Some reflections on English as a 'semi-sacred' language

BARRY ASKER

Has the language in recent times been *more* than just imperial and capitalistic?

BY GENERAL consensus English has become, if not a global language, then at the very least a *lingua franca*. Some commentators on English in the world, like Robert Phillipson (*Linguistic Imperialism* (Oxford University Press, 1992), use the term that serves him as a title to imply that English is itself part of the problem of having just such a global language. The argument here however is that English – like Latin, Sanskrit, Classical Arabic and Examination Chinese – through its political ascendancy (as a result of various waves of colonial activity alongside its use for religious purposes), may have taken on the character of a 'semi-sacred' rather than simply an imperial and imperialist language.

Introduction

A *sacred language* is one that embodies religious (or religious-like) beliefs that elevate it to the status of 'truth giving'. In my use here of *semi-sacred*, I am thinking of 'colonial' languages like English and French that are given particular status in authority and (initially at least) have a restricted membership: an elite that comprises not only priestly colonizers or mandarin officials but also those among the co-opted or oppressed whose complicity makes the enterprise of domination possible. The idea of a *sacred* language (or *semi-sacred*, in my hedged version) is related to the fallacious but energetic idea of *exceptionalism* in a language, whereby it is held to have unique and unmediated qualities that, in effect, make it 'chosen'.[1]

Sacredness in a language implies that the people who use it, protect it and (sometimes but not always) export it, conceive of themselves as in some sense central in the world and their language as embodying fundamental religious, philosophical or cultural concepts that are beyond question. The correctness of their arguments is neither relative nor subject to the processes of change. Joining such a community implies also *adopting* a language (or religion) and decidedly *not* adapting your language (or religion) to it and creating a hybrid, even though this may well also happen over time. Thus, Sinicized Mongols and Manchus were accepted as Sons of Heaven by the Chinese insofar as they learned to speak Chinese and to draw Middle Kingdom ideograms, however imperfectly.

By the same token, it was the sacred language Latin that enabled an Englishman, Nicholas Brakespear, to become Pope Adrian IV in 1154 and 1159. Without Latin this would have been impossible.[2] Similarly, learning English (or some other colonial language) enabled selected colonized people around the world to participate (at a varying and uncertain level) in the life of the linguistic inner temple as well

BARRY ASKER is Professor of English Studies at Lingnan University in Hong Kong and for many years was the head of its English Department and director of the Language Institute. Previously, he taught English in Canada, Germany, Switzerland, Jordan and the United Kingdom. His academic interests bridge language and literature and he considers himself (unfashionably) an English Studies generalist. He has published books and articles in the inter-connected domains of literary criticism, language studies, and ELT (including materials writing). He also writes text for musical performance. Currently, he is completing a study of contemporary fiction entitled English as a Foreign Literature.

DOI: 10.1017/S0266078406001052
English Today 85, Vol. 22, No. 1 (January 2006). Printed in the United Kingdom © 2006 Cambridge University Press

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078406001052 Published online by Cambridge University Press

as of other colonial peripheries and so gain remote (but usually impotent) access to the inner streams of distant power. A language of the powerful has a connecting function between peoples at the peripheries at the same time as it exerts its central authority. The pull is in two directions simultaneously. Over time, as we witness today in world literature in English, the vitality and dynamism of a language can shift its centre of gravity, the former peripheries becoming an amalgam of disparate centres in a new and enlivened 'international empire' of English.[3]

The case of classical Arabic as a sacred language is illustrative, if extreme, in that, since it was the language in which the Koran was written, it was not translatable into any other language. In this case, the language and the deepest part of the culture, religion, were truly inseparable. As Benedict Anderson puts it, 'Allah's truth was accessible only through the unsubstitutable true signs of written Arabic' (p. 14). This makes the point that the words in a sacred language were not (as in the modern Western concept of linguistic signs) arbitrary, but directly attached to the world of truth, hence perhaps the depth of misunderstanding in the case of *The Satanic Verses*. Arabic then (to take the most clear-cut case) is, as it were, a 'truth-language'.[4]

The concept of a truth language seems to have fallen out of fashion since the advent of Structuralist thought. But for the cultural and literary critic Walter Benjamin, in the 1920s, it was still a topical and meaningful idea. In his essay 'The Task of the Translator' (*Illuminations*, New York: Schocken Books, 1969), he writes of the great motif of 'integrating many tongues into one true language' and says that this true language is the 'silent depository of the ultimate truth that all thought strives for' (p. 77). Later he talks about Holy Writ 'in which meaning has ceased to be the watershed for the flow of language and the flow of revelation'. He adds:

> Where a text is identical with truth or dogma… in all its literalness and without the mediation of meaning, this text is unconditionally translatable… [L]anguage and revelation are one without any tension' (p. 82).

