

CAPES/CAFEP EXTERNE D'ANGLAIS SESSION 2017

EPREUVE DE MISE EN SITUATION PROFESSIONNELLE

Première partie :

Vous procéderez à la présentation, à l'étude et à la mise en relation des trois documents proposés (A, B, C non hiérarchisés).

Deuxième partie :

Cette partie de l'épreuve porte sur les documents A et B.

A partir de ces supports, vous définirez des objectifs communicationnels, culturels et linguistiques pouvant être retenus dans une séquence pédagogique en cycle terminal, en vous référant aux programmes. En vous appuyant sur la spécificité de ces supports, vous dégagerez des stratégies pour développer les compétences de communication des élèves.

Document A

Ce document est à visionner sur le lecteur qui vous a été remis.

Video: Nobel honors Bob Dylan, bard for a changing world | Oct. 13, 2016

Adapted from <http://www.pbs.org/newshour>

(<https://youtu.be/06vMWzaXI4>)

Document B

The Times, They are a-changin' (Bob Dylan – 1964)

Come gather around people
Wherever you roam
And admit that the waters
Around you have grown
And accept it that soon
You'll be drenched to the bone
And if your breath to you is worth saving
Then you better start swimming or you'll sink like a stone
For the times they are a-changin'

Come writers and critics
Who prophesize with your pen
And keep your eyes wide
The chance won't come again
And don't speak too soon
For the wheel's still in spin
And there's no telling who that it's naming
For the loser now will be later to win
Cause the times they are a-changin'

Come senators, congressmen
Please heed the call
Don't stand in the doorway
Don't block up the hall
For he that gets hurt
Will be he who has stalled
There's the battle outside raging
It'll soon shake your windows and rattle your walls
For the times they are a-changin'

Come mothers and fathers
Throughout the land
And don't criticize
What you can't understand

Your sons and your daughters
Are beyond your command
Your old road is rapidly aging
Please get out of the new one if you can't lend your hand
Cause the times they are a-changin'

The line it is drawn
The curse it is cast
The slowest now
Will later be fast
As the present now
Will later be past
The order is rapidly fading
And the first one now will later be last
Cause the times they are a-changin'

Document C

What Is Literature? In defense of the canon

By Arthur Krystal | March 2014 | HARPER'S MAGAZINE

There's a new definition of literature in town. It has been slouching toward us for some time now but may have arrived officially in 2009, with the publication of Greil Marcus and Werner Sollors's *A New Literary History of America*. Alongside essays on Twain, Fitzgerald, Frost, and Henry James, there are pieces about Jackson Pollock, Chuck Berry, the telephone, the Winchester rifle, and Linda Lovelace. Apparently, "literary means not only what is written but what is voiced, what is expressed, what is invented, in whatever form" — in which case maps, sermons, comic strips, cartoons, speeches, photographs, movies, war memorials, and music all huddle beneath the literary umbrella. Books continue to matter, of course, but not in the way that earlier generations took for granted. In 2004, "the most influential cultural figure now alive," according to Newsweek, wasn't a novelist or historian; it was Bob Dylan. Not incidentally, the index to *A New Literary History* contains more references to Dylan than to Stephen Crane and Hart Crane combined. Dylan may have described himself as "a song-and-dance man," but Marcus and Sollors and such critics as Christopher Ricks beg to differ. Dylan, they contend, is one of the greatest poets this nation has ever produced (in point of fact, he has been nominated for a Nobel Prize in Literature every year since 1996).

The word canon, from the Greek, originally meant "measuring stick" or "rule" and was used by early Christian theologians to differentiate the genuine, or canonical, books of the Bible from the apocryphal ones. Canonization, of course, also referred to the Catholic practice of designating saints, but the term was not applied to secular writings until 1768, when the Dutch classicist David Ruhnken spoke of a canon of ancient orators and poets.

