points towards the two main clashes that cultural studies has had with the university establishment, namely the departmentalisation of knowledge (resulting from the arbitrary boundaries set up between fully-established disciplines) and the canonisation of the objects of study of such disciplines (which in turn results in whatever lies beyond such boundaries being considered unfit for “serious” academic study).

The first sign of academic recognition was the creation of the University of Birmingham’s Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies

(CCCS) in 1964, which for years led the way in the field although never quite imposing a single or coherent theoretical model (Bathwick 1992, 330-331). In fact, cultural studies may be said to remain to this day a deliberately diffuse area of academic research which (1) has quite successfully resisted departmentalisation; and (2) draws on a variety of theoretical approaches with a single aim: the interpretation of *all kinds* of cultural phenomena. As Walton puts it, cultural studies, rather than a discipline understood in the traditional way, “is a knowledge-producing set of practices or strategies which, rather than search for certainties, produces knowledge and diverse forms of understanding which are constantly open to further questioning” (2008, 295).

This flexibility and systematic resistance of the strait-jacket of academic departmentalisation—which in many ways mirrors the complexity of its object of study—are probably two of the key ingredients of its success and expansion beyond the UK. This expansion is worth commenting on, as it spans a good many different (although especially English-speaking) countries including the United States (albeit the *cultural studies* label is not always used there) and Australia, and has been evidenced by the countless journal articles, books and conferences that have appeared or taken place over the last two decades.

However, this has been no easy ride for cultural studies. To mention but a relevant example, the University of Birmingham’s Department of Cultural Studies and Sociology, heir to the original CCCS, was closed down in 2002 amidst great controversy. This closure can be easily read in terms of the aforementioned departmentalisation of knowledge—which cultural studies has always been a threat to—not having been completely overcome in the very country it expanded from. More specifically, this notorious incident has been interpreted as an attempt to curtail what some sociologists viewed as an intrusion on the part of cultural studies.¹

If, as the example above suggests, cultural studies still faces resistance in the centre, i.e. in those very countries in which it rose to academic prominence, it is easy to imagine how much more difficult the situation must be in those other *peripheral* countries like Spain in which cultural studies is to be seen at best as an emergent research field. Cultural studies was still barely visible throughout the Spanish-speaking world in the early 2000s (García Canclini 1994; Gies 2000; Jordan and Morgan-Tamosunas 2000). And even if the situation is slowly changing at least in Spain—largely through the contribution of many scholars with an English philology background (Carrera-Suárez 2005; Walton 2012), there is still a long way to go before cultural studies becomes fully established in Spanish academia.

Some of the difficulties it still faces may be seen to derive once again from the challenge that cultural studies poses to traditional disciplinary approaches to knowledge. Indeed, its holistic concept of culture (more on this below) is diametrically opposed to traditional disciplinarity. This has already kicked off interdisciplinary forces within well-established academic fields.² Consequently, cultural studies, together with other closely-related approaches to cultural phenomena such as the “ethnoliterature” discussed by Picornell-Belenguer (this volume), has grown to be regarded not only as an *interdiscipline* but also as an *antidiscipline*. By way of example, many years had to pass before the University of Birmingham first offered a university degree in cultural studies. As a result and for a long time, those interested in doing cultural studies could only do so at PhD level. This was a clear attempt to avoid turning cultural studies into yet one more “orthodox” discipline.

The situation could not be more different today since, at least in Britain, a great many universities offer BAs in cultural studies, but reception to this change has been mixed. On the one hand, Stuart Hall, one of the so-called “fathers” of cultural studies, and still one of its most influential theorists, has made public his mixed feelings about the success, institutionalisation and, ultimately, worldwide expansion of the field (Hall 1999). On the other, there is increasing pressure (coming from outside the UK and perhaps especially from the USA) on cultural studies to become an academic discipline if only because this will help it gain valuable visibility both within and outside academia (McEwan 2002).

Whilst not completely exempt from controversy in the English-speaking world, the expansion of cultural studies has been harshly criticised in other territories. Such criticism has largely centred on both its alleged lack of rigour and object of study, although it could also be claimed that at the base of such accusations lies a notorious attempt to protect comfortably departmentalised knowledge. And to this day Spain remains one of those countries which, to say the least, have not particularly favoured the introduction and ulterior expansion of cultural studies. Thus, it has not been yet officially recognised by the Spanish university, with no degrees or departments to its name. Spain’s still recent immersion in the European Higher Education Area may still prove a positive influence in this regard, although the way reforms have so far been implemented, not particularly aided by the current economic recession, raises many doubts.

Doubts also result from the rather pessimistic description that both Carrera-Suárez (2005) and Cornut-Gentile D’Arcy (2005) provide of Spanish academia. In an account that leaves no stone unturned, both

authors discuss the highly hierarchical, conservative and compartmentalised Spanish university, convincingly describing how this overall situation becomes a stumbling block to promotion for those perceived not to have complied with the established conventions of disciplinary knowledge.