Such a transcendent notion of language as truth, as an ideal goal of all languages and especially in the mediation between languages, seems almost shocking, as we have become used to ideas about language that abjure metaphysics and even poetry. But one wonders (hypothetically) if linguists like Ferdinand de Saussure and the huge following he created did not somehow miss an important beat in their conceptualizing of language as arbitrary, and whether Benjamin is not worth revisiting in this regard.

As already indicated, this is entirely alien to the linguistics and semiotics we know today, which assert that signs (words) are arbitrary and quite detached from the world that the signs represent. However, this structuralist position regarding the word and the world is controversial among philosophers. Peter Lamarque and Stein Haugom Olsen, for example, write about the current preference for the structure of 'narratology' (where narrative and sign are analogous) over an interest in 'reference': the ability of a linguistic sound and a concept to have a relation that allows language to relate directly to objects. In other words, the use (some would say *abuse*) of Saussure to deny the relation between word and world through a loose definition of what *arbitrary* means, especially in post-structuralist discourse, is contested and there may be a need at some point to rescue one sense of 'arbitrary' from another.

At the very least, we may want to question whether the 'sacred' relation between word and world as set down in key cultural texts is really the deniable thing some would claim. [See Lamarque & Olsen, *Truth, Fiction and Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994:230) and Ora Avni, *The Resistance of Reference*.

Yet the view that a language embodies and represents (or certain languages embody and represent) 'the truth' has far from died out, and there are vestiges everywhere we look. One such vestige is the residual notion that a particular language has a privileged place in the world: today English, tomorrow who knows. And it is in this sense that I speak here of English as 'a semi-sacred language' (tongue half in cheek) – or, to put it another way, as a *part-secularized* version of an earlier concept. Thus, the 'language of Shakespeare' is sometimes cited as demonstrating both the superiority of English and in some sense the reason the language has spread so inexorably and naturally throughout the world, a counterpart to the imperialist spreading of 'the skirts of light', to quote John Ruskin.

Similar arguments may be heard about the flexibility and adaptability of English (more so

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078406001052 Published online by Cambridge University Press

than other languages it is implied but rarely demonstrated) as being qualities that aid and abet its inexorable spread, as if there are detectable and discrete linguistic qualities in English that partake of semi-sacred inevitability and sanction. This kind of argument is a counterpart to the Social Darwinian idea that the British Empire was the mechanistic outcome of higher adaptation and evolution, the English language being seen as an example of Darwinism at work.

In addition to Shakespeare, the various Protestant translations of the Bible into English have exerted a huge influence not only on the development of the English language but also on the perception of its centrality as a language set apart – and semi-sacred. Today, there is no shortage of those who continue this line of thought and scream out the 'victory' of English in a triumphalist manner, especially journalistic authors whose books accompany a television series.[5]

Among 'serious' linguists and literary critics, however, there is an opposite trend to gloss over (or simply ignore) the aesthetic virtues of English as a language as if we are rather ashamed of both its proliferation in the world and its alleged complicity not only in reinforcing imperialism but also being an instrument in its creation.[6]

The claim among some cultural and discourse analysts is that colonialism and English language discourses are inseparable, and that English, far from being a passive instrument of communication and translation, is a co-conspirator in the imperial enterprise. In personifying English in this way, such critics tend to exaggerate the role of language generally in military and political affairs, and the effect is to shift the discussion about politics and economics towards a linguistic rather than a sociological or historical analysis.

This emphasis on discourse studies is part of the Structuralist and Poststructuralist movement in the 20th century, which foregrounds discourse as a non-referential playground and which denies history as historiography. It may be that discourse studies generally have run their course as the Structuralist momentum slows down under the weight of its overemphases and uncertain premises. As Clive Bloom writes: in the new critical dispensation '[l]anguage analysis and the analysis of discourse… began to function in the ruins of cultural and sociological science. Thus language replaced political intervention on all levels of human action. Instead what was left were games (Lyotard), narratives (Jameson) and simulations (Baudrillard) in the empire of signs, floating in Ferdinand de Saussure's binary divide' (in *Literature, Politics and Intellectual Crisis in Britain Today*, London: Palgrave, 2001:140–141).

