

Juniper Ellis
Loyola College

Justice Matters in a University

Justice is one of the foundations of John Henry Newman's *The Idea of a University* (1852). His university stands for an ideal both legal and moral, for a social and ethical justice that sometimes means fulfilling and sometimes means transforming human laws and practices. The university Newman helps create with his series of talks offers a powerful means of achieving justice in a mid-nineteenth-century Ireland that is essentially a colony of the British Empire. Irish Catholics, Newman declares, have been "[r]obbed, oppressed, and thrust aside" (7). The university education he envisions will help reverse this injustice.

Specifically, his university will prepare Irish students to take their rightful place in the world. The university gives to its students the advantages of "the culture of the intellect," Newman continues, "Catholics in these islands have not been in a condition for centuries to attempt the sort of education which is necessary for the man of the world, the statesman, the landholder, or the opulent gentleman. Their legitimate stations, duties, employments, have been taken from them, and the qualifications withal, social and intellectual, which are necessary both for reversing the forfeiture and for availing themselves of the reversal. The time is come when this moral disability must be removed" (7). In other words, a university education gives its graduates the qualifications necessary to claim their legitimate station and do their legitimate work. Education is of course often viewed as a way to improve social standing, but Newman goes further: education can help de-colonize Ireland, restoring the land and culture that

have been robbed, allowing people to take on the mantle of leadership and claim a central place.

Justice matters in Newman's university. In three central ways justice shapes the university: 1) who the university's students are, and what they become; 2) what subjects the university offers, and how faculty teach these subjects; and 3) how the university works as an institution and therefore affects its own and surrounding communities. (These same categories--students, faculty, and university as institution--form the heart of Peter Hans Kolvenbach's 2000 address on justice in Jesuit higher education.¹) In each of these areas the university Newman presents is inclusive and expansive.

First let us consider what Newman says about students. He notes that the word university is "derived from the invitation which is held out by a University to students of every kind" (26). The university invites and welcomes students "of every kind," that is, both students who want to study all possible university subjects and students who come from and are looking for a variety of communities.

And these students become a powerful force in society. The university's graduates will help shape the world: "[W]hy do we educate," Newman asks rhetorically, "except to prepare for the world?" (160). People at universities understand that "There is a duty we owe to human society...the formation of the citizen" (119). Education forms citizens, prepares students for the world, and allows graduates to influence all areas of social life: "a cultivated intellect, because it is a good in itself, brings with it a power and a grace to every work and occupation which it undertakes, and enables us to be more useful, and to a greater number" (119). The good that is knowledge brings a further good

by preparing the educated citizen to act with power and grace in professional and civic life. Education is good in and of itself, and also does powerful good in the world.

Second, admitting students of all kinds who will influence every work and social community they join, leads naturally to seeking professors of all kinds of knowledge and background. It is therefore not surprising that in discussing the ideal array of students Newman declares, "[A]s to the range of university teaching, certainly the very name of university is inconsistent with restrictions of any kind" (25). Again he suggests that universal and university derive from the same word (he doesn't cite the word, but assumes that his audience is familiar with the Latin term *universum*, a term also important to the traditions of Jesuit universities). Throughout his lectures, Newman continues to proclaim, "[I]t is a great point then to enlarge the range of studies which a University professes" (77). The university provides a "range" of teaching and studies, enlarging its field of offerings as the field of knowledge expands.

More, the way professors teach this range of studies is crucial. Faculty help form the university's very identity. They offer "a living teaching...a *genius loci*" (106) that becomes embodied by the youthful communities of students. Teaching lives. Learning moves beyond the walls of the classroom to form the very spirit of the place. When he discusses poetry, Newman calls for teachers to "prevent a merely passive reception of images and ideas" (9). This point Newman repeats and generalizes (106): all teachers and all students should work to create active, lively learning. A university's culture and spirit are formed by vigorous colloquies and exchanges, formed when the entire campus community participates in judicious thought and action.

And finally, universities work as institutions by bringing together these groups of students and faculty, giving them a place to form a community where learning takes place always. Even daily life and daily conversations promote learning: "the conversation of all is a series of lectures to each, and they gain for themselves new ideas and views, fresh matter of thought, and distinct principles for judging and acting, day by day" (106). The same might be said for faculty, who continue learning from one another and as they teach, in ongoing dialogues.