The usage may have been novel, but the idea of a literary canon was already in the air, as evidenced by a Cambridge don's proposal in 1595 that universities "take the course to canonize [their] owne writers, that not every bold ballader . . . may pass current with a Poet's name." A similar nod toward hierarchies appeared in Daniel Defoe's *A Vindication of the Press* (1718) and Joseph Spence's plan for a dictionary of British poets. Writing in 1730, Spence suggested

that the “known marks for ye different magnitudes of the Stars” could be used to establish rankings such as “great Genius & fine writer,” “fine writer,” “middling Poet,” and “one never to be read.” In 1756, Joseph Warton’s essay on Pope designated “four different classes and degrees” of poets, with Spenser, Shakespeare, and Milton comfortably leading the field. By 1781, Samuel Johnson’s *Lives of the English Poets* had confirmed the canon’s constituents — fifty-two of them — but also fine-tuned standards of literary merit so that the common reader, “uncorrupted with literary prejudice,” would know what to look for.

In effect, the canon formalized modern literature as a select body of imaginative writings that could stand up to the Greek and Latin texts. Although exclusionary by nature, it was originally intended to impart a sense of unity; critics hoped that a tradition of great writers would help create a national literature. What was the apotheosis of Shakespeare and Milton if not an attempt to show the world that England and not France — especially not France — had produced such geniuses? The canon anointed the worthy and, by implication, the unworthy, functioning as a set of commandments that saved people the trouble of deciding what to read.

The canon — later the canon of Great Books — endured without real opposition for nearly two centuries before antinomian forces concluded that enough was enough. I refer, of course, to that mixed bag of politicized professors and theory-happy revisionists of the 1970s and 1980s — feminists, ethnicists, Marxists, semioticians, deconstructionists, new historicists, and cultural materialists — all of whom took exception to the canon while not necessarily seeing eye to eye about much else. Essentially, the postmodernists were against — well, essentialism. While books were conceived in private, they reflected the ideological makeup of their host culture; and the criticism that gave them legitimacy served only to justify the prevailing social order. The implication could not be plainer: If books simply reinforced the cultural values that helped shape them, then any old book or any new book was worthy of consideration. Literature with a capital L was nothing more than a bossy construct, and the canon, instead of being genuine and beneficial, was unreal and oppressive.

EMSP 17

Première partie en anglais

The announcement, on the 13th of October, that Bob Dylan had been awarded the Nobel prize for literature came at the end of a particularly troubled year, that had evidenced a conservative backlash, what with Brexit and the nomination of Donald Trump as Republican candidate for presidency.

In that particular context, why Dylan's lyrics could be considered "new poetic expressions within the great American song tradition" thus never was much cause for concern: it is indeed a case of dramatic irony that while the times were obviously a-changin', the critics were too busy prophesizing with their pens to remember to keep their eyes wide open.

Document C is an instance of a conservative definition or redefinition of the field of literature in unsubstantiated times. While its defense of the canon is echoed in document A, the latter proves to be a rather hagiographic portrait of the new laureate and concludes with James Taylor hammering out that Bob Dylan deserves his prize. Document B, an example of Dylan's lyrics, stands as the corpus delicti.

Whether or not Dylan's lyrics are to be seriously construed as literature is obviously one of the questions raised by this corpus, but its focal point goes far beyond the iconic, indeed almost mythical figure of Dylan: the crux of the matter here is that the definition of literature is and has always been a political question more than a theoretical debate, since literature, and more generally art, depend on a canon, which itself is the result of a consensus and, prior to that, of a power game. As a result, the candidates were invited to go further back than October 13th 2016, on a trip down memory lane, back to the sixties and all the way down to the dawn of literature, in order to put the Nobel Committee's latest decision to the test.

To put it bluntly, the candidates took four different paths through and around the three documents, depending on which notion(s) from the curriculum they saw fit to associate to the corpus.

Let us first note that some candidates unfortunately still fail to connect their presentations with the curriculum, thereby dissociating the first and second part of the exercise. The jury strongly advises them to read the previous reports, in the course of their preparation. Let us also repeat that the notions in the curriculum appear in the French language and that, even though it has become a common practice, it is not necessarily relevant to translate them word for word, especially in the context of this exercise.