There are strong grounds for celebrating the literature in English that has been written by those from formally colonized countries, acknowledging and valuing their work without resorting to linguistic triumphalism, false chauvinistic pride or a patronizing relegation of their work to the 'postcolonial ghetto' (cf. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's comment that 'postcolonial … is becoming a substantial subdisciplinary ghetto', in *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1999:1).

In this development we see English taking on a semi-sacred status. The early translation of the Bible into English by Tyndale was said to have established 'the consecrated dialect of English speech' and historians until quite recently waxed lyrical about the 'rhythmical beauty of his prose, skillful use of synonyms for freshness, variety, and point, and magical simplicity of phrase' (V. F. Storr, *The English Bible: Essays by various authors*, London, 1938:69). The King James Bible as the culminating version of Protestant translations came to be considered a literary text in itself and one that not only reflected but also helped create the 'divinely inspired' view of the English language and the English national character. Benson Bobrick, in *The Making of the English Bible* (Phoenix: London, 2001:2), describes the effects of the King James Authorized Version as follows:

> Only in England was the Bible in any sense a 'national possession', in that it seemed to exist apart in English as an original work of art. Englishmen looked to and cherished their Bible – as the ground and inspiration of their lives – *overseas*, even as it came to live in their own language with more abiding force than the greatest works to which their authors were giving birth. [emphasis added]

This pride in the grace and felicity of English has been complemented by the argument that one reason for this virtue in the protestant translations of the Old Testament is its closeness syntactically with the original Hebrew (the sacred language *par excellence* of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078406001052 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the Judeo-Christian world). Here is Bobrick, again:

> All the virtues of his [Tyndale's] New Testament translation were in evidence [in his Old Testament translation], even as he proved faithful to the force of Hebrew idiom, matching its common constructions to the forms of English speech. The syntactical rapport between the two tongues was clear: in word order (which was virtually the same, except that in Hebrew the verb normally precedes its subject, and the adjective follows the noun); and a propensity for the parallel phrase. The latter was especially true of Anglo-Saxon, enabling Tyndale to draw on traditions of native expression to give the Hebrew an English feel. His fidelity to the original also gave rise to the quintessential 'noun + of + noun' construction of English biblical prose … This imparted to English a certain rhythmic sonority it had not formerly possessed. Indeed, there was something in the pattern that completely captivated the English ear, and directed the language to a form of eloquence that became its paradigm. [7]

The unbounded self-confidence of Englishness that we see characterized in the reign of Elizabeth I and after, and which is reflected in a renewed faith in the aesthetico-religiously inspired nature of the English language, was carried over into the moment of trade and colonial expansion in the 16th and 17th centuries. English intellectuals like Richard Hakluyt, preacher, propagandist, and geographer, foresaw ('with a mix of imperial hubris and evangelical pride') that England would one day, as he put it, spread 'the incomparable treasure of the truth of the Gospel along with *English freedom and commerce to the farthest corners of the globe*'[8] [italics added]. The poet Michael Drayton was moved to write:

> A thousand kingdoms we shall seek from far …
> And those unchristened countries call our own
> Where scarce the name of England hath been known.[9]

The King James Version then, by its own merits and intrinsic excellence, replaced the earlier Latin Vulgate version of the Bible not only as a treasured religious artifact but also as a national, literary treasure which ran parallel with a surge of colonial energy that had its linguistic aspect. The historian S. L. Greenslade wrote that 'its victory was so complete that its text acquired a sanctity properly ascribable only to the unmediated voice of God; to multitudes of English-speaking Christians it has seemed little less than blasphemy to tamper with its words'.[10] Among many, the King James Version retains some of this prestige and sanctity up to the present day.

