

SELECTED WORKS OF
on Applied Linguistics

RUQAIYA HASAN

韩茹凯 应用语言学自选集

Ruqaiya Hasan (英) 著

Selection Series
of World-Famous
Applied Linguists

世界应用语言学
名家自选集

外语教学与研究出版社

FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING AND RESEARCH PRESS

SELECTED WORKS OF
on Applied Linguistics

RUQAIYA HASAN

韩 茹 凯
应用语言学自选集

Ruqaiya Hasan (英) 著

Selection Series
of World-Famous
Applied Linguists

世界应用语言学
名家自选集

外语教学与研究出版社

FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING AND RESEARCH PRESS

北京 BEIJING

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

韩茹凯应用语言学自选集 = Selected Works of Ruqaiya Hasan on Applied Linguistics: 英文/(英)韩茹凯(Hasan, R.)著. — 北京: 外语教学与研究出版社, 2011. 10

(世界应用语言学名家自选集)

ISBN 978-7-5135-1447-7

I. ①韩… II. ①韩… III. ①应用语言学—文集—英文
IV. ①H08-53

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2011) 第 216474 号

出 版 人: 蔡剑峰

选题策划: 刘相东

责任编辑: 郑丹妮

封面设计: 张 峰

出版发行: 外语教学与研究出版社

社 址: 北京市西三环北路 19 号 (100089)

网 址: <http://www.fltrp.com>

印 刷: 紫恒印装有限公司

开 本: 650×980 1/16

印 张: 32.25

版 次: 2011 年 11 月第 1 版 2011 年 11 月第 1 次印刷

书 号: ISBN 978-7-5135-1447-7

定 价: 67.90 元

* * *

购书咨询: (010)88819929 电子邮箱: club@fltrp.com

如有印刷、装订质量问题, 请与出版社联系

联系电话: (010)61207896 电子邮箱: zhijian@fltrp.com

制售盗版必究 举报查实奖励

版权保护办公室举报电话: (010)88817519

物料号: 214470001

出版前言

“世界应用语言学名家自选集”丛书收录世界知名应用语言学家的学术论文和专著章节，结集成书。本丛书的出版可填补两方面的空白：1. 以世界知名应用语言学家为主线的自选集；2. 以应用语言学学科为主题的系列丛书。

应用语言学有狭义和广义之分，狭义的应用语言学指跟语言教学密切相关的学科，如二语习得、教学法、语言测试等；广义的应用语言学则指利用语言学的理论解决社会生活的实际问题的边缘学科，如社会语言学、翻译学、词典学、文体学等。本丛书除有些学者的研究集中于狭义的应用语言学概念之外，一般采用广义应用语言学的概念。

本丛书选用的文章多散见于国外学术期刊、论文集和专著，时间跨度较大，读者不易觅得。这些文章汇集成自选集，充分展示了诸位名家对应用语言学各分支学科的研究脉络，是应用语言学研究领域不可多得的材料，可作为英语教师、英语专业研究生、师范院校英语本科生等从事科研、撰写论文的参考文献。

丛书编写体例如下：

一、收录发表于学术期刊、论文集中的学术论文以及学术演讲，文章字数无严格限制。专著中的章节酌情收录。

二、所收论文的语言仅限英语。

三、所收论文的内容须与应用语言学有关，纯语言学理论、文学研究、国情研究类论文不收录。

四、所收论文大多为原已发表过的文章，基本保持原貌以尊重历史的真实。文章一般注明论文发表的时间和发表刊物的名称（或论文集、专著书名）和期号（或出版社名）。文章格式也基本保持发表时的原貌。未在刊物上发表过的文章，如演讲等，则注明对外发布（成稿）的时间、地点和场合。

五、作者可将新的观点以尾注的方式放在相应论文的后面，表明作者目前的观点与当时有所不同。

六、每部选集作者撰写自序，详细地记录作者求学、教学、治学的经历和感悟。书后附有作者主要学术著述的目录。

世界应用语言学名家自选集编委会
2009年2月18日于北京

世界应用语言学名家自选集 编委会

主 任：胡文仲 Christopher Candlin

委 员：胡壮麟 王守仁 石 坚 秦秀白
杜瑞清 王宗炎 桂诗春 戴炜栋
刘润清 张正东 文秋芳 刘道义

策 划：刘相东

序

凡是读过《英语的衔接》(*Cohesion in English*)一书的学者一定都知道韩茹凯(Ruqaiya Hasan, 以前多译为哈桑)这个名字。该书是她和系统功能语言学创始人韩礼德(M. A. K. Halliday)合著的,称得上是自19世纪70年代以来最有影响的语言学著作之一,对过去世界范围内三十余年的语言学研究、语篇分析和英语教学产生了深刻、积极的影响。