Myth-making

For instance, saying that the story of Bob Dylan illustrates the notion of "myths and heroes" was awkward, to say the least. Some candidates, who relied on document A, to point out that Bob Dylan had become "a giant", as Obama puts it, did try to show, thanks to evidence from documents B and C, that this evolution followed a number of metamorphoses, from a chubby and sulky peddler of ballads (A & B) into a fashionable, iconoclastic "electric" angry young man (A), from a traditional herald into a vitriolic critic of the critics (B), from "a song-and-dance man" (C), into "one of the greatest poets the US has ever produced" (C & B), from a contender for the Nobel Prize for literature 20 years in a row (C) into a Nobel laureate (A), from a hero of the counterculture (A) into a cultural icon (C). In that sense, the story of Bob

Dylan somehow epitomizes the process through which an individual becomes an icon, if not a hero. Still, when it comes to the myth, the focus has to shift from the main character to the narrative that endows the latter with larger-than-life characteristics. The corpus could therefore lead the candidates to wonder, in the light of the story of Bob Dylan, how myths are constructed, how they reflect a reality and how they, literally, re-present it in hindsight.

Pop?

However interesting that approach might have been, it nonetheless proved limited in scope, in the sense that it dodged the cultural issue at the heart of the corpus. Starting from document C and drawing elements from the other documents, some candidates thus chose to focus on the notion of progress in relation with Krystal's linear history of literature and the canon. Although such a viewpoint determines a binary take on the corpus, pitting high against low or pop-culture, it provided the candidates with leverage, in order to crisscross the documents.

Somehow, all three documents revolve around the notion of progress-as in history and change, for better or for worse. They offer plenty of evidence that literature has evolved from a rather limited body of selected works and a narrow definition of the remit, toward an all-encompassing category, whose characteristics today are more elusive than ever, if not problematic. Details from documents A & B conjure up a portrait of Dylan as the epitome of "change" and "freedom". By contrast with Krystal's defense of the canon, they nonetheless indicate that, as a "bard" (A), he has replaced the iambic pentameter by some kind of nondescript skaz, and that, like Whitman or like Achille's shield, he "contains multitudes", and thus embodies a typically postmodern, meaning comprehensive, definition of art; one that mixes blues, folk, gospel and, as Hadju puts it, "other novels" (whatever that means) into an "original stew", reminiscent of Tolkien's "tale cauldron".

For those among the candidates who adopted that historical and chronological outlook, the point was thus to wonder whether Dylan was "worthy of consideration" or merely deserved to "huddle beneath the literary umbrella", along with Jackson Pollock, Chuck Berry or pornographic actress Linda Lovelace (C). To put it differently, their presentations hinged around the paradoxical nature of "pop culture": in documents A and C, some obviously consider it as valuable as the classics, but Krystal himself is obviously bent on demonstrating that "pop art" is an oxymoron.

The blatant orality of the lyrics and the absence of punctuation marks in document B, could be analyzed as signs of either liberation or deviation from the supposedly "bossy construct" of Krystal's "oppressive" canon (C). The more insightful candidates nevertheless understood that there was more to document B than mere arguments showing to what extent a songwriter can be regarded as a writer and, by extension and on principle, in what sense popular culture has watered down a centuries-old humanist tradition.

In keeping with the notion of progress, some candidates therefore endeavored to highlight the topical intertext in document B, drawing visual elements from document A to back up their reading of the lyrics as a journalistic chronicle. In hindsight, document B undoubtedly shows that, by the mid-1960s, the old order was inevitably "fading". Document A is proof positive that the "loser *would* be later to win", in other words that the protest movements of the period (the Civil Rights Movement was mentioned quite often, but the Free Speech Movement could have been alluded to), sponsored by the likes of Allen Ginsberg (whose cameo appearance in document A is worthy of note) would blossom into a new "pop", that is, more democratic culture and, later on, form a new mainstream, praised by the 44th President of the USA in a vibrant speech, partly featured in the report.

Full circle

The most astute candidates managed to burrow further into the documents and bring into light the opposition of time periods in document C and their superimposition in A and B. This not only reveals what a Janus-like figure the bard is, standing at the crossroads between past and present, here and elsewhere, but also and above all how circular history can be, from the poet's viewpoint. Taken together, all three documents indeed delineate a cycle of power, with a canon (C), the countercultural voice of a "protest-singer", engaging in a showdown with the mainstream (B) and a renewed canon as a result (A).