Universities put these learning and teaching communities into place and then work to promote ideal relationships between them. "In truth," Newman proclaims, "[the university] professes to assign to each study, which it receives, its own proper place and just boundaries; to define the rights, to establish the mutual relations, and to effect the intercommunion of one and all" (219). In this way, the university encourages humility within single departments and respect for other disciplines, advancing the common good of knowledge. Universities thus promote well-ordered and potentially transformative learning and life. Needless to say, in addition to creating "good members of society" (125), this kind of education can create citizens who work to further the good of society. In its students, its faculty, and its place within a larger community,² the university has a potentially profound influence for justice.

So strong is Newman's model of a university that it continues to be influential. Especially his valuing of knowledge for its own sake, even prior to the good knowledge does, remains significant. His model is built on the grounds that knowledge is good and does good beyond price. Like any excellent model, Newman's presents a solid

foundation and secure traditions, as well as the flexibility to add new buildings and new departments to the university as needed. His university is larger than some of his language, which can appear narrow. For instance, he addresses his audience exclusively as "gentlemen," even though women also listened to his lectures. He says nothing to or about women, who are not to be part of this university. He assumes that people attending university will be part of a high social class--those who will be properly gentlemen, large landowners, and statesmen.

Perhaps most interesting, he suggests that the university will teach what he identifies as a single representative civilization: "Looking then, at the countries which surround the Mediterranean Sea as a whole, I see them to be, from time immemorial, the seat of an association of intellect and mind, such as to deserve to be called the Intellect and the Mind of Human Kind" (168). "This civilization," he declares, "together with the society which is its creation and its home, is so distinctive and luminous in its character, so imperial in its extent, so imposing in its duration, and so utterly without rival upon the face of the earth, that the association may fitly assume to itself the title of 'Human Society,' and its civilization the abstract term 'Civilization'" (167). As to those people who live outside this geographical and cultural halo, "they are outlying portions and nothing else, fragmentary, unsociable, solitary, and unmeaning" (167). And that apparently includes the U.S. Contemplating the future of literature and civilization, he concludes, "I can prophesy nothing of America" (198).

Overlooking or dismissing non-European civilizations is of course integral to the thinking that supported imperialism. Newman, an Englishman speaking about a just university in Ireland, used the language of imperialism rather than nationalism. (The two

concepts and political realities are of course defined in relation to one another.) Today the term imperialism usually has connotations more negative than neutral. "Imperialism after all," declares contemporary writer Edward Said, "is an act of geographical violence through which virtually every space in the world is explored, charted, and finally brought under control" (225).³ For Newman imperialism has positive connotations, as in the above statement, which lauds the single civilization that is "so imperial in its extent." Newman praises "the philosophy of an imperial intellect, for such I am considering a University to be" (221). And the university itself claims an empire of knowledge: "What an empire is in political history, such is a University in the sphere of philosophy and research" (220).

Newman's model of a university exceeds the limitations that his language here imposes. His praise of imperialism makes more sense when we understand that he wants to enlist the strengths of imperialism in the cause of justice. Think back to the reasons Newman gave for founding a university in Dublin. The university would allow Irish Catholics to reclaim what had been robbed from them, to rise up from oppression, to regain the central place in their islands after hundreds of years. Remember the ways that students, faculty, and the university work for good. He declares, "Universities and scholastic establishments...have made England what it is,--able to subdue the earth, able to domineer over Catholics" (105). In turn, university education will allow people around the world to resist being subdued or domineered.

The larger context of his talks clarify that he means to adapt the techniques of imperialism and transform them. And that helps us understand why Newman and his ideas have been cited by people creating universities in places from Gaborone, Botswana

to Suva, Fiji. Why, when large numbers of Catholics started entering university studies in the late-nineteenth-century U.S. students, beginning at the University of Pennsylvania, founded so many Newman clubs across the country. And why scholars credit Newman with helping formulate principles that became formally articulated by Vatican II in the early 1960s. In his writings, Newman emphasized that when two individuals or groups came into contact, change occurred in two directions. He converted to Catholicism at age 44, and insisted later "that the Church must be prepared for converts, as well as converts prepared for the Church" (*Autobiographical Writings* 258). By extension, when two civilizations come into contact, both are transformed. A conventional approach might suggest that the apparently powerful force acts in one direction upon the apparently powerless force. But as Newman's statement and as situations around the world attest, Christianity is changed too, when people convert. Capitalism and monetary economies are changed by coming into contact with gift or barter economies. English is changed by all of the nations who speak it around the world. There's ample room for studying those mutual changes within Newman's idea of the university.

