

# Contents

<i>Notes on the Contributors</i>	ix
<i>Preface</i>	xii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xiii
Introduction: the Condition of the Subject <i>Philip W. Martin</i>	1
<b>Part I: English in the Plural</b>	
1 Only One Subject? 'Englshes' in Continental Europe <i>Martin A. Kayman</i>	21
2 Common Speech, Uncommon Discourse: Whose English is English? <i>Ronald Carter</i>	34
3 In Search of the Subject: English in the New South Africa <i>Natasha Distiller</i>	55
4 The Condition of Indian Writing in English Today <i>Revathi Krishnaswamy</i>	68
5 Twin-Share Accommodation: English and Creative Writing <i>Graeme Harper</i>	78
<b>Part II: Curricula</b>	
6 English Studies and the Life of the Mind <i>Craig A. Hamilton</i>	91
7 English after Anti-Humanism <i>Andy Mousley</i>	101
8 Deskilling English: Theory, Cynicism and Ethics <i>Laurence Steven</i>	108
9 Firm Foundations? The Condition of English at A-Level <i>Carol Atherton</i>	118
10 Defending the Canon <i>Gary Day</i>	126

11	Class Work: Site of Egalitarian Activism or Site of Embourgeoisement? <i>Sharon O'Dair</i>	142
<b>Part III: Knowledge</b>		
12	Framing Theory <i>Robert Eaglestone</i>	161
13	Impractical Criticism <i>Mark Robson</i>	168
14	The End of Difference <i>Mark Currie</i>	180
15	The Pedagogy of Historicism: 'Teaching and Learning' in a Historicist Mode <i>Simon Dentith</i>	191
16	In Defence of Gradgrind <i>Jonathan Bate</i>	199
	<i>Index</i>	209

# **Part I**

## **English in the Plural**



# 1

## Only One Subject? ‘Englishes’ in Continental Europe

*Martin A. Kayman*

### **A new (old) continent**

Given that the subject is English, ‘The Condition of the Subject’, could sound a little like ‘the state of the nation’. But of course ‘English’ in the UK is now long from being the instrument of nation-building it was once intended to be. It is virtually a generation since Brian Doyle published ‘The Hidden History of English Studies’ in Peter Widdowson’s seminal collection of essays, *Re-reading English* (1982), followed the next year by Chris Baldick’s *The Social Mission of English Criticism* and Terry Eagleton’s *Literary Theory*.<sup>1</sup> The present state of the British subject owes much then to its historicisation, which made visible the discipline’s project as a patriotic solvent of region and class within the United Kingdom, and as an instrument of imperial control ‘overseas’.

Work in English through the 1990s was driven in good part by a critique of ‘Englishness’ and its gender, sexual and racial assumptions and a turn to Englishes excluded by the national and imperial projects. Alterity has become the order of the day. Far from an education in national self-identification, English has in contrast become a locus for the understanding of the plurality and otherness of cultures.

The critique has, understandably, been driven by the concerns and agendas of Anglophone subjects regarding gender, race and ethnicity, national identity, postcoloniality, and multiculturalism. The principal loci of the critique have been the cultures within the UK and the Commonwealth or the USA, and the relations between them, and rethinking has thus been oriented largely around the figure of the postcolonial subaltern. As a consequence, effectively absent from the process of critical reconstruction of the multicultural and postcolonial subject has been consideration of the role of the non-domestic, non-colonial and non-Anglophone – as far as I am concerned here, specifically the Continental European. I do not of course mean by this that individual Continental scholars have not played an important role in this transformation of the subject. What is largely missing is not these individual contributions, but a paradigm or paradigms for English in which there is room specifically

to make visible and rethink the relations between Anglophone cultures and those of Continental Europe – a paradigm which would neither be a simple inter-national relation of equals, nor a postcolonial critique. In the absence of such a context, not only does the sense of the difference of the subject on the Continent disappear, but the very idea that there may be complex cultural politics bound up in the subject is likewise made invisible.

Nonetheless, Continental Europe has come to figure ever larger in the present, and therefore the future, of the subject – in large part owing to the major growth in the study of English in post-Soviet, or, as we will no doubt come to think of it in American English, the ‘new’ Europe. Investment in this development is, of course, far from innocent of ideological intent. In the 1990s, British academics, supported by the British Council, were actively involved in promoting British Literature, Culture and Theory and their associated critical values in Central and Eastern Europe. At the same time, the no less innocent forces of globalisation have ensured that this expansion has been matched, at least until recently, by growing demand throughout Western Europe for degrees in English.

The most visible face of the expansion of English throughout Europe, old and new, has been the European Society for the Study of English (ESSE), founded at the beginning of the 1990s, in part too to intervene in post-Soviet Europe, but also, more generally, to give voice to European perspectives on English.<sup>2</sup> A great deal has been achieved by ESSE over the last twelve years through its biennial conferences, its biannual newsletter, *The European English Messenger*, and its quarterly journal, *The European Journal of English Studies*. And yet, as I observed to Philip Martin, ‘overseas’ here did not seem to recognise Continental European English as a significant specific dimension of ‘The Condition of the Subject’. My presence on the ‘English Futures’ plenary panel was proof that it does, and I would like to express my thanks to the organisation. However, as if to prove my point about its being trapped between two paradigms, neither of which is necessarily appropriate, Continental Europe found its way into the conference seminar programme precisely under the rubric: ‘Postcolonialism/ English in International Contexts’. As I say, Europe has neither a postcolonial relation to the UK or USA (although relations between European countries and former British colonies can be extremely complicated in that context), nor necessarily do all Europeans relate to the UK or USA as equal or rival sovereign national cultures.<sup>3</sup>

Europe, in other words, has its specificities. How the specificities are located says a fair amount about the extent to which ‘English futures’ are to be ‘English’ in the sense of dominated by English agendas, or ‘of English’, in the sense of ‘of the discipline’. Is the future of English to be a future in which the discipline in Britain enriches itself from other ways of doing it elsewhere, which it then exports back to the Continent? Or will the future recognise, as some language theorists now argue, that ‘English’ no longer ‘belongs’ to its native speakers, and think the discipline from other positions?

If nothing else, there is the simple question of numbers. ESSE has between 7,000 and 8,000 members of whom just over a thousand work in British universities.<sup>4</sup> Objectively, then, Continental Englishes exist. The question is whether the theoretical examination of the condition of English will address them as significant alterities of the subject or not.

Or perhaps it has no choice . . . Europe is, after all, a substantial new market for English. I do not mean this in a crude commercial sense. If the Continent is a market for publishers, it is no less so for agenda-setting academics who speculate in 'English futures'. Even if large areas of Europe are too poor to matter to many publishers, the intellectual influence of British academics is enormously enhanced by the expansion of English studies in Europe. By the same token, as European funding trickles into departments of English on the Continent, British academics find themselves more than ever before giving guest lectures around Europe. Many universities have used British departments to train the new staff they have required for expansion, thereby further extending British intellectual influence. In these senses, willy-nilly, 'The Condition of the Subject' in the UK is deeply involved in Continental Europe. There are therefore, I would suggest, academic, ethical and political reasons for thinking hard about these relations, if only to avoid falling unawares into neo-colonial traps.

### **Thinking specific differences**

Thinking about these relations means, amongst other things, being prepared to conceive English differently and therefore being prepared to listen. Notwithstanding mobility, there is throughout Europe a remarkable lack of awareness regarding the condition of the subject in other parts of the region.<sup>5</sup> As usual, one simply assumes that elsewhere similar things are done in broadly similar ways.