In comparison to those cyclical patterns, the scope of document C therefore appears minor: in his brief and linear history of the canon, Krystal tends to jump the gun: Dylan going electric in 1965 is an explosive and striking example that, whatever the canon may be, sometimes, boom, "enough is enough" as Krystal ironically puts it. In that sense, the corpus works as a triptych, each document dismissing a canon, each defending another canon: document C obviously roots for the canon of the Renaissance, the so-called classics, document A somehow adopts existentialism and the "new definition of literature" derided in doc C, that of the "mixed bag", and document B, although it is supposed to exemplify that new definition, is actually steeped in a pre-Renaissance subtext that harks back to previous canons, that of the epic, of the bardic and of the biblical traditions.

To substantiate their analysis, some candidates therefore highlighted the ambiguity of each document. Krystal's bias is blatant when he blames Marcus and Sollors for devoting equal attention to Henry James and Linda Lovelace, or when he reviles the "politicized professors" whose interpretation of the canon he obviously rejects. First, the "professors" took no more exception to the existing canon than the Defoes, Spences and Wartons actually did in their day and age. Second, Krystal seems to argue that the difference between them actually lies in the distinct forms of power they exercise: that of the doxical, conservative scholar versus that of the paradoxical, liberal analyst. However, to bring the debate back into focus, it had to be pointed out that Krystal is a tad opaque since he is NOT a scholar, but a columnist, and that passing off actual scholars for theory-happy revisionists reeks of dystopia, at best.

As far as documents A and B are concerned, the ambiguity is of a different kind: some candidates cleverly analyzed the snippet from "Don't look back" in document A, where Dylan, accompanied by Ginsberg, flashes fragments from his lyrics of Subterranean Homesick Blues. Here, Dylan may borrow from the Beat's cut-up techniques but he subverts the practice to literally dispose with the written word and restore the power of the spoken word. The same applies to document B, although, here, the spoken word is steeped in the Bible: indeed, beyond the various topical references mentioned above, and although the lyrics can pass off as broken English, the fabric of document B is actually woven around threads from the Old and New Testaments, most notably the episode of the Flood in the first stanza, where the bard likens his contemporaries to their corrupt counterparts in the book of Genesis. Some candidates also unearthed references to the Pharisees in stanza 2, Pilate in stanza 3. As to the last stanza, it could be read as an apocryphal version of the "sermon on the mount". The in-depth reading of document B thus led the very astute candidates to call into question the notion of textual linearity in comparison with that of intertextual circularity.

Token gestures in an ever-changing world

Now, in the course of the interview, the very best candidates were led to further develop textual microanalyses and ponder the interconnections between the various notions of the curriculum.

When it comes to the text proper, they expatiated on the mix between the spoken and written word: the phraseology in document B is both archetypal (the old-fashioned "come gather round"), and proverbial, indeed biblical (the pseudo-cleft "he that gets hurt will be he who has stalled"). Besides, the

conflation of past and present is nowhere more striking than in the chorus, which, at first, seems to suffer from grammatical sloppiness (“the times, they” being a textbook case of dislocation) but morphs, after the comma, into an antiphon, in other words a response, the listener being expected to join the herald in a slightly eerie singalong. This antiphonal structure is akin to that of a psalm, in which the chanting acts as both a punctuation mark and a prompt, and the response itself, with its dramatically vivid a-verbing structure, definitely shatters the illusion of temporal linearity: if the times are a-changin’, then history goes round in circles; moreover if the first will later be last, you can expect the last to later be first, and this leads the candidates to ponder the resurgence of ultra-square, anti-modernist views on art, such as Krystal’s in document C: they are undoubtedly an instance of a new, alt. right counterculture.

When it comes to the interconnections between the notions, the various forms of tradition and authority manifest in the corpus are closely associated to specific places, and more abstractedly, distinct spaces or spheres: to put it bluntly, in all three documents, the inside is the place of the doxa and of conservatism (consider the pundit in the studio at the top of a skyscraper in A / the gilded wainscoting of the Nobel’s headquarters / the mention of congress in B / the hallowed college grounds in C). Conversely, the outside is a place of liberation (the stage in A; the street in A & B: the herald in B is an avatar of Dylan in A, when he sings “I’m on the pavement, thinking of the government”). Below street level, there’s also an underworld: “Johnny’s in the basement, mixing up the medicine”, finds a strange, distorted echo in the opening sentence of document C: “there’s a new definition of literature in town”, which Krystal likens to a new fad, indeed possibly a new drug, bound to spread out onto the street and to subvert the social order, like an updated version of the Flood.

