

Is the English of Literary Works Really “Unique”?: Doubts about Its Exclusion from Second Language Learning

Kazuko TAKAHASHI

要旨

本稿では、英語教育における文学作品の役割を理論面から分析することを通して、文学で用いられている英語は、豊かな文脈を持ち、さまざまなジャンルのテキストを融合・呈示できるため、教育に十分活用できることをおもに示す。

1章では、最近、英語教育から文学が敬遠される一方で、新聞・広告・雑誌などの題材が好まれる傾向を見直すべきだと指摘する。2章では、文学を英語教育で用いるか否かについて論じた先行研究を概観する。ここでは特に文学で用いられている英語の特殊性に焦点を当てる。3章では、Widdowsonの理論を踏まえて、文学の英語は新たな尺度(“usage”と“use”)で捉え直す必要があることを説明する。さらに、文学は豊かな文脈を持つため、“usage”と“use”を併せて教える上で有効だと指摘する。4章では、CarterとNashの“literariness”に関する研究を踏まえ、文学と一線を画すと見なされがちな題材にも“literariness”が含まれていることを説明する。さらに、文学は“literariness”の条件を十分に備えている点を、実際に作品を引用しながら確認する。以上の分析を通して、文学で用いられている英語は特殊だから教育に使えないと性急に決めつけることなく、その特性を十分に生かして教育に活用するべきだと結論づける。

Key Words: literary works, L2 learning, reading, usage and use, literariness

1. Introduction

The primary aim of this paper is to analyze the role of literature in second language (L2) learning mainly from a theoretical standpoint.¹⁾ Through this analysis, it is suggested that literary language should not be excluded from L2 learning.

Nowadays, literary works tend to be excluded from L2 textbooks. In many cases, these textbooks welcome “so-called ‘authentic’” materials. Cook (2000) characterizes the current situation in L2 learning as follows: “Invented examples were replaced by so-called ‘authentic’ examples (bits of language lifted from their original context) or by student language generated by the communicative activity itself. The use of literature both as a means and an end of

language teaching declined.” He also says that “the term ‘authentic’ is often used superficially as a synonym for ‘real’,” and that if some examples have “once occurred in some conventionally ‘real’ environment,” they are called, “in pedagogic terms, authentic” (Cook, 2000: 189; 172). It can safely be said that, from Cook’s viewpoint, newspapers, advertisements, and magazines are typical examples of “so-called ‘authentic’” materials. Through the rather ironical reference to “so-called ‘authentic’ examples” he implies that the word “authentic,” which is often used in present language teaching, is not appropriate.

Originally, text authenticity is defined, according to Lee (1995), “in terms of the origin of the materials.” She explains that “[a] text is usually regarded as textually authentic if it is not written for teaching purposes, but for a real-life communicative purpose, where the writer has a certain message to pass on to the reader” (Lee, 1995: 323-324). If we read Lee’s explanation closely, we can easily find that artificial works such as literary works should not be excluded from this classification. Most literary works are not written “for teaching purposes” but are written to pass on “a certain message” to the readers. Therefore, it is proper to include literary materials as “authentic” texts.

The time has come for us to reconsider our attitudes, and to make the best use of literary works together with “so-called ‘authentic’” materials, as we shall discuss in the following sections.

2. Arguments about Using Literary Works in Second Language Learning

In this section, several arguments about using literature in L2 learning are considered. McKay’s analysis (1982) of the common arguments against using literature in English education will provide a useful starting point: First, “since one of our main goals as ESL teachers is to teach the grammar of the language, literature, due to its structural complexity and its unique use of language, does little to contribute to this goal.” Secondly, “the study of literature will contribute nothing to helping our students meet their academic and / or occupational goals.” Lastly, “literature often reflects a particular cultural perspective; thus, on a conceptual level, it may be quite difficult for students” (McKay, 1982: 529). These three arguments are interconnected, either directly or indirectly. We will focus here on the question of the “unique use of language” in literature, an issue that has been the subject of much discussion. Lazar (1990), for example, argues that “[teachers] and learners often cite literary language as being particularly problematic because it does not adhere to accepted norms of use, but exploits and even distorts the accepted conventions in fresh and unexpected ways” (Lazar, 1990: 206). Moreover, Carter and Nash (1990) outline the Russian Formalists’ view on literature, and show that “[their] main theoretical position was that literary language is deviant language” (Carter & Nash, 1990: 31).