It is a good thing that Newman's model allows new ideas and new fields of knowledge to build upon the already strong traditions of reason and inquiry. As an English literature teacher, I am part of a field that did not exist in Newman's time. Students read Homer in Greek and Horace in Latin, but they didn't read any writers in English, not even Shakespeare or Milton, and they certainly did not read any Irish writers. The curriculum in Newman's time included a bit of theology, a rich offering of classical Greek and Latin literature, and scientists like Francis Bacon or Isaac Newton. Not much direct teaching occurred either; classes typically relied upon having students

recite facts or reel off translations. There was no set beginning of the academic year; first-year students joined at any of three different times in the course of the year, which meant either that the class would have to begin again, making some students repeat the same material three times, or that the class would consist of students at very different levels. A student might speak with a professor only three times a year--or fewer. When Newman, a young professor at Oxford, suggested that professors should actively teach students, he was prohibited from teaching anything at all.⁴ When Newman, many years later, gave his talks about a university, he established a strong model that was expansive enough to accommodate all of us who wouldn't have been there at the specific university he founded. There is a strength and flexibility in Newman's university, in Newman's ideas, that transcend a single time, place, or civilization.

Now that we have scrutinized the foundations of Newman's university, let us take a closer look at the way justice matters in both the university as a whole and in particular departments, focusing here on English literature. A relatively new arrival to the university, English literature was incorporated into the curriculum in the late 19th century; American universities began systematically teaching American literature in the 1920s; and literature in English from nations including Nigeria, India, Trinidad, and Papua New Guinea featured in university courses beginning in the 1960s. These literatures present striking stories and lyrics and new aesthetic forms that evoke the ethical relationship between self and other, the variety of our individual, collective, and religious responsibilities, the recognition that "obligation is what makes us human" (Korsgaard 5). In other words, the question of justice features in the study of all of these literatures, as it

has done beginning with the first literatures of people everywhere, from Africa to classical Greece and the Americas and beyond. Literature treats justice evocatively, not programmatically: rather than offering a check-list of answers, writers and storytellers create vivid, living questions.

Literature has a way of getting under your skin, haunting you, and even shaping the way you speak and think. You might expect a literature teacher to say such a thing, but Newman too suggests that literature moves off of the written page and into people's lives. (The same thing goes for oral literatures, which move beyond the circle of the storyteller and listeners, and into the life of the community.) Great writers, Newman says, are "the creators of their language" (188).⁵

Even if you never read any of these great writers, (though of course you should), you speak them all the time. Their words and phrases inhabit our language. Shakespeare contributed more words to the English language than any other writer. Words from "advertisement" to "zany" first appeared in his plays. When you find the naked truth behind the smooth talk and say, "Let's shake hands on it," that's Shakespeare. When you are tongue-tied or wear your heart upon your sleeve, when you find cold comfort and cannot obtain what is meat and drink to you, when you make a virtue of necessity and prove yourself a tower of strength even though you have not slept one wink, that's Shakespeare. When you are fancy free, and laugh yourself into stitches in the twinkling of an eye without rhyme nor reason--even if it's Greek to me--that's Shakespeare. That is the long and short of it. That's Shakespeare.⁶ And it didn't stop with Shakespeare. From the gilded age to the jazz age and into the information age, we can thank writers for naming each era. In today's global village writers continue to create our language.⁷

As we shall see, writers and storytellers use language to present questions of justice; and language itself can be a question of justice. The powerful presence of the English language in today's world is a matter of hot debate among linguistics scholars. English is deemed the leading language in the world: more than two thirds of all science writing worldwide is in English; three fourths of all mail in the world is in English; eighty percent of all information stored electronically is in English. These facts, documented in the *Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*, raise a question for scholars who study language. Is English serving as a powerful force to unite people in a democratic way, so that people around the world can share ideas and information? or is English a language of imperialism that people learn not freely but because they must in order to survive?