Beyond referential illusion, space therefore takes on a metaphorical dimension: the new road mentioned in document B obviously diverges from the old road. Still, the adventurous trailblazer who bears the torch and paves the way is eventually canonized and morphs into a heroic “searcher of truth”, to paraphrase Obama (A). And canonization is precisely the moment when the new road turns into a loop and is threatened to become old itself. Drawn into a studio for a rare interview, Dylan is finally trapped. But instead of delivering the new doxa (it is the critic’s job after all), what he does, as if springing up from a line in document B, is lend his hand: “You always have to realize that you’re constantly in a state of becoming. As long as you can stay in that realm, you’ll sort of be alright.”

As James Taylor so relevantly points out, beyond the poet’s impact on his day and age, what remains and makes up the substance of poetry is and has always been the poet’s ability to chronicle the times as they change, in other words to make token gestures in an ever-changing world, to substantiate the unsubstantiated.

Jean-Grégoire ROYER

Seconde partie en français

La seconde partie de l’épreuve portait sur les documents A et B. Il s’agissait pour les candidats de proposer une exploitation pédagogique de ces documents selon le programme du cycle terminal en identifiant « des objectifs communicationnels, culturels et linguistiques ». En s’appuyant sur la spécificité des supports, les candidats devaient dégager des stratégies pour développer les compétences communicationnelles et culturelles des élèves.

L’analyse didactique proposée par les candidats nécessitait une étude fine et nourrie en première partie de l’épreuve. Il s’agissait de bien cerner la spécificité des documents et les problématiques en jeux pour être en mesure de proposer une réflexion didactique et une mise en œuvre pédagogique pertinentes. Les candidats qui sont parvenus à problématiser le lien entre les deux documents en s’interrogeant sur la légitimité littéraire de l’œuvre de Bob Dylan ont perçu la tension au cœur du dossier.

Liens avec les notions

Le candidat devait s'appliquer à définir la situation d'enseignement, à savoir la classe choisie, et la notion ou la thématique retenue. Le niveau visé en cycle terminal est B2 pour la LVO (toutes séries), B2 pour la LELE, et C1 pour la LVA en classe de TL. Dans le cadre général de l'entrée culturelle « Gestes fondateurs et monde en mouvement », le dossier invitait les candidats à proposer le croisement et la mise en perspective de plusieurs notions : « mythes et héros » (la construction du mythe du chanteur engagé, la dimension iconique de Dylan), l'idée de progrès (l'évolution des canons littéraires et l'avènement d'une culture populaire, dont le reportage de PBS News montre qu'elle ne fait pas l'unanimité) et « lieux et formes du pouvoir » (la rébellion et la transgression par la chanson, le questionnement de la tradition et de l'autorité, le prix Nobel et le canon littéraire).

En s'appuyant sur la problématique soulevée par le dossier, les candidats pouvaient également opter pour une thématique de LELE « L'écrivain dans son siècle », afin d'engager une réflexion sur la littérature (la remise en question de l'immuabilité de la notion de poésie, l'écrivain chroniqueur de son siècle).

Il revenait bien entendu aux candidats de justifier leur choix en proposant des pistes d'exploitation en cohérence avec la notion retenue ou sa déclinaison.

Analyse didactique des documents

Une fois ce cadre défini, il était attendu des candidats qu'ils repèrent les éléments facilitateurs et les obstacles dans l'accès au sens des documents.

Le document A est un reportage issu de PBS diffusé suite à la décision du comité Nobel d'attribuer le prix de littérature au chanteur américain Bob Dylan. Cette vidéo comporte plusieurs extraits de discours (Barack Obama, Sara Danius), une interview du chanteur, deux voix concordantes en faveur du Nobel (David Hadju et James Taylor) et une voix discordante (Gary Shteyngart). En dépit de la succession rapide d'images et d'informations, et la multiplication des intervenants, et des lieux, les différentes interventions sont compréhensibles par des élèves de cycle terminal, et les lieux (Stockholm, the White House, the USA) clairement identifiables. En revanche, la musique en fond sonore peut représenter un obstacle à la compréhension du document et le commentaire sarcastique de Gary Shteyngart être mal perçu par les élèves.