This does not mean, however, that cultural studies does not exist in Spain. As Carrera-Suárez points out, the *Asociación Española de Estudios Anglo-Norteamericanos* (AEDEAN) holds annual conferences and both its conferences and its journal, *Atlantis*, are open to cultural studies. It is equally worth mentioning that the cultural studies panel is also one of the most popular at the AEDEAN conferences, as judged by the number of papers presented in it. Moreover, there is the still small but active *Iberian Association for Cultural Studies* (IBACS), responsible for the organisation of the successful Culture and Power conferences, and SELICUP (*Sociedad Española de Estudios Literarios de Cultura Popular*), which has also made a valuable contribution to the visibility of Spanish cultural studies and popular culture.

It follows that cultural studies has somehow infiltrated the Spanish university establishment, mostly through its English departments (Walton 2012). This is hardly surprising since the same departments have also served to disseminate closely related interdisciplinary areas of research such as gender and women's studies. What is slightly more surprising is that it is precisely English studies (which only became established in Spanish universities as recently as the 1970s, most possibly with some resent and scepticism from the more traditional areas of classical, romance or even Spanish philology) that has produced some of the most critical attitudes to cultural studies.

On the other hand, the debt that cultural studies owes to English studies in Spain has also had another negative consequence. Ironically, most of the cultural studies-related research produced in Spain does not tackle Spanish or Hispanic issues but focuses on cultural phenomena from the English-speaking world. This is due not so much to lack of interest on the part of Spanish scholars but to the rules of academic promotion as applicable in Spain, since the fear exists that non-pertinent research might not be fairly taken into account in the context of e.g. research assessment exercises or job applications. This in turn goes a long way towards explaining why the best-known pieces of work in Spanish cultural studies have been published in English abroad and, needless to say, authored by non-Spanish scholars. Among these, Gies (2000) and Jordan and Morgan-Tamosunas (2000) stand out, and mention must also be made of the pioneering work carried out by the likes of Jo Labanyi (Graham and

Labanyi 1995) and Paul Julian Smith (2003, 2007), both founding editors of the *Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies*.

This cannot but stress the value of the present volume which, although clearly aiming at an international readership, has been conceived in Spain by an all-Spanish editorial team, and includes analyses of a wide range of cultural phenomena and materials—many of which are Spanish. Hence the suggestive title, *De-Centring Cultural Studies*, chosen for this volume, as it makes reference to both our own position within the discipline and the socio-academic context in which we live and work. To this an equally suggestive subtitle has been added, a justification of which shall be provided below.

2. Why Past, Present and Future of Popular Culture?

As suggested above, through its holistic approach to culture, now generally considered as “everyday life” and not just the “High”, elitist “Culture” traditionally studied in university contexts (Williams 1973, 1997), cultural studies has gradually taken it upon itself to trace what Cuthbert refers to as the “the primary social—rather than natural—laws informing subjective experience in everyday life” (1996, 396). Particularly useful for the purposes of this volume are the semiotic approaches to this issue. Thus, Danesi and Perron regard culture as “a way of life based on a signifying order [...] that is passed [...] from one generation to the next” and which draws on the signifying order of a first community (“tribe”) (1999, 23). They complete the picture with a definition of “society”, which they perceive as “a collectivity of individuals who, although they may not all have the same tribal origins, nevertheless participate, by and large, in the signifying order of the founding or conquering tribe (or tribes)” (Danesi and Perron 1999, 24).

Such views are particularly relevant since they highlight one of the main points that both cultural studies and the present volume make, namely the blurring of the division between “High” and “low” culture, since what matters from this perspective is not the aesthetic or artistic value of cultural materials but culture understood as “the whole system of significations by which a society or a section of it understands itself and its relations with the world” (Dollimore and Sinfield, quoted in Wilson 1995, 26). It follows that cultural studies invariably takes an ideological stance, as it conceives of culture as something both inherent to, and resulting from, a given political and economic system (Wilson 1995, 34). This easily relates to the foucauldian notion of discourse (Foucault 1984) as “language in action” (Danaher et al. 2000, 31). Indeed, Stuart Hall is

widely held responsible for introducing the ideas of French theorists to the mainstream of British cultural studies, and this includes foucauldian theory—Foucault having excelled in disentangling “the ways in which signs, meanings and values help to reproduce a dominant social power” (Eagleton 2000, 221).

In turn, this widening of the concept of culture has had another side-effect, namely that the hitherto sacrosanct canonical literary text need no longer be at the centre of the research carried out within cultural studies. In fact, as Stuart Hall put it, much research has so far focused primarily on “‘neglected’ materials drawn from popular culture and the mass media, which [...] [provide] important evidence of the new stresses and directions of contemporary culture” (1996, 21; see also Williams 1979), thus demonstrating that “culture” is no longer synonymous with, but far more complex a term than, say, the literary canon. As an offshoot of this, the debate remains open as to how to refer to (and what academic status should be granted to) those studies inquiring into literary phenomena beyond the canon. At all events, in refusing to automatically deprive the “here and now” of academic worth and interest, rather than just wait for time (and a complex net of ideological and economic factors) to “canonise” some materials whilst burying others, cultural studies moves further away from the traditional humanities and comes up as a “history of the present” (Valdés-Miyares 2006, 1).