On the other hand, Short and Candlin (1986) focus on the use of language in literary works, and state that “[contrary] to much received opinion, it is difficult to make a *linguistic* distinction between literature and other kinds of language” (Short & Candlin, 1986: 91; italics in the original). Moreover, Qiping and Shubo (2002) focus on the use of literary language, and assert that “language and literature, after all, cannot be separated without doing violence to the organic structure of language itself” (Qiping & Shubo, 2002: 320).

To repeat the major point, on one hand it is generally asserted that literary language is unique, compared with language in other kinds of texts. On the other hand, it is firmly believed that literary language is not unique and cannot be separated from language in other text types. About the uniqueness of literary language, both pros and cons have been circulating for a long time.

3. Widdowson’s Theory of “Usage” and “Use”

In this section, Widdowson’s “usage” / “use” theory is mainly analyzed. He points out that literary language is different from customary uses of language, and proposes that we should accept the new binary distinction: “usage” / “use.”

3.1 Theoretical Frame of “Usage” and “Use”

Widdowson’s opinions have been influential in the field of literary and pedagogical stylistics. In *Explorations in Applied Linguistics 2*, he says “it seems clear that literature *does* differ from customary uses of language in quite fundamental ways” (italics in the original). Moreover, he draws attention to the essential points that “in reading literature we are required to enter into a different kind of contractual agreement from the one we subscribe to in normal communicative circumstances” (Widdowson, 1984: 150). That is to say, a sort of different standard is necessary to interpret literary works.

In relation to this, in *Teaching Language as Communication*, Widdowson proposes that literature cannot be interpreted only through verbal meanings, and concludes that it is useful to make a distinction between two kinds of meanings: “usage” and “use.” According to his explanation, “usage” means a set of linguistic rules around a certain linguistic form, and “use” means how to use these rules effectively with due consideration of context. Moreover, he shows that there has been an overoptimistic tendency to “concentrate on usage on the assumption that learners will eventually pick up the necessary knowledge of use on their own.” He then points out that “[the] teaching of usage does not appear to guarantee a knowledge of use,” and that “it would seem to be sensible to design language teaching courses with reference to use” (Widdowson, 1978: 19).

As for the contemporary situation of literature in language learning, Widdowson laments “the arguments against the inclusion of literature in language courses” (Widdowson, 1984: 160). Confronting the disadvantageous position of literary works in language learning, he concludes that “literature cannot be effectively taught unless it is conceived of as a kind of language use,” and that “literary uses of language can contribute to the effective teaching of language” (Widdowson, 1984: 137-138). In order to justify this opinion, he takes some examples out of texts recently used in language learning classes, and compares them with literary works: “typical textbook language cannot of its nature develop the procedural activity so essential to language use and learning. Literature, of its nature, can. It can contribute significantly to both the process and the purpose of learning because it is a significant use of language” (Widdowson, 1984: 172). That is to say, “typical textbook language” might be useful for teaching language at the usage level; however, it is not very effective in teaching language at the use level. In contrast to this, literary language promises great benefits for teaching language use.

3.2 Examples of “Usage” and “Use”: Typical Textbook Language and Literary Language

To confirm Widdowson’s argument we have discussed in the previous subsection, let us analyze Texts A and B, which can be utilized for teaching the participial construction. Through this analysis, we will be able to confirm that literary works are often more useful in L2 learning than typical language textbooks.

Text A below is taken from *Select Readings*. According to the authors, this textbook deals with “a wide range of fresh and engaging topics, like how to be a successful businessperson, electronic books of the future, love at first sight, and baseball fans around the world” (Lee & Gundersen, 2002: viii):

Text A (A Typical English Textbook): *Select Readings*

Exercise A. Choose the **-ing** clause that best completes each sentence. Write the number of the sentence.²⁾

- | Sentences | -ing clause |
|----------------------------------|---|
| 1. The plane crashed, | —wearing his best suit. |
| 2. The nuclear reactor exploded, | —killing the pilot and flight engineer. |
| 3. He came to the meeting, | —leaking radiation into the atmosphere. |

Exercise B. Rewrite each sentence, using an **-ing** clause.