Le document B est une chanson de Bob Dylan : la structure répétitive (*Come...For/Cause the times they are a-changing*), le lexique abordable et la valeur intemporelle des paroles (absence de références historiques explicites) représentent de nombreux points d'appui pour accéder au sens du document. Toutefois, l'intertexte (les références sibyllines à l'actualité de l'époque et les références bibliques) et l'absence de ponctuation peuvent être un frein à l'accès au sens.

Ces différents axes amenaient les candidats à proposer plusieurs tâches écrites ou orales principalement argumentatives, sans perdre de vue l'ancrage culturel dans la sphère anglophone : écrire un article pour donner son opinion sur le prix Nobel décerné à un chanteur, rédiger et prononcer le discours de l'Académie justifiant le choix d'attribuer le prix Nobel au chanteur (amorce du discours de Sara Danius dans la vidéo), réaliser une vidéo à dimension artistique pour présenter un chanteur (dans une liste de chanteurs imposée aux élèves) et éclairer la dimension littéraire de son œuvre, imaginer un débat au sein de l'Académie au sujet de l'attribution du prix à un chanteur dont le nom est tiré au sort à partir d'une liste proposée par le professeur.

Ecrire une chanson engagée à la manière de Bob Dylan, ou rédiger un couplet supplémentaire au document B ne permettait pas aux élèves d'appréhender la controverse, les contradictions, les dimensions politiques et littéraires soulevées par le dossier.

Pistes de mise en œuvre pédagogique

Il était attendu des candidats qu'ils s'interrogent sur la prise en compte de la spécificité du document B (une chanson) et sur la pertinence de construire des compétences en compréhension de l'écrit à partir d'une chanson. Il était en effet judicieux de partir des paroles écrites et de la structure du document (les strophes, les répétitions) et de proposer aux élèves un travail sur le découpage syntaxique afin de dégager l'aspect littéraire et poétique du document. Attirer l'attention des élèves sur la construction syntaxique du titre (reproduite également dans la dernière strophe avec *The line it is drawn / the curse it is cast*) permettait de s'interroger sur la dimension socio-linguistique du document.

Ces deux axes de repérages (la structure indiquant un poème vs le langage relâché) permettaient de mettre en lumière l'une des problématiques en jeu : qu'est-ce que la poésie ? Le poète-musicien est-il un homme de « Belles Lettres » ? Dans quelles mesures ?

L'étude du document A permet de contextualiser la séquence et de mener les élèves vers une prise de position sur le statut littéraire du document B. La vidéo permettait également d'enrichir le contexte culturel des années 1960 aux USA et de l'articuler au document B (Civil rights movement, Free speech movement, Counter culture).

Une fois l'étude du document A réalisée, l'écoute de la chanson permet un travail sur la phonologie liée à la métrique (repérage de l'accentuation de mots, les rimes) et de tenir compte de la nature du document.

Outre la nécessité d'enrichir le bagage linguistique des élèves afin de réaliser les tâches argumentatives proposées (exprimer l'opinion, l'accord, le désaccord, nuancer ses propos) un travail sur les relatives (*He who/ He that*), sur -ING pour construire des adjectifs (*world- changing stuff* dans le document A) ou réfléchir au processus de nominalisation (*a state of becoming* dans le document A ou *There's no telling* dans le document B) pouvait être envisagé.

Les candidats qui ont proposé des objectifs en accord avec la réalisation et les besoins de la tâche finale proposée ont été valorisés.

Certains candidats ont montré leur capacité à proposer une démarche différenciée tenant compte de l'hétérogénéité des besoins des élèves : lors de l'étude du document A, il était envisageable de proposer des activités de groupes afin d'amener les élèves à se focaliser sur des thématiques précises et de niveaux variés : la biographie de Bob Dylan, le discours académique, la controverse. Les outils numériques tels que les tablettes, sont également un moyen pour chaque élève d'écouter la vidéo à son rythme et opérer des repérages de nature différente.

Enfin, on pouvait envisager de varier les supports en proposant d'y intégrer d'autres documents tout en restant dans la thématique ou la notion choisie : extraits de *Chronicles: Volume 1* de Bob Dylan, les films *I'm not There* (réalisé par Todd Haynes), *Inside Llewyn Davis* (des frères Coen), le film documentaire *Don't Look Back* (DA Pennebaker), le poème *Easter 1916* de WB Yeats.

Marion DUBOIS-PAGER