Needless to say, such achievements have come at a price. The revaluation of “neglected materials” has been so prominent that these have arguably become the flagship of cultural studies. A simple browse through the different cultural studies programmes offered by many British universities, or the titles offered by some of the most visible publishing houses leads to one conclusion: (canonical) literature has been reduced to a clearly marginal position within cultural studies (Spiropoulou 1999, 53).

Although a natural reaction in the wake of centuries of canonical tradition, this has led to harsh criticism even from certain circles within cultural studies itself. In this regard, some refer to the “banalisation” or “trivialisation” of both its contents and interests, and this criticism is perhaps most visible outside the UK (see Grossberg 2006, 22–23, who discusses the issue from an American perspective). Clearly illustrative of this critical strand is Striphas (2002), who, whilst fully recognising the merit and quality of early cultural studies research, adds that much of the research currently produced under this label is “ordinary” (an adjective that, in his view, no longer describes the object of study but research itself). Never one to mince words, Striphas largely blames the main

publishing houses for this, adding that they are after the easily sellable and not the intellectually stimulating (2002, 441-442).

Such risks do exist although they arguably apply to much of the academic world and not just cultural studies. As for the latter, and considering its output over the last few decades, it might be argued that cultural studies has come of age and that the value of literature and literary studies (as well as other artistic fields and related disciplines) has never been consciously questioned. Spiropoulou, however, calls for a rapprochement between these and cultural studies (1999, 55), making it clear that the value of canonical literature (and all other forms of “High” culture) is reaffirmed. It should be remembered, however, that such claims may be seen to misunderstand the very nature of cultural studies. Richard Hoggart himself repeatedly insisted that the belief that popular culture is worth studying does not automatically mean that it has the same (aesthetic, artistic) value as that traditionally recognised in certain key works of canonical culture (Gibson and Hartley 1998, 14-15; Schwarz 2005, 178).

And this is so because, as stated above, cultural studies does not seek to analyse the aesthetic or artistic value of the materials it studies. Thus seen, those who despise cultural studies on the grounds of the little value of the materials it analyses simply demonstrate very little knowledge of what cultural studies is or does. Moreover, it might also be argued that a rejection of the canon might prove just as dangerous as a rejection of the popular since, as also suggested above, and as the present volume makes abundantly clear, the boundaries between “High” and “low” culture are all but blurred (Spiropoulou 1999, 57).

3. About this volume

The present volume, therefore, offers an exciting collection of original papers whose common denominator is their rejection of (1) canonical culture as the only legitimate object of study; and (2) disciplinary knowledge as the only viable epistemological and methodological framework. In their markedly interdisciplinary approach to their respective object of study, and through their focus on the non-canonical nature of the latter, the different chapters make up a volume that showcases work on a wide range of cultural phenomena and materials whose relevance is no longer exclusively related to aesthetic issues. Thus seen, one may see this volume as an attempt to embrace the more socially relevant, mostly *interdisciplinary* “post-Humanities” (Badmington 2006) continuum of knowledge that the academic world is currently witnessing and to which, sadly enough, the only too often dusty environment of many (especially

southern) European Faculties of Arts has so far proved a virtually impregnable fortress.

The different chapters in the volume explore a vast range of materials from different perspectives—literature, semiotics, linguistics, film, television, gender and women’s studies—bringing to the fore the ideological content and social relevance of the materials under analysis. These chapters have their origin in the 4th International SELICUP Conference, held in Palma de Mallorca, Spain, in October 2010. It must also be stated, however, that this is no ordinary conference proceedings volume. Such a volume was indeed published in 2011 (see Bastida-Rodríguez et al. 2011) although the intention was already there to produce an entirely different book that somehow managed to capture the essence of this truly fruitful academic gathering. And this is exactly what the editors now present. *De-Centring Cultural Studies. Past, Present and Future of Cultural Studies* is a selection of chapters covering topics and addressing issues which are all tightly related to each other. Although based on, or inspired by, papers actually presented at the conference, all of the authors (including several fully-consolidated international personalities and an exciting sample of new, young academic voices) have substantially re-worked their respective original papers—a process that has often involved their translation into English—to such an extent that each of the chapters in the volume can now be considered a new piece of writing in its own right.