1. We stood inside the room we built, and we felt a sense of fulfillment.
2. He stayed up all night, and watched TV.

(Lee & Gundersen, 2002: 147; italics and bold in the original).

Before Text A, there is a reading passage (Lee & Gundersen, 2002: 140-141). After that, there are grammatical explanations and sample sentences related to the participial construction. Through these exercises, the authors insist, students can “review language they have already learned in the context of a reading passage” (Lee & Gundersen, 2002: xiii). It is true that the authors quote two sentences directly from the reading passage in order to explain the participial construction. However, this is not sufficient to justify saying that they fully exploit the context of the reading passage. This is mainly because there is no coherence between the reading passage and the grammatical exercises at all. The reading passage deals with traveling, while the grammatical Exercises A and B quoted above deal with a plane crashing, a nuclear reactor explosion, watching television, and so on. True, students can understand to some extent how to make the participial construction at the language usage level, but they cannot understand through these exercises why they should use this construction. All they can do is to imitate the pattern of the ready-made sentences; they cannot create meanings by themselves out of these exercises.

On the other hand, Golding’s *Lord of the Flies* is very effective in teaching the participial construction both at the usage and the use levels. To cite one example:

Text B (A Literary Work): Golding, Lord of the Flies

Ralph screamed, a scream of fright and anger and desperation. His legs straightened, the screams became continuous and **foaming**. He shot forward, burst the thicket, was in the open, **screaming, snarling, bloody**. He swung the stake and the savage tumbled over; but there were others coming toward him, **crying out**. He swerved as a spear flew past and then was silent, **running** (Golding, 1954: 199; double line, square, bold are mine).

These sentences were taken from the final scene of the novel where Ralph desperately tries to flee from the other boys, who fanatically chase him across the island. First, let us look at the squares in the quotation; they show the present participle which makes the participial construction. Next, let us examine the present participle in bold; “foaming” serves as the adjective complement in the second sentence, and “coming” serves as the modifier of “others.” Text B is very useful in explaining several usages of the present participle. However, we will focus on the participial construction in order to compare Texts A and B.

Then, how can we actually utilize Text B in teaching the participial construction? The first step is to remove some of the verbs from Text B, and to replace them with the infinitive form of the verbs in brackets (we will call this modified version “Text B-2”). The second step is to ask students to read Text B-2 and write down the correct form of the verbs in brackets. The third step is to call on some of the students to say their answers for each of the verbs in the brackets. The

fourth step is to give the students Text B, and get them to discuss the difference between their answers and the original wording. In some respects, these four steps are not very different from the conventional grammar exercises. However, there is an important difference, as Duff and Maley (1990) emphasize: “In the standard approach, the students work on model (or ‘made up’) sentences which have no real context. Here, by contrast, they work on a coherent passage which not only provides a clear context, but also makes it easier for the students to decide which form of the verb is most suitable” (Duff & Maley, 1990: 135). That is to say, in many cases, typical textbooks do not lead students to think about what is presented at the language use level as we have already seen in Text A. On the other hand, literary works often lead students to consider the context of a text, and to interpret what is presented at the language use level.

If we read Text B, we can clearly find the context of the text. This can be proved by the analysis of the tense of Text B and the participial construction. First, let us look at the double lines in Text B; all of the sentences are written in the past tense. “The past tense,” as Lodge (1992) says, “is ‘natural’ for narrative . . . since anything that has been written down has by inference already happened” (Lodge, 1992: 135). As in other types of narrative, most of the sentences in *Lord of the Flies* are written in the past tense. At the same time, Golding effectively uses other styles of writing to provide a clear context. He utilizes the participial construction in the quotation above. By using this construction, Golding shows that one action happens at the same time as another action, or that one action happens just after another action; he can accelerate the speed of Ralph’s actions. The author tries to create the feeling that the atmosphere of this scene is very tense, and that Ralph might be killed if he stopped his numerous actions. Therefore, we can utilize Text B for teaching the participial construction not only at the level of language usage but also at the level of language use.