In the context of a people willing to impart exceptional qualities to a particular language for reasons connected to the expansion of trade and religious practice, we have noted that a sacred language requires a sacred text or texts and it is clear that the roots of believing English to be semi-sacred stems from the hugely important efforts of the Reformation translators of the Bible. Arabic has of course the Koran and where the Islamic religion has gone (invited or as colonizer) Arabic has followed as a consequence. This intense focus on language as truth is shared by other religions and much Jewish scholarship of the Hebrew in the Old Testament, for example, has been exegetical and linguistic, trying to understand the *original* language as a means of preserving its sacred qualities. Christianity, however, as Northrop Frye has pointed out, is a religion that from the beginning has been entirely 'dependent on translation' as a model for the transmission and dissemination of the word of God.[11]

The New Testament, as we have it in its oldest form, is in a Greek that was certainly not the language of its 'original' authors (let alone of Christ himself) and the history of the Bible in Europe has been one of constant translation and re-translating, culminating in the vernacular versions of the Reformation period and thereafter. It is these translations of the Bible that are important in the colonial period, reflecting as they did a superabundant confidence needed in exploring far-off and dangerous regions of the world. But the picture is not a simple one of linguistic imposition, an unholy alliance of belief in God and belief in English expansionism (economic and linguistic). We should recall that it was the missionary purpose not to get the peoples of the colonized world to read the King James Version, with the exception of those few who had access to British-style education, but to translate the King James and other versions into every spoken language in the world, as part of the Reformation zeal to democratize the word of God through multilingual translation.[12]

This consistent emphasis on translation into other languages of the key cultural text of the Western, Christian world suggests an approach

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078406001052 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to language that may be religiously but decidedly *not* linguistically hegemonic, despite the theoretical rhetoric of English as divinely inspired and as one supposed motivator for colonial energy. We might recall too that missionaries, as well as colonial administrators, placed high value on learning the language of the people they were either ruling or converting and that there is a tradition of language exchange in the colonial era as well as cultural domination through the English language.

This is not to say that English did not dominate politically, economically and militarily or that local languages were not learned in part as a help in maintaining control. It did dominate and control certainly as a function of military and economic power but domination is not the whole colonial story in the context of language just as language and 'discourse' are not (in my view) central to the main drivers of the colonial enterprise as such. Contemporary postmodern and postcolonial theory as exemplified in Michal Foucault, Edward Said and others, holds that the discourse of language (here English) always creates power and that the language of power is not just the handmaiden of imperialism but its progenitor. This argument remains for me an epistemological assumption, though it is often presented (wrongly I believe) as historical fact.

In European history it is Latin that took on the dual aspects of *lingua franca* and sacred language, and the Vulgate translation of the Bible stood for a thousand years as *the* Bible. But the dominance of Latin and its preferred Vulgate translation was doomed and its ascendance collapsed very rapidly as the Medieval world gave way to the Reformation, the rise of capitalism, and of the print media. The fall of Latin in a sense de-internationalized Europe for five hundred years, as languages became associated ever more directly with individual nation-states. This coincided with the moment of greater discovery and conquest by European colonizers and traders and the rise of self-confidence as evinced in the hyperbolic representation of the English language as something *ordained*.

As explorers ventured out into the world beyond European shores, they began to create word lists to enable communication (in effect translations in dictionary form) and from this developed the golden age of lexicography, grammar and philology. The rise of the colonizing, self-defined nation-state is associated directly, I would say, with the rise of competing national European languages, though of course there were other broad trends beyond colonialism that played a far larger part in the development of European philology.[13] In this process, the natural and organic links *between* languages became less privileged than those characteristics of a particular national language that supported notions of exclusion and division. In one sense, the later impetus of the British Empire to establish (directly and indirectly) a new Lingua Franca could be seen as a way to reinstate the idea of supra-nationality and linguistic convenience, though this was far from its central feature.

One consequence of the rise of European, academic philology (as an outcome of colonial expansion among other factors) was the study of comparative grammar, the classification of languages into families, and the creation of theoretical proto-languages that were presumed to have existed in some dim moment of pre-historical time. In other words, the study of language, as Hobsbawm notes was the first science 'which regarded evolution as its very core'.[14] All and any language now became the subject and object of legitimate study and their modern descendents (such as French, English, Spanish, Portugese and German) competed directly with the ancient sacred languages on an equal footing. No language, it seems, was the language of God as of right – this status had to be fought for and won through colonial competition. Whether or not it is true (or even arguable) that the modern nation state was, in the words of Benedict Anderson, 'conceived in language, not blood', it is certainly true that anyone can be invited into any linguistic community and change their national status as they can their linguistic.[15]