The essays in Part I (“Theoretical Approaches to Popular Culture: Borderlands between Canonical and Popular Culture”) fittingly open this volume. Drawing on the ever exciting Catalan cultural scene, Chapters 1 and 2 point to the limitations of traditional literary studies and concepts if a full understanding is to be gained of the more recent literary (and especially poetic) developments in the area. In her essay, Picornell-Belenguier denounces the “neglected material” status of the phenomena she studies, thus highlighting both a lack of interest on the part of “orthodox” experts and the inadequacy of their theories and constructs to refer to a remarkably dynamic range of materials in which (popular?) art is tantamount to the expression of national and cultural identity. More specifically, by discussing slippery concepts such as ethnoliterature, ethnopoetics or ethnofiction, often associated with orality, collectivity and “indigenous” cultures, she argues that the debates over issues of authenticity and representativeness surrounding the cultural production of certain groups actually conceal an ethnocentric wish on the part of “canonical” disciplines and discourses to keep them in a subaltern,

marginal position, which inevitably involves diminishing their cultural value.

For her part, Pons further explores the situation, drawing on economic policy terminology to more adequately refer to, and account for, the latest—and crucially, popularised—manifestations of Catalan poetry. As she sees it, a full account of such phenomena will always be incomplete should it not address the extra-literary factors she fittingly focuses on in her chapter. Feeling that the “High” / popular culture divide, very much like “separating what is traditional from what is contemporary” (42), leads absolutely nowhere, particularly in the context of the often multi- or even trans-media phenomena she analyses, Pons openly embraces Raymond Williams’ liberating view of culture as a set “of social practices” and advocates an interdisciplinary, “hybridised” form of literary criticism that places ideology on a par with intrinsically literary aspects.

A second body of chapters follows in the volume’s Part II, entitled “Popular Culture: From the Past to the Present”. This section further questions the borders between “High” and popular culture. In this particular case, this is done by looking back at the past and exploring how the popular culture of yesteryear has influenced and inspired later “canonical” cultural materials and vice versa. This involves a(n often comparative) revision of works that may well fall into different genre categories, which once again calls for interdisciplinary approaches. That is the case of Sanz-Mingo’s paper, which offers an overview of Arthurian production through history reminding readers of the diversity of disciplines it stems from both in “High” and popular culture—from painting, music and the decorative arts to literature, cinema and television, to name only a few—and its adaptation to the social and political milieu of each specific period. Focusing specifically on recent texts such as Bernard Cornwell’s trilogy “The Warlord Chronicles” and Joseba Sarrionandía’s Arthurian short stories in Basque, the article highlights the contemporary productivity of the Arthurian myth as well as its intercultural scope.

Marta Miquel-Baldellou develops an original comparative analysis of Edgar Allan Poe’s literary work and Michael Jackson’s musical production, including his lyrics, video-clips, and short films. The author finds interesting intertextual connections between both popular figures, and she approaches their common thematic interests (consumerism, love, crime, and revenge, amongst others), as well as the settings, motifs, time frameworks and discourse modalities activated by Poe and Jackson.

Amores’s chapter analyses a renowned Spanish writer’s (Juan Valera, 1824-1905) literary adaptation of a folktale. Under a pseudonym, and following a trend started by some widely acclaimed 18th and 19th century

European writers, Valera re-creates a simulacrum of the Orient and, more specifically, China, somehow making it part of the Western literary canon.

Next in the volume is Prado's contribution, which presents a detailed analysis of the role exerted by the *National Confederation of Labour* (CNT), an anarcho-syndicalist union, in the production of political films during the Spanish Civil War. Reviewing the most significant examples of films released during this time, and placing emphasis on their innovative character, the author provides insights into how this cinema came to represent a transition between other relevant European types of political cinema, as is the case of the Soviet avant-garde in the 1920s and Italian Post-World War II neo-realism in the 60s.

A clear endorsement of interdisciplinary approaches can be seen in the chapters included in Part III, which once again look into a wide range of textual genres (film, different examples taken from the canonical-popular literary continuum, the periodical press) in order to inquire into their extra-aesthetic content. On this occasion, racial, ethnic and gender issues come to the fore, as can be observed in the title of the section, "Gender and Genres: New Perspectives in Popular Culture". In the case of Bello-Viruega's article, the gender and ethnic variables are combined in a study of the film adaptation of the novel *Memoirs of a Geisha*. Through the application of Edward Said's theories on Orientalism and Laura Mulvey's conceptualisation of the male gaze, the author concludes that the Hollywood production reinforces the extant stereotypes of Asian people in general and women in particular, and that it is undeniably an audiovisual text created by, for, and with Western sensibilities.

Corneeltje Van Bleijswijk's contribution focuses on two novels by contemporary British writer Maggie Gee and the way they explore alterity and racial prejudice by reversing the stereotypes of the white master and the African servant often found in dominant culture. Using Rosi Braidotti's theories on nomadism and bell hooks' concept of "yearning", Van Bleijswijk contends that through both narratives Gee is articulating her own political position by claiming what can be called "likeness under difference", or a fundamental likeness between individuals from different ethnic backgrounds, thus suggesting the possibility of conviviality and the creation of empathy ties across cultures.