Prominent linguists line up on both sides of the issue, arguing either that English is liberating or English is imprisoning. One of the most articulate scholars to celebrate the spread of English is David Crystal, perhaps the most well-known linguist in the world and the author of several bestsellers on this question. In *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language* (1995) and *English as a Global Language* (1997), Crystal announces, English is a “world language,” a “global language,” a “natural choice for progress.” Presenting a very different view, Robert Phillipson is a leading scholar who suggests that English threatens other languages. Phillipson cautions against “linguistic imperialism” and denounces the “globalization of English” that helps create “catastrophic ecological and cultural effects” (*Linguistic Imperialism* [1992], Rev. of *English as a Global Language* [1999] 265). What is most surprising about the debate these two scholars represent is that neither side examines the way people around the world use

English. Neither proponents nor opponents of global English take into account the people who must, according to these models, surf or drown in the rising tide of English.

To take one important example, a short story by Papua New Guinean writer John Kasaipwalova suggests that English is not dominant in the ways that scholars of global English claim. "Betel Nut is Bad Magic for Airplanes" (1972) portrays three university students who chew betel nut while they meet arriving friends at the airport and endure the wait for luggage, only to be told by colonial authorities that chewing betel nut is against the law. Since no such law exists, the students must defend their rights, wielding the same weapons as the colonial representatives, namely language. Kasaipwalova presents the serious battle over language in a mock-heroic, comic style. The story portrays a vibrant linguistic medley, using all three official national languages of Papua New Guinea: English, and the two creole languages Tok Pisin and Hiri Motu. The story presents new linguistic forms and new models of global English, suggesting that English does not stamp out but is itself stamped by other languages.

Papua New Guinea, located in the South Pacific just north of Australia, is home to more than 800 languages. Geographically the nation consists of the eastern half of the large island Papua New Guinea (the western half of this island is Irian Jaya, an Indonesian territory) and many surrounding smaller islands. The nation's many languages developed in the 10,000 years since people settled the island. The country, formerly divided with the northern half claimed by Germany and the southern by England, after World War I became a United Nations Trust Territory administered by Australia, and in 1973 gained political independence.⁸ Writing on the eve of national independence, Kasaipwalova helped catalyze the nascent identity of his nation; he has

been active in politics and is now chief of his people on Trobriand Island, a geographically small and culturally large part of the country.

"Betel Nut is Bad Magic for Airplanes" emphasizes differing forms of linguistic power. In this story, language is not an abstract, formal system but a practice performed in changing places of struggle and contest. The story's opening sentence introduces Kasaipwalova's rich language: "One Saturday afternoon in May 22 this year some of we university students went to meet our people at Jacksons Airport in Seven Mile" (613). The narrative voice creates a sense of immediacy, with its direct colloquial address and open assurance that the events unfold in the recent past, "this year." Continuing in Niugini English, the unnamed narrator tells a story that is from an expanded first-person perspective, one that conveys a collective story. The pronoun "we" shapes the unfolding events: "We was standing about thirty of we, waiting to catch our things. We was chewing plenty buwa like civilized people. We was not spitting or making rubbish. Only feeling very good from the betel nuts our people had bringed to Moresby" (614).

In the above-cited passage, Kasaipwalova introduces the significance of language to the people and situation of Niugini. He uses no italics to set any of his languages off from any other. He contextually translates the Motu term *buwa* into the more familiar *betel nut*, but does not explain that betel nut is the nut from a palm tree, chewed with betel leaf and lime for its mild stimulant effects. (In fact, about ten percent of the world's population chew betel nut. Those numbers are concentrated largely in South Asia and the Pacific.) "We was chewing plenty buwa like civilized people," his narrator declares in an uncomplicated phrase that performs a good deal of cultural and linguistic work. Chewing betel nut is a cultured and social act that draws the community together. Readers from

outside Niugini are invited to celebrate Niugini practices, to witness the community formed by sharing betel nut. They learn the Motu word for betel nut, and may in turn have to undertake the responsibility of educating themselves about what exactly is betel nut--the thing that “civilized people” chew. The sentence presumes--and helps ensure--that readers will be flexible with languages and civilizations.