Disrupting this assumption of English as 'one subject' is the motive behind the survey of English Studies in Europe that Filomena Mesquita and I are conducting on behalf of ESSE and the British Council. Yet the experience of organising a questionnaire capable of generating a sense of the specific differences of Englishes on the Continent has itself underlined for me the very difficulty of thinking the differences between the English one knows and the subjects that may go under that name for other subjects. Uncomprehending replies to what had seemed obvious questions brought awkwardly home the extent to which, especially when striving for an international language, one's own vocabulary imposes unexamined meanings as universals. The very 'naturalness' of the assumptions embedded in one's language actively precludes the consciousness of alternatives by closing off from oneself the possibility that those assumptions may not be shared, even if the language is. Formulating questions and interpreting answers regarding the constitution of the discipline in different countries disrupts this veil of the natural.

How might one think those differences, then? The *European Journal of English Studies* necessarily struggles with these issues, as it seeks to establish an identity which manifests the specificity and variety of European 'Englishes'. In their introduction to a recent number dedicated to 'Current Critical Theories in Europe', Catherine Bernard and Ansgar Nünning adopted the expression 'intellectual styles' to characterise the variety of approaches they encounter as editors of the journal.<sup>6</sup> In its substantial sense – 'Le style, c'est l'homme', as one might say – a different 'intellectual style' constitutes, in effect, a different language. In this sense, English would not be a universal language, but a number of different languages for speaking (of) Anglophone texts.

Certainly, there are significantly different *methodological* traditions and practices in different parts of Europe. As a result of the multiple educational and disciplinary contexts in which English is studied on the Continent, approaches are likely to be influenced by methods which were not developed specifically within the field of English, and which may well remain foreign to it. In literary studies, for example, the different approaches to the text traditional to, say, the French, German, or Scandinavian systems still amount, indeed, to quite different *disciplines* of reading. Differences here in procedures and protocols of reading imply significant divergence regarding the object under study, and particularly regarding the reader's relations to the text and to critical authority. Of course, one might view these differences as a simple plurality of approaches to a common subject. But, in terms of the politics of postmodern culture, plurality is never 'simple'; it can often imply the existence of ultimately incommensurable languages – different subjects, as it were.

In another sense, plurality is itself a fundamental *structural* characteristic of English as a subject in Continental Europe. The study of literature which, for many, is the heart of 'English' in Britain, is only one among a number of disciplines that students study when they study English on the Continent.<sup>7</sup>

Broadly speaking, most degree schemes on the Continent require not only the study of distinct courses (in varying proportions) in Literature and in Linguistics, but also in areas which translate as 'Language' and 'Culture'. Our disciplinary language should not, however, lead us into believing that these areas necessarily map exactly onto isolated or combinations of disciplines in the UK, least of all in the problematic cases of Language and Culture. Furthermore, it is the particular combination of all four areas (in their various internal configurations) that marks English on the Continent as a different subject from that studied in Britain.

Ideally, these distinct disciplines should complement each other and provide an integrated understanding of a unified subject – a Continental 'English'. In practice, however, the configurations of theoretical models in play within each of those fields result in a complex, if not frequently contradictory, relationship. This is partially the result of differential histories in the diverse disciplines, whose particular configuration will thence vary from place to place. In their early Philological paradigm, Literature and Linguistics,

for example, could be seen as two disciplines in the same subject; but to what extent has that integration survived the shift to Modern Languages or other more recent configurations? Similarly, is the language component still designed to serve the study of the literary text, or has the literary now become subordinated to a more functional model of English? Is the 'Culture' component a support to the literary, or to the linguistic, or a subject area in its own right? To ask such questions is to ask after the relationship between Literature and Language and the place of Culture in relation to both. British students may well find themselves asking similar questions, but they do so in a radically different context.

This is because English on the Continent is not only a different language in these disciplinary senses; it is, clearly, in a very real and decisive sense, a different language, a foreign language, a language for foreign subjects. This, of course, is the crux of the issue. Obvious as it is, it is one of those glaring facts that the power of assumption often elides; and when it is remembered, it is most often at a level of deficiency, focusing on the fact that, on average, continental students are likely to have a weaker command of English than most students for whom it is a first or second language. But, I would argue, the differences here are as much qualitative as quantitative; they are *cultural* differences, not just differences of performance, and they affect both the discipline(s) and the human and academic subject(s) produced by those disciplines.

This foreignness is often disguised to the Anglophone by the fact that, in marked contrast to the study of Modern Languages in the UK, English on the Continent is nowadays most often taught in English – only in Italy, Portugal and Ukraine does the decision to teach their disciplines in their own language continue to prevail. In either case the language of instruction is one of the natural assumptions which provokes most surprise: for the majority who teach mainly in English, the idea that the subject can be taught in the local language seems absurd, while those who teach in their own language, like teachers of Continental Literatures in the UK, certainly find this a natural way of talking with their students. What is concealed by the naturalness of either assumption is the particular relation between the culture ('the subject') studied and the culture of those subjects studying it. In short, the cultural difference of the subject on the Continent is inscribed not only in, but also *as*, language.

Whichever it is, the choice of language of instruction will reflect a cultural history of relations to different embodiments of English. The explanation for English operating as the language of instruction may, for example, derive from a reliance on Anglophone scholars in developing the discipline in a particular university or country, or it may be a consequence of a long tradition of English studies, expressive of particular relations with the UK or USA, and expressed in the high level of linguistic competence of students entering the university, or it may be a policy decision concerning the learning outcomes and economic purposes of the degree, emphasising proficiency in active contemporary English as central to the subject/subjects in question.<sup>8</sup>

Studying a discipline, I would suggest, involves in effect elaborating one's (the subject's) *relationship* to the subject in question. The nineteenth-century British founders of English were explicit about the sort of relationship that the discipline was intended to inculcate in its students, foreign or domestic – one of affection and allegiance. Nowadays as often as not students are incited to aspire to an ideal of linguistic fluency, a – to my mind – spurious illusion of mastery over the subject, since language is never transparent, instrumental, outside culture (not even when studied 'for Special Purposes'). Meanwhile, no doubt, most students develop their own critical relationships to what they encounter as 'English'. In this sense, then, the study of English in a foreign context is both conditioned by and conditions the relationship between the subjects who study it and the values 'English' embodies for and to those subjects.

Those relations vary in different historical and geopolitical contexts, as does the equally influential factor of the international status of the local language and its cultural products. Just as there is a clear danger in seeing 'English' as a global subject, there is an equal danger in assuming that it is the same subject, for the same subjects, in all parts of Europe, North and South, West and East. Bearing equally in mind the generally more vocational context of university education in many European cultures, the investment in the study of English is likely to be more closely tied to the actual economic, political and cultural position of that particular society towards what, for reasons I shall explain below, I shall call 'Anglophonia'. The complexities of the subject 'English' are bound up then in the complexities of historical and actual relations of power between the relevant societies, and they are peculiarly sensitive to the geopolitical realities of globalisation.

## Literature, language and culture

Awareness of the importance of Continental Englishes goes further than understanding the discrete conditions for and of the subject in diverse parts of Europe. If, as Robert Crawford argued, in the eighteenth century English was a Scottish invention, or as Guari Viswanathan has shown, it developed in the nineteenth century in large part as an Indian discipline, the intellectual and theoretical debt of the subject to Europe has not been given due recognition.<sup>9</sup> Although we are all aware of the recent influence of Continental theory on various parts of our disciplines, the longer history of Continental contributions to English in the UK, in the sense of both the object of study and its methodologies, is only very partially written.