熟悉系统功能语言学的学者都知道,在韩礼德周围云集了一大批在国际上颇有影响的语言学家和应用语言学家,韩茹凯就是其中的佼佼者。自20世纪60年代以来,韩茹凯不仅在理论上发展了韩礼德创建的系统功能语言学,还在应用语言学的诸多领域中作出了杰出的贡献。在理论方面,她对系统功能语言学的语境理论、语义学、词汇语法做了深入、独到的研究;在应用方面,她潜心探讨将系统功能语言学的框架应用到文体学、语篇分析、儿童语言发展等诸多方面的可能性。我们当然也不会忘记她曾参加伯恩斯坦(Basil Beinstan)的多个研究项目,在社会语言学领域的理论和应用方面也取得了令人瞩目的成就。

她本人精心挑选编辑成的这本应用语言学自选集就集中展示了她在应用语言学研究方面的成果。读者若想全面了解她的研究情况,可阅读她的由Equinox出版、香港城市大学卫真道教授(Jonathan Webster)编辑的七本论文选集。

本自选集包括了她的自1969年以来在不同时期发表过的14篇论文,分成四个部分。

第一部分的三篇论文主要讨论语言与社会的关系。她从系统功能语言学的视角,认为语言和社会之间存在着密不可分的辩证关系,回顾了语域、域码、社会方言的发展脉络,从理论上论证了这几个概念的区别,提出了语域和语码理论框架。她一再强调语言是一种意义潜势,语言学应当被看作是一种社会符号意义学¹,研究语言就必须涉及分布在语

¹ 这是笔者对 social semiotics 的试译。在中国,一般译为社会符号学。韩礼德多次提出,他倾向于将其译为“意义学”。但是这在汉语中容易被理解成其他意思,笔者的试译是在考虑两方面的意见后的折中译法。

篇各个层次上的语言意义。这种对语言本质的探讨对应用语言学研究有着重要的意义。

第二部分包括四篇论文，涉及与社会、语言相关的几个问题，强调语言学习和语言教学的社会实践性质。首先，通过分析 24 对母亲与孩子的日常交谈，探讨了母亲的说话方式在建构孩子的意识形态和价值观中所起的重要作用。第二，建立了学前儿童和母亲提问和回答方式的两个语义系统网络。通过对原始材料的语义分析，说明母亲的提问和回答方式对孩子的知识取向、性格特征的形成有重要的引导作用。第三，分析了在小学教育的开始阶段，教师在引导学生阅读图画读物时的说话方式在孩子中产生不同效果的原因，讨论了激活学生知识潜势发展的方式。第四，作者从社会符号意义学的角度，分析了无意识地传播知识的方式对儿童的生存方式、知识结构会产生相当大的影响。强调教师必须认真考虑符号意义、社会、认知三者之间的关系。

第三部分的四篇论文从语篇的功能角度讨论了与语篇密切相关的几个问题。她反复强调语境在语篇研究中占有中心地位以及情景语境与语篇之间存在着辩证关系。她还详细讨论了形成语篇的语篇纹理 (texture) 和语类结构潜势 (Generic Structural Potential 或 GSP) 这两个重要因素，阐述了语境配置与语域、语类和语篇结构之间的关系，讨论了必要成份与非必要成份在构成语篇中的作用，探讨了语类结构潜势的重要意义和广泛应用价值。此外，她还分析了连贯与衔接和谐之间的关系，特别是被忽略的词汇衔接及几种词汇链的作用和互动情况。最后，她强调了语篇具有四种元功能，指出系统功能语言学的独特贡献在于说明语言具有这些元功能的原因。

第四部分的三篇文章从社会符号意义学的角度，通过理论阐述、对传统文学评论方法的批评和对两篇诗歌和一个莎士比亚戏剧片段的分析，讨论了作者与读者、作者的创作意图与读者接收信息之间的关系；揭示了文体学的本质、语言学与文学的关系以及社会、符号和意义之间的关系；讨论了文学作为一门学科的性质、特点，文学语篇与其他语篇的共性与区别以及文学的符号意义与其他符号意义和其他艺术活动的区别。提出了研究文学作品的三维研究模式，涉及词汇、语法在文学作品中的规则范式与前景化一致性的关系以及前景化一致性与文学表达之间的关系等深层次的问题。