The reader remains aligned with the university students, especially as the civility of their practice is broken by a security guard. “Then for nothing somebody in brown uniform with cap like pilot, and wearing boots like dimdim and black belt,” the narrator relates, “he comes up to one our people and he gives some Motu and English. That one our people didn't understood. So soon that uniform man was redding his eyes and rubbing his teeths just like white man's puppy dog. Maybe something like five minutes died but still he talk” (614). The “uniform man” declares in his clothing and his words his commitment to please the “dimdim” whose boots he copies. (*Dimdim*, or *white man*, remains a phrase that Kasaipwalova does not in any way translate.) The man forbids the students’ betel nut to protect “plenty plenty white people inside the terminal”⁹ from seeing “kanaka natives” (614).¹⁰ (*Kanaka*, another untranslated word, means *native*, and here carries a sense of “uneducated” or “un-Europeanized” natives.)

As the students, the administration, and the tourists intersect at the airport, language becomes a battle. The students carry off a multilingual triumph:

Straightaway my face blooded because many black, white and yellow people, they was watching us too and this white papa dog, he was talking bad like that way to me. Plenty time I hear white people calling black men "bois" so this time I hear it and my mind was already fire. I wanted to

give him some. Maybe good English or maybe little bit Strine [Australian English]. So I says loudly to him, "All right white man, on what moral grounds is it unlawful for me to chew betel nut here? This is a free country of which we black people are citizens and unless you can show me the moral basis for your 'so called laws' I cannot recognize and therefore comply to that law!"

Well he was very very angry now because one black man answering him in very good English. Maybe he didn't understand what I say.

"Listen boy, don't be smart. You are breaking the law and the law is laid down by the lawful government in the book" (615).

The narrator “gives” languages to the Australian man in a manner that demonstrates the students’ superior grasp of the white man’s native language.¹¹ More, Kasaipwalova’s use of the word “gives” provides a literal English translation of the Tok Pisin verb that is central to the story. *Bekim* means *to give back, answer, avenge*, indicating that the narrator and the story *answer back* or *talk back*.

Tok Pisin, one of the official languages of Niugini, shapes the syntax of English. Kasaipwalova depicts the prominence of Tok Pisin, a feature of PNG life well-documented by linguists. The story is set in the remaining days of the Australian colonial administration, a time when English should have been at its strongest. Yet in 1973, the year of political independence, and the year after Kasaipwalova's story was written, 95% of parliamentary business was conducted in Tok Pisin, which is itself a written language (Noel 78). Tok Pisin continues to predominate in government-sponsored radio

broadcasts and printed media as well as recreational broadcasts and printed materials (Mühlhäusler "Code Switching"169). And people use Tok Pisin to talk and write about everything from internal combustion engines and information technology to the laws of the country and the hymns and gospels of the church (Laycock 180-81). Accordingly, Kasaipwalova portrays Tok Pisin as the primary, or native language. He bends the narrator's colloquial English, the foreign language, to the structures of Tok Pisin.

To take two parts of speech as examples, Tok Pisin shapes the pronouns and the verb forms of the narrator's colloquial English. The first person collective pronoun, as observed above, is especially important to the story. The word *we* not only appears with great frequency, it also exhibits grammatical principles of Tok Pisin.¹² For one thing, Tok Pisin uses the same word, *mipela*, for *we* and *us*. Kasaipwalova's colloquial English follows the grammar and syntax of Tok Pisin. For another thing, Kasaipwalova's English is shaped by Tok Pisin semantics. There are two forms of *we* in Tok Pisin, one form that is inclusive and one form that is exclusive.¹³ Kasaipwalova's English reaches toward Tok Pisin's differentiated collective pronouns. Verbs in Tok Pisin do not change form to indicate person or number, nor do they change to provide a temporal marker.¹⁴ Kasaipwalova's English verb forms repeatedly follow this Tok Pisin structure.¹⁵ Lexical traces of Tok Pisin occur throughout the story in words, phrases, and collocations.