One domain where we see very clearly the legacy of English as a language that has adopted those that have adapted it is in contemporary literature. The dominance of non-native English-speaking literature today is striking with Salman Rushdie's *Midnight's Children* voted the strongest 'British' novel in a quarter of a century. The act of learning English (combined with the demographic fact that for every native speaker of English there are now three non-native speakers) has created a variety of 'literary nationhood' that is transnational and multilingual – with the English language as the linking but fast-evolving thread.[16] Rushdie writes that English is 'no longer an

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078406001052 Published online by Cambridge University Press

English language, now grows from many roots; and those whom it once colonized are carving out large territories within the language for themselves'.[17] Chinua Achebe writes that English is able to carry the weight of his African experience 'but it will have to be a new English, still in full communion with its ancestral home but altered to suit its new African surroundings'.[18] Han Suyin argues that English is 'the international vehicle, most effective in accomplishing the task to which every writer is dedicated, i.e., in rendering the unfamiliar and the unknown accessible to all, removing the barriers of ignorance, interpreting for a world audience the wealth of our own cultures, our modes of feeling and thought'.[19]

Similar sentiments can be listed *ad infinitum* from numerous writers for whom English is an adopted language, retaining its special qualities of expressiveness and portability but devoid of limiting, nationalistic chauvinism. They stress the value and potential of English as a literary language (divorced from yesterday's arguments of colonial wrongs and language imposition) but one that is being nativized and hence modified. Rushdie talks about the 'transnational, cross-lingual process of pollination' and being an 'international writer', and describes his work and that of others as 'translated writing', which picks up the point that the dominant mode of spreading the word of the Christian faith has been through translation.

In this literary space, one prominent legacy of English as a geo-political, semi-sacred language is the acceptance that literary expressiveness and human creativity may find an outlet beyond the politics of international hegemony and local contestation. National and linguistic boundaries are there to be negotiated away, not in a process of manipulation that privileges one language over another in the changing power structures that competing nations have created in the past and will continue to create in the future, but as part of a trans-national realm of writers and readers writing a 'global fiction'.[20]

The nature and history of the English language (as the language *du jour*) has proven protean in creating imagined and shared cultural realities that extend beyond and above ideas of a bounded state or nation or ethnic group. A cursory glance at those who now write creatively in English around the globe is sufficient evidence of this. Indeed the concept of a shared linguistic culture predates political boundary-making (nation-states specifically) just as it will post-date it. In this sense, though the status of English as 'semi-sacred' may be accepted only ironically and metaphorically, there can be no doubt that today English exists as a creative force that extends well beyond its original borders and keeps within itself the glowing fire of evolving and fierce energy. Indeed, it may be said that the creative literature produced by those for whom it is 'foreign' redeems the English language for all of us in our time.[21] ■

Notes

1 David Crystal in *The Stories of English* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 2004:57) reminds us of the prevailing and mischievous idea that a language can be pure, that its sounds, words and structures 'can be traced back continuously to a single point of origin'. He argues that 'no language has been found which displays lexical purity'. In other words, all languages are hybrid and evolved.

2 For further exploration of the concept of a sacred language see Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities* (London: Verso, 1991:14–19. I am grateful to this author for his insights into this conception and for his analysis of the true and false relationships between languages and nation-states.

3 Pico Iyer calls this international empire 'a hundred cultures divided by a common language'. See his *The Global Soul* (London: Bloomsbury, 2000:31 for this and other insights into the current condition of global migrancy.

4 Salman Rushdie, 1983

5 A good example of this is Melvyn Bragg's *The Adventure of English* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 2003).

6 Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1990), chapter 2, for an account of the misrepresentation of Saussure by structuralists.

7 Bobrick, p.116. See also Hammond, G. *The Making of the English Bible*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1982), p. 50; and his 'William Tyndale's Pentateuch: Its Relation to Luther's German Bible and the Hebrew Original', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 33 (1980), 351–85. Bobrick relies heavily on Hammond's analysis of the comparative grammar and syntax of English and Hebrew. Notable is the effort to align English as essentially Anglo-Saxon with Hebrew, perpetuating a long-standing bias in favour of Anglo-Saxon words as somehow more original or authentic than Latin-based words in modern English. See Crystal, pp. 57–58.