韩茹凯的论文有几个特点：1) 她对系统功能语言学框架有着深刻的理解，这使她的分析目标明确、方向清晰、结论可信度强；2) 研究的切入点把握准确，采用了科学、严谨的研究方法，对大量的原始资料做了深入、详尽的解析，为语篇分析和实证研究提供了范例；3) 她深厚的文学功底使她的语篇研究不仅包括日常生活的各种语类，还涉及了文学语类的多个子语类，提出了对文体学和文学语篇研究的真知灼见和研究框架。事实上，韩茹凯大学期间主修的是英国文学。攻读博士学位期间，她在教授文学课的过程中，就试图引导学生借助语言学寻找欣赏文学作品的理论依据，并将研究成果写成了探讨文体学的博士论文。从此，对文学语篇的关注从没有离开过她的视线。相信她这方面的研究会从事文体学、文学作品分析的研究者有着深刻的启示。她的研究说明，语言学者需要有扎实的文学功底才能对各种语篇作出深入的解析；同样，文学研究人员则需要有语言学的基础才能避免使自己的研究仅仅停留在观察表面现象的层面，才能避免只重复别人的观点，并做到尽可能深入到现象产生的原因和文学所表达的本质。

韩茹凯对中国怀有深厚的感情，一直对中国系统功能语言学的发展非常关心，曾给予多方面的指导。自 20 世纪 90 年代以来，她与韩礼德一起参加过在杭州、苏州、北京、上海、南昌等地的中国系统功能语言学和语篇分析会议，还应邀在清华大学、中山大学、北京师范大学、云南大学、西安外国语大学、北京科技大学作过学术报告，现在还担任中国香港城市大学“韩礼德中心”研究规划主任，对推动中国系统功能语言学的发展作出了贡献，在中国系统功能语言学学者中产生了很大的影响。

她不仅与中国系统功能语言学界有着深厚的渊源，她还是笔者的好朋友，是一位在笔者学术成长的道路上给过笔者多方面帮助和指导的学者。笔者第一次见到韩茹凯是在悉尼大学韩礼德的语言学课堂上，聆听她的一场精彩的学术报告。1984 年暑假，我们又受到韩礼德和她的邀请到他们家做客，受到他们的热情款待。她还亲自下厨，做了很多南亚风味的美食，至今令人回味。特别让我难忘的是 1995 年，她接受我代表清华大学的邀请，与韩礼德及其他两位国际著名学者到我校，在“功能语言学暑期研讨班”上作了三个星期的学术讲座，为我们培养了一批在当今中国系统功能语言学界颇有影响的学者。令我感动的是，由于我申

请不到经费，她和韩礼德自掏腰包购买了往返机票，才使这次学术活动能顺利进行。我还要感谢她于 1992 年部分资助笔者参加了她主持的 19 届国际系统功能语言学大会，并将笔者的论文 *On Theme and in Chinese: From Clause to Discourse* 收入由她和费里斯（Peter Fries）主编的 *On Subject and Theme: A Discourse Functional Perspective* 一书之中（1995, John Benjamins Publishing Company）。以后在多次的学术会议中她都对笔者的发言给予鼓励，并提出中肯的意见和建议。此外，她还积极支持笔者主持的第 36 届国际系统功能语言学大会以及在北京师范大学举行的会前系列报告会，并对我正在编辑的大会论文集提出了很多宝贵的建议。

韩茹凯嘱笔者写序，笔者深感荣幸但实不敢当。笔者把它当成一次宝贵的学习机会，使笔者有幸成为本书的第一个读者；通过仔细阅读，笔者受益匪浅。在此向她表示深深的谢意，同时对这本自选集在北京的出版表达诚挚的祝贺与推荐。

方琰
2011 年 3 月
清华园

Preface

It is a pleasure to introduce this selection of papers by a distinguished linguist whose published work has extended over the past forty years. Throughout this time, Ruqaiya Hasan has always maintained the essential continuity between theoretical and applied linguistics. She sees linguistics as theory that is in principle designed to be applied—because it is from its application that one gets to try out, to modify and to improve the efficacy of the theory. Hence ‘applied linguistics’ means using a theory of language to engage with problems of any kind where language is a critical factor. It is a way of thinking about language in all its various contexts of use.