Interest in the history of the Continent's *cultural* contribution to English Literature and Culture is certainly undergoing a period of intense activity, harnessing the talents of Continental scholars, not least in the 'Reception of British Authors in Europe' project, founded in 1998.<sup>10</sup> There are various reasons for the popularity of this sort of research (which existed independently

around Europe before the British Academy award), not least the availability of the material in local, otherwise often under-resourced, archives. Such work values an expertise that British scholars have great difficulty in reproducing and therefore stakes out a secure terrain for the Continental scholar. There is a considerable future here, without question; but a critical view of its one-directionality needs to be kept in place.<sup>11</sup> The specificity of local expertise can too easily become a ghetto and the work reduced to a footnote to the canon. At least equally interesting, but less well financed, is the work that goes on with parts of Europe 'writing back' to English Literature, analysing representations of the local literature and culture in British Literature.<sup>12</sup>

While histories of relations between English and various Continental literatures are being researched, there is, as I suggest, work to be done on the role of Continental English studies in the development of English as a discipline. This is not a matter of the influence of the Prague School, Parisian structuralism, German reception theory or Italian semiotics on the theoretical armoury of contemporary English studies. None of these were developed within Continental English Studies; rather, Anglophone English Studies has become the means by which such 'theory' is re-exported to the Continent as Anglo-American 'Theory'.<sup>13</sup>

On the other hand, notwithstanding the notable tenacity of the traditional canon in many places, the plural cultural relations between the various nations of Europe and what I am calling 'Anglophonia' has made the Continent a particularly propitious terrain for the expansion of both the constitution and contexts of literary study in relation to the orthodoxies of the English canon.<sup>14</sup> The cultural geopolitics of Anglophonia in Europe has, for example, given a more prominent role on the Continent to American Studies, a subject in part created in the postwar period for and by Europeans.<sup>15</sup> In many places English is read as a national literature in dialogue with other national literatures, in comparative literature and reception studies. Alongside this, one finds a particularly high level of interest in postcolonial literatures, Irish Studies, and the literatures of migrants.<sup>16</sup> The shift suggested by the latter field, from static bodies of writing to writings in migration, is further born out by recently growing interest in translation studies, which promises to rethink the subject in very interesting ways.<sup>17</sup>

As this last example suggests, Continental Englishes have had most to do, I would suggest, with the relations between Literature and Language, and with the place of foreignness in both – and hence with the fulcral issue of the 'location of culture'.<sup>18</sup> Whereas the emancipation of English from Germanic Philology in the UK led to largely (although of course not universally) autonomous disciplines of Literature and Language, Continental Englishes have tied the study of literature and culture in with the study of language in particular, complex and, as I have suggested, often problematic ways, specific to their condition of the foreign. This has fed back into the subject in the UK, albeit more in Linguistics than in Literature, and has contributed to the

emergence of hybrid fields like Literary Linguistics, Stylistics, British Studies, and, as I say, Translation Studies. Whatever one's view of the merits of these particular fields, they testify to the fact that Continental Englishes insistently recall the alterity of English as a foreign subject and therefore the need to think the literary, the cultural and the linguistic in relation to each other.

It is however this intense interrelationship of the literary and cultural with the linguistic that is currently under increasing pressure on the Continent in ways which are likely to impact severely on the subject. In the last part of this article, I shall delineate some of the main features, both intellectual and institutional, of the present situation.

### **The world, and Bologna**

My use of the unattractive term, 'Anglophonia', is itself a symptom of the crisis. I used it because, as I have already suggested, the foreignness of English questions further – or questions in a radically different way – the object of study, and in this context the term 'English' has becoming increasingly both too vague and too precise. In other words, 'Anglophonia' alerts us to the increasing globalisation of English – a phenomenon that is probably more apparent to the non-Anglophone subject than to the native.

The issue is clearest and most material in relation to the language, where the traditional alignment of 'English' with the speech of the subjects of the United Kingdom has recently come under intense theoretical and practical debate. The debate is particularly live here in part because of publishing ventures seeking to cash in on the globalisation of English, and in part because the rise of English as a lingua franca in many fields of activity, not least of which the academy, has provoked those for whom English was not their first language to propose their own corpus, with a view to modelling a new language standard, an 'English' by definition distinct from that of native speakers.<sup>19</sup> This move towards defining 'English as a lingua franca' by language use between non-natives is contested by a re-assertion of a rigorous standard form, modelled on British educated norms. However, this position no longer asserts its standard in terms of the privilege of British culture, but precisely on the grounds that this standard is the best instrument for a vocationally-oriented education in English as a global lingua franca.<sup>20</sup>

In both cases, then, the move towards the appropriation of the foreign language as a lingua franca seeks to redefine the foreignness of the subject in a way which radically severs its link to Anglophone national cultures. It therefore puts important questions to the cultural component of the curriculum. Here, in contrast to the tendencies in Language and in Literature to open 'English' out, the national paradigm has hitherto shown few signs of revision – rather the contrary. While enthusiasm for postcolonial, migration and translation studies grows in Literature, the tenacity of 'the British Isles' or 'the United States' as objects of study continues in the cultural component of Continental degrees.

Again, there are, perhaps, historical explanations for this. In its institutional forms, as *civilisation* and *Landeskunde*, the cultural component has traditionally been concerned with providing historical, social and institutional background to the literary and linguistic components of the subject. The discipline has sought to operate in effect as a supplement to make up for the fact that the students do not live in the country supposedly under study. As such, whilst this is the only specifically Continental discipline in the curriculum, teaching in this field has tended to enjoy, along with the teaching of language as a foreign language, a lower academic status than Literature or Linguistics. And yet, as the most intense locus of English's foreignness, it is of major strategic importance for the future of the subject.

The cultural component is crucial precisely because it is located on the faultlines between the national (UK/USA), the postcolonial, and the global subject. Theoretically awkward as it may be in relation to paradigms in Literature and Language, the persistence of the study of British and North American culture thus denounces, symbolically at least, the elision of the power structures that support the place of English as 'world language' in a sort of communicative utopia whereby, free from the cultural locality of a foreign language, it has become 'everybody's' lingua franca.<sup>21</sup>

As a corollary, by virtue of its nation-based paradigm, the cultural component is also of major strategic value through its role in the construction, in the classroom, of the image of the national culture or cultures that form the object of study. Its importance in this context was demonstrated by the British Council's decision to make this the explicit focus of its attempt during the 1990s to reinvent the study of English in the resource-dependent capitals of post-Soviet Europe and other margins of Western Europe, under the title of 'British Studies'. 'British Studies', advertised as a joint creation of British and local scholars, was intended to transform low-status *civilisation* and *Landeskunde*-style programmes into a new and central discipline that would rival or replace traditional literature-centred courses.<sup>22</sup> By investing heavily in this project in strategic centres, the Council not only helped Britain and its restyled brand of English resist the expansionist ambitions of German and of American Studies in the period following the fall of the Berlin Wall, but it also helped to reinvent Britain as a multicultural, vibrant culture, studied with what were presented as exciting new theoretical instruments – 'cool Britannia' *avant la lettre*.