To recapitulate, in Section 3, we have looked at several of Widdowson’s theories. He points out that literary language is different from customary uses of language, and suggests that we should accept the new dichotomy of “usage” and “use” when we fully appreciate literature. Although typical language textbooks are useful for teaching language usage, literary works are more effective in teaching not only language usage but also language use. That is because, for one thing, most of the literary materials give clear and interesting contexts to L2 learners.

4. Carter and Nash’s Theory of “Literariness”

In this section, Carter and Nash’s “literariness” is mainly examined. According to their theory, literary language is not special; every language should be seen in terms of “a cline of literariness” in language use.

4.1 Theoretical Frame of “Literariness”

Carter and Nash’s opinions (1990), just like Widdowson’s, have been influential in the field of literary stylistics. They believe that “[the] notion of a special language of literature or literary style is not a helpful one.” Rather, they emphasize that literary language should be seen as “a continuum, a cline of literariness in language use with some uses of language being marked as more literary than others” (Carter & Nash, 1990: 15; 34). That is to say, literary language is not special, and language should be measured by the formal feature named “literariness.”

Carter and Nash set up six criteria for judging literariness: medium dependence, re-registration, semantic density produced by interaction of linguistic levels, displaced interaction, polysemy, and discourse patterning. Although all of the six criteria are important when we analyze the “literariness” of texts, space prohibits detailed analysis at all levels. Thus, I hope to underline the point with reference to the three criteria: medium dependence, re-registration, and polysemy. The explanation of these criteria runs as follows: first, medium dependence is a criterion for defining the extent to which the text depends on another medium or media such as illustrations, photographs, pictures, diagrams, and codes or keys to abbreviations for its interpretation. Carter and Nash explain that “the more literary a text” is, “the less it will be dependent for its reading on another medium or media.” Secondly, re-registration shows that “no single word or stylistic feature or register will be barred from admission to a literary context.” Any language can be used “to literary effect by the process of re-registration.” Lastly, one characteristic of the polysemic text is that “its lexical items do not stop automatically at their first interpretant.” In other words, “denotations are always potentially available for transformation into connotations, contents are never received for their own sake but rather as a sign vehicle for something else” (Carter & Nash, 1990: 38-42).

To repeat the major point argued by Carter and Nash, literary language is not special, and “features of language use more normally associated with literary contexts are found in what are conventionally thought of as non-literary contexts” (Carter & Nash, 1990: 18). Language should be seen in terms of “a cline of literariness” in language use.

4.2 Examples of “Literariness” (1): “So-Called ‘Authentic’” Materials

To justify Carter and Nash’s theory we have discussed in the previous subsection, let us examine the following examples: Text A (a classified advertisement from *The Japan Times*); Text B (an advertisement for carpets by Carpet One, which is a North American floor covering retailer); and Text C (a magazine article in *Good Housekeeping*, which is one of the magazines for American housewives). Although all of these texts deal with home(s) or houses, they come from different sources. If we analyze these examples, we notice that “literariness” can be found

not only in literary works but also in “so-called ‘authentic’” materials such as newspapers, advertisements, and magazines.

Text A below can be said to be medium-dependent:

Text A: A Classified Advertisement

TAMAGAWA DENENCHOFU, 277 sq.m.,
4 Bedrooms + Maid room, with sunny lawn garden!
2-car parking, close to Denen Supermarket,
¥ 900, 000. **LIBERTY** (03) 3497-0611 info@libco.co.jp
[http://www/libco.co.jp](http://www.libco.co.jp) (*Japan Times*, 2004; bold in the original).

This advertisement taken from the real estate pages of *The Japan Times* contains abbreviations and codes such as “sq.m.” and “+.” In this respect Text A is medium-dependent. As for its discourse style, it is typical of the classified pages in newspapers. It uses the formulaic code of the heading such as “TAMAGAWA DENENCHOFU.” Moreover, it passes on minimum information such as a room arrangement, an address, a telephone number, and a homepage address. As for polysemy, we can find a very small but interesting example: the exclamation mark “!” soon after “with sunny lawn garden.” On one hand, the advertisers simply explain that a garden of the house has a lawn, and that it is very sunny. On the other hand, by adding the exclamation mark, they imply that the lawn garden is surprising and impressive because it is very beautiful. According to Carter and Nash, polysemy is “a regular feature of advertisements” (Carter & Nash, 1990: 41). It is precisely because advertisers in real estate pages can use only very limited space for their property information, they try to use it as effectively as possible.