In recent decades the term ‘applied linguistics’ has often been thought of as equivalent to language in educational contexts—or, even more narrowly, to the teaching of English as a second or foreign language. Professor Hasan has never adhered to this very limited view. Not that she excludes, or undervalues, the application of linguistics to educational problems and practices; far from it. But the linguist’s contribution, in her view, is to offer and to formulate an account of language that is theoretically powerful while at the same time capable of being adapted to the needs of the learner; and that means it must be accessible, and acceptable, to the teacher, since it is the teacher who mediates in, and gives structure to, the learning process.

The domain of applied linguistics, in Hasan’s work, includes both practical and research applications. The two volumes *Continuing Discourse on Language*, which she edited together with Christian Matthiessen and Jonathan Webster, illustrate the very broad range of activities where functional linguistics has been usefully applied; and in doing so they bring out the significance of her own contribution, since many of the papers in those two volumes have been written by her former students, those that she taught and supervised during the almost twenty years of her tenure at Macquarie University. These include discussions of teaching grammar in schools, of the linguistic study of literature, of linguistics and scientific method, of analyzing the contexts of language use, of models of discourse, of multimodal texts, and of language disorders and clinical linguistic

practice. All these topics are explored by different scholars who were once students of Ruqaiya Hasan.

In addressing topics such as these, both in training other scholars and in pursuing her own research, Hasan has had to address a variety of issues all of which will be seen reflected in the present volume. One of these issues is the importance of everyday talk, both in developing a child's mode of learning, in the home and subsequently in the school, and in establishing and maintaining interpersonal relationships at all ages and all levels in society. Another issue is the relation between text and context: between what is said, or written, and the verbal and material environment within which it is produced and interpreted. Understanding the nature of that relationship, in Hasan's view, is fundamental to the successful deployment of linguistic theory in almost all its domains of application. A third issue is that of the nature of text itself. The underlying system of language is manifested, or instantiated, in the form of text; but a text is not simply an array of interconnected sentences; it is characterized by the two features of structure and texture: structure in the sense of configurations of functional elements selected from the GSP ('Generalized Structure Potential') of the register in question, and texture in the sense of a semantic profile—an orientation towards a particular mode of meaning and the forms of expression from which the meanings are to be extracted.

For Hasan, the analysis of a text, or discourse analysis as it is now generally known, is not an application of linguistics; it is a necessary and indeed central component of 'doing linguistics', and as such it is likely to have a place in most of the activities that would be thought of as exemplars of applied linguistics. Perhaps the most obvious of these is the linguistic study of literature, traditionally known under the name 'stylistics'. Hasan likes to characterize literature by Mukařovský's term 'verbal art', and three of her studies in this field make up the final section of the present volume.

She brings to the study of verbal art a unique blend of literary and linguistic experiences. Her own intellectual formation began with the study of English literature in Pakistan, first as a postgraduate student and then as a university teacher, at different colleges of the University of the Punjab, Lahore. Moving to the U.K. she took up linguistics at the University of Edinburgh, where she did her Ph. D. in linguistic stylistics, undertaking a detailed text-based comparison of the work of two contemporary English prose writers, William Golding and Angus Wilson; and she has continued to

carry out studies of different writers in English poetry and prose. But at the same time she has always cherished the poetry of her own language, Urdu, and has recently been analyzing some of the work of an outstanding twentieth century poet Faiz Ahmed Faiz, of whom she is a great admirer. This background gives her a many-dimensioned approach to the study of verbal art: combining both literary and linguistic ways of thinking, about both mother tongue and second language literary texts, and with the awareness of both European (especially English) and Asian (especially Persian) criteria of evaluation and canons of criticism.

As a co-author of *Cohesion in English*, a study of what makes a text in English hang together, which was originally published in 1976 and is still maintained in print, Ruqaiya Hasan has always been very conscious of the role of cohesion—semantic relations above the sentence, construed in the various patterns of grammar and lexis—in contributing to the overall texture of the text. In using the categories of cohesion as a resource for discourse analysis in various fields of applied linguistics, she found that she needed to extend the scope of cohesion analysis so as to include the type of regularities in experiential meaning, especially (but not limited to) patterns of transitivity in the clause. She referred to this as ‘cohesive harmony’, and it has proved to be extremely valuable in bringing out the essential character of a text—the source of energy, so to speak, for its logogenetic progression.