The Council's investment in British Studies has faded, but the nation-based paradigm has not lost its currency. What has happened at the turn of the century is a move by a group of largely Western European academics to claim back the territory occupied by British Studies for a specifically non-native discipline of 'Area Studies'. As one of the leading figures of the 'European Network of British Area Studies' (ENBAS), François Poirier, writes: 'Its ambition is to confront the Britons' view of themselves with the rich variety of foreign countries' visions of Britain generated by the diversity of the European experiences.'<sup>23</sup> ENBAS is an interesting project inasmuch as it is driven most

of all by an issue of ownership of the discipline – specifically as a foreign discipline. However, although very active in organising conferences, ENBAS lacks a coherent theoretical core to support what appears to me to be its largely revisionist intellectual project, aimed at subordinating approaches drawn from radical Cultural Studies to a more traditional view of the subject. Elsewhere, however, other individuals or groups in different parts of Europe are seeking to work out how such Cultural Studies approaches can be adapted to the study of a foreign culture.<sup>24</sup>

To judge by these investments and contestations, then, the traditionally low-status and supplementary area of ‘culture’ has become a crucial terrain in which the meanings of ‘English’ are being remade, in disciplinary, theoretical and cultural terms. And yet, whatever the issue of ownership, the debate is still centred around the study of national culture. If, however, the language component continues to be geared increasingly towards global English, this paradigm is headed for a terminal crisis. If Greek subjects learn English in order to communicate with Danish subjects, what is the rationale for culture anyway (let alone literature)? In that context, unless culture in English can be theorised in substantial terms that are not restricted by traditional national paradigms, there are real dangers that the cultural difference of the subject will be reduced to the behavioural rules of ‘intercultural communication’ – a postmodern form of the ‘polite reader’ that English originally aimed to produce. The fact that the British Council is currently ‘re-positioning British Studies within the wider field of Intercultural Studies’ may be a sign of things to come.<sup>25</sup>

One might think that there is a false problem here. I have already stated that the various disciplinary components of the subject on the Continent do not necessarily complement each other theoretically. Why worry about their theoretical coherence now? Why not just ignore what goes on in language? I hope I have argued sufficiently that the specificity of Continental Englishes is that they cannot abstract themselves from the cultural politics of the English language which define their very conditions of existence. But this is not just a nice question of theory. The theoretical crisis that I have been describing is currently being severely exacerbated by very powerful institutional pressures, particularly the structural transformation of the subject that is beginning to get underway under the aegis of the Bologna agreement. This is a future in which the subject in the UK has demonstrated little interest hitherto, but which is at the heart of anxieties and projects in Europe.

English degree schemes on the Continent vary considerably in their duration (from three to five or more years), in their breadth (although most constitute half of joint honours schemes), and in the quantity and proportionality of their students’ exposure to the different components of the subject. The Bologna agreement will require the modularisation of degree schemes and, in many cases, a reduction in their duration to a standard cycle of three (BA), five (MA) and eight (Ph.D.) years. Many colleagues on the Continent feel that the most likely outcome of these reforms will be a decline in both the

demand and the curricular space available for Literature, and a large increase in demand for the English language, as a 'transversal' skills-based discipline servicing other subjects. This prospect is driving a wedge between what have otherwise been the (however awkward) pair of 'Language and Literature' and is likely to condemn Culture to a supporting role to language training precisely in the guise of 'intercultural communication' skills, as suggested above.

Two scenarios present themselves. The first is a situation in which those who profess the literary subject are driven from, or abandon, the field, retreating to some sort of narrow high ground and leaving English to the market as a set of transferable skills. The other is a new theorisation of the subject which asserts the interdependence and specificity of the study of English language, literature, and culture as a foreign subject.<sup>26</sup>

These, clearly, are issues for colleagues on the Continent, who don't need to come to London to discuss them. But that does not mean that they are not issues of concern to the 'condition of the subject' in the UK. It forces one to confront the relations between the theories of language deployed in literature and in linguistics and their implications within the context of concrete cultural relations. Specifically, it obliges one to do so in the concrete historical context of the cultural power of English's globalising 'Empire', rather than burying the questions in the flattering and abstract generalisation of English as a 'world language'. The articulation of language, the cultural, and the literary in Continental Europe is about to undergo a crisis brought about precisely by European unification. This cannot help but have implications for the theory of the subject and for its futures in Britain as well.

## Notes and References

1. Brian Doyle, 'The Hidden History of English Studies', *Re-reading English*, ed. Peter Widdowson (London: Methuen, 1982); Chris Baldick, *The Social Mission of English Criticism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983); Terry Eagleton's *Literary Theory* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1983).
2. See Hans-Jürgen Diller, 'The Birth and Growth of ESSE: Some Personal Recollections', in *European English Studies: Contributions Towards the History of a Discipline*, ed. Balz Engler & Renate Haas (n.p.: The English Association for the European Society for the Study of English, 2000), pp. 323–34.
3. I speak as someone who worked for over 20 years in Portugal, which manages to 'not fit', as it were, into both situations, as a former rival colonial power in India and Southern Africa, as Britain's 'oldest ally' and, for major parts of its history, as Britain's dependent. See my 'A Very Old Alliance? An Introduction to English in Portugal', in Engler & Haas (eds), *European English Studies*, pp. 13–32.
4. This, moreover, is a nominal figure, since it is based on departmental membership, for which, furthermore, individuals are not required to pay – whereas Continental members of the affiliated national associations all pay their own membership.
5. After all, contact does not of itself guarantee an awareness of difference, let alone a sense of the substance of that difference. One does not have to subscribe to

'academic tourism' for the encounter with different contexts and systems to remain largely incidental. Indeed, specialist conferences tend to emphasise what people have in common more than what is different in their position. Giving a guest lecture is not the same as working on a regular basis in the context.

6. Catherine Bernard and Angsar Nünning, 'Introduction: Mapping Critical Theories, Meeting Intellectual Styles', *European Journal of English Studies*, 6.3 (2002): 249. The expression is adapted from Johan Galtung.
7. The position of Ireland in relation to this article is complex. In some cases where I oppose Britain to Continental Europe, I should strictly speaking refer to 'Britain and Ireland'. But there are enough situations in which Ireland would be aligned with the 'rest of Europe' that I have opted, somewhat unhappily, to dodge the issue, thereby allowing Irish readers to take up the subject position they feel most appropriate at different points in the text.
8. This will particularly be the case where, as is so frequently the case, school-teaching is almost the exclusive destiny of graduates.
9. Robert Crawford (ed.), *The Scottish Invention of English Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998); Gauri Viswanathan, *Masks of Conquest: Literary Study and British Rule in India* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1989).
10. See <http://www.sas.ac.uk/Rbae/introduction.htm>.
11. See Ljiljana Ina Gjurgjan, 'Comparative Literature: a Cure for an Inferiority Complex?' *The European English Messenger*, XII. 1 (2003): 30–2.
12. See, for example, Ludmilla Kostova, '(En)Gendering a European Periphery: Images of the Balkans in Nineteenth-Century British Fiction', *The European English Messenger*, VI. 2 (1997): 53–8.
13. See Jean-Jacques Lecercle's introduction to a recent conference on 'Whither Theory/ Où Va La Théorie', held at Nanterre, 19–21 June 2004, at <http://www.cf.ac.uk/encap/sections/cct/conference/english/home.html>, last accessed 15 July 2004; also published in French as 'Introduction', in *Etudes Anglaises*, 55. 3 (2002): 259–61.
14. See particularly Theo D'Haen, 'Pound Wise, Euro Foolish?' X. 1 (Spring 2001): 60–3, written in reply to Michael Alexander's 'Not "Other Literatures": Writing Literary History Revisited', *The European English Messenger*, IX. 2 (Autumn 2000): 16–18. Yet the purpose of Alexander's article was to promote *A History of English Literature*, published by Palgrave as part of their 'Foundations' series in 2000 – and heavily promoted on the Continent.