The gender variable is also studied in Ramón-Torrijos's paper, which is concerned with detective fiction, a traditionally male-dominated genre. In her case, she analyses the fictional representation of Cordelia Grey and Kate Fensler, the female detectives created by P. D. James and Amanda Cross, and focuses on the contribution these authors have made to the development of female detectives, portraying them as active and

independent characters, and the influence they have had on subsequent generations of female detectives.

Part III is fittingly brought to a close with De Gregorio-Godeo's chapter. In presenting the main points of multimodal discourse analysis (which integrates the visual component in semiotically syncretic texts), and illustrating its application, this work provides cultural studies with a sound theoretical framework and methodology with which to "unearth" the ideological leanings of cultural materials. Although much has been written on the interpretation of meaning arising from multiple semiotic resources, in this contribution the author sheds light on how to apply common principles of meaning-making across and between different media (particularly advertisements), with the aim of disentangling the role of discursive and linguistic features in the creation of cultural phenomena.

For their part, the chapters in Part IV ("Popular Culture and Age Subcultures") offer transmedial analyses from a perspective which, although integrating variables already discussed in earlier chapters (such as ethnic affiliation or gender), clearly focus on an equally relevant identity variable and context: age (subcultures). Especially within cultural studies, the term "subculture", which results from the attempt to study "the enormous variability of culture within some societies", is most often used to refer to "norms that arise specifically from a frustrating situation or from conflict between a group and the larger society" (Milton Yinger 1960, 627). Taking this into account, alternative terms have been suggested (Milton Yinger put forward "contraculture"); yet "subculture" prevails in the literature.

This conflictive, often rebellious nature is perhaps best seen in youth subcultures, as shown in two pioneering works that still need to be referred to today: Hall and Whannel (1964) and Hall and Jefferson (1976). The former shows how mass commercial culture and in particular pop music, in spite of its manufactured, commercial nature, can be used symbolically by the young in order to build and express a collective identity. As Walton sees it, the value of Hall and Whannel's volume lies in no small part in that the authors "see that the rebellious teenager is a media construction but they also see that the pop phenomenon can't be reduced only to market forces" (Walton 2008, 147) since, however formulaic and predictable, consuming pop music and culture in general is a meaningful activity for the teenager. Hence the relevance of the chapters by Esquirol-Salom and Smith.

Esquirol-Salom's contribution approaches youth culture from a feminist perspective, dealing with the extremely popular *Twilight Saga*. Touching upon issues of representation and, most significantly, reception,

she argues that Stephanie Meyer's novels and, particularly, their film versions, stand out as cultural manifestations encoded as "feminine". The author performs an analysis of the dynamics of consumption of the texts as developed via traditional reading and viewing, but also through transmedial phenomena like *fanfics* or *fanvids*. Her conclusion is that, in the line of Hall's "dominant or preferred meanings" (1993, 98), the traditional gender values encoded in *Twilight* have been commodified and unproblematically incorporated into the discursive maps of contemporary Western youth—especially girls and young women, with little room left for real, productive cognitive and / or cultural resistance.

Smith's contribution is especially relevant since, as he rightly puts it, even though much is being written on teen (sub)cultures in the English-speaking world, youth-oriented cultural materials in Spain have been left out of the academic discussion altogether. In his suitably transmedial study, Smith looks into two recent, highly successful Spanish TV shows without neglecting their connections with other media such as film or the Internet. Focusing on both representation and reception—the latter being one of the strengths of this interesting chapter—Smith's acute analysis reveals the immense relevance of (transmedial and even transnational) television as a vehicle for the dissemination of (not always hegemonic) discourses on such essential identity variables for youths as ethnicity, sexuality and sexual orientation.

However, in what might be regarded as a potentially shocking *coup d'effet*, Part IV opens with a chapter that does not focus on youth but on ageing and old age, providing fascinating insights into the discourses at play in today's (trans)mediated Western societies. Dolan's comprehensive account focuses on the iconicity of media stars to reflect on the different (and gendered) meaning and expectations that Western discourses have placed on old age. Through this, the latter is gradually yet inexorably revealed not as a natural given but crucially as a social construct that has in many ways victimised millions of individuals.

Finally, Part V ("Popular Culture and National / Cultural Identities") addresses yet another relevant variable in today's notably (trans)mediated, increasingly globalised societies: national identity and its links to (popular?) culture forms such as film, folk tales, television and the periodical press. It has been reported that "the idea of a common national culture is heavily under attack" (Hjarvard 1993, 72). Balibar localises part of the problem in "the role of the nation" and, it could be added, the changing role of the state (1996, 369). There are, as he notes, "'old' nation-states searching for a new role on the world stage; infranational entities with their fictive ethnicity attached to their name [...]; and

supranational entities” (Balibar 1996, 373). Such factors as the growing availability of travel, the increasingly mobile nature of today’s population, as well as the widespread use of IC technologies (resulting in increasingly mediated societies) may all have played a role in the possible destabilisation of formerly solid national identities. Still, there is evidence that national identity remains crucial in today’s western world. This is partly due to the fact that media representations are influential channels for the birth and reinforcement of discursive constructions (Coleman 1998; Brewer et al. 2003; Slater et al. 2006; Simon and Jerit 2007) whilst textual genres, however widely available internationally, always present country-specific features (Foster 1991; Barker 1999) that somehow firmly root them within the limits of the imaginary communities (Anderson 1991) that nations are.