Much of the impetus for this aspect of her work came from her close association with one of the outstanding sociologists of the twentieth century, Basil Bernstein. Bernstein was Professor of the Sociology of Education in the University of London, and in the 1960s he was conducting research into the nature and causes of educational failure, at a time when this could no longer be brushed aside as an inherent deficiency in some children’s aptitude for learning. Bernstein had identified language as a major contributory factor, showing that there was a certain section of the population where the modes of verbal interaction were such as to militate against successful learning in an educational context—in other words, they were not oriented towards the linguistic demands of the school. But not being a linguist, Bernstein lacked the specialized understanding of language to be able to formulate the theory in sufficiently explanatory terms. Hasan worked with Bernstein for several years, and was able to develop her own ideas about language—specifically about lexicogrammar and semantics—to the point where she could transform Bernstein’s insights into a testable hypothesis about a particular kind of

variation in language, that which Bernstein referred to as ‘code’ (explained in his terms as ‘socio-linguistic coding orientation’).

The central concept here is that of variation: a language as an inherently variable system. This has always been familiar to linguists (and everyone else) in the sense of dialect: dialectal variation is variation among different sublanguages which are typically mutually intelligible and share the same semantic system. The distinction between ‘different languages’ and ‘different dialects’ is blurred, and is often drawn on political and/or ideological grounds: thus Spanish and Portuguese are said to be different languages, while Pekingese and Cantonese, which are much further apart—more like Portuguese and French—are said to be different dialects (of the Chinese language). Work in Britain in the 1950s had led towards the recognition of another kind of linguistic variation, variation in ‘register’—that is, variation according to the functional context in which the language is being used. All the variations that speakers become aware of in level of formality, in the kind and degree of technicality, or in the relative social status and social distance among interactants, would constitute variation in register. Whereas with different dialects, the speakers were using their language to do essentially all the same things, with each different register the language was being used for doing something recognizably different.

The traditional definition of a dialect was of course regional: it was a variety of language that was spoken in a particular locality. But class societies—those with a clearly delineated social structure—also evolve social dialects, varieties spoken by different social classes. Bernstein’s concept of code was not a form of social dialect; but it was being widely misunderstood as if it was. Hasan recognized that the critical distinction between code and social dialect needed to be made clear if the notion of variation in language was to be of any value to educators, and other workers in applied linguistics; she saw that language had to be understood to be an inherently variable system, with variation built in as a central element in a general linguistic theory. Labov’s work in variation theory was coming into prominence at just this time, and provided sufficient underpinning for the conception of dialect as a socio-regional phenomenon in complex urban societies. But Labov failed to take account of coding orientation; in fact, he explicitly ruled it out, because he had no place for variation at the semantic level, being convinced that the patterns of meaning remained the same across all populations within a speech community. Hasan saw that they don’t.

Hasan had read widely in sociolinguistics, and also in theoretical aspects of sociology; she had found sources of insight in Whorf, in Malinowski, and most of all perhaps in Vygotsky. With this background, together with her own ongoing research in systemic functional linguistics, she was able to develop Bernstein's code into a major research tool, introducing the category of 'semantic variation' as the critical organizing concept. The principle behind semantic variation is this: different groups within a society may select different ways of meaning in what are otherwise identical contexts of situation. The 'groups' in question might be men versus women, or rural versus urban, or working class versus middle class, or younger folk versus older folk; they are speaking the same language, even the same dialect, but they deploy its semantic resources in different ways. In a major research project at Macquarie University in the 1980s, using statistical techniques of principal components analysis, Hasan found that there were highly significant differences in the semantic patterns favored by a population of Sydney mothers interacting with their three-and-a-half-year-old children: in some contexts the differences were between mothers of sons and mothers of daughters (that is, there was considerable variation between the ways mothers talked to boys and the way they talked to girls), and in other contexts the differences were between mothers from the working class and mothers from the middle class (with class status defined in terms of the kind of job held by the main breadwinner of the family). Following these children into their first year of schooling, she could already begin to see how these different habits of meaning in the home were reflected in the educational performance of their children: some children came prepared to meet the demands of learning in school; others did not.