There are likely also to be relevant historical and material constraints affecting the canon here as well – not only the availability of texts, but the reduced time allowed to Literature in what are most usually joint honours courses, involving the study of two foreign cultures. Furthermore, the history of cultural relations between the country in question and the UK as well as the intellectual influences on the development of the discipline in the country are likely to shape the canon in a different way to the UK (hence, perhaps, the particular weight given in many places to Romanticism).

15. See Heinz Ickstadt, 'Globalisation and the National Paradigm', *The European English Messenger*, IX. 2 (Autumn 2000): 19.
16. As witnessed by the activities of the Association for the Study of New Literatures in English, founded in Germany in 1989. Reports on the annual conferences can be found in *The European English Messenger*. Yet again, as Barbara Korte has pointed out, after unification East German students took to Postcolonial literatures in quite a different way to students had in the West: the cultural context radically

- changes the subject – Barbara Korte, 'Teaching Postcolonial English Literatures in Germany', *The European English Messenger*, IX. 1 (Spring 2001): 25–9.
17. See, for example, Stephanos Stephanides, 'Europe, Globalisation, and the Translatability of Culture', *The European English Messenger*, X. 2 (Autumn 2001): 39–46; and João Ferreira Duarte, 'Translation and the Space of History', *The European English Messenger*, XII.1 (Spring 2003): 16–20.
  18. The echo here of Homi Bhabha's text is not accidental – Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (London: Routledge, 1994).
  19. See Barbara Seidlhofer, 'Brave New English?', *The European English Messenger*, X. 1 (Spring 2001): 42–8.
  20. See Ian Mackenzie's rejoinder to Seidlhofer: 'English as a Lingua Franca', *The European English Messenger*, XII. 1 (Spring 2003): 59–62.
  21. See my 'The State of English as a Global Language: Communicating Culture', *Textual Practice*, 18.1 (March 2004), 1–22.
  22. See *British Studies: Designing and Developing Programmes Outside Britain* (London: The British Council, 1993) and Nick Wadham-Smith (ed.), *British Studies Now Anthology Issue 1–5* (London: The British Council, 1995).
  23. François Poirier & Slavka Tomascikova, 'ENBAS at ESSE 6', *The European English Messenger*, XII. 1 (Spring 2003): 76. See also 'ENBAS: Declaration of Principles & Call for Papers', *The European English Messenger*, IX. 1 (Spring 2000): 64–5.
  24. See, for example, Chantal Cornut-Gentile, 'Does Cultural Studies exist in Spain?', *The European English Messenger*, X. 2 (Autumn 2001).
  25. 'British Studies and Intercultural Studies', British Council website, <http://www.britcoun.org/studies/index.htm>; last accessed 12 July 2003.
  26. I was most encouraged by Jean-Jacques Lecercle's call for such a project in the final panel discussion at the 'Whither Theory/ OÙ Va La Théorie' conference, Nanterre, 21 June 2003.

# Index

- AAWP (Australian Association of Writing Programmes), 81, 87n
- ACE (Arts Council of England), 80, 87n
- Achebe, Chinua, 70, 76n
- Adler-Kassner, Linda, 155n
- Adorno, Theodor, 104, 107n, 164, 167n, 201
- Ahmad, Aijaz, 76n
- AHRB (Arts and Humanities Research Board), 17n, 80, 82
- AHRC (Arts and Humanities Research Council), 17n, 80, 82, 87n
- Alabama, University of, 152, 183
- Alberti, John, 152, 157n
- Alexander, Michael, 32n
- Althusser, Louis, 61, 178n
- Amis, Martin, 49, 118, 119, 124n
- ANC (African National Congress), 57–60
- Anglia Polytechnic University, 18n
- Anson, Chris M., 155n
- Apple, Michael W., 112, 117n
- AQA (Assessment and Qualifications Alliance), 121–3, 124n, 125n
- ARC (Australian Research Council), 80
- Ariosto, 200
- Aristotle, 98, 130, 134, 185, 205
- Armstrong, Isobel, 32n
- Arnold, Matthew, 102, 107n, 112, 114, 117n, 128, 137, 141n, 165
- Arnold, Oliver, 125n
- Arrowsmith, William, 92, 100n
- Ashcroft, Bill, 60, 65n
- Ashton, E.B., 167n
- Association for the Studies of New Literatures in English, 32n
- Atherton, Carol, 7
- Attridge, Derek, 167n, 179n
- Auden, W.H., 91, 122, 141n
- Austen, Jane, 126–9
- AWP (Association of Writers and Writing Programmes), 79, 81, 87n
- Badiou, Alain, 10, 182, 186, 188, 190n
- Baker, Ernest, 138
- Bakhtin, Mikhail, 45, 48
- Baldick, Chris, 21, 31n, 108–9, 116n
- Bantu Education Act, 57
- Baran-Cohen, Simon, 97, 100n
- Barker, Francis, 65n
- Barnes, Julian, 98
- Baron, N., 54n
- Barry, Peter, 16n, 162, 167n
- BARS (British Association for Romantic Studies), 4
- Barthes, Roland, 184
- Bass, Alan, 167n
- Bassnett, Susan, 6, 14, 18n, 92–3, 99, 100n
- Bate, Jonathan, 11, 13, 208n
- Bauman, Richard, 54n
- BAVS (British Association for Victorian Studies), 4
- Belsey, Catherine, 2, 12, 16n, 18n, 57, 60, 65n, 109
- Benjamin, Walter, 185
- Berlin Wall, The, 29–30
- Berlin, James A., 155n
- Bernard, Catherine, 24, 32n
- Bernstein, Jared, 151, 157n
- Berthoff, Ann E., 114, 117n
- Bhabha, Homi, 33n, 59, 65n, 69, 75
- Bible, The*, 103, 122, 131–3, 199
- Bickley, Pamela, 120, 124n
- Birmingham University, 35
- Bissell, Elizabeth, 139n
- Bizzel, Patricia, 155n
- Black, Laurel Johnson, 146, 156n
- Blair, Tony, 43, 44, 51
- Blitz, Michael, 156n
- Bloom, Harold, 127, 140n, 166, 184
- Bloomsbury, 196
- Bologna, 28
- Booth, Wayne, 112
- Bowkers Books in Print*, 199
- Bozzoli, Belinda, 65n
- Bradford, Barbara Taylor, 197
- Brandt, Eric, 156n
- Brennan, Tim, 76n
- Briggs, Charles L., 54n
- Brindt, Steven G., 157n
- Bristol, Michael, 57, 65n
- British Academy, 27