Text B below is more literary than Text A because it delivers a message without much reliance on other media, and gives words more than one meaning:

Text B: An Advertisement

Relax. Unwind. **You’re Finally Home.**

Introducing Good Housekeeping flooring. Available exclusively at Carpet One.

Now you can enjoy quality, elegance and comfort in any room in your home with Good Housekeeping carpet, made with extra-soft Anso Caress fibers. Choose from a range of styles, textures and colors, all from a name you know and trust. Good Housekeeping carpet is available exclusively at Carpet One and is backed by the prestigious Good Housekeeping Seal. **Call 1-800-CARPET 1 or visit carpetone.com**
(Carpet One, 2004; bold and italics in the original).

Text B, an advertisement for the carpet called “Anso Caress,” is accompanied by a big photograph of a living room. In the center of the thickly carpeted room, there is a fireplace where the firewood is crackling. On the mantelpiece, there are family pictures, candles, and potted flowers. A man and a woman, presumably a married couple, talk happily over a cup of coffee. Overall, this photograph gives an image of a happy life. Text B runs under this picture, so it can be said to be medium-dependent. At the same time, one of the most striking features of this text is that the lexical items can be effective without much reference to the picture.

As for polysemy in Text B, the word “home” carries more than one meaning. On one hand, a home means a house or a mere building where people live; this meaning is often used in real estate advertisements as we have already seen in Text A. On the other hand, home means a place where people can feel relaxed. Text B delivers messages that their carpet can literally be laid down over the floors of a house, and that their carpet can make people feel more comfortable. The headline, “Relax. Unwind. You’re Finally Home,” carries the message, there’s no place like home. Text B gives us the same kind of information as Text A: a company’s telephone number, and its homepage address. However, the former can be said to be more literary than the latter. It is not only because Text B delivers a message without much reliance on other media, but also because it gives the words more than one meaning.

Text C below is more literary than Text B because it uses words in double meanings, and applies the quasi-simile structure which often appears in fiction:

Text C: A Magazine Article

To keep the space light and open, she [Christine Dimmick] created an outdoor feel, painting the walls light blue and green and the wooden furniture white. . . . Some of her small, homey touches: making a chalkboard for the kitchen out of an old picture frame and covering tabletops with family photos and fond mementos from friends and trips. Dimmick says that, in her home . . . she aims to “make you feel as warm and special as if someone had baked you a pie.” And she makes it look that easy (*Good Housekeeping*, 2004: 74-76).

Text C can be described medium-dependent, for it goes with some photographs: light blue and green walls, white wooden furniture, and a chalkboard for a kitchen. These pictures are directly related to the text; they help readers to imagine what is described in the text.

As for polysemy in Text C, the expression “in her home . . . she aims to ‘make you feel as warm and special as if someone had baked you a pie’” has a double meaning. First, a home is a place where Dimmick lives, and she decorates it as she likes. At the same time, she hopes to make her home “warm and special as if someone had baked you a pie.” She neither tries

to say that someone has actually baked a pie, nor tries to say that someone will bake it in her house. What Dimmick tries to say here is that her ideal home is the place where people willingly do something for the person they love. In such a house, they may actually smell something good baking in the oven. As Leech and Short (1981) say, “as if . . .” is one of the quasi-simile structures which often appear in fiction. Unlike orthodox similes such as “X is like Y,” these structures “suggest an ‘explanation’ which we know is not true,” and they “strengthen the impression of a mind stretched to explore and understand” (Leech & Short, 1981: 88). Although Text C is medium-dependent to some extent, it has many aspects of literariness; it uses the word “home” in double meanings, and applies the quasi-simile construction of “as if . . .” to show Dimmick’s ideal home.

In this subsection, we have analyzed three texts quoted from “so-called ‘authentic’” materials: a newspaper, an advertisement, and a magazine. Through this analysis, we may be able to say that these kinds of texts often meet criteria for literariness. Although some of them are more literary than others, the difference among them does not matter so much; that is simply a matter of degree.