The papers in this volume illustrate the many sides of Ruqaiya Hasan's interests and concerns with language. If there is one motif that runs throughout these chapters, it is this: that in linguistics, as in any other field of scientific study, successful application will always depend on combining accurate observation and description with a robust, task-oriented theory. In other words, there have to be some ideas, and some methods, available for being applied. But the movement of ideas goes both ways: the theory will continue to evolve with the insights deriving from its application—to problems of all kinds, both practical and theoretical, where the critical factor is whatever phenomenon it is that is under focus, which in the case of Hasan's work is language. This means language in any of its multiple aspects

and functions, but particularly language as the predominant mode of interaction among human beings as denizens of society. We are obsessively meaning-making creatures, and the task of the linguist, in any of the fields of application, is to explain how we do it—how we make meaning, collectively and individually, or, in one of Ruqaiya Hasan's favorite quotations from Firth, how we use language to live.

M. A. K. Halliday

Sydney

March, 2011

A Timeless Journey: On the Past and Future of Present Knowledge

Preamble

I have been asked to write an account of my intellectual life by way of introducing the chapters in this volume. On the face of it, this should have been easy: after all, having undertaken the work deliberately, even the most modest of us would admit to knowing its history better than that of any one else's work. It should, therefore, be simple to say why I chose the directions I did; and, with some effort, it might be possible to even distance myself enough from my work to speculate dispassionately on its impact either at the present moment or possibly some time in the future. But these things simply *appear* simple; the fact is that the history of human knowledge, no matter how humble, neither has a simple beginning nor a simple route to development: the humbler the knowledge, the truer this observation. Unless one is able to work from a reasonably detailed diary—and I was never a diarist—one is somewhat liable to seeing the remembered past with the eyes of present preoccupations, adjusting events with a view to positions that are favored here and now; and so far as the present is concerned, it seems to possess a protean quality—you can make of it what you will—which means that ideas about the future of present knowledge are likely to rest on somewhat shaky grounds. Faced with these realizations, only one possible solution presents itself to me, and that is: leaving the issue of any impact of my work aside, I should turn to the context of this volume searching for a starting point for what led me to work of the kind included here and continue the story from that point. This, most probably, will not prevent the present from coloring the events recounted in this 'autobiography', but at least it will avoid having to say anything about the usefulness of 'the deeds done' either now or in the future.

From this perspective, the most important element of that context is surely the use of linguistics in attempting to solve linguistic problems. This thought takes me to September 1960 when I first arrived in Edinburgh to do a

post-graduate diploma in Applied Linguistics. At that time I had only a vague idea of linguistics as something that might help in solving problems which concern doing something where language plays a central role. As a teacher of English language and literature in Pakistan I had naturally encountered some of these—which is why I was grateful to the British Council for enabling me to do some linguistics at Edinburgh. Two problems engaged me particularly at that time: one, how to teach English to non-native speakers so as to enable them to cope successfully with what we now call ‘curriculum genres’ following Christie (1987a, 1987b); and, secondly, how to conceptualize the ‘teaching of literature’ at the university level so as to enable the students to produce their own reasoned analysis of a literary work; this was essential if they were to free themselves from simply following renowned critics, whose unquestioned reputation for taste rendered their literary taste unquestionable. As it happened, to qualify for a Diploma in Applied Linguistics, I focused on the problem of teaching literature for my independent research: to me the learning of English as a second language was simply a politically imposed requirement—whereas literature had seemed more important—socially, morally, and pedagogically.

Challenging linguistics with literature

As an academic, this was the most important decision of my life. I had, of course, no inkling of the many aspects of language which I would have to explore from a state of considerable ignorance in pursuit of this problem, so at that stage, the complexities of the problem seemed not very complex. This was perhaps a stroke of luck, for, otherwise, I might have been intimidated from rushing in quite so readily. Plunging headlong into my chosen problem—how to teach literature to enable the learner to produce an independent reasoned ‘reading’ of some existing work in literature—opened unimagined vistas unchecked by preconceived ideas; it took me into multiple new domains of the study of language in its socio-cultural context. With a post-grad degree in English literature, I was familiar with how language was said to feature in literary criticism, and how the artistic milieu of the work of art and the artist’s own biography were relevant to the qualities of its formation. Some of the lecturers who taught us literature at University College Lahore in Pakistan were brilliant teachers: from Safdar Mir I had learned about the critical importance of ideology to the creation and