- British Association for Eighteenth Century Studies, 4
- British Council, The, 22–3, 29–30, 87n
- British National Corpus, 41, 48
- Brontë, Emily, 129
- Brooker, Peter, 103, 104, 107n, 141n
- Brooks, Cleanth, 111
- Brown, Alan, 17n, 198n
- Brown, Gordon, 99
- Browning, Robert, 161
- Buchan, John, 202
- Buck-Morss, Susan, 179n
- Bunyan, John, 129, 137
- Bush, George W., 98
- Butler, Judith, 186, 190n
- Cain, William, 114, 115, 117n
- California State University, 152
- Cambridge Quarterly*, 14
- Cambridge University Press, 35
- Cambridge University, 97, 108, 118
- Campbell, Abigail, 87n
- CANCODE corpus, 38–9, 41, 43, 45, 49, 51, 52
- Cantalupo, Charles, 64
- Cardiff University, 2
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 142, 155n
- Carney, Ray, 109, 113, 116n, 117n
- Carroll, Lewis, 168
- Carter, Angela, 167n
- Carter, Ronald, 5, 34n, 54n
- Caves, Richard E., 88n
- CCUE (Council for College and University English), 16n
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh, 164, 167n
- Chambers, Iain, 101, 106n
- Chanaiwa, D., 65n
- Chandra, Bankim, 75
- Chandra, Vikram, 70, 73–5, 77n
- Chaucer, Geoffrey, 128, 135, 137, 202, 206
- Cheltenham Literature Festival, 95
- Chicago Universities, 94
- Chomsky, Noam, 34
- Christianity, 57, 131–3, 145, 150, 194
- Christopher, Renny, 152, 157n
- Churchill, Winston, 42
- Cicero, 133, 140n
- Clare, John, 207
- Clark, Timothy, 179n
- Clarke, Cheryl, 156n
- Clinton, Bill, 151–2
- Cohen, Cathy J., 146, 156n
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor, 96, 97, 163
- Collini, Stefan, 123, 125n
- Collins, John Churton, 118, 124n
- Collins, Randall, 153, 154, 157n
- Colls, Robert, 141n
- Connors, Peter, 179n
- Conrad, Josef, 127
- Constantine-Simms, Delroy, 145, 156n
- Cornut-Gentille, Chantal, 33n
- Cosman, Carol, 65n, 106n
- Couzens, T., 65n
- Craddock, Mike, 121–3, 124, 125n
- Crawford, Robert, 26, 32n, 49
- Crick, Brian, 117n
- Crowther, Leslie, 53
- Crystal, David, 35, 54n
- Culler, Jonathan, 206
- Cunningham, Michael, 199
- Currie, Gregory, 99
- Currie, Mark, 10
- D’Haen, Theo, 32n
- Damasio, Antonio, 98
- Dante, Alighieri, 137
- Danto, Arthur C., 121
- Darwin, Charles, 183
- Davies, Tony, 58, 61, 65n, 66n
- Davis, Todd F., 117n
- Dawkins, Richard, 98
- Dawson, Paul, 86n
- Day, Gary, 7
- De Kock, L., 65n
- De Man, Paul, 9, 112, 117n, 161, 167n, 168, 171–4, 176, 178n, 179n
- De Montfort University, 48
- Denet, Daniel, 96, 100n
- Dentith, Simon, 10
- Derrida, Jacques, 18n, 48, 109, 114, 164, 167n, 175–6, 178n, 179n, 206
- Descartes, René, 97, 102, 105
- Dews, C.L. Barney, 156n
- Dickens, Charles, 75, 126, 128, 137, 195, 202, 205, 208
- Digges, Leonard, 105
- Diller, Hans-Jürgen, 31n

- Distiller, Natasha, 5, 64n, 65n, 67n  
 Docherty, Thomas, 127, 139n  
 Dodd, Philip, 141n  
 Dollimore, Jonathan, 57, 60, 65n  
 Dorfman, Ariel, 139  
 Douglas, Michael, 36  
 Doyle, Brian, 21, 31n  
 Doyle, Roddy, 49  
 Dryden, John, 135–6  
 Duarte, João Ferreira, 33n  
 DuBois, Andrew, 116, 117n  
 Durham University, 126  
 Durst, Russel K., 146, 148, 155n  
 Dutoit, Thomas, 179n
- Eaglestone, Robert, 8, 167n  
 Eagleton, Terry, 21, 31n, 109, 162–3,  
 178n, 185, 190n  
 Easthope, Antony, 11, 18n  
 Economic Policy Institute, 151  
*Edinburgh Review*, 137  
 Edmundson, Mark, 136, 141n  
 EEBO (Early English Books Online), 200  
 Eggert, Paul, 114  
 EJES (European Journal of English  
 Studies), 24  
 Elbow, Peter, 156n  
 Elgar, Edward, 138  
 Eliot, George, 47, 126–7, 194, 198n  
 Eliot, T.S., 102, 108  
 Empson, William, 163  
 ENBAS (European Network of British  
 Area Studies), 29–30, 33n  
 Engler, Balz, 31n  
 English Association, 120, 138  
 English Subject Centre, 16n, 17n, 83,  
 87n, 88n, 162  
 Erasmus, Desiderius, 103, 107n  
 ESSE (European Society for the Study  
 of English), 16n, 22–3, 33n  
 Essex University, 2  
 European Commission, 80  
 Evans, Colin, 17n  
 Evans, Malcolm, 57  
 Everett, Nick, 18n
- Farris, Christine, 155n  
 Fauconnier, Gilles, 97–9, 100n  
 Ferns, John, 117n  
*FHM (For Him Magazine)*, 52
- Finkielkraut, Alain, 104, 107n  
 Fischer, Claude S., 150–1, 155n, 157n  
 Fish, Stanley, 91, 100n, 112, 114, 147–8,  
 156n  
 Ford, Henry, 113  
 Forster, D., 64n  
 Forster, E.M., 129  
 Fort Hayes State College, 152  
 Foucault, Michel, 111–12  
 Fowler, Alistair, 127, 140n  
 Franzen, Jonathan, 199, 208n  
 Frederick the Great, 170  
 Freeman, E.A., 119  
 Freire, Paolo, 112, 143, 155n  
 French-German Philosophy  
 Colloquium, 96  
 Freud, Sigmund, 109, 165
- Galloway, Janice, 49  
 Galtung, Johan, 32n  
 Garber, Marjorie, 161, 167n, 204  
 Gauteng Education Department, 55  
 Gawthroppe, Jane, 16n  
 Gaye, Marvin, 52  
 Geiman, Kevin Paul, 178n  
 Gervais, David, 14, 18n  
 Gibbs, R.W., 54n  
 Gilbert, Sandra, and Gubar, Susan, 112  
 Giovanni, George di, 178n  
 Giroux, Henry, 155–6n  
 Gitlin, Todd, 150, 157n  
 Gjurgjan, Ljiljana, 32n  
 Glasgow University, 138  
 Goellnicht, Donald C., 110–11, 116n  
 Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von, 138  
 Gollancz, Isaac, 59  
 Gorak, Jan, 140n, 141n  
 Gower, John, 133  
 Graff, Gerald, 6, 93–4, 99, 100n  
 Grant, Elizabeth A., 155n  
 Gray, Kenneth C., 157n  
 Green, Ann E., 144–6, 155n, 156n, 157n  
 Green, Daniel, 152, 157n  
 Greenblatt, Stephen, 201  
 Greene, Donald, 141n  
 Greenspan, Alan, 99  
 Greenwald, Richard A., 155n  
 Gregoe, Mary J., 178n  
*Guardian*, the, 97  
 Gubar, Susan, 110, 116n