The first chapter in this part, by Mihai Iacob, beautifully illustrates some of the main tenets of identity theory. As Hall puts it, “all identities operate through exclusion, through the discursive construction of a constitutive outside and the production of abjected and marginalized subjects” (1996, 15). It is quite important, then, to realise that the moment an identity is created another community is also created only to be excluded from it. This abjected community is what cultural theory has come to refer to as “the Other”, “Otherness” being the term used to refer to the condition derived from being “the Other”. However, as Foucault has repeatedly argued, power is not stable; consequently, and as Hall (1997) would probably put it, what being a perceived member of a given imagined community means is no longer controlled (if it ever was) by the alleged members of such a community. This meaning is, on the contrary, in a permanent stage of negotiation and dialogue between the national culture and its respective Others. Illustrating this with the case of Transylvania (arguably Romania’s most visible historical region), Iacob demonstrates that the full meaning of *Transylvanianness* cannot be grasped unless we also consider not only how the Transylvanians see themselves but also how the Transylvanians see their traditional Others, and crucially how these traditional Others see the Transylvanians. Iacob’s paper, articulated around the politics of representation in vampire films and in the line of others included in this volume (e.g. Bello-Viruega’s), adapts Edward Said’s theories on Orientalism, in this case in combination with Maria Todorova’s conceptualisation of Balkanism, to explore the relationship between real referents and fictional signs in the building of Transylvania as a *locus* of identity construction and reinforcement for the Romanian imagined community. Drawing on examples that cover over one century—from Murnau’s *Nosferatu* (1922) to Tatopoulos’ *Underworld*

(2009), he makes a case for the unidirectional vectorisation of the influence between historiographic, journalistic and political texts on the one hand and Gothic fiction (literary or filmic) on the other.

For her part, Bosch-Roig re-visits the folk tale, already studied by Amores in Part II, exploring the powerful connections between this genre and the rise and consolidation of German national identity. In her essay, she traces the transformations carried out by the Brothers Grimm on the folk tales they compiled in their attempt to combine Romantic aesthetic ideals with the new nationalist ideology sustaining German society and their wish to educate the reader. By examining the different types of sources they used and their successive thematic revisions when drafting the texts, the author reveals to what extent their contribution was significant in the creation of the fairy tale genre for children as we know it today, which has been popularised again in recent decades through new cultural forms like the cinema.

The next chapter, by Slávka Tomaščíková, takes us to a different medium—television, this time—and a different cultural context: post-communist Europe and, more specifically, Slovakia. She draws on narrative theory to provide an interesting account that chronicles what seems to be a universal tendency—a gradual shift from the “information” to the “communication” poles of the televised narrative continuum, although especially exacerbated in both its narrative and visual forms in the post-communist reality of Central and Eastern European countries. Her informative report, aided by her acute observations, once again evidences how textual genres, no matter their nature, adopt distinctively unique forms across different cultural contexts; and, perhaps more relevantly, points to the media dissemination of (in this case) Western discourses which have changed those territories formerly under Soviet influence well beyond recognition.

It is precisely this Soviet influence—in this case disseminated through the medium of the periodical press—that makes a link between Tomaščíková’s paper and the last chapter in the volume, authored by Andrada Fătu-Tutoveanu. Focusing on the two crucial decades following the end of World War II, the author convincingly argues that, upon the imposition of a process of Soviet “mimicry”, Romania’s cultural press was effectively used as an instrument of the new regime’s cultural and identity policies. Ironically, and as opposed to the cultural reality portrayed by Picornell-Belenguer and Pons in the opening chapters of this volume, this Sovietisation, which was meant to draw culture closer to the masses, led to artificially *popularised* cultural forms that, rather than accurately reflect

the feelings of Romanian society, can now be read as *simulacra* of an (imposed) identity that never truly caught on among the Romanian people.

As this brief overview suggests, the present volume aims at making a valuable contribution to the cross-discipline of cultural studies. The book builds up a substantial body of evidence so as to convincingly argue for the blurred division between the High and lower forms of culture, the case being made by referring to and providing close readings of a wide range of materials (most definitely one of its strengths), produced both in the past and in the present and spanning different geographical territories. The inclusion of materials from beyond the English-speaking world (with a special focus on Spanish culture), together with the contributors' diverse origin, may also contribute to one fundamental task, namely making it known that cultural studies also gets done in Spain and other countries outside the cultural studies mainstream. Finally, the interest of this collection lies in no small part in the novel, interdisciplinary approaches that the authors take to their object of analysis. Offering theoretically-sound methodological proposals and, especially, analyses of their texts, the different chapters revolve around one key concept in cultural studies, namely, identity, most visibly exploring three of its variables: nationality and sense of place, gender and—clearly pointing the way to the future—age. In doing so, the volume not only places itself at the cutting edge of research produced in the field but also makes itself appealing to a fairly wide range of readers. More specifically, the volume should be of interest to both academics and students in the following fields: British and American studies, Spanish studies, European studies, cultural studies, film and television studies, gender studies, sociology and literature.