The students continue using language to deflate higher and higher echelons of the administration's authority, besting first the Australian boss and then the police reinforcements he summons. The white head of airport security fails to provide a moral basis for the law, as the student demands, and cannot even cite any particular ordinance which the students are violating. He invents a charge of obscenity to level against the

students, but "the police sergeant and his boys didn't know what means 'obscene language'" (618). The police search unsuccessfully for a dictionary, as Kasaipwalova uses comedy to convey serious insights into the workings of power, language, and law. The university students demand that the police drive them back to join their people, the newly arrived group now waiting for them at the university. The closing words exult, "[W]e was chewing our betel nut on the way" (619).

Kasaipwalova's story portrays the continuing existence of PNG languages alongside foreign ones. The narrator conveys no conflict between being a university student fluent in English and the "[o]nly one thing I wanted to be--a true kanaka" (616). English does not replace Motu or any of the other 800-plus languages. The story neither romanticizes native languages nor portrays English as rapacious. Instead, the story shows characters using English, retaining multilingual fluency, and wielding words with both humor and power (a combination unusual in most literatures of decolonization).

Kasaipwalova's work encourages new ways of thinking about language and literature. It is not necessary either to celebrate the increase of English as an assumed and unequivocal good or to pronounce English a deadly virus. Learning English at school is not necessarily a free choice made because "the world knows what it wants" (Hindmarsh qtd. in Pennycook 8) but neither is it necessarily a "conspiracy" (Oladejo 615) by the U.S. and Britain to secure unequal power by promoting the teaching and speaking of English.¹⁶ Between these utopist and dystopic linguistic studies, there is the working reality of people around the world who use English as they see fit. Achieving a triumph in English does not diminish Niugini languages.

In the story, the students use their university education to work against a colonial administration that would rob, oppress, and thrust aside the people of the land. In other words, more than one hundred years after Newman challenged people in Dublin to consider a new model of the university, Kasaipwalova represents this model and extends it by placing Newman's one civilization among the many that make up this world. Just as Newman's model is strong and flexible, languages co-exist and represent both tradition and innovation in the mouths of speakers around the world.

Writers continue to create new ways of speaking and thinking. Newman himself did so. His own works contradict his gloomy assessment that all of the good works in English had been written long before he lived (198). It takes a fine writer to proclaim that there will be no more classics written in English, even as he himself writes some of those classics. Newman declared, "[W]e have well nigh seen the end of English Classics" (198), but literary scholars judge his autobiography, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua* (1864) a classic of the Victorian era. And the great Irish writer James Joyce declared that Newman was "the greatest nineteenth-century master of English prose" (Gilbert 30).¹⁷

Newman's own works embody his call that literature is the "Autobiography of Mankind." His vivid praise of literature rises to a fine example of his virtuoso style: "the power of speech is a gift as great as any that can be named...by means of words the secrets of the heart are brought to light, pain of soul is relieved, hidden grief is carried off, sympathy conveyed, counsel imparted, experience recorded, and wisdom perpetuated...by great authors the many are drawn up into unity, national character is fixed, a people speaks, the past and the future, the East and the West are brought into communication with each other" ("Literature" 33). A gift of communication that joins

the past and future, the East and West, makes possible humane understanding and knowledge. The best uses of language and writing reach beyond the individual and into the world. And that humane communication, Newman suggests, can foster a significant justice in the university and the world.

¹ Kolvenbach's talk, titled "The Service of Faith and the Promotion of Justice in Jesuit Higher Education," is available at www.scu.edu/news/releases/1000/kolvenbach_speech.html. We shall see that the third category presents Newman with the most difficulties. Kolvenbach too notes the difficulty of examining "our way of proceeding" in universities. He states, "If the measure of our universities is who the students become, and if the faculty are the heart of it all, then what is there left to say? It is perhaps the third topic, the character of our universities--how they proceed internally and how they impact on society--which is the most difficult."

² Newman is a bit vague about the specific ways in which the university relates to the larger community. His very series of lectures was of course delivered to an audience drawn from the larger community, and he attempts throughout to convince this community of the need for the proposed Catholic university. The implication is that the Catholic university will directly benefit these prominent citizens' children. But he is much more clear in presenting the university graduates in the world than he is the university in the world. Kolvenbach's suggestion, almost 150 years later, carries through on the trajectory Newman implies: "the university must be present intellectually where it is needed."