- Guillory, John, 116n, 129, 140n, 157n  
 Guinness, B.F., 167n  
 Guy, Josephine, 119, 124n
- Habermas, Jürgen, 105, 201  
 Hallberg, Robert von, 139n  
 Halliwell, Martin, 106n  
 Halworth, P., 190n  
 Hamilton, Craig, 6, 91  
 Haos, Renate, 31n  
 Haraway, Donna, 112  
 Hardin, Joe Marshall, 155n  
 Harper, Graeme, 6, 78, 87n, 88n  
*Harry Potter*, 92  
 Harvard University, 205  
 Haskell, Thomas L., 157n  
 Heathcott, Joseph, 144, 155n, 156n  
 Hegel, Friedrich, 185–7  
 Herr, Edwin L., 157n  
 HETE (Higher Education Teachers of English), 4, 16n  
 Hoare, Antony, 208n  
 Hobbes, Thomas, 97  
 Holland, Siobhan, 18n, 88n  
 Homer, 200  
 Horner, W.B., 156n  
 Hout, Michael, 155n  
 Hoyes, Richard, 120, 122, 124n  
 Huddersfield University, 35  
 Hulme, Peter, 65n  
 Hurlbert, C. Mark, 156n  
 Hutchinson, Earl Ofari, 156n
- Ickstadt, Heinz, 32n  
 Irving, David, 204  
 Iser, Wolfgang, 91, 97, 100n  
 Iverson, Margaret, 65n
- Jackson, Alan, 156n  
 Jackson, Dennis, 117n  
 Jakobson, Roman, 36, 54n, 180, 189n, 206  
 James, Henry, 127, 183  
 Jameson, Fred, 201  
 Jankowski, Sanchez, Martin, 155n  
 Jasper, David, 140n  
 Jeffrey, Francis, 137  
 Jencks, Christopher, 153–4, 157n, 158n  
 Johnson, Barbara, 169, 178n  
 Johnson, Ben, 137  
 Johnson, David, 55, 64n, 66n
- Johnson, Samuel, 97, 133, 135, 141n, 201  
 Jones, Tamara, 146, 156n  
 Jordan, A.C., 65n  
 Joughin, John J., 18n, 178n  
 Joyce, James, 185
- Kachru, Braj, 70  
 Kamuf, Peggy, 179n  
 Kant, Immanuel, 169–71, 174–6, 178n  
 Kastan, David Scott, 105–6, 107n  
 Kaufmann, David, 110, 111, 117n  
 Kay, Jackie, 49  
 Kayman, Martin, 5  
 Keegan, T., 65n  
 Kelman, James, 49  
 Kennedy, A.L., 49  
 Kermodé, Frank, 126–7, 139n, 140n, 163, 167n  
 Kirkwood, M., 64n  
 Kneale, Matthew, 167n  
 Korte, Barbara, 32n, 33n  
 Kostora, Ludmilla, 32n  
 Krishnaswamy, Revathi, 6, 76n, 77n  
 Kroll, Jeri, 88n  
 Ku Klux Klan, 59  
 Kumar, Krishnan, 141n
- Lacan, Jacques, 109  
 Lacapra, Dominic, 183  
 Laclau, Ernesto, 186–7, 190n  
 Lamont, Michéle, 146, 154, 156n  
 Lankshear, Colin, 155n  
 Lareaü, Annette, 149, 154, 157n, 158n  
 Larson, Magali Sarfatti, 153, 157n  
 Latour, Bruno, 109–10, 116n  
 Laurillard, Diana, 167n  
 Lawrence, D.H., 114–15, 136–7  
 Laws, Carolyn Leste, 156n  
 Leahy, Anna, 88n  
 Leathes, Stanley, 118, 124n  
 Leavis, F.R., 16n, 102–3, 108, 107n, 111, 114–16, 122, 127, 137, 140n, 163–4, 166, 205–6, 208n  
 Lecécrcle, Jean Jacques, 32n, 33n, 46, 54n  
 Leeds University, 35  
 Lentricchia, Frank, 116, 117n, 184  
 Leonard, Tom, 49  
 Levine, George, 116, 117n  
 Levison, Andrew, 149–50, 154, 157n, 158n

- Levi-Strauss, Claude, 109, 182, 206  
 Levy, Andrew, 88n  
 Linkon, Sherry Lee, 144, 155n, 157n  
 Liverpool University, 35  
 Locke, John, 97, 102  
 London, University of, 17n  
 Long Beach City College, 152  
 Lords, Erik, 157n  
 Louis XIV, 99  
 Lowell, Robert, 111  
 Lowth, Robert, 132  
 Luhmann, Baz, 197  
 Lukács, Georg, 200, 203  
 Lye, John, 124n  
 Lynott, Phil, 52  
 Lyotard, Jean-François, 9, 172–3, 178n
- MacDonald, Susan Peck, 147, 155n, 156n  
 Macmillan, 138  
 Malpas, Simon, 18n, 178n  
 Mandela, Nelson, 60–1, 63, 66n  
 Martin, Philip, 16n, 22  
 Marxism, 55, 58, 65n, 108–9, 113, 163–4, 170, 184, 194, 201  
 Maseko, S., 67n  
 Mavimbela, V., 67n  
 Mbeki, Thabo, 63, 67n  
 McBride, Dwight A., 156n  
 McCarthy, M., 50, 54n  
 McEwan, Ian, 80, 97  
 McGann, Jerome, 95, 100n  
 McLaren, Peter I., 155n  
 Meintjies, F., 66n  
 Melville, Herman, 169  
 Mensah, Patrick, 179n  
 Mesquita, Filomena, 23  
*Methuen, New Accents*, 109  
 MFA (Master of Fine Arts), 82, 85  
 Michael, C., 65n, 66n  
 Michael, John, 149–50, 157n  
 Miller, J. Hillis, 148, 156n, 177, 179n, 183  
 Miller, Richard, 143, 145–6, 148, 155n  
 Milton, John, 126, 135, 137, 200  
 Mishel, Lawrence, 151, 157n  
 Mithen, Steven, 98, 100n  
 MLA (Modern Languages Association), 17n  
 Mousley, Andy, 7, 106n  
 Mphahlele, E., 65n
- Mugomba, A.T., 65n  
 Mukherjee, Meenakshi, 72–3, 76n  
 Munden, Paul, 87n  
 Murray, Heather, 111, 117n
- Nabokov, Vladimir, 126  
 Nancy, Jean-Luc, 177, 179n  
 Narasimhaiah, C.D., 71, 76n  
 Narayan, R.K., 73  
 National Centre for Education Statistics, 142, 151  
 NAWE (National Association of Writers in Education), 81, 87n  
 Newbolt Report, 138  
 Newbould, Frank, 138  
 Newcastle University, 35  
 Newman, Gerald, 141n  
 Nietzsche, Friedrich, 109, 204, 208n  
 Nimade, Balanchaudran, 72–3  
 Nisbett, H.B., 178n  
 North, Stephen, 147, 156n  
 Norton, 200  
 Nottingham University, 35, 41, 45, 91, 93  
 Noyes, John, 61, 65n, 66n  
 Nünning, Angsar, 24n, 32n  
 Nutall, S., 65n, 66n  
 Nyaggah, M., 66n
- O'Dair, Sharon, 8, 13, 156n, 157n  
*OED (Oxford English Dictionary)*, 168–9  
 Office of Education Research and Improvement, 151  
 Ohmann, Richard, 127, 139n  
*OK! Magazine*, 36  
 Orkin, Martin, 55, 62–3, 64n, 66n  
 Osborne, P., 66n  
 Oxford University Press, 35, 200  
 Oxford University, 108, 118–19
- Palgrave, 42, 138  
 Pari, Caroline, 148, 155n, 156n  
 Pateman, Matthew, 178n  
 Pears, D.F., 167n  
 Pechey, Graham, 56, 61, 65n, 66n  
 Peele, George, 207  
 Penguin Classics, 129  
 Pepys, Samuel, 167n  
 Phillip, David, 65n  
 Pieterse, E., 66n  
 Plaatje, Solomon, 59–60, 63, 66n