Works cited

- Anderson, Benedict. 1991 (1983). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Revised Edition. London and New York: Verso.
- Badmington, Neil. 2006. Cultural Studies and the Posthumanities. In *New Cultural Studies. Adventures in Theory*, eds. Gary Hall and Clare Birchall, 260-272. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Balibar, Étienne. 1996. Is European Citizenship Possible? Trans. Christine Jones. *Public Culture* 8: 355-376.
- Barker, Chris. 1999. *Television, Globalization and Cultural Identities*. Maidenhead: Open University Press / McGraw-Hill.
- Bassnett, Susan. 1998. The Translation Turn in Cultural Studies. In *Constructing Cultures. Essays on Literary Translation*, eds. Susan

- Bassnett and André Lefevere, 123-140. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Bastida-Rodríguez, Patricia, Caterina Calafat-Ripoll, Marta Fernández-Morales, José Igor Prieto-Arranz and Cristina Suárez-Gómez, eds. 2011. *Actas del IV Congreso Internacional de SELICUP*. Palma de Mallorca: Edicions UIB.
- Bathwick, David. 1992. Cultural Studies. In *Introduction to Scholarship in Modern Languages and Literatures*, ed. Joseph Gibaldi, 320-340. New York: The MLA of America.
- Brewer, Paul R., Joseph Graf and Lars Willnat. 2003. Priming or Framing. Media Influence on Attitudes toward Foreign Countries. *Gazette. The International Journal for Communication Studies* 65: 493-508.
- Carrera-Suárez, Isabel. 2005. Review of *(Mis)representations: Intersections of Culture and Power*. *Atlantis* 27: 183-190.
- Coleman, Stephen. 1998. BBC Radio Ulster's Talkback Phone-In: Public Feedback in a Divided Public Space. *The Public—Journal of the European Institute for Communication & Culture* 5: 7-19.
- Cornut-Gentile D'Arcy, Chantal. 2005. 'The rain in Spain stays mainly in the plain': Insights and Imperatives on the Practice of Cultural Studies in the Spanish University. *Cultural Studies* 19: 318-337.
- Cuthbert, David. 1996. The Everyday Life of Cultural Studies. *University of Toronto Quarterly* 65: 393-403.
- Danesi, Marcel and Paul Perron. 1999. *Analyzing Cultures. An Introduction and Handbook*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Danaher, Geoff, Tony Schirato and Jen Webb. 2000. *Understanding Foucault*. London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: Sage.
- Eagleton, Terry. 2000 (1991). *Ideology. An Introduction*. London and New York: Verso.
- Foster, Robert J. 1991. Making National Cultures in the Global Ecumene. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 20: 235-260.
- Foucault, Michel. 1984 (1969). *L'archéologie du savoir*. Paris: Gallimard.
- García Canclini, Néstor. 1994. Culture and Power: the State of Research. In *Culture and Power: A Media, Culture and Society Reader*, eds. Paddy Scannell, Philip Schlesinger and Colin Sparks, 17-47. London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: Sage.
- Gibson, Mark and John Hartley. 1998. Forty Years of Cultural Studies. An Interview with Richard Hoggart, October 1997. *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 1: 11-23.
- Gies, David T. 2000. Modern Spanish Culture: An Introduction. In *The Cambridge Companion to Modern Spanish Culture*, ed. David T. Gies, 1-8. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Graham, Helen and Jo Labanyi, eds. 1995. *Spanish Cultural Studies. An Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gray, Ann. 2003. Cultural Studies at Birmingham: The Impossibility of Critical Pedagogy? *Cultural Studies* 17: 767-782.
- Gray, Ann, Joke Hermes and Pertti Alassutari. 2001. History and Cultural Studies. *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 4: 259-260.
- Grossberg, Lawrence. 2006. Does Cultural Studies Have Futures? (Or What's the Matter with New York?). *Cultural Studies, Contexts and Conjunctures*. *Cultural Studies* 20: 1-32.
- Hall, Stuart. 1993 (1980). Encoding, Decoding. In *The Cultural Studies Reader*, ed. Simon During, 90-103. London and New York: Routledge.
- . 1996. Cultural Studies and the Centre: Some Problematics and Problems. In *Culture, Media, Language. Working Papers in Cultural Studies*, eds. Stuart Hall, Dorothy Hobson, Andrew Lowe and Paul Willis, 15-47. London and New York: Routledge / The Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, University of Birmingham.
- . 1997. The Spectacle of the 'Other'. In *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*, ed. Stuart Hall, 223-290. London: Sage / The Open University.
- . 1999. Cultural Studies and its Theoretical Legacies. In *The Cultural Studies Reader*, ed. Simon During, 97-109. London and New York: Routledge.
- Hall, Stuart, and Paddy Whannel. 1964. *The Popular Arts*. London: Hutchinson.
- Hall, Stuart, and Tony Jefferson, eds. 1976. *Resistance through Rituals. Youth Subcultures in Post-War Britain*. London: Hutchinson.
- Hjarvard, Stig. 1993. Pan-European Television News: Towards a European Political Public Sphere? In *National Identities. The Television Revolution*, eds. Phillip Drummond, Richard Paterson and Janet Willis, 71-94. London: British Film Institute.
- Jordan, Barry and Rikki Morgan-Tamosunas. 2000. Introduction. In *Contemporary Spanish Cultural Studies*, eds. Barry Jordan and Rikki Morgan-Tamosunas, 1-12. London: Arnold.
- Marsh, David. 2005. Sociology and Cultural Studies at Birmingham and Beyond. A Response to Frank Webster. *Cultural Studies* 19: 388-393.
- McEwan, Paul. 2002. Cultural Studies as a Hidden Discipline. *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 5: 427-437.
- Milton Yinger, John. 1960. Contraculture and Subculture. *American Sociological Review* 25: 625-635.
- Schwarz, Bill. 2005. Stuart Hall. *Cultural Studies* 19: 176-202.