³ In the historian Solomon Modell's broader definition, imperialism is "a policy of extending a country's power beyond its own borders for the purpose of exploiting other lands and other peoples by establishing economic, social or political control over them" (529).

⁴ In hindsight, Newman's proposals do not seem outrageous: he proposed adding written exams to the standard oral examinations; he proposed that students should be able to see their teachers outside of the lecture halls, and that students should be able to ask their teachers for further help--rather like our office hours. Students could theoretically seek such meeting with faculty members, but the standard practice was that one faculty member would lecture the students and a separate faculty member would answer any questions students might have (Culler 52-79).

⁵ Newman granted great power to writers to create language, but suggested that most of the creation had occurred in the past. He suggests gloomily that the English language itself is moribund: "the language has become in a great measure stereotype; as in the case of the human frame, it has expanded to the loss of its elasticity" (197). In other words, English has become so fixed, so overweight and unbendable, that writers can no longer stretch and shape the language to form great works. Newman's own works, as well as many others, complicate this assessment.

⁶ Bernard Levin, in *The Story of English*, provides a virtuoso example of Shakespeare's presence in our language: "If you cannot understand my argument, and declare "It's Greek to me", you are quoting Shakespeare; if you claim to be more sinned against than sinning, you are quoting Shakespeare; if you recall your salad days, you are quoting Shakespeare; if you act more in sorrow than in anger, if your wish is father to the thought, if your lost property has vanished into thin air, you are quoting Shakespeare; if you have ever refused to budge an inch or suffered from green-eyed jealousy, if you have played fast and loose, if you have been tongue-tied, a tower of strength, hoodwinked or in a pickle, if you have knitted your brows, made a virtue of necessity, insisted on fair play, slept not one wink, stood on ceremony, danced attendance (on your lord and master), laughed yourself into stitches, had short shrift, cold comfort or too much of a good thing, if you have seen better days or lived in a fool's paradise - why, be that as it may, the more fool you, for it is a foregone conclusion that you are (as good luck would have it) quoting Shakespeare." (Bernard Levin. From *The Story of English*. Robert McCrum, William Cran and Robert MacNeil. Viking: 1986).

⁷ Like it or not, literature shapes our language and our thinking. Newman doesn't necessarily like it. He suggests that writers can "seduce" people into sin with images of worldly temptation, and that even when English writers present faith and religion they create something dangerous to Catholic readers. "[S]o tyrannous is the literature of a nation" that English literature will always be Protestant because its great writers have been Protestant (189). He concludes that Catholic writers in English must use the language and literature they have inherited--that is, a subtly Protestant language and literature--to write about Catholic subjects. Creating an English Catholic Literature sounds daunting when viewed this way, but that is exactly what Newman is doing with his larger model of the university, using tools that have at times created constraints to create new freedoms. And we know that Newman is wrong when he says there can be no such thing as an English Catholic literature.

⁸ The Torres Strait stands between Papua New Guinea and Northeastern Australia. "Mainland" Papua New Guinea occupies the eastern half of the large island (the western half remains the Indonesian colony Irian Jaya). PNG once formed two separate colonies, in the north the German-held New Guinea, and in the south the British- and Australian-held Papua. When World War I ended, Australia controlled the former German New Guinea and administered the territory under a League of Nations mandate. Australia administered Papua and New Guinea separately until the end of World War II, when the U.N. granted Australia the right to combine the two territories and administer them jointly.

⁹ Here Kasaipwalova obviously repeats the word "plenty" to intensify the description of the numbers of white people who are arriving. But, more significantly, he uses the grammar of Tok Pisin to shape his narrator's English. The technique of reduplication in Tok Pisin provides emphasis. Thus, *bikpela* means *big* and *bikpela bikpela* means *very big*.

¹⁰ In a brief memoir on his education in PNG, “The Need for a Cultural Programme: Personal Reflections” (1974), Nelson Giraure notes, “The chewing of betelnut in any form was disallowed. This was considered by Europeans to be a filthy, disgusting habit. No one seemed to realize that in village communities throughout Papua New Guinea the habit of chewing betelnut was an important social custom and European teachers never failed to remind us what a dirty habit it was. This was told to us as they ground their cigarette butts into the floor and blew their smoke into our faces” (64).