- Plato, 130, 205  
 Pliny, 130  
 Plug, Jans, 179n  
 Pluhar, W.S., 178n  
 PMLA (Publications of the Modern Languages Association), 110  
 Poirier, François, 29, 33n  
 Polley, J.A., 64n  
 Polycletus, 130  
 Poovey, Mary, 201  
 Pope, Alexander, 134, 140n, 163, 197  
 Prague School, The, 27  
 Prickett, Stephen, 140n  
 Princeton University, 152
- QAA (Quality Assurance Agency), 17n  
 QCA (Qualifications and Curriculum Authority), 120–1  
 Quiller-Couch, Sir Arthur, 138
- RAE (Research Assessment Exercise), 4, 17n, 80  
 Ramos, M.B., 155n  
 Rampton, Ben, 44–6, 54n  
 Rancière, Jacques, 177n, 178n  
 Rand, Richard, 178n  
 Ransom, John Crowe, 185  
 Rao, Raja, 70–1, 76n  
 Ravenscroft, Ian, 99  
 Readings, Bill, 176–7, 181, 178n, 179n, 190n  
 Reagan, Ronald, 43  
 Reddy, Sheila, 76n  
 Reiss, Hans, 178n  
 Rich, P.B., 65n  
 Richards, I.A., 14, 16n, 96, 108, 111  
 Ricouer, Paul, 112  
 Ridley, M.R., 201  
 Rizzolatti, Giacomo, 100n  
 Robbins Era, 2  
 Robinson, Ian, 117n  
 Robinson, John P., 158n  
 Robson, Mark, 7, 9, 168  
 Rockefeller, John D., 113  
 Rockhill, Gabriel, 177n  
 Rorty, Richard, 204, 208n  
 Ross, Charles L., 117n  
 Ross, Kristin, 178n  
 Ross, Trevor, 131–2, 140n, 141n  
 Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, 208
- Roy, Arundhati, 69  
 Roy, M., 64n  
 Royle, Nicholas, 179n  
 Rushdie, Salman, 69–71, 75, 76n  
 Russell Group, 174
- Saccheri, Gerlamo, 99  
 Said, Edward, 112, 165  
 Salusbury, T., 64n  
 Salusinsky, Imre, 184, 190n  
 Sartre, Jean-Paul, 97  
 Saussure, Ferdinand, de, 109, 164, 182  
 SCEPSHE (Standing Committee for English in Public Sector Higher Education), 16n  
 Schalkwyk, David, 60, 66n  
 Schmitt, John, 151, 157n  
 Scholes, Robert, 13, 18n  
 Schor, Juliet B., 154, 158n  
 Schwarz, Daniel R., 116, 117n  
 Scott, Sir Walter, 75, 203  
 Sebeok, T., 54n  
 Seidlhofer, Barbara, 33n  
 Seitz, David, 146, 148  
 Sepamla, Siphoo, 62  
 Serote, M.W., 67n  
 Shakespeare, William, 6, 48, 55, 57, 59–63, 72, 105–6, 122, 126, 135–7, 197, 199, 201–2, 205–7  
 Sheffield University, 35  
 Shelley, Percy Bysshe, 119, 206  
 Shklovsky, Viktor, 96  
 Shor, Ira, 155n  
 Showalter, Elaine, 7, 17n, 101, 106n, 123, 125n  
 Sidney, Sir Philip, 200  
 Small, Ian, 119–20, 124n  
 Smiley, Jane, 200  
 Smith, Jeff, 143, 155n  
 Smith, Zadie, 34, 49  
 Snow, C.P., 164  
 Socrates, 130, 203  
 Sokal, Alan, 109–10, 116n  
 Sole, Kelwyn, 59–60, 65n  
 Southampton University, 2  
 Spenser, Edmund, 163, 199–200, 206  
 Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty, 61, 66n, 69, 184  
 Sprat, Thomas, 134, 140n  
 Stephanides, Stephanos, 33n  
 Steven, Laurence, 7

- Steyn, M., 64n  
 Stockton, Kathryn Bond, 144, 155n  
 Strand, Mark, 92, 100n  
*Sun, The*, 36  
 Sussex University, 126  
 Sweet, Matthew, 198n
- Tannen, Deborah, 54n  
 Tate, Allen, 185  
 Taylor, Charles, 105, 107n  
 Thin Lizzie, 52  
 Thiong'O, Ngugiwa, 56, 64n, 70, 76n  
 Tinberg, Howard, 149, 154, 157n, 158n  
 Todorov, Tzvetan, 7, 58, 65n, 100n, 101  
 Tomascikova, Slavka, 33n  
 Tomasello, Michael, 96–7, 106n  
 Tory Party, 43  
 Trilling, Lionel, 102, 107n, 163  
 Trow, Martin, 151, 157n  
 Turner, Mark, 6, 95, 97–9, 100n  
 Turner, Sarah, 150, 157n  
 Tusa, John, 139, 141n
- UCE (University of Central England), 35  
 UK Centre for Creative Writing Research  
   through Practice, 79, 87n  
 Updike, John, 180, 189n
- Vale, P., 67n  
 Vijayan, O.V., 73  
 Vilakazi, H.W., 67n  
 Virgil, 200  
 Visnawathan, Guari, 26, 32n, 64n
- Wadham-Smith, Nick, 33n  
 Wallace, Ray, 156n  
 Wallace, Susan Lewis, 156n  
 Warburton, William, 135  
 Weamy, Ann, 200
- Weber, Max, 105  
 Wellek, René, 103, 107n, 164  
 Welsh, Irvine, 49, 51, 54, 54n  
 Whalley, George, 116, 117n  
 White, Hayden, 204, 208n  
 Widdowson, Peter, 2, 16n, 18n, 21,  
   142n, 178n  
 Willan, B., 66n  
 Willhelm, P., 64n  
 Williams, Raymond, 47, 50, 54n, 58, 65n  
 Williams, Sadie, 16n  
 Wimsatt, William, 16n, 185, 187, 190n  
 Winch, Peter, 164, 167n  
*Winnie the Pooh*, 98  
 WISER (University of the  
   Witwatersrand's Wits Institute for  
   Social and Economic Research), 66n  
 Wittgenstein, Ludwig, 164–5, 167n, 183,  
   204  
 Wolverhampton University, 126  
 Womack, Kenneth, 117n  
 Wood, Allen, 178n  
 Wood, David, 179n  
 Woolfe, Virginia, 126, 128, 206  
 Wordsworth, William, 126, 137,  
   195, 200  
 Wragge-Morley, Juliet, 87n  
*Writernet*, 87n  
 Wroth, Mary, 200
- Yadav, Rajendra, 72  
 Yeats, W.B., 126  
 Young, Robert, 165
- Zandy, Janet, 145–6, 156n  
 Zeta-Jones, Catharine, 36  
 Zizek, Slavoj, 186, 190n  
 Zweig, Michael, 150, 157n