4.3 Examples of “Literariness” (2): Richness of Literary Materials

Next, we will look at three literary materials, focusing on medium dependence, re-registration, and polysemy. All of these materials deal with houses and home(s) like the texts in the previous subsection. None of the following texts are accompanied by other media, and so they can be called medium-independent:

Text D: Dickens, *A Christmas Carol*

Then all the Cratchit family drew round the hearth. . . . [At] Bob Cratchit’s elbow stood the family display of glass. Two tumblers, and a custard-cup without a handle.

These held the hot stuff from the jug, however, as well as golden goblets would have done; and Bob served it out with beaming looks, while the chestnuts on the fire sputtered and cracked noisily (Dickens, 1843, reprinted 1994: 47).

Text E: Forster, *Howards End*

It is old and little, and altogether delightful—red brick. . . . From hall you go right or left into dining-room or drawing-room. Hall itself is practically a room. You open another door in it, and there are the stairs going up in a sort of tunnel to the first floor. Three bedrooms in a row there, and three attics in a row above. That isn’t all the house really, but it’s all that one notices—nine windows as you look up from the front garden.

Then there's a very big wych-elm—to the left as you look up—leaning a little over the house, and standing on the boundary between the garden and meadow (Forster, 1910, reprinted 1992: 19; italics in the original).

Text F: Mansfield, “An Ideal Family”

And then he [Mr Neave] faced the big white-painted house, with its wide-open windows, its tulle curtains floating outwards, its blue jars of hyacinths on the broad sills. On either side of the carriage porch their hydrangeas—famous in the town—were coming into flower; the pinkish, bluish masses of flower lay like light among the spreading leaves. And somehow, it seemed to old Mr Neave that the house and the flowers, and even the fresh marks on the drive, were saying, “There is young life here. There are girls—” (Mansfield, 1922, reprinted 1951: 240-241).

The house in Text E is made of “red” brick, and that of Text F is “white-painted.” Moreover, the house in Text F is decorated with “blue” jars of hyacinths and “pinkish, bluish” hydrangeas. There are no full-colored pictures in the literary texts quoted above. However, there is much literary color in these texts.

As for re-registration, property information can be found in Text E: a hall, a dining-room, a drawing-room, three bedrooms, and three attics. Text E, just like Text A quoted from *The Japan Times*, expresses a room arrangement of the house very clearly. Moreover, words in Text D could be compared with those of Text B, the carpet advertisement. As suggested in the previous analysis, Text B is accompanied by a big photograph of the living room where firewood crackles in the fireplace; this photograph gives an image of a happy life. Similarly, in Text D, the whole Cratchit family gathers at Christmas, and enjoys hot drinks and roasted chestnuts by the warm fireplace. Thus, a fireplace, which is the symbol of home life in advertisements like Text B, is more clearly described in literary materials such as Text D; the warm fireplace symbolizes happy relations.

Next, we will discuss polysemy in Texts D and E. As we have already discussed in the previous subsection, home has a double meaning: on one hand, a home simply means a building where people live; on the other hand, home means a place where people can feel comfortable. These images of home are more deeply described in literary materials. First, let us look at Text D. Although the Cratchits are very poor, they feel happy at their house. Their happiness is much emphasized through the metaphor of “golden goblets.” They feel as if they were drinking out of brilliant cups, though their cups are actually poor tumblers and a custard-cup “without a handle.” Secondly, *Howards End* in Text E is an “altogether delightful” house. Although the former part

of Text E shows the room arrangement, Forster adds “[that] isn’t all the house really.” This house has something more than what one can easily see. The latter part of Text E describes “a very big wych-elm,” which symbolizes what one cannot easily see. That is to say, as Forster writes later in this book, *Howards End* is not only “a house” but also “a spirit” (Forster, 1910, reprinted 1992: 107). In a word, literary materials use lexical items in multi-layered meanings; the rich ideas of houses and home(s) are one of these examples.