¹¹ Kasaipwalova refers to a fourth language, namely Strine or Australian English (characterized by its abbreviations and transliterations of words from Aboriginal languages), but he does not directly portray his narrator or characters speaking Strine.

¹² *Em i lukim mipela* means *he sees us* and *Mipela i lukim em* means *we see him* (or *we see her*). In the first case, the plural pronoun appears as the direct object, in English indicated by *us*; in the second, as the subject, or *we*. True to the form of Tok Pisin pronouns, many of Kasaipwalova’s collective pronouns in the narrator’s colloquial English follow the pattern of using one word to indicate both *we* and *us*. Thus, “He was making *we* feel like *we* was some ‘bad cowboys’ or criminals,” “He starts walking away and threatening *we*,” and “The cars and the lorry was all for *we* three university students” (614, 616, 617). Standard English would use the word *us* instead of each italicized instance of *we*. But Kasaipwalova structures the narrative voice so that English pronouns follow the grammatical rules of Tok Pisin pronouns.)

¹³ *Yumi* is an inclusive form of *we*, encompassing *you and I* (both the auditor and speaker). And *mipela* is an exclusive form of *we*, that indicates *our group*, separate from you (the auditor). *Yumi i kaikai buwa* means *we (you and I) are chewing betel nut*. *Mipela i kaikai buwa* means *we (but not you) are chewing betel nut*. As noted above, the reader occupies a productive and uncertain place in relation to the student group, sympathetic but not quite part of that collective. Kasaipwalova’s English reaches toward Tok Pisin’s differentiated collective pronouns. At only one point in the story does Kasaipwalova make it clear that his narrator employs an exclusive plural pronoun. When the narrator describes what “all of *we* can see” in the “white papa dog” he responds to his own fear by laughing, and states, “Maybe if you seen him too, *ei*, you will really laugh” (615). At that point, Kasaipwalova points toward the exclusive pronoun *mipela* that clearly separates the auditor or reader from the reported action.

¹⁴ For every pronoun but *mi*, *yu*, and *yumi* (*we* [inclusive]), *i* serves as a predicate verb marker. Thus, *Mi lukim balus* or *I see the airplane*; *Em i lukim balus* or *He/She sees the airplane*; *Ol i lukim balus* or *They see the airplane*; *Yu bin lukim balus* or *You saw the airplane*. In the final example, *bin* indicates time, specifically an event that has already taken place, and is an example of one of the auxiliary markers that allows a speaker to clarify the time, aspect, or modality of the action.

¹⁵ “[H]e *comes* up to one our people,” “Then we all *comes* to that backyard corner,” and “They *comes* marching up to we and our people” (614, 614, 617). Second person singular, first person plural, and second person plural take the same verb form (the one

reserved in standard English for second person singular). Using the same verb form regardless of person or number accomplishes at least two things. Again, the narrator's Tok Pisin directs the form that his English takes. And omitting the temporal marker or past tense provided in standard English makes the action occur in an ongoing continuous present. In this way, Kasaipwalova conveys that the narrator and his people occupy the time of the listener or reader. The narrator's background in Tok Pisin continues to transform his colloquial English.

¹⁶ Oladejo suggests that his study of English in Papua New Guinea supports Phillipson's work, which he describes as "the powerful proposition of Phillipson's (1992) ESL [English as a Second Language] conspiracy theory" (615).

¹⁷ Ellmann in his massive biography of Joyce also notes Joyce's lifelong admiration of Newman's writing. In a 1905 letter to his brother Stanislaus, Joyce says Newman and Renan are the great masters of prose style. In Part II of the *Portrait of the Artist* Stephen declares that Newman is the greatest writer and in the same episode tells Heron that Joyce presents a discussion of Newman. Heron asks Stephen who the greatest writer is, and Stephen declares for Newman. In the same episode Stephen tells Heron that the greatest poet is Byron and, even when accused of heresy by the other young men, refuses to recant. (Ellmann states that Byron and Newman remained the greatest writers for Joyce throughout his life.) The episode is presented in a novel of course, and a writer is not his characters; but like much in the *Portrait* the episode did happen to Joyce when he was about 16, and is recorded independently by Stanislaus.