- Simon, Adam F. and Jennifer Jerit. 2007. Toward a Theory Relating Political Discourse, Media, and Public Opinion. *Journal of Communication* 57: 254-271.
- Slater, Michael D., Donna Rouner and Marilee Long. 2006. Television Dramas and Support for Controversial Public Policies: Effects and Mechanisms. *Journal of Communication* 56: 235-252.
- Smith, Paul Julian. 2003. *Contemporary Spanish Culture: TV, Fashion, Art, and Film*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- . 2007. *Spanish Visual Culture: Cinema, Television, Internet*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Spiropoulou, Angeliki. 1999. The Marginalisation of Literature in the Teaching of Culture. In *Teaching Culture. The Long Revolution in Cultural Studies*, eds. Nannette Aldred and Martin Ryle, 53-65. Leicester: National Institute of Adult Continuing Education.
- Striphas, Ted. 2002. Banality, Book Publishing and the Everyday Life of Cultural Studies. *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 5: 438-460.
- Surber, Jere Paul. 1998. *Culture and Critique: An Introduction to the Critical Discourses of Cultural Studies*. Boulder and Oxford: Westview Press.
- Tomaselli, Kenyan. 2003. Crossroads in Cultural Studies. Tampering with Tampere: Cultural Studies after Birmingham. *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 6: 104-109.
- Valdés-Miyares, J. Rubén. 2006. Towards an Anatomy of 21st-Century British Culture: Case Studies from the Newspapers. Unpublished paper. London: 8th ESSE Conference.
- Wallace, Jo-Anne. 1995. English Studies versus the Humanities? Cultural Studies and Institutional Power. *University of Toronto Quarterly* 64: 506-513.
- Walton, David. 2008. *Introducing Cultural Studies. Learning through Practice*. London: Sage.
- . 2012. About us. *IBACS. Iberian Association for Cultural Studies*. <http://www.cultureandpower.org/about-us> (accessed September 29, 2012).
- Webster, Frank. 2001. Sociology, Cultural Studies, and Disciplinary Boundaries. In *A Companion to Cultural Studies*, ed. Toby Miller, 79-100. Malden (MA) and Oxford: Blackwell.
- . 2004. Cultural Studies and Sociology at, and after, the Closure of the Birmingham School. *Cultural Studies* 18: 847-862.
- . 2005. A Reply to David Marsh. *Cultural Studies* 19: 394-395.

- Williams, Raymond. 1973. Minority and Popular Culture. In *Leisure and Society in Britain*, eds. Michael A. Smith, Stanley Parker and Cyril S. Smith, 22-27. London: Allen Lane.
- . 1979. *Politics and Letters. Interviews with New Left Review*. London: NLB.
- . 1997 (1958). Culture is Ordinary. In *Studying Culture. An Introductory Reader*, eds. Ann Gray and Jim McGuigan, 5-14. London: Arnold.
- Wilson, Scott. 1995. *Cultural Materialism. Theory and Practice*. Oxford and Cambridge (Mass.): Blackwell.

Notes

¹ For a full chronicle of the Birmingham episode, see Gray 2003; Tomaselli 2003; and, especially, Webster 2004; Marsh 2005; and Webster's 2005 reply to the latter.

² See, for example, Bassnett 1998; Gray et al. 2001; and, above all, Webster 2001 and 2004, on the so-called "cultural turn" in sociology and other disciplines.