In this subsection, literary works which deal with houses and home(s) are analyzed. These works are not accompanied by other media; they are medium-independent. Although there are no full-colored pictures in these texts, the precise descriptions carry rich literary color. As for re-registration, property information can be found in Text E. Moreover, a fireplace, which is the symbol of home life in advertisements like Text B, is more clearly described in literary works such as Text D. In addition, literary materials use lexical items in multi-layered meanings. The images of home(s), for example, are more deeply described in literature than in “so-called ‘authentic’” materials.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, the role of literature is examined mainly from a theoretical standpoint. Widdowson points out that literary language is different from customary uses of language, and proposes that the new dichotomy of “usage” / “use” should be accepted. Carter and Nash argue that literary language is not special, and every language should be seen in terms of “a cline of literariness” in language use. The features of language use which are conventionally associated with literature can be found in “so-called ‘authentic’” materials. About the uniqueness of literary language, there is room for further discussion. Recently, however, quite a lot of researchers come to insist that literary language is not unique, and try to utilize literary works as effective L2 materials (Simpson, 1997: 7-19; Hall, 2005: 9-38).

Moreover, this paper argues that literary works are very effective in teaching the L2. It is firstly because they give clear and interesting contexts to L2 learners, and they can be used to teach both language usage and use. It is secondly because literary works meet most of the criteria for literariness; for example, they admit a variety of materials by the process of re-registration. Therefore, they provide rich content for students. For these reasons, literary works should not be excluded from L2 learning but should be utilized in L2 classrooms.

Notes

- 1) In this paper, the term “second language (L2)” is used in a broad sense: (a) a native language in a country as learnt by people living there who have another first language; (b) a language which

is taught as a school subject but which is not used as a medium of instruction in schools nor as a language of communication within a country. Cf. *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. 2nd. ed. (1992).

- 2) The titles “Exercise A” and “Exercise B” are added by me for convenience’s sake. Some of the questions and answers are omitted for lack of space.

Works Cited

- Carpet One. Advertisement. *Good Housekeeping* June 2004: 122.
- Carter, Ronald and Walter Nash. (1990). *Seeing through Language: A Guide to Styles of English Writing*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Cook, Guy. (2000). *Language Play, Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dickens, Charles. (1994). *A Christmas Carol*. 1843. *The Christmas Books*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Duff, Alan and Alan Maley. (1990). *Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Forster, E.M. (1992). *Howards End*. 1910. Ed. Oliver Stallybrass. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Golding, William. (1954). *Lord of the Flies*. New York: Perigee.
- Good House: Charm on the Cheap. *Good Housekeeping* June 2004: 73-76.
- Hall, Geoff. (2005). *Literature in Language Education*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Japan Times*, Sept. 27, 2004, 4th ed.: 10.
- Lazar, Gillian. (1990). Using Novels in the Language-Learning Classroom. *ELT Journal* 44.3: 204-214.
- Lee, Linda and Erik Gundersen. (2002). Introduction. *Select Readings: Pre-Intermediate*. New York: Oxford University Press: viii-xiii.
- . (2002). *Select Readings: Pre-Intermediate*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lee, Winnie Yuk-chun. (1995). Authenticity Revisited: Text Authenticity and Learner Authenticity. *ELT Journal* 49.4: 323-328.
- Leech, Geoffrey N. and Michael H. Short. (1981). *Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose*. London: Longman.
- Lodge, David. (1992). *The Art of Fiction: Illustrated from Classic and Modern Texts*. London: Penguin.
- Mansfield, Katherine. (1951). An Ideal Family. *The Garden Party and Other Stories*. 1922. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- McKay, Sandra. (1982). Literature in the ESL Classroom. *Tesol Quarterly* 16.4: 529-536.
- Qiping, Yin and Chen Shubo. (2002). Teaching English Literature in China: Importance, Problems and Countermeasures. *World Englishes* 21.20: 317-324.
- Short, Michael H. and Christopher N. Candlin. (1986). Teaching Study Skills for English Literature. *Literature and Language Teaching*. Christopher Brumfit and Ronald Carter, eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 89-109.

Simpson, Paul. (1997). *Language through Literature: An Introduction*. London: Routledge.

Widdowson, H.G. (1978). *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. (1984). *Explorations in Applied Linguistics 2*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.