8 Quoted in Bobrick, p. 199.

9 Michael Drayton, 'England's Heroical Epistles' (1597) in J. William Hebel (ed.), *The Works of*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078406001052 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Michael Drayton, 5 Vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1931–41), Vol. II, p. 170, lines 75–82. The reader interested in these early examples of English imperial ambitions (fuelled in this case by the competition with Spain) might also care to read Drayton's much better poem 'To the Virginian Voyage' (in Hebel, II, p. 363, lines 21, 24, 41–2, 1–8). On Drayton's direct use of Hakluyt's *Principal Navigations* see Gerhard Friedrich, 'The Genesis of Michael Drayton's Ode "To the Virginian Voyage"', *Modern Language Notes*, 72 (1957), pp. 401–6. Hakluyt seems to have been confused about the mineral wealth, as well as the weather, in Virginia and his errors are repeated in the Drayton verses.

10 S.L. Greenslade, *The Cambridge History of the Bible* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), p. 168.

11 Northrop Frye, *The Great Code: The Bible and Literature* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Johanovich, 1981), p. 3.

12 Erasmus, a key voice in Reformation thought, wrote: 'I totally dissent from those who are unwilling that the sacred Scriptures, translated into the vulgar tongue, should be read by private individuals, as if Christ had taught such subtle doctrines that they can with difficulty be understood by a very few theologians, or as if the strength of the Christian religion lay in men's ignorance of it … And I wish they were translated into all languages of all people, that they might be read and known, not merely by the Scotch and the Irish, but even by the Turks and the Saracens. I wish that the husbandman may sing parts of them at his plough, that the weaver may warble them at his shuttle, that the traveler may with their narratives beguile the weariness of the way' (quoted in Bobrick, p. 108). It was this spirit that inspired the majority of protestant Christian missionaries in colonized countries around the world, rather than a particular wish to do the impossible, namely to get learners of English in great numbers to understand the Elizabethan English of the King James Version.

13 See for example Anna Murpurgo Davies, *Nineteenth Century Linguistics* (London: Longman, 1998), Chapter 1: Historiography and Institutions.

14 Eric Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution, 1789–1848* (New York: Mentor, 1964), p. 337.

15 Anderson's claim that the nation-state was 'conceived in language, not blood' may be just a very bad metaphor as it is hard to see how this phrase could be meaningful, though it sounds well. The roots of the development of the concept of the nation-state are surely very complex and involved armed conflict and the shedding of a great deal of blood. A particular state may well have consecrated itself in one chosen language (perhaps after suppressing many others within its national borders), but to imply that it was language *per se* that caused ('conceived') the nation-state seems absurd and is another example of the exaggerated role given to language in political and military history.

16 David Crystal refers to a 'brave new linguistic world' in which literary discourses 'on a global scale' and 'characterized by a fresh regional linguistic diversity' are a common feature of creative literature in English in the latter part of the previous century and in this: *The Stories of English* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 2004), p. 533.

17 'The Empire Writes Back with a Vengeance', *The Times*, 3 Jul 82, p. 8. Also quoted in Timothy Brennan, *Salman Rushdie and the Third World* (London: Macmillan, 1989:6).

18 Chinua Achebe, 'English and the African Writer', *Transition* 4 (1965:27–30).

19 Han Suyin, 'Plenary Lecture', in Mimi Chan & Roy Harris, eds, *Asian Voices in English* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 1991:20).

20 Paul Jay writes: 'Global fiction suggests a critical or generic category designed to supersede the category of national fiction. Like globalization itself, the concept of global fiction threatens not only the originary and regulating power of the nation-state, but the forms of national categorization we've used to regulate and control literary production and its study' <http://home.comcast.net /~jay.paul/ fiction.htm>. Though this concept of global fiction is beset with difficulties, as Jay acknowledges, there is something productive in thinking about contemporary new fiction as (at the least) not narrowly national in character.

21 I choose to retain the word 'foreign' even though (according to Pico Iyer) global news organizations like CNN ban its use on air. Whereas in the past, right-thinking people may have objected to the word 'foreign' as it implied being marginal and secondary (a word that excludes and reduces), today it is equally disliked by global companies that see a strong marketing purpose in promoting world consumer 'unity'. Globalizing multinationals have become good postmodernists it seems. But for many writers, among others, the hard experience of migrancy still makes the term 'foreign' meaningful. 'Foreigner' is a word I cheerfully and positively apply to myself in my (soft and privileged) peregrinations in the world. For many people today, the most certain conception of 'home' is linked to being a foreigner.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078406001052 Published online by Cambridge University Press